Introduction

RICHARD ASHDOWNE & CAROLINNE WHITE

The use of Latin in the medieval world is so fundamental a fact that it is commonly not remarked upon and rarely discussed in detail. Yet both the fact of its continued use in Europe after the demise of the Roman Empire and the broad extent of that use—chronological, geographical, and functional—are remarkable. For more than a thousand years after the end of the Roman Empire people across Europe used the Latin language for a wide array of functions: different people, at different times, for different purposes, all using in essence recognisably the same language in their various circumstances yet exhibiting linguistic variation in its use as they did so. The Latin language in its medieval context thus forms a nexus of internal variation in usage (vocabulary, grammar, spelling, etc) and external variation in distribution (over time, place, and function).

While such twin variation is the ordinary state of affairs for living languages used by native speakers, its existence for Latin in the medieval world is of particular note. By that time Latin was not its users' native language but exclusively a 'second' language.[1] Moreover, for them Latin was also primarily a written language, its oral uses being chiefly confined to limited domains, especially ones closely allied to writing (e.g. the recitation aloud of prepared texts such as the liturgy): spontaneous conversation was instead normally carried out in native vernacular language(s). Both these facts might be expected to have militated against the survival of Latin altogether and especially against its exhibiting variation of this kind: it is observable across languages that diversity and frequency of oral use are important for linguistic

[1] Studies of multilingual individuals distinguish their native 'L1' language(s), acquired through the natural child language acquisition processes beginning in infancy, of which children may acquire one or more depending on their circumstances, from 'L2' languages learned, sometimes aided by explicit instruction, after the age for L1 acquisition has passed. The difference is generally considered a qualitative one in how L1 and L2 languages operate as systems in their users' minds, but it is most clearly seen in such areas as the different processes of acquisition and the different types of error made by L1 and L2 users during acquisition. L2 users may, however, develop a very high level of fluency and performance in the language that is quantitatively close to L1 native competence.

Proceedings of the British Academy, **206**, 1–57.

variation to arise and spread; conversely, written usage very often has a tendency to conservatism (i.e. a slowness to admit innovation, on which variation largely depends). The continued use of Latin in the medieval world is therefore doubly significant.

Moreover, the use of Latin should be of particularly wide interest to modern scholars because its extensive use means it bears on the entire spectrum of human activity: insofar as human life consists to a high degree in interaction between people and inasmuch as language has a correspondingly central role by enabling people to interact, there is scarcely a field of human activity in the medieval world in which Latin is not significant in some way, either for its presence and usage or for its absence in favour of another language.

This volume sets out to examine the contexts for, and formed by, the use of Latin in the medieval world. By considering the existence and nature of the complex diversity of usage of that Latin, we aim to highlight its diversity and show how bringing together perspectives and examining the broad context when looking at any individual area of use can enhance our understanding of Medieval Latin in general as well as be revealing for the particular material under consideration.

In addition to developing this holistic approach to Latin in the medieval period, the present collection has an aim beyond the methodological: namely, to focus attention especially on the Latin of medieval Britain. Not only does this make sense as a test case from a methodological perspective, in view of the richly multilingual situation of Britain in the Middle Ages that constitutes one important aspect of context for the language; it also highlights a body of Medieval Latin that, despite the extent of its survival and use, seems especially neglected even by comparison with Latin elsewhere in the medieval period and the other contemporary languages of Britain.

Since some of the neglect of broad context and of British Medieval Latin seems to us to derive from specialists in particular areas of medieval studies not looking outside their various fields or not feeling confident to do so, the main function of this introductory chapter is to set the scene, providing the background to open up to a fresh audience some of the areas dealt with by our contributors; we also suggest ways in which the various studies relate to one another. We begin with a brief overview of the contents of the volume (§1). We then discuss the boundaries and scope of the volume (§2) and give an outline of the nature and use of Latin in medieval Britain (§3); finally we consider the previous attention given to the Latin of the medieval period and of Britain in particular (§4), before summing up the main issues to be considered (§5).

1. Overview

The present collection is not intended to be a comprehensive account of the Latin of medieval Britain but rather a selective illustrative representation of the diversity to be observed in the use of the language, examined with regard to the effects of various types of context that influenced the writers who wrote Latin in this period. Contexts inherently overlap and interact, as is clear in very many of the chapters that follow, and so although the material is divided into three parts reflecting one type of grouping of contexts, in setting these out we would especially highlight the many connections, comparisons, similarities, and differences that can also be observed in chapters across the three parts.

1.1 Part I

The first part of this collection consists of chapters that examine the use of Latin and the Latin literary tradition in four periods within our chronological bounds of the 6th to 16th centuries (§2.1 below). David Howlett looks at some of the key features of the early development of the Latin (Hiberno-, Cambro-, and Anglo-Latin) tradition in the British Isles, focusing on the way different elements, such as the Classical and Biblical, the Irish and the Continental, the Celtic, Saxon, and Norse, came together to produce a vibrant and distinctive cultural tradition running through the works of such writers as Gildas, Bede, and Alcuin, which went on to become oft-cited classics in their own right. He stresses that, although there was a continuous tradition of Latin learning from the Romano-British period, later inhabitants of these islands needed to learn Latin as a second language alongside the Celtic, Germanic, or Scandinavian vernacular and therefore developed, as did the Irish, grammars and glossaries to assist them. Howlett points both to cultural unity and to regional differences, as well as to some of the variations in the Latin caused by historical factors, such as the observation that the Latin charters of the 9th century reveal a poor knowledge of Latin, attributable to the Viking destruction of centres of Latin learning.

Neil Wright examines the use of classical literary allusions by two key authors from the 12th century: the historian and hagiographer, William of Malmesbury, and the epic poet, Joseph of Exeter. The examples demonstrate how these authors are particularly attracted by the satirical and grotesque in post-Augustan writers such as Juvenal, Lucan, and Suetonius, alluding to them to enrich their own texts in subtle and original ways for the entertainment of their learned readers.

Considering the diversity of functions for Latin is at the heart of Wendy Childs' examination of two sets of 14th-century texts: namely, chronicles and customs accounts. She demonstrates how chroniclers continue the tradition of learned allusion and rhetorical style in their accounts of such subjects as Edward II's relationship with Piers Gaveston or the Peasants' Revolt of 1381, while also incorporating neologisms relevant to their contemporary world, whereas the customs accounts, despite being written in a plain and formulaic language by less highly educated merchants and port authorities and offering a wealth of neologisms based on vernacular words for commodities, nevertheless present a grammatically accurate Latin, albeit often abbreviated as was the accepted style in accounts of this period.

To conclude the first part of the volume, Robert Swanson looks at the especially neglected role of Latin in the late medieval and early modern period, making a strong case for the continued importance of the language in this era, and indeed its expansion with the coming of printed texts, contrary to what is often assumed. Swanson highlights the massive presence of Latin, not just that being produced at the time but that which survived from all preceding eras, and stresses that although knowledge of Latin across the range of skills of reading (with or without understanding), writing (copying or composing), listening and speaking may have varied enormously across the population and that despite the increasing use of English in the period between 1400 and 1530, Latin still had a living presence at many levels and in many social contexts.

What emerges from all four chapters in the first part is a core of continuity in the use of Latin, tempered with adaptation to the linguistic situation of the period in question with increasing influence of the vernaculars, particularly in the post-Conquest period: the subject of adaptation is developed further in the chapters of the third part. The questions of tradition, what was read as well as what was written, education, and genre recur throughout these chapters.

1.2 Part II

The theme of a balance between continuity and the production of new ways to express oneself in Latin is present again in the second part, in which chapters look at the context formed by what the language was being used for: they examine its use in some defined areas as well as the development of technical terms in certain genres, particularly in the hugely productive period after the Norman Conquest. Paul Brand looks at the development of legal Latin within English Common Law, concentrating first on words for the participants in the court case, which demonstrate semantic shift in classical words such as *justicia* and the use of terms borrowed from or calqued on vernacular, primarily

Anglo-Norman, words; second he focuses on terms for and in writs, which were such an essential element of the legal process, linking the royal court with local courts. In the following chapter Leofranc Holford-Strevens sheds as much light as possible on the Latin words and usages peculiar to English writers on musical theory from the mid-12th to the 15th century, grappling with the lack of harmony in the names of the authors as well as in the musical terms themselves, particularly in the areas of plainchant and staff notation, including the vexed question of the ways in which the different lengths of notes were indicated. Despite the differences between authors and between English and Continental musical theory, there is evidence that English music was appreciated and influential on the Continent for a time in the first half of the 15th century. Carolinne White takes the Latin in some texts and documents from a variety of genres all in some way linked to the killing of Archbishop Thomas Becket at Canterbury in 1170, from saints' lives to wills, poetry to charters and accounts, chosen from the huge number of extant materials relating to the church in medieval Britain. In them she finds a mixture of styles and lexical forms, from those that would have been familiar to Classical and early Christian writers (the latter including words taken from Greek and Hebrew to express specifically Christian concepts), to those that underwent a semantic shift as well as new terms fashioned from the vernaculars. By this means she seeks to demonstrate that not even ecclesiastical Latin, let alone Medieval Latin as a whole, can be considered to have been as rigidly modelled on the Latin of the early church as is often taken to be the case: it displays variety of register and social context as well as of genre, including ways in which women acted within a Latin context—an area touched on by Swanson in his chapter in part I. In the final chapter of the second part, Charles Burnett considers an aspect of the language of scientific discourse, focusing on the use of Arabic terms introduced into British Latin by British writers of the 12th and early-13th centuries in their translations from Arabic scholarly texts and writings on astronomy, astrology, alchemy, and natural science. Contact with Arabic led to different ways of handling or expressing the foreign terms: at first the individual Arabic word remained in Arabic script, but in later texts it appeared transliterated and either kept separate from the Latin text or incorporated into Latin with or without Latin suffixes, or a Latin word (or a certain sense of a Latin word) is calqued on the Arabic (a method with the potential to lead to misunderstanding if the Arabic word and/or the Latin word has a range of meanings, only one of which is relevant to the scientific context). An example of an Arabic word incorporated into the text is *elmuarifa*, used by Adelard as a synonym for the Latin *irregularis*: as Holford-Strevens notes in his chapter, this word also occurs in a British writer's work on musical theory to describe a lozenge-shaped note.

1.3 Part III

While part II concentrates on the observable effects on Latin associated with its use in certain, often technical, genres, the effect of other languages on Latin is also seen (as indeed also in part I in the chapters by Howlett, Childs, and Swanson). Part III tackles the questions raised by the linguistic context still more directly by considering language contact between Latin and contemporary local vernacular languages in view of the different forms of multilingualism of Britain found in different places and at different times. Several authors in part III consider the effects on the Latin while many also consider the native languages.

The coexistence of Latin alongside 'English' was of course still relatively new in our period with the advent of the Anglo-Saxons, as was its subsequent coexistence with Anglo-Norman French. However, one area of Britain in which there had been continuity since native-speaking antiquity was Wales, which remained Celtic-speaking as it had been during the Roman era. Paul Russell looks at the particular nature of Latin in medieval Wales: using examples both in Latin and in Welsh he shows that mutual influence between Welsh and Latin is detectable in chronicles and legal texts in the period 1197–1250 which have hitherto not received the same scholarly attention as earlier texts from Wales.

Richard Sharpe looks at the recognition of official, and indeed unofficial, substitutions of Latin terminology for corresponding pre- and post-Conquest vernacular terminology, a very particular kind of relationship between languages at the level of individual words. Looking in detail at examples associated with certain ranks and offices (such as thegn, shire, earl, and reeve) in arguably equivalent texts (translations, paraphrases, and other less clearly parallel texts) and taking account of other contextual evidence he shows how there are real challenges for the modern reader in recognising and interpreting their Latin representations, especially in the case of non-standard classicising substitutions. There are interesting parallels to be drawn between this kind of technical usage in the domain of government and the examples discussed in part II.

Laura Wright takes us forward to the 14th century to examine an example of a document in the mixed language register that was characteristic of business documents at this period, where English and French words appear in a Latin matrix in a form of code-switching. Her chapter, which includes a brief account of code-switching in medieval Britain from the time of the Norman Conquest, deals primarily with the question of why the vernacular words, such as words for gutters and nails, are often unintegrated in otherwise Latin documents, i.e. they are not given a Latin suffix or any form of abbreviation; statistics of different usages are given for this particular set of accounts (with

an appendix of unintegrated terms dated by year of appearance in the accounts), which reveal that a change occurs around the year 1390. She also touches on the problems for lexicographers of dealing with words that are first found in other languages, and of words whose form creates linguistic ambiguity, problems also mentioned by Trotter and by Durkin and Schad in their chapters in relation to Anglo-Norman and English dictionaries.

David Trotter bases his chapter on his observation of the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* (*DMLBS*) as a repository of words of Germanic origin, related by complex etymological routes to both English (before and after the Norman Conquest) and Anglo-Norman, which influence Latin, particularly after the Conquest. He shows that because of the way the vernaculars developed and the nature of the extant evidence, it is often the case that the earliest evidence for an English or French word is found embedded in a Latin word. He provides many examples of the circuitous and overlapping interaction between these languages but focuses on the fascinating example of *warda*, showing, by reference to the theory of *etimologia prossima* and *etimologia remota*, how the Latin word must be analysed with regard both to etymology and semantics in order to reveal the different layers of influence at different stages of the word's development in this multilingual society. Etymology is equally at the heart of the chapter by Philip Durkin and Samantha Schad of the *Oxford English Dictionary* (*OED*) etymological team, showing with myriad examples what evidence is provided by the *DMLBS* that is particularly illuminating of the history of English for the *OED*: this includes Latin evidence for previously unattested forms of the etymon of an English word or for the borrowing of Greek or Arabic words having been made via Latin rather than direct; it includes Latin words displaying a degree of morphological naturalisation in English, such as 'the specialist vocabularies of various technical fields', as for instance the vocabulary of alchemy (which harks back to Burnett's chapter in part II). They also consider Latin words and phrases adopted into English without morphological adaptation, touching on the question of code-switching and mirroring the material presented by Laura Wright where vernacular words were similarly adopted into Latin, while in section 5 they consider calques, already mentioned by Burnett in connection with Arabic.

In the final chapter, David Howlett reviews the making of the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* and how he and colleagues addressed some of the challenges met in the course of its compilation, many of which pick up on issues and themes from throughout this collection, especially ones arising from the multilingual context.

2. Scope

Since comprehensive treatment of the huge extent of the use of Latin after the end of the Roman Empire would of course be impossible in a single book, we have defined some overall boundaries for this volume. These offer two further benefits. First, boundaries serve to provide a sharper focus, setting up a body of Latin that is broad enough, and yet not too broad, to offer the possibility of meaningful comparisons in different perspectives and approaches. Second, since the boundaries demarcate our material from other material that consequently forms part of the external context to the use of Latin in medieval Britain, their elucidation illuminates some of the contextual issues that we wish to bring to the fore.

2.1 'Britain' and 'Medieval'

This volume takes inspiration for its particular British focus from the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*. The completion of the *DMLBS* in print in 2013, after a century of work, was marked by a conference in Oxford under the title 'Latin in Medieval Britain: sources, language, and lexicography', at which many of the contributors to this volume gave papers that appear here in revised form.[2] For the *DMLBS* the geographical scope, which we also adopt for this collection, is the Latin of the largest of the British Isles, i.e. Great Britain, and the smaller islands surrounding it (excluding Ireland, except during a limited period).[3] Languages, of course, have their existence in places only insofar as they exist in people in those places. This geographical scope is thus interpreted as first and foremost the Latin of those who lived and worked in Britain, whether born there or having made Britain their temporary or permanent home: indeed, many very notable writers of Medieval Latin in Britain belong to the latter category, including Anselm and, among his predecessors at Canterbury, Lanfranc, and, centuries earlier, Theodore. It is also taken to encompass those whose Latin is known (or may be supposed) to have been learned in Britain, wherever they subsequently

[2] On the history of the *DMLBS* see Ashdowne (2010; 2014) and Howlett (this vol., ch. 15). We have encouraged our contributors to extend their chapters from their conference presentations, which were limited by the available time. The chapters by Carolinne White and Leofranc Holford-Strevens were not presented at the conference; papers were also given at the conference by Mary Garrison and Andy Orchard.

[3] Originally planned to include Ireland, the *DMLBS* largely omits Irish Latin, which is instead covered by the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from Celtic Sources* under preparation by the Royal Irish Academy. The main exception is material arising from English control of parts of Ireland. The early parts of the *DMLBS* also cite the works of the 9th-century writer John Scotus Eriugena, which were used to supply examples of usage from a period (mistakenly) felt to be insufficiently rich in evidence; this practice was discontinued in later fascicules as unnecessary.

worked: again many significant writers, such as Boniface and Alcuin, come under this heading. This criterion also brings in the many writers, often not known by name, who produced Latin documents in territories under the administration of the 'English' crown, including Normandy, the Channel Islands, Gascony, and Ireland during the relevant periods.

The geographical bounds themselves call for some comment. It might seem tempting to dismiss having a regional focus at all by pointing to the use of Latin across Europe through the Middle Ages and its coexistence there too with diverse native vernacular languages. Indeed, the inclusion of the Latin of 'Britons' working abroad and of those who came to Britain itself underlines the geographical linguistic continuity in Latin use of which Britain was arguably merely a part: people, and with them their languages, are inherently mobile not only as individuals but also as substantial populations (especially when a period of many centuries is under consideration),[4] and so the drawing of geographical borders when looking at linguistic matters is always difficult if they are not to appear arbitrary. Moreover, mobility of individuals in this instance is also bound up with the inherited wide area over which Latin had spread during its earlier native use in the Roman empire: part of what made Latin successful in surviving in regular use after its native era was that geographical range, which gave it a utility as a common language shared by people across a wide area who did not necessarily share another language.[5] However, adopting a regional focus for this collection allows many of the intersecting issues raised by the particular local historical social context of Britain to be considered alongside each other (e.g. Latin in the context of the English legal system, ch. 6, or government, ch. 11), and the approach offers a model for other studies of Latin in its various contexts around Europe by raising relevant kinds of question.

Nevertheless, one may still question how useful a geographical unit *Britain* is in the medieval period: obviously Britain as defined above geographically corresponds to no single coherent political or social entity during the entire period of the Middle Ages. Throughout our period (see below) the land and population of the main island, Great Britain, were divided among territories, and they were divided in different ways at different times. Even—indeed

[4] For Britain these would include most notably the Romans, Anglo-Saxons, Vikings, and Normans, among others.

[5] This was the case even though Latin was primarily a written language (but see also §3.1 below): to be more precise, its reach across peoples of differing native languages and the consequent potential for enabling communication enhanced its desirability or prestige (see also §2.2 below), and this in turn contributed to its continued use. A key component of its reach and prestige was its inherited position as the language of the Christian church in the West. We should also not overlook the fact that texts were 'mobile' too: as well as the obvious example of letters, written specifically for transmission, many other types of document and text were passed deliberately or incidentally from one place to another.

especially—in linguistic terms there was also great diversity in the local native vernacular languages in use at any one time, including varieties of English, Welsh, Norse, and French, and there was variation in their use. However, we see value in a regional focus on Britain in respect of Latin, and it is on linguistic grounds. Britain is an area where native Latin had previously been present across a wide area but where it did not survive in any area as a native language, being instead supplanted by other languages whether indigenous (e.g. Celtic) or introduced (e.g. Anglo-Saxon). This sets Britain's linguistic situation apart from much of mainland Europe, where native spoken Latin developed into the local native vernacular (Romance) languages. It also sets it apart from Ireland, never within the Roman empire and therefore outside the spread of native Latin.[6] Britain thus inherited and maintained a Latin tradition going back to native Roman use, but this took place in what turned out to be a historical and linguistic context that makes it of particular interest. For this reason, despite the indisputable and important continuities with the Latin of mainland Europe and the diversity of local vernacular varieties within Britain, there is good reason to focus on the Latin of Britain in the medieval period.

Like geographical boundaries, defined start and end dates also tend to obscure the inherently continuous nature of language use and especially of change in language. As hinted above, the *DMLBS*'s geographical bounds naturally inform its chronological limits, which extend beyond what might commonly be considered medieval, again on linguistic grounds. The starting point is Gildas' *De excidio Britanniae* from the mid-6th century, i.e. it comes from the period in which the population in this territory starts to find a new role for Latin as a solely non-native language. Continuities with the Latin of the earlier native-speaking Roman era are clearly detectible in grammar, vocabulary, style, and function,[7] but the position of Latin as an option for the

[6] The far north of Great Britain (Roman Caledonia) presents a particular challenge in also remaining outside the Roman domain. The full extent of Romanisation and of Latin use north of the frontier, marked at times by the walls of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, is not clear, though some have argued there is evidence of the influence of Latin on 'highland' Celtic during the Roman era, suggesting substantial contact with Latin (Schrijver 2002). In any case, the Latin of the area in medieval times would merit inclusion within Britain not only on grounds of geographical contiguity but in view of the intertwined histories of the peoples of Great Britain as a whole during our period. On the transmission of Latin to Ireland, see, e.g., Howlett (this vol., ch. 2). Latin in Roman Britain is discussed further below, §3.2.

[7] There are key questions about what we understand by Latin of the Roman era (or indeed any era, see §2.2.1 below). Although there is debate about the extent of the Latinisation of Britain and whether there were significant numbers of indigenous L1 (and especially monolingual) Latin speakers in Britain at any point during the Roman period, nevertheless the Roman presence and especially the legions over a long period certainly brought a substantial number of L1 (or highly competent L2) Latin speakers and established good communicative contact with the centre and the rest of the empire; on the multilingual character of the Roman army see Adams (2003). This

population underwent a relatively rapid shift in just a few generations in the new and changing linguistic situation resulting from, for instance, the departure of the Roman legions and the advent of the Anglo-Saxons.

At the other end of the *DMLBS*'s period comes the end of the House of Tudor on the throne of England at the conclusion of the reign of Elizabeth I. Although even by the time of the Reformation Britain was very different from how it had been in the earliest years after the end of the Roman empire, as indeed was the rest of Europe, Latin did still continue in use in Britain during the 16th century for many of its previous functions, including international communication (such as Thomas More's correspondence with Erasmus and others in mainland Europe) and administration such as formal record-keeping, now alongside English (as in, for instance, the new series of 'State Papers Domestic' inaugurated in the Tudor era).[8] Such continuity draws the 16th century into the purview of the *DMLBS* and so of this volume too, but it is a period during which a twofold linguistic transition is observable: that is, in both the role and the form of Latin. Just as the transition from (partly) native to (exclusively) non-native Latin can be taken as the start of the Latin of the medieval world, so the eventual supplanting of Latin by the vernacular in Britain by the end of Elizabeth's reign marks a clear step-change away from more than a thousand years of continuous use. As well as the much diminished range of functions for which Latin was regularly being employed (among which the near-total loss of religious usage following the Reformation and Henry VIII's separation of the Anglican church from Rome is particularly notable), the Renaissance and especially the influence of humanism also changed the form of Latin, breaking away from the continuity of inherited medieval usage to bring it much closer to the classical variety of antiquity from which it had descended.[9] Though Latin continued to be used in Britain beyond this time (indeed including by such notable writers as John Milton and Isaac Newton, and others right down to the present day), the changes in the form and functions of the language mean the 16th century can be seen as an end of the continuous tradition of Latin that started out in the years after the end of the Roman Empire.

Even in identifying an appropriate scope, then, we find a need to draw on interactions between time and space in order to capture a body of language

---

brought Roman Britain into contact with a broad spectrum of Latin use in different registers and functions. See also §3.2 below.

[8] e.g. MS TNA PRO SP 10 (Ed. VI); SP 11 (Mary); SP 12 etc. (Eliz. I).

[9] This was, of course, not the first renaissance attempting to restore Latin to something more like its classical form; reform of Latin had, for instance, also been a central part of the Carolingian renaissance in the 8th to 9th centuries. However, the Renaissance beginning from the 14th century arguably went much further in respect of the content of texts, rehabilitating the tradition and texts of (Roman) Classical Latin. However, see also §4 below.

use: what it makes sense to include or exclude geographically changes over time while a geographical definition that also incorporates that social and political dimension is vital in determining overall chronological bounds. Moreover, in turn linguistic factors inform both temporal and spatial bounds. Here we see one kind of interaction of context and language, and it lies at a macro level; the aim of this volume is to explore at a more detailed level some of the practical causes and consequences associated with these and other interactions of language and context as witnessed in material within our bounds.

2.2 'Latin'

Alongside bounds of time and space clearly linguistic matters are also crucial and we must consider what we understand by the term 'Latin', all the more so in view of our particular focus on the contexts of its use, of which contact with other languages forms a significant part. (Although contact between languages is more often thought of as the effects of the movement of people, bringing users of one language into contact with users of another, in the present section we concentrate primarily on relevant issues arising from the linguistic 'contact' within multilingual individuals in our context.) The question of what is Latin arises because as well as being able to choose to use different languages on different occasions (e.g. according to the language of their audience or their purpose in speaking/writing) users of multiple languages often introduce vocabulary or even grammatical features from one of their languages into their use of another, and the users of Latin in the medieval period, who all had native mastery of at least one other language, were no exception both in Britain and across Europe.

The particular set of new introductions into the language is of course one of the features that distinguish Medieval Latin from the earlier language, as is the apparently increased incidence of such contact effects compared with Latin during its former period of native use. Clearly the nature and extent of such effects are a prime matter of interest for a dictionary such as the *DMLBS*, for which the compilers must decide whether, for instance, a form (word, phrase, construction, etc) found in the evidence is 'in' the language described by the dictionary and should therefore be covered by it. While the question of what language a word, phrase, or even whole text is in may superficially seem a straightforward one that will very often have an obvious answer, not all examples are clearcut. The question in fact highlights the existence of significant graduality across texts as to which language (or variety) is being employed.

Indeed, this graduality goes far beyond how a word of, for instance, Old English or Anglo-Norman origin (e.g. OE *thegn* (see Sharpe, this vol., ch. 11), AN *rigoil* (L. Wright, this vol., ch. 12)) has been introduced into an otherwise

Latin text. Certainly such items can be introduced in various ways, some involving a greater degree of adaptation and integration into the language of the surrounding text (e.g. the addition of inflectional affixes), others a lesser degree. However, the status of an item as recognised to be an introduction from another language can itself change over time, potentially resulting in the item coming to be treated as part of the language, with its true origins more or less overlooked; this status may well correlate with the form of the item in question, such that change in the one comes to be reflected in change in the other.[10]

There is the whole further related functional question of language users' conscious or unconscious motivations for their choice of Latin, another language, or some mixture (and within mixed use, the motivations for the form of mixing used).

There are challenges, then, in setting bounds when dealing with a situation of language contact that led to texts which collectively—and often also individually—show graduality. The approach in this book is not so much to take a firm view on what is or is not 'Latin', nor on what 'ought to be considered Latin', as to discuss some of the forms of that graduality seen in our evidence and their connections with the contexts in which they arise.

We do, however, need to see what the dimensions of the continuum are, and so we may usefully here distinguish four broad areas of graduality seen in our evidence, all interrelated and all arising from the contact between Latin and other languages inherent in the position of Latin as a non-native language in our period and area: they are (a) 'language-internal' contact and the relationship of Medieval Latin to other varieties of Latin, especially the Classical language (§2.2.1 below); (b) the choice between Latin and vernacular, especially for different functions (§2.2.2); (c) the variable integration of vernacular elements within Latin texts, considered both quantitatively and qualitatively (§2.2.3); and (d) the emergence of a mixed 'interlanguage' as a communicative choice in its own right, appropriate to certain functions, to which Latin is a major contributor (§2.2.4). All four areas raise questions about contexts that lie at the heart of the many chapters in this collection that examine why writers chose to use Latin to the extent that they did for the purposes that they did. It is for this reason that we raise these areas here, although it is not our intention to imply that the multilingual nature of the context for our material is of greater interest or significance than the other contextual questions addressed in this collection, such as those relating to the content of what Medieval Latin writers were writing.

[10] See further §2.2.3 below. Compare, for instance, modern English *outrage*, borrowed from French *outrage* (ultimately a derivative from Latin *ultra*) but now commonly thought by native speakers to be a compound of *out* + *rage* and pronounced as such.

2.2.1 Latin: Classical, Vulgar, Late, and Medieval

A common modern approach to Medieval Latin is to compare it, typically unfavourably (see also §4 below), with the Latin of the Roman era, a period when Latin had native users. The comparison that is being made in this case, however, is generally with the better-known surviving evidence from that earlier period, and that evidence is self-evidently not a straightforward record of the everyday spoken language of the people of the Roman republic or empire; rather, it is the 'standard' Classical Latin language of literature, oratory, history, philosophy: that is, in the main the variety of the Roman elite writing in educated formal contexts. While a comparison of medieval and Classical texts is in any case often too simplistic to be fair by failing to separate out consideration of linguistic matters (such as accidence, syntax, vocabulary, and spelling) from literary ones (such as competence in verse form or rhetoric) and creativity or technical content (such as historical accuracy, philosophical rigour, or scientific prowess), the linguistic aspect of such comparison points to our first area of graduality in language. Certainly not all Latin of the medieval period adheres to all the norms of the standard Classical language: texts do so to a greater or lesser degree. We thus need to examine the relationships between these varieties, and their origins are key to understanding the issues.

As an ordinary everyday language the Latin of the Roman era had, we may be sure, variation of all the kinds we find in languages used today by substantial, socially diverse, geographically spread populations (differences according to such factors as age, sex, social status, level of education, and register, as well as regional differences, and, of course, changes over time). It is well known, however, that the surviving evidence for the Latin of this period presents a very limited picture in this respect, showing remarkably little variation. Those who learned to write were, of course, only a portion of the population; by definition they were the better educated part and as such not representative of the whole. Moreover, what people choose to commit to writing cannot be expected to be representative of the full range of human interactions for which any native language is used. Finally, there is also the loss of evidence over the intervening centuries due to the variable durability of different writing materials on the one hand and to the various choices and chance events that determined what written texts people preserved, even those considered of enduring value.[11] However, beyond the paucity and partly self-selected, partly accidental nature of the material that survives, there is a

[11] Several issues arise here: for instance, much writing will have been of only ephemeral significance and not considered worth keeping; the choice to keep things and, in the case of some types of text, produce multiple copies may often reflect popularity and fashion as much as intrinsic merit or interest.

further, more powerful, cause of the appearance of homogeneity in written Latin of the Roman era: namely, the emergence of a prestigious standard variety of the language in the late republic, Classical Latin.

This is not the place for rehearsing in detail the standardisation process by which Classical Latin originally arose.[12] However, a key part of this process was the sociolinguistic prestige that was associated with the variety: this prestige reflected the social status of the people who 'created' and used it and the functions for which they used it, and it was made manifest in the desire of others to emulate this elite group and adopt the features of the Classical variety, particularly when writing and in contexts that might be considered formal. The surviving evidence for Latin of the Roman era after the advent of the Classical form very often comes from the kinds of source that we expect to show attempts to meet that standard and so exhibits relatively little variation: an intrinsic part of standardisation is the 'selection' and promotion of a single form for any given function and the elimination of alternatives through stigmatisation and avoidance.

In the wider everyday language (that is, outside the formal usage of the elite), which we may conveniently refer to as 'Vulgar Latin', we may suppose the existence of considerably more variation and change.[13] Hints of this can

[12] See for instance Clackson & Horrocks (2007: 77–228) or Clackson (2011).

[13] Though in a strict sense unproblematic for referring to the Latin language of the ordinary people (*vulgus*), 'vulgar' is today widely and rightly felt to be an unsatisfactory term for the everyday Latin language for several reasons. First, there is the negative value judgement that it may seem to imply, stigmatised by comparison with the desirability of the prestigious standard Classical language. This is compounded by 'Vulgar' being most reasonably used in opposition to 'Classical': while the latter can, with due caution, sensibly be used of a definable variety of Latin, 'Vulgar Latin' in this context is not a unitary phenomenon but, like Latin in general, a continuum of varieties. Third, inasmuch as they are all Latin, there are of course very substantial overlaps between Classical and Vulgar Latin varieties defined in this way; moreover, while a theoretical division may be made between Classical and the rest, real uses of the language would regularly have consisted of a mix of features from the Classical variety, ones from the non-Classical, and features found in both (and so not markers of either). Fourth, there is the understandable tendency for both terms to be used to refer to historical periods of Latin use, even though Classical Latin continued from its first invention down to the Renaissance (and beyond) and even though an everyday language had existed, changing and varying, before the emergence of Classical Latin and continued to vary and change over the centuries after, eventually becoming the daughter Romance languages. Finally, related to this last point, there is the tendency, especially in the context of discussing the transformation into the daughter languages, to compare 'Vulgar' Latin to the Classical variety by reference to 'changes' between the Classical and Vulgar varieties (implicitly or explicitly from the former to the latter), where 'differences' would be a more appropriate term (or, in the early period of standardisation, changes from Vulgar to Classical).

However, while other apparently more precise terms such as 'colloquial' (e.g. the papers in Dickey & Chahoud 2010 with references) or 'sub-elite' are fitting for particular discussions of varieties of the everyday Latin of the Roman era, our interest here does lie precisely in the opposition between Classical as prestige standard and all the other native usage, without prejudice to the variation and change within them; we therefore retain the term 'Vulgar Latin' in

be seen in various ancient sources, especially ones in which the writer's attempts to meet the Classical norm are unsuccessful through error or ignorance or ones in which the writer has for some reason chosen not to aim at that norm.[14] We also see the reflexes in the later Romance daughter languages of forms and patterns that must be supposed to have been present in their Latin ancestor but cannot be traced back to the attested Classical standard: they point to features we must infer instead to have been in the everyday language of speech and informal writing from which Classical Latin differentiated itself.[15]

The high status of the Classical language in the period in which it first arose contributed significantly to its enduring prestige and continued existence through to the medieval world and beyond in two related respects: first, the attitude of valuing this variety was itself passed on from generation to generation (even as the divergence grew between the changing, variable everyday language and the fixed standard, and as acquisition of this 'Latin' therefore became increasingly dependent on education); second, the quality of the content of works written in the Classical variety also meant they were transmitted and admired not only for their linguistic features but for their own merit, whether literary, historical, philosophical, or in any other field, and this made them desirable models for subsequent writers in respect of both content and language.

Alongside these prestigious Classical works, there are two other groups of written works that we may see to have had special importance for Latin in the medieval world because of the direct or indirect exposure to them that the users of Latin in medieval times had: namely, the Latin grammatical tradition and the works of the early Christian church.

The Latin grammatical tradition—writings about language and its use in general, and about the Latin language and its use in particular, including the works of Varro in the early days of Classical Latin and subsequently the works of Quintilian (1st century AD), Donatus (4th century), and Priscian (end of 5th century), among many others—contributed significantly to its users'

---

our discussion here, aware of the many difficulties, so as to highlight the fact that there is more to Latin in its native era than the Classical variety with which many modern readers of Latin from the medieval period onwards may unwittingly identify the term Latin. See also Versteegh (2002). Besides the work of Adams (n. 14 below), on Vulgar Latin see also Herman (2000).

[14] See, e.g., Clackson & Horrocks (2007: 229–64). Indispensable on variation of all kinds in Latin is the extensive and detailed work of J. N. Adams (esp. 2003; 2007; 2013). Much of his work highlights the detectible effects on Latin of contact with the local languages of the areas that the Romans conquered and movement of people from those areas; though we think primarily of L1 Latin in the Roman era, we should not overlook the extent of L2 Latin in 'bilingualism' during the period.

[15] Clackson & Horrocks (2007: 265–304) introduce some of the issues; see also Varvaro (2013), who also considers the spread of Latin across Western Europe, including Britain, and the works by Adams cited above (n. 14).

knowledge and view of the language.[16] Codification of the language in its Classical form—a combination of description and prescription of its accepted forms and usages—can be seen as responding to an on-going demand for guidance on how to produce (and, indeed, understand) Latin that met the standard; moreover, as well as aiming to satisfy that demand, these works must also have contributed to promoting the status and prestige of Latin, especially in its codified form, and to increasing the demand.[17] The direct significance of these texts for the Latin of the medieval world can, for instance, be seen powerfully in Alcuin's use of Priscian's *Institutiones grammaticae* in developing his textbooks at the time of the Carolingian renaissance (see e.g. Law 2003: 146). Nor is this an isolated instance. Linguistic works of one kind or another survive from throughout our period in Britain, from Aldhelm's works on verse *De metris* and *De pedum regulis* and Bede's *De arte metrica* and *De orthographia* to the grammar of Ælfric, the *Colloquia* of Ælfric Bata, and Abbo of Fleury's *Quaestiones grammaticales*, all in the Anglo-Saxon period,[18] and then after the Norman Conquest, for instance, the works of Geoffrey de Vinsauf (ob. 1208) and Thomas Linacre's *De emendata structura Latini sermonis* (1524) with numerous others in between. Admittedly, many of these works deal more with style or literary technique than grammar in the narrow sense of accidence and syntax, and their fidelity to actual Classical norms in what they say (and in their own use of the language) varies from text to text, but together with practical manuals (such as *Dictamen* and *Ars notaria* both *c.*1400), their compilation still bears witness to a continuing desire to do the 'appropriate' thing with or in the Latin language, and they show that at least some writers felt a need for guidance in doing so, most likely because this Latin was not the language of their everyday speech. Similarly we should note the medieval tradition of lexical aids, both monolingual and bilingual, from the glosses on Aldhelm's prose *De virginitate* to Osbern of Gloucester's *Derivationes* (late 12th century), the *Promptorium parvulorum* (1440), the *Catholicon Anglicum* (1483), and Peter Levins' *Manipulus vocabulorum* (1570), among others; these too attest a need, perceived or actual, for linguistic assistance in respect of Latin.[19] Thus, whether medieval users strove to use the

[16] On these various authors and their works see Law (2003: 58–93).

[17] Haugen (1966) identifies codification as an important part of the emergence of a standard language.

[18] Gwara (1998) discussing Bata observes effects of English on Latin arising as a result of the acquisition of Latin as a second language by native users of English. See also Wright (2011) on Abbo.

[19] See also §2.2.3 below on bilingual linguistic texts. Howlett (this vol., ch. 2) discusses the start of the lexicographical tradition in Britain with reference to glosses from the Anglo-Saxon period. The examples mentioned here are British, but similar instances could be cited from elsewhere in Europe; indeed Osbern's work can be seen to follow Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae* and Osbern's work in turn was drawn on by Uguccione of Pisa for his *Derivationes*.

Classical language according to the norms of Classical antiquity or the norms they believed the Classical language to have had, or simply wished to use what would be considered to be good Latin in their own time without interest in the extent this reflected the Classical language's norms, all these texts were important in enabling them to do so and influential in encouraging them to do so.[20]

Fundamental too was the Latin of the early Christian church, including the works of the Church Fathers and especially the Latin translations of the Bible, which culminated in Jerome's version, later known as the Vulgate, and the Latin liturgy.[21] Although these texts are only a subset of what is termed 'Late' Latin (a chronological designation of quite nebulous bounds, but often taken to encompass roughly the 3rd to the 6th or 7th centuries AD) and they are variable in their adherence to Classical norms,[22] they subsequently occupied a critical position with regard to their content and they were accordingly influential in respect of their language. They were essential texts through

[20] The importance of the grammatical tradition is especially bound up with the role of education as needed for Latin as an L2 language. The nature of education in respect of Latin in the medieval world raises many questions: who was learning or being taught what, how, and for what purposes. The answers to these clearly vary according to period and place even within our bounds. We discuss the most important aspects in §3 below.

[21] There were points of contact between these texts and the Latin grammatical tradition, e.g. in Jerome (said to have been Donatus' pupil), Augustine (whose early writings include a treatise on grammar, Bonnet 2013), and, at the very end of the Late Latin period, Isidore of Seville (whose early-7th-century *Etymologiae* transmitted Classical, grammatical, and Patristic material and became a fundamental reference textbook down to the Renaissance).

[22] While Classical and Vulgar are unsatisfactory as chronological terms with reference to Latin (see n. 13 above), the difficulty with 'Late' Latin is that it designates chronologically the diverse and still-changing varieties of the everyday language, the written language of the educated which met or approached the Classical standard, and everything in between. There is, however, a tendency to overlook the more Classical usage of the period and concentrate instead on the non-Classical features, especially when seeking evidence for the diversification of the everyday language into the daughter Romance varieties during the period; similarly, those interested in Vulgar Latin have often paid considerable attention to texts of the Late Latin period because many texts surviving from this period show non-Classical features: certainly some writers did have a less strong grasp on the inherited Classical standard, knowledge of that standard in general may not have been accurate, and there may well have been a greater acceptability of texts not strictly adhering to it. Still, the relationship between Classical and other varieties of Latin in this period is just as complex and interesting as in other periods and it is of enduring importance in respect of these particular texts. For instance, Herman (2000: 23–4) shows how some non-Classical uses are found in the early Latin Bible translations in places where Jerome's Vulgate translation uses a Classical form; but while noting the high level of education and linguistic capability of Augustine and Jerome, Herman also observes in the Latin of Christianity the development of a new stylistic tradition that included non-Classical features (from, for example, spoken usage), reflecting a desire to remain accessible and not stray too far from the familiar language of contemporary Christians, especially in sermons or other texts directed towards them. For an introduction to Late Latin, see Adams (2011) or Clackson & Horrocks (2007: 265–304). On Patristic Latin see White (2015).

the whole medieval era, heard every day in monastic and other ecclesiastical contexts, which were the very settings in which many medieval writers learnt their Latin and, indeed, went on to use it; the language of these texts was therefore a form of Latin with which the later users of the language frequently came into contact.[23]

From this historical background came three important medieval consequences of the linguistic story that began with the emergence of Classical Latin. First and foremost, the very emergence of Classical Latin itself was a key contributory factor in the continued existence of Latin in the medieval world and in the significant extent of its use. Even though much Latin in the medieval period, in Britain and across Europe, was not in strict accordance with Classical norms (and may not even have been an attempt to be so), the fact that some variety of Latin had achieved a high status and position as a standard provided the language as a whole with a reputation that was transmitted and retained while Latin ceased to be a native language and long after. This prestige, augmented by the use of Latin in the Western Christian church, made the continued use of that language desirable in certain circumstances in preference to the everyday vernacular (see also §2.2.2 below). We would suggest this is particularly significant for Britain, where the advent of the Anglo-Saxons and of their language displaced the local languages then in use across much of the area of Great Britain that had formerly been under Roman control and, coupled with the withdrawal of the Roman legions in AD 410, might have been expected at the same time also to eliminate the use of Latin entirely or at least restrict its use to religion and some limited practical functions (such as communicating with those in mainland Europe who used a descendant of Latin, or with speakers of other languages with whom Latin was the only available shared language).[24] It seems reasonable to think that the continuing uses were instead substantial, bringing about not only the survival of Latin but also the following thousand-year tradition of such keen vitality in so many other uses. This was continuation of a prestigious tradition, both intellectual and linguistic, which was maintained alongside the development of Anglo-Saxon England because of its status and supported by the existence of grammars and education. This can be seen again, later, in the British contribution to the Carolingian renaissance, triggered by a new

[23] See White (this vol., ch. 8) on the later ecclesiastical use of Latin.

[24] On Latin in Britain during the Roman era see §3.2. A view that Latin was lost entirely with the departure of the legions and advent of the Anglo-Saxons but then reintroduced with the Christian mission at the end of the 6th century is still found in some histories of English but is unsustainable. Howlett (2008) discusses in some detail the invention of the Insular Latin tradition, documenting continuity from Roman Britain into the Cambro-, Hiberno-, and Anglo-Latin traditions; see also Howlett (this vol., ch. 2).

recognition and reinforcement of this status of Latin and crucially enabled by the maintenance of that tradition in Britain.[25]

The second important medieval consequence of the emergence of Classical Latin is the enduring influence of the works written in the Classical language of the Roman era that is observable in medieval texts alongside the numerous echoes of Biblical and Patristic Latin: the influences include the adoption of whole literary forms, such as epic in the poetry of Walter of Châtillon's *Alexandreis*, Nivard of Ghent's *Ysengrimus*, and, in Britain, Joseph of Exeter's *Bellum Trojanum* (on which see N. Wright, this vol., ch. 3), as well as smaller scale effects such as quotation from or allusion to Classical works and themes.[26]

Third, although by no means universally employed, the Classical norms of grammar (accidence and syntax) continued to be observed widely in texts throughout our period, whether writers were aware that this was what they were doing or not. Even in their choice of vocabulary writers predominantly used words found in the Classical language in the senses and constructions in which the Classical language had employed them; moreover, the coining of new vocabulary (wholly new items and new uses for existing items through semantic extension) frequently respected the principles of the Classical language for doing so, whether by derivation from existing vocabulary or by borrowing, both of which had also happened in Latin of the Roman era.

All three of these points remind us that the users of Latin in medieval Britain were not only producers but also, indeed primarily, consumers, not only of their own contemporary Medieval Latin but of the Latin of earlier periods back to antiquity too. The Latin of medieval Britain, if taken as the total usage of its users in the territory at the time, was massively broader than merely what people were writing there and then: it equally encompassed their ability to read the inherited Latin texts to which they had access (and of course also contemporary and earlier Latin from other areas in Europe). It is hard now to assess this part of the Latin usage of medieval Britain: for example, what texts were known where and when, and what their reputation and popularity were. In the main we see mere traces of it, in the writings of those

[25] Maintenance should not be understood to mean constancy: we may note the rise and fall of the appreciation and knowledge of Latin over our era, both of contemporary Latin in relation to the Classical norms and of Latin in relation to vernaculars. See, for instance, Brooks (2013) on the decline of the tradition in 9th-century Britain, or Mortensen (2011) on the prestige of the Romans as perceived in the 12th century by Henry of Huntingdon and Geoffrey of Monmouth.

[26] Some of the contact with Roman-era Latin came through quotations and summaries in works in the grammatical tradition mentioned above, but direct knowledge of Classical texts should not be underestimated. Early Latin works, such as the comedies of Plautus and Terence, which predate the establishment of the Classical standard were clearly also known via one route or the other: Osbern of Gloucester's *Liber derivationum*, for instance, contains numerous quotations from both authors to illustrate his lemmata.

readers who also wrote (e.g. in their allusions and quotations) and in the evidence we have for the ownership and use of texts (e.g. catalogues of books and letters accompanying loans of books).[27] However, we can be confident that, as now, since writers read more than they write (and not all readers write at all), reading formed the greater part of Latin usage in this period and so it must not be neglected, neither for itself, nor for the effects on the writing of those who did also write, nor for the context it forms for the medieval reader of other contemporary and earlier texts.[28]

Overall, as far as graduality in what counts as Latin is concerned, we must be clear that Latin as a language had never been unitary, despite any superficial appearance to the contrary in the surviving evidence: there was at all times graduality in its form. The Classical variety that emerged in the 1st century BC established a position as a standard and prestigious form that remained largely fixed at one position in a continuum while around it the everyday language(s) of users varied and changed, including native and later non-native Latin. The Classical form and works written in it remained admired and, especially through the grammatical tradition and education, available in the medieval period.

When considering any instance of Medieval Latin usage in its linguistic context, then, the Classical benchmark may often be a reasonable measure against which to assess it. However, this is an assessment to be made only with care: at the very least, linguistic (i.e. grammatical and lexical) matters, 'literary' form, and content must not be confused with each other, and consideration must be given to the extent to which a writer can be seen to have in mind the Classical language, or some contemporary idea of the Classical language, or something else as an aim. Certainly if the simple terms 'good' or 'bad' in reference to Latinity are useful at all, which is doubtful in our view, it is vital not to equate them with competence or skill in employing *Classical* norms of grammar, verse form (or rhetoric, etc), style, or content, except insofar as the medieval writer gives us reasonable grounds for expecting them. Simply having chosen to use Latin is not sufficient per se to demonstrate that a writer has chosen to attempt to use *Classical* Latin (or any other particular variety of Latin); nor, for that matter, is successfully adhering to what *we* may recognise as Classical norms evidence in itself that employing Classical norms is what the writer was aiming to achieve. Indeed,

[27] These may at least give some sense of the possession and circulation of literary or scholarly texts. Although ownership can never be simply equated with readership, evidence of numbers of surviving copies or their production may give indirect clues as to the popularity and contemporary significance of certain works.

[28] Alongside the reading of Classical and Late Latin texts for themselves, copying of these texts in the medieval period should not be wholly neglected as a point of contact with those forms of the language. See also §3 and §4 below.

as we see below (§§2.2.3 and 2.2.4), in some circumstances writers seem to have made choices of Latin according to other models or indeed of other codes; in these cases the Classical variety is at best a basis for descriptive comparison and at worst an irrelevant distraction.[29]

2.2.2 Functional diglossia

The preceding section has already highlighted the prestige arising from the heritage of its Classical variety that was then associated with Latin in general when in use alongside other contemporary languages in the medieval period.[30] This prestige is important for the second area of linguistic graduality that we may observe concerning Latin—namely diglossia: that is, a distribution of languages in a multilingual environment in which they are used in different situations, typically according to a consistent pattern in which certain functions or types of interaction are carried out in one language, others in the other(s).[31] The coexistence of Latin and the developing local vernacular languages across Europe from the end of the Roman Empire has long been regarded as a classic instance of diglossia, and the situation in medieval Britain, where no indigenous local vernacular was a descendant of Latin, is especially clear in this regard.[32] Latin occupied the so-called H ('High')

[29] Brooks (2013: 116–18) makes a similar point of the importance of selecting the right model when evaluating Latin evidence.

[30] In the period when Latin had been a native language its prestige relative to other languages derived more generally from the position of the Romans, whose language it was, and that prestige certainly lay at the heart of its spread with them to many of the peoples of their territory as their conquests expanded their domain through Italy and then across Europe, North Africa, and the Near East. The processes of Romanisation (i.e. the establishment of the typical structures of Roman society, administration, etc) and Latinisation (i.e. the spread of Latin from Roman incomers to the people of each area through the choice of the latter to use it alongside their indigenous languages, initially in a few types of situation, but later in more, and often, ultimately, all occasions, leading to the end of the indigenous languages in question) that took place across that area are outside our scope, but we note of course that much of Britain was under Roman control for several centuries, certainly long enough for the local population to have substantial contact with Latin (see also §2.1 above and §3.2 below).

[31] Recognition of diglossia as a particular phenomenon goes back to Ferguson (1959), writing with reference to varieties of the same language. This 'classical' diglossia was subsequently added to by Fishman (1967), who extended it to similar distributions of unrelated (or historically distant) languages ('extended' diglossia) and also nuanced the relationship between situations of bilingualism and diglossia by observing that each can occur without the other. Helpful introductions providing an overview of this and more recent scholarship can be found in Schiffman (1997) and Romaine (2000: 32ff.). On diglossia involving Latin in the Roman era, see Adams (2003).

[32] See, by contrast, the work of Roger Wright (e.g. 1982; 2002) on the more complex situation in western mainland Europe, where the relationship between the early Romance vernacular(s) (as descendants of Latin) and 'Latin' can be argued to be one between varieties of a single language rather than between different languages (or, at least, it may have been perceived as such by users

position, being used for 'high' functions, i.e. ones to which social prestige attaches; vernacular languages were used in other, so-called 'low' (L), functions which do not attract prestige (or at least not sufficiently to qualify as H). Across diglossic situations, typical functions identified as H include use in religion, law, administration, and other formal situations, while informal situations characterise L.

Diglossia as a phenomenon in general raises three main areas of questions: namely, how such situations arise, how best to describe the distributions (i.e. what are the functions and associated varieties), and finally whether and how such distributions change. Chapters in this volume relate in various ways to the issues raised by these questions, but here we want to highlight specifically the associated graduality in the coexistence of the languages. In viewing the multilingual situation of Latin in medieval Britain in the framework of diglossia we can see graduality both synchronic, looking at the distribution of Latin and vernacular at any particular point in time, and diachronic, as the distribution changes. Diglossia refers to a division of functions between H and L, and of varieties likewise, but within the synchronic distribution there was in fact a gradual continuum rather than a simple correlated dichotomy of H/L functions and associated varieties: some functions were more H than others, accordingly being carried out more 'usually' in Latin and only occasionally in vernacular, rather than 'always' or 'never' in one or other variety. Indeed, some functions for which Latin is predominant in our written record corresponded to extensive vernacular oral usage in much the same domain: for instance, members of a jury whose verdict was ultimately recorded in Latin did not hear oral proceedings conducted exclusively in Latin nor should we think they conversed with each other in it.[33] The proportions making up this continuum also changed gradually over time: although the overall use of Latin endured over the centuries, the proportion in relation to the vernacular was neither constant in particular functions nor constant overall: certain

at the time): clearly a situation akin to that of Britain did eventually arise, in which the vernacular was both distinct from 'Latin' and recognised as such, and the point or points at which that distinction arose and was recognised are a source of considerable debate among Romance linguists, with some identifying the recognition of difference as not taking place until the time of, indeed as a result of, the reform of Latin in the Carolingian renaissance.

[33] See also Brand (this vol., ch. 6), O'Brien (2011), Richter (2000; 2013), Clanchy (2012, on the Domesday inquest), and §3.1 below. Mainland Europe supplies the famous example of the decision of the Council of Tours in 813, made in the context of the liturgical use of the reformed Latin of the Carolingian renaissance, that sermons—the part of the liturgy directed to the congregation rather than to God—should be delivered in a variety that those who heard them would understand, i.e. a vernacular (*transferre in rusticam Romanam linguam aut Theotiscam*).

The definition of functions in a diglossic situation is itself difficult if one wishes to avoid the circularity of basing their identification on the distribution of the varieties being used. It is not at all clear whether it is best to treat 'legal' use as one function, or legal writing and speech as separate functions, or even specific types of legal writing and argument as separate.

functions themselves came to be done more or less over time; there was also a gradual change in what functions were H or L; the status of vernacular language changed by rising, such that it could come to be used for functions previously carried out in Latin. Most notable among the increase in certain functions was the development of the culture of written records in Britain after the Norman conquest; because the keeping of written records was at this point an H function this brought with it also an increase in the overall extent to which Latin was being used, reinforcing its position;[34] even in this field, however, ultimately vernacular came to be used for more and more types of document.

A few further brief observations relating to the distribution of languages in Britain in our period should be made. First, although writing tends to be more used in domains that have H status, we should be clear that this H/L distinction was not simply one of medium—between vernacular for oral interactions and Latin for writing—the situation was much more complex, with both Latin and vernacular being used both orally and in writing. Second, as a language acquired from L2 *teaching* (by contrast with vernaculars acquired through L1 *learning*) Latin had an association with education (as is common for H varieties in diglossic situations) and so with functions for which education was also required; education also provides a strong connection between literacy (again acquired from teaching) and higher social status (of which it was both effect, since education was more readily available to those of higher status, and cause, since education brought the other knowledge needed for entry into some positions of higher status). Finally, although fuller studies considering all the contemporary local languages are certainly still needed, our perspective in this volume is, where relevant, to look at the role of Latin in a diglossic relationship with vernaculars: nonetheless, this is just one such set of relationships, and the vernaculars themselves—the Celtic languages used in Britain since before the start of our era (among which we especially note Welsh), the English of the Anglo-Saxons, the Norse of the Vikings, and the French of the Normans—also related to each other in complex varying and changing ways that should not be overlooked.[35] In particular, their relative prestige reflects the uses to which they were put and the differing social positions of their users: these together lie behind the ultimate success of English across Britain in both spoken and written use at the expense of all the other varieties, including Latin.[36]

[34] But see also §§ 2.2.3 and 2.2.4 below.

[35] Among other languages involved, we might note the use of Hebrew, at least in writing (Clanchy 2012: 203–4).

[36] It is not uncommon for modern discussions of the multilingualism of medieval Britain to confine themselves to the relationships among the vernaculars with scarcely a mention of Latin, presumably on the grounds of the primacy of spoken language, which was predominantly

2.2.3 Multilingual texts, translation, borrowing, and code-switching

Diglossia is the complementary conditioned distribution of *varieties*, or 'codes', among and according to the different functions for which speakers/writers use them, such as Latin for liturgy and English for bartering in the marketplace. However, we also find texts which include elements from more than one language appearing *in the same text*, and thus we find another kind of continuum, ranging from texts which contain exclusively Latin to those which contain exclusively vernacular: between them sit texts with various proportions of Latin to vernacular. We may consider these under three headings: 'translation', in which the same text is represented in two (or more) languages, 'borrowing' of vocabulary and/or syntax, and 'code-switching'.[37] All three can be viewed as pragmatic responses to real or perceived needs in a multilingual situation: whereas the primary motivations for diglossic distributions are typically social, based on prestige and expectations associated with different functions, intratextual multilingualism often shows some tempering of social expectations (which may nonetheless have a role in determining the predominant or primary variety for the text) with a desire to achieve more effective communication with the text's intended audience.

2.2.3.1 Translation

Translations of whole texts were made and circulated through much of the medieval period, including medieval translations from original Latin into vernacular (for example, the English translation of the *Regularis concordia*, Trevisa's English translations of Higden and Bartholomaeus Anglicus, and Wace's Anglo-Norman translation of Geoffry of Monmouth) and from original vernaculars into Latin (for example, the *Ancrene Riwle* translated

---

vernacular, over written language. To overlook the role of Latin seems to us to be a fundamentally flawed approach, not least because we are dependent on written evidence for historical periods and Latin was arguably the major written language throughout our period; we discuss it further in §4 below. Useful accounts can be found, with understandable focus on the developing place of English, in Townend (2012), Hogg (1992), Blake (1992), and, with focus on Anglo-Norman, in Rothwell (1980; 1994); on Welsh see Fulton (2011), also Smith (2000); and on Norse, as well as Townend (2012), note Howlett (this vol., ch. 15 §2 on *noutegeld*). Many of these rightly also consider the important evidence of multilingualism *within* texts in some of the kinds considered in §2.2.3 below.

[37] There is a further, more difficult, category of intentional multilingual text, where an individual word or phrase is intended to be interpreted by means of punning or other word play in more than one language at the same time, whether through coincidence of form, translation, borrowing, or otherwise. Generally such instances are either the result of great linguistic and literary skill (see, e.g., Zacher 2011) and/or could be seen as accidental or incidental (cf. Bede *HE* II 1 on Gregory the Great taking the name *Deira* as Latin *de ira*, Zacher 2011: 100). See also below on the idea that multilingualism of a text may correspond to high linguistic competence rather than any inadequacy.

from English and the *Itinerarium* of John Mandeville translated from French); we should also include here, alongside the local contemporary vernaculars, translations from languages more remote in time and/or space, such as Classical Greek and Arabic, for example, Adelard of Bath and Robert of Chester's translations of Arabic mathematical texts (see Burnett, this vol., ch. 9).[38] These translations raise questions such as what prompted the preparation of the original text in its selected variety and what prompted its translation: translation into Latin might have been intended to make an original text more accessible to potential readers internationally, while translations from Latin could have made a document accessible to those affected by its content. It is also important to examine the method of translation and how differences between the two varieties, e.g. in grammar and vocabulary, are handled.[39]

Also highly significant are the frequent smaller scale translations in the form of glosses on texts, some monolingual (i.e. Latin glosses offering explanation on a Latin text)[40] but many bilingual (e.g. Old English glosses on a Latin text). Not only do they give information about how the glossed items were interpreted by the glossators, but the choice of items to be glossed can illuminate what was perceived as, for instance, hard to understand in terms of language and/or content. The subsequent decoupling of some of these collections of glosses from their original base text and their independent circulation, often with additions, is evidence for their importance in keeping Latin texts accessible throughout the medieval period, both directly in themselves and indirectly through providing the foundation for a lexicographical tradition.[41]

2.2.3.2 'Borrowing'

'Borrowing' is the adoption into one language of features from another language with which its users have come into contact, and it is a phenomenon

[38] Rigg (1992) is a good reference on many of the translations to and from Latin in the post-Conquest period.

[39] See, e.g., Burnett (this vol., ch. 9) and Sharpe (this vol., ch. 11) for examples. Not all apparent pairs of texts can be interpreted neatly as original and translation: some, such as Byrhtferth's *Enchiridion*, could instead be viewed as alternative parallel versions of the 'same' text, each original in its own language (see Stephenson 2011). This is not the place for discussion on general issues of translation theory, such as the extent to which translators bring the text to the reader or the reader to the text; however, medieval translators were clearly aware of a range of relevant issues, as Godden (1992) discusses.

[40] Cf. §2.2.1 above.

[41] See also Howlett (this vol., ch. 2). Not all glosses were as reliable and accurate as their subsequent users might have believed or hoped: since they typically related to text perceived as difficult enough to cause a reader to need assistance, they were themselves at particular risk of misinterpretation, especially when detached from their base text and circulated independently (the *DMLBS* entry for *tauto* documents a case in point).

that has been widely studied:[42] typical observations are that the effects are more often lexical than syntactic, that within the lexicon content words (e.g. nouns and verbs) are more commonly borrowed than function words (e.g. conjunctions and pronouns), and that vocabulary is often borrowed to fill a gap where no existing item or new native formation is felt adequate. Much has been written specifically on borrowing in Britain from Latin into contemporary vernaculars during the medieval period and also about borrowing from one vernacular to another;[43] less has been said about the borrowing from vernacular into Latin, although the *DMLBS* documents a wide array of examples. Nevertheless, in each case the questions to be considered are the same: what is borrowed from what sources, in what way, by whom, and for what reasons? These in turn raise questions about the alternatives that might have been available and how the observed borrowings relate to the circumstances of borrowing (e.g. the linguistic competence of the borrower in the two languages or the borrower's expectation of the linguistic competence of the intended audience for their borrowing).

Borrowing gives rise to graduality in two respects. The first is in what exactly is being borrowed. The adoption into a recipient language of a full lexical item in its source-language form with all its source-language meaning(s) and connotations is only one of several possibilities. Sometimes only a limited range of the source-language item's meaning, appropriate to the context of initial borrowing, is taken over (for example, *insensamentum* 'instruction, bidding' for AN *ensensement* (*assensement*) 'advice; teaching; ?agreement'), though this can be hard to identify with confidence: borrowing in our material is most commonly of items that appear to have simple semantics (in both source and recipient languages), and in any case our knowledge of the range of meanings of the items in both source and recipient languages is hampered by the limitations of the available evidence, especially of the source vernaculars. Very often the form in the recipient language shows modification in sound (e.g. where the source and recipient languages differ in their inventory of sounds) and/or corresponding spelling, as for instance *realgar* for Arabic *rahj al-ghār*. Inflection may also be affected, depending on the different systems of the source and recipient languages (e.g. remaining or becoming uninflected, retaining the source-language inflection, acquiring recipient-language inflections).

[42] Winford (2010) provides a useful overview.

[43] That Anglo-Norman and Middle English borrowed extensively from each other can make it effectively impossible to decide what is the direct source language for many borrowings into British Medieval Latin, whether from ME directly into Latin or via AN, or from AN directly or via ME; and of course one must not overlook Latin as an intermediary for borrowing between ME and AN in both directions. Cf. Trotter (this vol., ch. 13).

Sometimes what is adopted is not even a modified form of the source-language term, and instead the (partial) semantics of a source-language term are borrowed and represented by a translation or calque within the recipient language, as in the case of Bede's *hiemiplenium* for *winterfilleth* (Bede *TR* 15) or *de longo in longum* ('lengthwise') alongside AN *de lung en lung*. Other examples may involve a complex mixture of several of these processes, such as the use of *fussella* (< AN *fussel* 'stick, piece of wood') not only in the sense 'stick, piece of wood' but also, in one example, as 'stick, a measure of eels', for which the usual term is *stica* (< ME *stik* 'measure of eels' < OE *sticca* 'stick, piece of wood' (> ME *stikke* 'stick, piece of wood'); cf. AN *estike* 'stick, piece of wood; measure of eels' borrowed from ME).[44] Each of these types falls at a different point on a continuum, the ends of which are represented by the source and recipient languages, and thus these 'borrowed' items themselves, as well as the whole texts that contain them, represent graduality in what counts as, say, Latin.[45]

The difficulty is compounded by the second dimension of graduality in borrowing, which relates to change: over time some borrowed items come gradually to be naturalised, i.e. no longer perceived as non-native, but not all items do this, and different ones do so at different rates.[46] Moreover, what is felt by one user of the language to be a borrowed item may be a normal part of what is perceived by another to be native to the language (especially if they have a different level of familiarity with the source language). Thus within the history of any individual borrowing there is likely to be a graduality of perceived Latin-ness to be reckoned with.[47]

Given both these points we should pay particular attention to a relevant general feature of Latin graphic practice in the medieval period, not confined to borrowed terms but highly significant for them: namely the prevalence of

[44] See Howlett (this vol., ch. 15) for some further examples of complex etymologies of British Medieval Latin terms.

[45] In borrowing situations in general many borrowed terms are initially co-opted and subsequently spread into the usage of others precisely because of their associations with their source languages (or at least because they are felt to stand in some way outside the recipient language), and so such an item's very existence often argues for its liminal position as, e.g., Latin (by virtue of having spread into the language of other users) but at the same time 'not Latin'.

[46] Many studies of borrowing are also concerned with the gradual nature of the adoption in the first place: at what point is an item to be considered borrowed into the language (i.e. into its lexicon or structure) rather than merely an ad hoc nonce usage?

[47] Cf. n. 10 above. Here again we stress that this notion of Latin-ness is not to be equated with Classical-ness: clearly medieval borrowings joined the language too late to be included in the Classical language as defined by its Roman-era form; however, Classical Latin even in that period had not been wholly averse to the use of loanwords as appropriate, as of course was more colloquial or informal Latin too. Trotter (2010), discussing naturalisation in both Anglo-Norman and Middle English, sets out the issues raised by what we might term the naturalisation continuum (see also Trotter, this vol., ch. 13).

abbreviation of inflectional endings by means of suspension marks of various forms. The degree of integration of some borrowed forms into Latin is often masked by such abbreviation, with the item thereby retaining essentially its vernacular form but ending in a suspension mark standing for an appropriate Latin ending: for example, *gutter*' (L. Wright, this vol., ch. 12, ex. (2)).[48] However, it is far from clear that the suspension mark in all such instances represents an abbreviation of a particular ending that the writer could really have supplied in full if pressed; rather, it is exploited as a convenient device that allows a writer to borrow far more freely, remaining vague on morphological integration and thus on the linguistic affiliation of the word.

For this collection all of these types of borrowing are of interest, and indeed it is examining how they relate individually and collectively to the context of their use that is at the heart of several of the chapters in this volume:[49] Burnett, Sharpe, L. Wright, Trotter, and Durkin and Schad all address issues relating to borrowing. That said, we might note that although Medieval Latin exhibits a richly multilingual heritage in respect of borrowing and these borrowed items are often very noticeable in texts of the medieval period, they are only a small part of the language's total vocabulary when set alongside the inherited vocabulary; they are also only a part of the language's new vocabulary in the period alongside considerable numbers of coinages through long-standing regular derivational processes (e.g. nouns in *-tio* from verbs) and extensions or shifts of existing vocabulary to new meanings.

2.2.3.3 Code-switching

The most striking kind of text that contains elements of multiple languages is text which exhibits code-switching, i.e. repeated change back and forth from one language (or 'code') to another within a text while maintaining in each the forms and grammar appropriate to that code; such 'switches' may take place between sentences or within them.[50] The extent to which each of the

[48] See also §2.2.4 below. The paucity of written vernacular evidence for some items means that the vernacular nature of a form must often be inferred (e.g. on the basis of parallels or later vernacular evidence); see also Durkin & Schad (this vol., ch. 14) for examples of English terms first attested by means of Latin (cf. also Trotter 2009, and this vol., ch. 13 for similar instances of Anglo-Norman).

[49] For instance, Howlett (1997: 87–9) cites the existence of just one example each of borrowing into Latin from Welsh and Old English from pre-Conquest Britain, as compared with a flood from post-Conquest Britain: 'These [two cited] examples apart, when Anglo-Saxons wrote English, they wrote English, and when they wrote Latin, they wrote Latin. They did not contaminate their Latin with English. But from the very beginning of Norman traditions in England one encounters scores and hundreds of English words in Latin forms in hundreds of documents.'

[50] For an introduction to code-switching see Gardner-Chloros (2009). Key work on the phenomenon in general has been done by Carol Myers-Scotton (e.g. 1993, including a valuable summary of previous work; also Myers-Scotton & Jake 1995), who developed the notions of

participating codes contributes can vary considerably, but where code-switching takes place within a sentence the relative grammatical and pragmatic (functional) status of the codes (as ‘matrix’, i.e. supplying the grammatical structure of the clause, or ‘embedded’) is also important. The key challenges are considered to be identifying the size of units that are involved in switches (e.g. nominal phrases, whole clauses or sentences), their functions in the text, and the motivation for such switches; it is also difficult to distinguish code-switching from substantial and frequent borrowing of forms that show minimal grammatical integration or are ambiguous.[51]

Some examples of multilingual text will serve to illustrate these points:

> in j cleto empto cum putokrynges et in iij chopis emptis, xvj d.
>
> 1299, (*KR Ac* 7/25) *Sea Terms* ii. 131

> For 1 cleat bought, with ‘puttock [? futtock] rings’, and 3 ‘chopis’ [*s. dub.*], 16 d.

> Nauis Joh*ann*is de Long’ int*r*auit in portu de Rauenser’ xx die junii
>
> Id*e*m h*ab*uit in ead*em* vj^{M} de Bulkebord*is*, j^{M} tygnor*um,* iiij^{xx} boll*as* olei, v^{M} de luscrayth, vj^{M} de croppelyng, v^{M} de Lenges
>
> 1305, *KR AcCust* 55/17 (Childs, this vol., ch. 4, §2.2)

> The ship of John de Long’ entered the port of Ravenser on 20 June.
>
> The same had in it 6,000 ‘bulk’ boards, 1,000 timber beams, 80 bowls of oil, 5,000 luscrayth, 6,000 cropling, 5,000 lings

> fenestre ... et hostia de estrichborde cum ligaturis et crokis, hespis, et stapulis
>
> 1335, *Building in England* 430

> windows ... and doors of Baltic timber with bands and crooks, hasps, and staples

> lego dicte Agneti ... unum coverlet diversorum operum cuius chaump est de viridi et coton, unum matras et duo linthiamina
>
> 1341, will, Sylvester (2014: 30)

> I leave to the said Agnes ... one coverlet of various styles, of which the background is of green and cotton, one mattress and two linen sheets

> *Itᵓ ad supponenđ vnū postem & vnū seme in la stabiłł & ꝑ ij stapp̄ ꝑ* ***gᵃd****ibʒ ꝟsus Garderobam & vno* ***stair****schide xiiijđ*
>
> 1396, *DC S. Paul. RentAc* 033 (L. Wright, this vol., ch. 12, **(6)**)

> And in propping up one post and one seam in the stable & for 2 steps for stairs towards the garderobe and one stair-shide [‘stair-board’], 14d

‘matrix’ and ‘embedded’ below. On the application, and applicability, of code-switching as a phenomenon to languages preserved only as textual corpora, Adams (2003) is indispensable.

[51] Adams (2003: 25–9) highlights the morphological criteria as important. Arguably single-word code-switches fall at the far, i.e. least integrated, end of the naturalisation continuum (n. 47 above). See above on the ambiguity of abbreviation.

All of these exhibit a Latin matrix with switches and/or extensive borrowing of minimally integrated English or Anglo-Norman terms.

Until recently the majority of work on code-switching has concentrated on present-day evidence of informal speech among bilinguals who share high levels of competence in their multiple languages. These studies clearly show that code-switching is not usually indicative of limited competence of either interlocutor in either variety involved: switches do not typically take place because of a speaker's inadequacy in a second language or because a speaker expects such inadequacy in the hearer; instead, they often involve a second language in which both interlocutors have L1 competence or near-native L2 performance and they offer the interlocutors communicative options to exploit that are unavailable to non-bilinguals. In particular, intra-sentential code-switches are generally found only in the speech of those interlocutors with greatest fluency in both varieties involved, and typically the choice of when and how to switch codes reflects the interlocutors' assessment of the discourse situation and especially the speaker's attitude towards the addressee and the topic of the discourse.

Scholars have now, however, also begun to consider written texts from earlier periods with reference to code-switching. Relevant work on the appearance of code-switching in medieval British texts has been done by Schendl (2000; 2012), and particularly notable is the substantial body of work by Laura Wright.[52] Written texts raise fresh questions for the existing analyses, given the potential for distance in time and space between writer and reader, and it remains to be seen how well such approaches can be applied to this evidence; further questions are raised by the inevitable limitations of the surviving evidence for earlier periods.[53] As far as code-switching involving Medieval Latin is concerned the most crucial questions relate to whether code-switching involving a clear L2 language can be successfully analysed with the same kinds of approach and explanation. We might note, for instance, Adams' (2003: 107) cautions against any assumption that the patterns of code-switching observed in (typically informal) off-the-cuff speech in the present day will be the same or have the same causes as any that may be observed in writing in earlier periods. That said, he observes (again for the earlier Latin period) that 'imperfect competence is only one determinant of code-switching, and it is by no means the most important' (ibid. 308), which parallels observations regarding present-day oral use. Given the importance of the discourse situation and the topic of discourse as determinants in

[52] See her chapter (12) in the present volume. Other studies include Peersman (2012) and the papers in Schendl & Wright (2011). See also Trotter (2009; 2010) and Ingham (2013).
[53] Note Langslow (2002) on multilingualism as seen in corpus languages.

present-day code-switching analyses, i.e. matters of context, we highlight their potential importance for the examination of examples from our texts and period.

2.2.3.4 Texts as multilingual

The result of borrowing and code-switching (and to a lesser extent translation) is an overall text that includes material from several linguistic heritages. The difficulty of putting a label to such texts, or even parts of them, as 'Latin' is obvious, and this in fact shows that part of their interest lies in how they demand a much more subtle analysis, with due consideration of their full context. Certainly such texts must not be taken casually to indicate any degree of deficiency either in the capacity of Latin to express the desired meanings of its users, or in those users not having the Latin to express themselves freely; rather they demonstrate the users' ability and willingness to continue to develop the language—as their native-user forebears had done—and adapt it to their needs.[54]

2.2.4 Interlingual code-mixing

From code-switching we may turn finally and briefly to code-mixing, which for our purposes can be considered to be the result of repeated code-switching such that the code-switched mixture comes to be accepted as a (new) code in itself.[55] The case in point here is the highly switched language of medieval administrative documents, especially accounts. For this genre a persuasive case can be made that there grew up an expectation that such documents would be in such language, i.e. a mixture of the codes involved in the switching. On this view, documents of this kind are not in Latin, but neither are they in any contemporary vernacular; rather, they are in a new mixed code containing elements of both Latin and vernacular heritage.

[54] Note, however, also Gwara (1998), who discusses the carrying over of features from learners' first language ('interference') during the process of second language acquisition of Latin. Adams (2003) has invaluable discussion on second language learning, borrowing, interference, code-switching, and related phenomena in respect of Latin in the ancient world. See also Adams & Swain (2002: 3), noting that a text containing elements from various language heritages 'cannot be assessed in purely linguistic terms', i.e. that the presence of such elements in a text is not per se evidence for multilingual competence (nor, of course, lack of competence). Sharpe (this vol., ch. 11) rightly draws attention to the need to treat even monolingual Latin texts as reflecting a multilingual heritage as far as translation equivalents, both official and unofficial, are concerned. See also Trotter (2009) on the issues raised by multilingual texts containg elements of French, English, and Latin.

[55] Linguists differ in their use of the terminology of code-switching and code-mixing. There are many similarities between the notion of code-mixing here and the emergence of pidgin languages, which are also found in contact bilingual situations and have been the subject of even more extensive literature.

While this could take such texts out of consideration as Latin, the emergence of this code—if that is how such texts are best analysed—depends so heavily on code-switching and Latin that for this reason they must be considered within the bounds of this collection, and instances of this type of language are discussed in detail in the chapters by Childs and L. Wright.[56]

2.3 Medieval Latin in Britain

Medieval Latin, especially in Britain, presents numerous areas of graduality in relation to what might be understood to be words and texts that are Latin. All of these areas are continuations or repetitions of graduality that also existed for native Latin in earlier times. We have argued here that adopting a broad view of this diversity opens up areas for research especially in relation to other languages but also in relation to the various functions for which Latin was employed and the people who were using it. Many of the interesting effects are precisely the result of the multilingual situation of the users of Latin, who knew it to a greater or lesser degree and did so always alongside one or more native vernacular languages.

Multilingualism is most often studied in the modern world with reference to spoken language and to language contact between varieties which are native languages for at least some contemporary speakers. The contact situation of Medieval Latin shares similarities but also exhibits significant differences in it being a non-native language manifest to us in writing (and often to its original users too). Accordingly, it raises new and interesting questions about multilingual situations which extend beyond the confines of this collection.

While we have adopted our boundaries for this collection from the *DMLBS*, our aim is not to cover the use of Latin within them comprehensively in the manner of a dictionary.[57] Rather, looking across the use of Latin

[56] Note also Peersman (2012) discussing the rise of the written vernacular via periods in which code-switching and code-mixing were important.

[57] The scope chosen for a dictionary such as the *DMLBS* in any case has to take account of a range of factors, some linguistic, others practical, such as the availability of evidence and the needs of the dictionary's expected users, crucially including the need to finish the dictionary (cf. Ashdowne 2015; the *DMLBS*'s ambitious extent was certainly a factor in its eventual hundred-year gestation, but it makes it the most comprehensive dictionary of Medieval Latin to have been completed). For a dictionary to be essentially comprehensive in covering usages does not in practice necessarily require a comprehensive survey of the material within its bounds. The *DMLBS* is based on an extensive but selective survey of texts from within its bounds (as contrasted with, for instance, the *TLL*'s aim at comprehensive study of all Latin texts of the first half of its period): however, the careful selection of texts for its survey means that usages, both items and meanings, found in texts within the *DMLBS*'s bounds are rarely absent from the dictionary.

broadly defined within our overall bounds of geography and period we have selected areas of interest with regard to the contexts for the use of Latin and invited expert contributors from those areas to select examples and contexts from their fields for discussion.

3. The Use of Latin in Medieval Britain

We began this introduction by drawing attention to the scale of Latin use in the medieval world and in Britain in particular. Moreover, modern surveys (e.g. Sharpe 1997; Lapidge 1993; 1996; Rigg 1992; Clanchy 2012; as well as the 80 pages of bibliography for the *DMLBS*) bear witness to the fact that an enormous number of texts and documents written in Latin in Britain during the Middle Ages have been preserved to the present day. This Latin use is significant for not only its quantity but also what it was used for and who it was used by. Indeed, so much survives first because of the use of Latin as the predominant language of writing but then also because these writings were produced within a cultural context where the written word was regarded as prestigious and worth not only producing but also preserving to hand down to posterity, which regularly recognised them as valuable and preserved them.[58] As Gerald of Wales explains in the preface to his *Gemma Ecclesiastica,* information that is set down in writing using the mind, hand, and eyes tends to be more trusted, and usually more useful and long-lasting, than that which is delivered using the lips, tongue, and ears (Gir. *GE proem*. 3–5). The cultural context that had developed from classical antiquity continued to encourage the gaining of linguistic and literary expertise to benefit from reading 'the classics', which these new medieval readers then helped to preserve and pass on, as well as providing the training to study and interpret Christian scripture and the exegetical and theological writings that had been produced from around AD 200 (§2.2.1 above). But Latin was also the language of government and administration, reflecting the need for the durability of writing for storing information, and it was used as such, alongside the use of West Saxon, as a written language for laws and charters through the Anglo-Saxon period. However, in the period after the Norman Conquest the secular administrative machine grew to a vast size in England, particularly in the late 12th and through the 13th century, and for this group of functions Latin effectively sidelined English and became the primary language alongside only limited use of vernacular languages. This complex administrative machine,

[58] Clanchy (2012) provides invaluable background and references to medieval sources for many of the issues we discuss in §3: for example, 147–86 on the preservation and use of documents, 111–13 on liturgy, and 106–11 on literary and learned works.

emanating from the king's demands, affected all strata of society, and although it was only at an early stage of development in the 11th century, the production of the Domesday Book in the period following the Conquest shows that royal thoughts were already extending down to the grassroots of society. Eventually these grassroots came to take a more active part in the administration, in that anyone could arrange to have a charter or will made to deal with even small amounts of property. Alongside secular record keeping and administration there was also the extensive and growing need for similar functions, again conducted in Latin, within the Church for both its spiritual and temporal affairs.

In broad terms, one may say that these three bodies of text—classical pagan literature and its successors (which included a wide variety of material from poetry and history to technical and scientific handbooks), Christian writings, and administrative documents—account for most of the Latin read, written, and used in Britain in the Middle Ages.[59] In addition they reveal a continuity of content that parallels the linguistic continuities discussed in §2 above. Much of the Latin produced in medieval Britain shows at least a strong awareness of, and often a deep familiarity with, earlier Latin writings from one or more of these areas, to which they often allude: such works include some from within our period that had already become classics in their own right, such as the works of Bede (cf. Gir. *GE proem.* 5, where he expresses gratitude to earlier Latin writers from whom so much has been learned).[60] Moreover, much of the Latin of medieval Britain also reveals writers looking to the future, whether in the case, for example, of chronicles preserving information about past and present, or in the case of charters securing the possession of land into future generations, or in the case of writers confident of the value of their work who, like writers in every age, hoped for admiration from future readers (e.g. Gir. *EH* 411, where he expresses his hope that he will gain favour from God and good will from men *in posterum*, quoting Ovid *Amor.* I 15. 40). The parallel in continuity is of course matched in geographical terms too, in that the material similarly often shows familiarity with Latin material from across Europe, again both contemporary and earlier, whether

[59] Some types of text clearly represent intersections of two or even all three of these groups, such as chronicles or the compilation of records of saints' lives and miracles. Oral use (§3.1.2 below) can be similarly divided between these three areas of use, 'literary' (e.g. philosophical disputation), 'Christian' (liturgy), and administrative, again with overlaps.

[60] Allusions and quotations have the potential to be doubly strong evidence in that we may suppose that writers making them also expected at least some of their texts' readers to recognise and appreciate them. That said, we must assess each instance on its own merits: allusions, even quotations, may come via intermediaries (of which we may be unaware) or in some other way not represent much or even any knowledge of their original context.

literary texts, treatises, and the like, or the letters and other documents sent to and received from correspondents across the continent.

To be sure, it was a minority within the British population who came into direct contact with works of classical Latin literature, even if many within that minority were impressively learned in that respect. Such learning could to varying degrees have been acquired in monasteries, in church schools, from personal tutors, and (from the 12th century) in the universities, all of which would provide contact with these linguistic models for the writing of Latin as well as the content of such texts. As for Christian writings in Latin, knowledge of Scripture and an understanding of theology were present in a rather wider range within society, albeit at very varying levels, and not necessarily accompanied by an ability to write or even read Latin: such knowledge could be gained aurally and visually (for instance, during church services, especially if sermons were given in or translated into the vernacular). However, even at a basic level such knowledge would have given some historical perspective and awareness of the use of Latin being within a continuous and ongoing tradition. The ability to read and write specialised Latin for administrative purposes, focusing more on present events, may have been gained alongside a basic education in schools or gained 'on the job': the fact that Hubert Walter who was Archbishop of Canterbury, legate of the Apostolic See, and Justiciar of England at the end of the 12th century, admitted that he was no scholar and had in fact gained his education in the household of the chief justiciar and in the Exchequer (Brakelond 81) demonstrates that learning and a successful career were at that time not wholly restricted to those educated in church or monastic schools, or even at the newly developing universities. This would gradually allow some of those from the lower levels of society to obtain the necessary training to be employed in clerical positions within the administrative and legal bureaucracy producing the increasing number of documents in Latin (and increasingly in French, and, some time later, in English), including writs giving official instructions, accounts, registers, charters (either the originals or as copied into cartularies), coroners' rolls, and other legal or administrative records.[61]

3.1 Written and spoken Latin

From this general outline of the contexts in which Latin was acquired and used in medieval Britain, our attention is directed especially to the range of people who used it, and there evidently existed among these people a spectrum of levels of capability with regard to written and oral uses of Latin, from

[61] Clanchy (2012: 83–106) surveys the range of types of record.

passive understanding to active application, whether in listening, reading aloud from written text, translating between oral and written or between different languages, conversing, or composing texts by dictation or by the act of writing.[62] In discussing these different ways of engaging with and using Latin, it is important to see them as ranging across an oral–written continuum in which both the spoken and written, and the active and passive are not mutually exclusive but mutually interactive, with the understanding of a few phrases or an ability to recite some Latin prayers or passages from Scripture from memory at one end and the linguistic and rhetorical skills to debate aloud or compose original works in a Latin that is controlled, fluent, and inventive at the other end.[63]

Furthermore, with regard to the relation of Latin to the vernacular languages, far from there being a simple correlation between each of the three main languages used in post-Conquest Britain and the three estates into which society has traditionally been divided, whereby 'those who normally fought used French, those who worked, English, and those who prayed, Latin' (Hogg & Denison 2006: 273), the situation was extremely complex, with each individual having a different profile with regard to their active and passive knowledge of these three languages, depending on birth, education, profession, gender, and so on. The evidence is far from straightforward for what has been called 'a fundamental split between the spoken tongues, the vernaculars, ... and the prestigious Latin used for writing' (Peersman 2012: 640), particularly in respect of Britain, where Old English was in fact used at a remarkably early stage to write down the laws of Æthelbert, issued around the year 600, and where there is clear evidence that Latin was used as a spoken language in at least some contexts.

Indeed, though the importance of the church for the use of Latin in the medieval period is undeniable—an association which may well have contributed to the later decline in interest in Medieval Latin (§4 below)—clearly not all who had a role within the church knew Latin to any significant level. We may note two instances by way of illustration. Bede, writing to Egbert in AD 734, recommended that all should be taught the Lord's prayer and the Creed, and although he assumed that the *clerici* and *monachi* would learn them in Latin, he did make provision for English translations for *sacerdotibus idiotis* (BEDE *Egb.* 5), by which he probably meant priests who were uneducated or knew only the vernacular. Centuries later, in around 1200 Gerald of Wales cited the example of the abbot of Malmesbury who was accused of being

[62] See, for instance, Swanson (this vol., ch. 5) on this spectrum as seen in the 15th and early 16th centuries, at the end of our period.

[63] Koch & Oesterreicher (2001) is helpful on questions of the relationship between spoken and written language.

illiteratus (Gir. *GE* II 36 p. 346): the abbot was consequently tested by judges appointed by the Pope, who required him to translate orally *factus est repente de caelo sonum* (Acts ii 2) from Latin to French, and when he reached the word *repente*, he hesitated and then in desperation translated it as 'il se repenti'. (Despite his lack of skill in Latin—and note that it was only his comprehension skills being tested—the judges decided that he was in fact too good an administrator to be removed from his post.) Just from these two small instances we can see the need to remain cautious about the extent to which even its seemingly most obvious class of users were able to use Latin.

3.1.1 Latin in writing

We highlighted above (§2.2.1) that while concentrating on works *produced* in Latin in our period it is important not to lose sight of the fact that the reading of Latin was a far greater part of its use, but one far less visible to us. Inevitably in a discussion of reading and writing in the medieval period there arises the difficult topic of literacy which, as scholars such as Clanchy have shown, carried different connotations from modern ones.[64] Behind this one term lurk questions with complex answers, as to who had the ability to read, who could copy written texts, who could write with comprehension, who 'knew' Latin, who was a churchman and who a layperson, and indeed how far such distinctions are really helpful, to say nothing of the question of how literacy skills were acquired. For present purposes, however, the chief point to highlight is that all these questions direct us to the diversity of skill levels mentioned above. For instance, with regard to what might be meant by 'literacy', in general it would seem that the medieval terms *litteratus* and *clericus* were regarded as synonymous. However, particularly in the earlier part of our period, before 1300, the Latin terms *litteratus* and *illiteratus* seem to have conveyed more than their modern English equivalents; until this period *litteratus* tended to be used of those who had more than a basic education, who knew Latin and could read and write well, or could even be described as learned, which is why even someone like Hubert Walter could be described as *illiteratus* (Clanchy 2012: 231) inasmuch as he had no formal higher education, and yet he became Archbishop of Canterbury. We might note that the related Medieval Latin adverb *litteraliter* could be used to mean not only 'by means of letters, in writing' but also, by extension, 'in Latin' (*DMLBS* s.v. 1 & 2, respectively); that it can be interpreted as referring to the use of the specific language is evident in the following examples which refer to Latin spoken or

[64] Clanchy (2012: 226–54) deals at length with the issues of literacy discussed here, and especially questions of education; see also Hunt (1991). Gwara (1998: esp. 1–4) deals with aspects of the evidence for literacy in pre-Conquest England and provides invaluable references.

delivered orally, thus excluding an interpretation with reference to the medium of writing:

1282 non solum lingue Anglicane inscius est, verum etiam satis literaliter loqui nescit
PECKHAM *Ep.* 266

> Not only is he ignorant of the English language but also he does not know how to speak in Latin.

*s.***1300** Magnam Chartam ... legi coram omnibus ... jussit prius litteraliter, deinde patria lingua
Ann. Ang. & Scot. 405

> He had the Great Charter read before everyone first in Latin and then in the native language.

Above all, knowledge of Latin and the ability to read and produce written language were inextricably linked to each other and to education. Notwithstanding some of the instances given above, the significance of the church in the acquisition of literacy was profound, as seen in that use of the term *clericus*. Down to a century after the Conquest, the majority of those regarded as *litterati* were trained within the church, either in monasteries or cathedral schools or by priests as private tutors, and through the medium of Latin. However, it is clear that even in this period, and certainly increasingly from the 12th century, there was a considerable part of the wider population with at least some capability of reading Latin, which they used as a practical tool in business, and possibly of writing it too. Many of these, literate in Latin in the more limited modern sense of capable of reading and perhaps also writing, must have acquired their literacy and Latin from much the same sources, i.e. those trained within the church. The Latin they read and used may not have been—indeed typically was not—highly literary, but it reminds us of two things: first, if we are to assess Medieval Latin material in its own context, no one area (literary, technical, documentary, etc) can be properly understood without some consideration of the other areas of its use and of those who used Latin in those other areas;[65] second, the Latin was diverse, each instance being suited to the circumstances and purposes of its use. This raises a final point, that the expansion in the use of Latin for writing and the corresponding growing part of the population needing to use it is itself not to be underestimated: though not the native language of any of its users, Latin was present and accepted not only for religious functions (which we might

[65] Within the 'literary' we may note that many British authors wrote on an impressively diverse array of topics (e.g. Bede not only as historian but biblical exegete, Adelard of Bath as translator of mathematical texts but author of a work on the care of hawks, John Peckham, archbishop of Canterbury, writing on theological topics but also natural philosophy including optics, as well as ecclesiastical matters).

more readily understand to have been able to perpetuate the use of a 'special' language) but also for an expanding range of administrative functions that increasingly touched the everyday lives of people across the social spectrum.[66]

3.1.2 Latin as Oral Language: Speakers and Hearers

We have understandably begun from the obvious starting point that Latin was a language used extensively in the written medium in the Middle Ages; indeed, within our bounds throughout this period it was, with not many exceptions, *the* prime language used for writing. But what of Latin as a spoken language? What evidence is there for its oral use (and aural comprehension)?[67] These are potentially crucial questions. Even among those able to read and write to some degree, medieval culture was through much of our period an intensely oral one not just with regard to everyday intercourse but for formal purposes too: the spoken word was frequently authoritative, with writing merely as a record of it.[68] If the nature and extent of literacy and related questions are hard, these questions are even more so, and the evidence on which we depend, inasmuch as it is *written*, is inherently indirect.[69]

The difficulties of interpreting written evidence for speech in historical periods are huge, especially when reports are ordinarily silent on the language of an oral exchange: it is rarely safe to take the language of a report of speech to have been the language used for that exchange, just as generally even a purported direct quotation of words scarcely can be taken with any degree of confidence to be a verbatim report of the actual words used. Thus Higham (2011: 16), discussing Bede as a historian making use of oral sources when writing history in Latin, rightly raises the question, often overlooked in historical discussion, of the language in which the author's information came

[66] On the pre-Conquest period and on vernacular literacy in Old English, see Brooks (2013).

[67] See below (§3.2) on the native spoken Latin in ancient Britain. For those parts of Europe where Romance vernaculars developed from Latin the question of spoken 'Latin' is potentially much more vexed during the period of that development, with a mismatch between the new spoken (vernacular) languages actually being used and its speakers' perception of speaking Latin (supported by believing, not wholly erroneously, that their written language was also Latin, differing in register as well as medium); however, it is a different question, relating primarily to the naming and identity of something being spoken (and/or written) *natively* (on the various issues surrounding the relationship of speech and writing in this period see notably Wright 1982 and more recently, from a different perspective, Adams 2003; 2007; 2013).

[68] Indeed, the chief contention of Clanchy (2012) is the change from an oral to a literate culture in England in the two and a half centuries following the Norman Conquest.

[69] Cf. Putter (2010). Stotz (1996–2004: i. 149–54) gives only brief consideration to the distribution and function of spoken Latin, though he devotes a whole volume (III) to phonology, mainly in relation to the vagaries of medieval Latin spelling. See Wright (2011) on some aspects of pronunciation but note also the question of spelling as one of the few areas where CL norms are less adhered to (though hypercorrection is rife).

to him and wisely questions any assumption that Latin was the sole medium when the Old English vernacular was surely used in many of the actual events reported.[70]

To begin with the most certain, there can be no serious doubt about written Latin being read aloud[71] regularly over the whole of our area and period; indeed, whereas nowadays reading is associated with the ability to write, in the medieval period reading was still very often oral. Certainly Latin could be heard by all in the context of Christian religious worship, in which the liturgy was spoken and sung in Latin, and Latin responses made. There is also some evidence that Latin documents were occasionally read out in public—as for example the Magna Carta—possibly with an oral translation into the vernacular, or in the case of wills and grants of land made orally in the presence of witnesses, at least down to the end of the 13th century.[72] Another situation for Latin to be used orally was in the production of literary works, which might be dictated to someone else writing them down (as when Arculf dictated his account of his travels in the Holy Land, and Adamnan wrote it down (Bede *HE* V 15)),[73] or occasionally read aloud to an audience on completion, as a form of publication, as in the case of Gerald of Wales with his *Topographia Hibernica* in Oxford.

However, once we turn to speech proper, especially in spontaneous discourse, intended for simultaneous aural comprehension, things are quite different. It is difficult to be confident even about individual circumstances of use, and the overall distribution or extent of use of Latin in spontaneous spoken discourse is not clear. Certainly it must have varied from time to time and place to place, and indeed within this its use in at least some of these contexts may have been less spontaneous and more formulaic or prepared (as in the case of, for instance, sermons).

In recent years much has been written on the subject of the oral use of Latin in the Middle Ages, and many views have been taken around the generally held position that Latin was at least spoken in monastic communities (as being the language of the church and as an available lingua franca among monks from different linguistic backgrounds), evidenced by the teaching of Latin by means of such texts as the colloquies of Ælfric and Ælfric Bata in

[70] Cf. Winterbottom (2010); see also Clanchy (2012: 222–3), Baxter (2011), Brand (2000), Dolan (1989), Richter (2000; 2013) on similar issues.

[71] Clanchy (2012: 268–70).

[72] Clanchy (2012: 266 (a French translation of the Magna Carta exists, preserved in a MS from Pont Audemer, but if there was an English translation during the Middle Ages it would seem that a written version has not been preserved) and 254).

[73] This meeting between Arculf and Adamnan on Iona also provides an example of Latin presumably being used as a spoken lingua franca between the Frankish bishop and the Irish monk, see Herren (2013: 104) and cf. Crick (2011: 231); on the use of dictation see Clanchy (2012: 272–4).

the 11th century.[74] However, even this minimal position has been questioned: Barrau (2011) argues, with plentiful if ambiguous evidence, that Latin was too difficult for any but a few monks to have learnt it to any degree of competence, except in a passive sense deriving from immersion in the liturgy. Certainly it seems that the relevant vernacular was often permitted for speech within monasteries, and indeed after the Norman Conquest, despite the continued predominance of Latin as the language of the church, the use of French became widespread in monasteries in England, even if English was the monk's native language: Jocelin of Brakelond describes Abbot Samson as *homo eloquens, Gallice et Latine, magis rationi dicendorum quam ornatui verborum innitens* (Brakelond 40, 'he was eloquent both in French and Latin, having regard rather to the sense of what he had to say than to ornaments of speech' (tr. ed. OMT)), although was able to read English and to preach in English, in the dialect of Norfolk, where he was born and bred.

Outside the walls of the monasteries the evidence for spoken Latin discourse is still more vague, sporadic, and anecdotal. Unsurprisingly what evidence there is points mainly to oral Latin being associated with ecclesiastical and/or educational contexts. For example, Gerald of Wales claims to have preached the crusade in Wales in both Latin and French and had such a powerful effect even on those in the audience who knew neither language, that someone joked that it was lucky he had not preached in Welsh or there would be no one left who had not gone off on the crusade.[75] Although it is clear in this case that we are dealing with spoken Latin—Gerald uses the word *loqui*—and the understanding, or lack of it, of the listeners, not all sermons would have been given off the cuff: others may have been delivered aloud from a written script, or read later in a version that had been written up, in the manner of Cicero's speeches.[76] The word *loqui* is also used by the 13th-century philosopher Roger Bacon when he writes (*CSPhil.* 433) that theologians cannot be expected to be as proficient in Greek, Hebrew, Arabic, and Chaldaean (i.e. Syriac) as they are in their mother tongues, *ut nos loquimur Anglicum, Gallicum, et Latinum* ('as we speak English, French, and Latin'), but he does not specify in what context he is thinking of Latin being spoken.

Then there is the case of Hugh of Eversdone, an early-14th-century abbot who was second to none in French and English but *parum nactus de Latino*

[74] e.g. Lapidge (2005: 3–4). On these colloquies, see also Gwara (1998), but cf. Lapidge (2010). Wright (2011) discusses Abbo at Ramsey and his writing on the pronunciation of Latin. See also n. 73 with reference to Latin as a lingua franca.

[75] Gir. *RG* II 18 (cf. id. *IK* I 11) and see Putter (2010: 87).

[76] Numerous collections of sermons in Latin by British authors survive, including those of Bede in the pre-Conquest era, and Anselm, Herbert of Losinga, Ailred of Rievaulx, Isaac of Stella, John of Ford, Peter of Blois, John Wycliffe, Thomas Chobham, Thomas Brunton, among many others in the post-Conquest era.

('who had acquired too little Latin'). He found himself having to use spoken Latin during an audience with the Pope, an occasion that clearly terrified those who feared that their Latin was not up to scratch. Fortunately he managed to avoid rebuke by covering up any linguistic defects with some munificent donations (*G. S. Alb.* ii. 113), but the nature of the defects (whether of style, grammar, fluency, pronunciation, or something else) is not specified.

As for educational contexts, it is presumably Latin that was being used by schoolboys when competing in dialectic, verse, or grammar, or wittily teasing their friends, in the description by William Fitzstephen of the London in which Thomas Becket grew up (W. Fitzst. *Thom. prol.* 9). At university level we find plentiful evidence, particularly from the 13th century, of oral activity in Latin in the form of disputations: that is, scholarly dialogues in which masters or masters and students argued on various philosophical or theological topics, sometimes in prepared form, sometimes on a subject that was put forward on the day—these latter were the so-called *disputationes de quolibet* or *Quodlibeta*—some of which were recorded in note form or written up as a more polished literary work, as in the case of those by Richard Middleton, Thomas Sutton, and William of Ockham. These occasions were often open to the public and could attract huge audiences, who were presumably able to comprehend the language of the debate: Matthew Paris (*Maj.* II 476–7) mentions that Simon of Tournai at Paris in 1202 lectured and held disputations to packed lecture halls (*legit ... subtiliter valde et subtilius disputavit ... tot igitur habuit auditores quot amplissimum palatium potuit continere*, 'he gave very fine lectures and disputed rather finely ... and so he had as many hearers as the most spacious building could hold').[77]

However, caution is clearly needed in every case of possible oral use of Latin. A context in which from the written evidence one might think that Latin was used orally is that of the law courts, but although Latin was the key written language of legal record (Brand 2000: 63–76), particularly for the plea rolls, at least until the end of the 13th century, much that was recorded in Latin was a rendition of what had been said in the court in English or French, once these proceedings had been accepted (Clanchy 2012: 206–7). Such Latin 'transcripts' can be of interest when examined in terms of their relation to their vernacular (particularly French) originals. For instance, Richter (2000: 51–61) discusses the relation between spoken and written, and between Latin and vernacular (including Welsh) in connection with the depositions made to the church authorities seeking evidence of miracles supposedly performed by Thomas Cantilupe in the early 14th century: here the language of record is usually Latin, but the spoken language used when witnesses were examined

[77] On the oral nature of disputations see Weijers (2015: 121) and Novikoff (2013: 143); see also Weijers (2002).

varies among Latin, French, English, and Welsh, with two clerics recorded as giving their evidence in Latin, one layman witnessing in French though he is said to understand and speak Latin, and a further layman said only to understand Latin while opting to make his statement in French.[78]

Though difficult, such evidence as we have paints an overall picture of significant oral use of Latin across a range of contexts, and if this use was not to have been in vain—which in general it surely was not—we may suppose that this was accompanied by a correspondingly significant level of aural comprehension, at least among the desired audience for any particular use.

3.2 The Latin of Britain

At several points in this introduction we have explicitly drawn attention to a significant degree of continuity of the medieval with what preceded it. This is clearly true at the level of the texts of the literary language (broadly defined to include, alongside poetry, also prose genres such as philosophy, science, law, epistolography, historiography, and so on). It is also true of the core basic vocabulary and grammar of the language, notwithstanding various additions, shifts, and changes in frequency of particular features. Indeed for Britain as a key source of what was perceived as unadulterated Latinity for the Carolingian renaissance, that linguistic continuity is to some degree axiomatic. But we may ask whether there is a specifically *British* continuity that can be identified for Latin.

The evidence for any regional diversity in Latin during the Roman era has only recently begun to receive the attention it deserves, and for this period the identification of any features of Latin in Britain that are distinctive to Britain is difficult. (The same is true, other than in respect of vocabulary, for Latin in Britain in the Middle Ages, below.) The strong influence of the standard can be seen as the main reason for this, and this is only to be expected in view of the fact that the surviving direct evidence is written (see §2.2.1 above). Latin in Britain under the Romans was, so far as we are able to tell from the limited available evidence, in line with the general picture of Latin in the Roman Empire, consisting of the Classical variety exhibiting relatively little variation or change and varieties of everyday Vulgar Latin varying by function, register, and medium of use, and by the age, sex, level of education, and, more generally, social status of its users, as well as varying across space and changing over time.[79] The extent to which Latin was adopted by the indigenous people of Britain is not clear, though it may have been considerable.

[78] Cf. also Baxter (2011) on the multilingual process of the compilation of Domesday.

[79] Adams (2007: 577–623) surveys the evidence for Latin in Roman Britain, also with reference to his earlier work (2003).

Indeed, Schrijver (2002) boldly hypothesises that in the later Roman Empire the ordinary man in the street in lowland Britain, an area which was more thoroughly Romanised, could well have been a monolingual Latin speaker, in view of the evidence he finds of an extensive influence of Latin on the indigenous Celtic of the less Romanised highland zone.[80] It certainly seems likely that the higher echelons of local society acquired Latin to some degree (Adams 2007: 581).

On the question of direct continuity of a recognisable regional variety the evidence remains unclear, not least in view of the difficulty of identifying strictly regional features in Latin of the Roman era. Adams (2007: 614–16) sees it as unlikely that there was direct continuity between Roman-era Latin in Britain (as at, for example, Vindolanda or Bath) and British Medieval Latin as a distinct variety, but he quotes one example for which continuity cannot be convincingly excluded: *excussorium* appears at Vindolanda and then again later in medieval texts from Britain in the sense, not attested elsewhere, of 'threshing-floor' (ibid. 604–6).

As in the Roman era, the Latin of Britain in the medieval period in the main has the features of the language of its time across Europe in respect of its grammar. Where authors consciously or subconsciously reach the Classical standard there is little if anything that can be said to be distinctively British: for instance, in the use of the case or tense and mood systems of the language, or even in the spelling. Indeed, there is little distinctively *medieval* in writing that respects the classical standard. Clearly among those still learning the language or using it with a different model or striving for the Classical form with less than complete success there is not only variation but also the potential for those non-Classical features to be local, in which case such local features are highly likely to be the result of interference from the users' native languages.[81]

The most distinctively British features of Medieval Latin in Britain lie in the vocabulary, much as the most discussed features of Roman-era Latin in Britain also relate to vocabulary. Borrowings from the various languages of Britain are numerous (§2.2.3 above), such as *huswiva* from Middle English *huswif* ('mistress of the house, housewife'), attested earlier in its Latin borrowing than the corresponding English form from which it must nevertheless have been borrowed; indeed, vocabulary lies at the heart of many of the chapters in this volume, and this speaks to that connection between the use of

[80] Tomlin (2002) observes evidence of the use of Latin by the Celtic population. See also Filppula (2010: 437–8) on early influences of Latin, including that of British native speakers of it, on Anglo-Saxon/Old English.

[81] Gwara (1998) looks at such interference patterns in the Latin of Ælfric Bata's colloquies. Howlett (this vol., ch. 15 §2) quotes a number of examples of lexical interference from various vernacular languages, such as seen in some uses of *latitudo* and *digitus*.

the language and the local context. But if we leave aside vocabulary, the grammar of varieties of Medieval Latin in Britain, insofar as they differ from the Classical norm, is typically in line with that of the Latin of the period found in the rest of Europe, and indeed its non-Classical features are regularly ones found in earlier non-Classical Latin, either of the Late Latin period or even earlier. Thus in syntax the use of *quod* ('the fact that') to introduce a nominal clause was a construction already present in the Latin of Cicero's day; although its frequency has increased, corresponding to a spread in its distribution from its original context to indirect statement (as an alternative to the accusative and infinitive construction), the medieval usage itself nevertheless appears to represent continuation.[82] Similarly, changes in pronunciation that are represented in the differences between medieval and Roman spelling of the same word, such as the monophthongisation of *ae* and *oe* to merge with *e* (a process already under way in the 1st century AD), the palatalisation of *t* before *i*, or the loss of *h* (cf. Catullus 84), are often ones that long predate the medieval period.[83] That said, many of these general Medieval Latin features that continued earlier non-standard Latin (which included the everyday usage of ordinary people) were also the features of non-standard Latin that developed into the ordinary usage of the daughter Romance languages in mainland Europe: their presence in Medieval Latin there cannot but have been promoted by the relationship between the developing vernaculars and Latin, even as they diverged.[84]

4 A Language Neglected

It is customary in an introduction to a collection such as this to set it in its context and acknowledge its relation to previous work in the field; we, and our contributors, have tried wherever possible to indicate relevant work helpful to setting this collection in its various contexts for those who come at the Latin of medieval Britain from different backgrounds (history, philosophy, linguistics, etc): for example, scholars using similar approaches to other languages in Britain or similar circumstances, or considering our material from other perspectives. However, it is striking to us how little previous work has addressed the overall topic of the use of Latin in medieval Britain. Given the extent of that use, it is surprising that the large amount of material from

[82] By the medieval period *quia* (originally 'because') is used in the same way by analogy with *quod* (which could also mean 'because' and introduce a causal clause).
[83] On Latin pronunciation in the Roman era see Allen (1989).
[84] Thus, for instance, Italian *che* and French *que* for indirect statement. For the general features of Medieval Latin see, e.g., Stotz (1996–2004) and Bourgain (2005).

different centuries, genres, and sociolinguistic contexts has not excited more scholarly attention hitherto as a coherent corpus, especially because so much of it survives. While Medieval Latin has been a subject of study and scholarship in many universities in Europe since the 19th century, especially among German-speaking scholars from Max Manitius and Traube to Peter Stotz, and more recently in North America, notably in Toronto, interest in Britain itself has been fitful, often associated with particular scholars as what may seem to be a sideline to their main scholarship (e.g. Mynors, Southern, Winterbottom). In recent decades some more general accounts of subsets of Latin writings of the period have been produced, such as A. G. Rigg's *History of Anglo-Latin Literature 1066–1422* (1992), Michael Lapidge's *Anglo-Latin literature* (1993; 1996), and *The Oxford Handbook of Medieval Latin Literature* (Hexter & Townsend 2012) on literary writings, or Clanchy (2012) on documentary material.[85] Nevertheless, despite works such as the bilingual editions of the Oxford Medieval Texts series, and some collections of conference papers,[86] the potential significance—indeed the very existence—of the role of Medieval Latin in the culture of the Middle Ages often goes unobserved or greatly underestimated in other medieval studies, even in works that deal primarily with sources that are in Latin, and certainly in many studies of the vernacular languages and their texts in the period.[87]

Perhaps the most extensive study of the corpus as a whole is to be seen in the *DMLBS,* which offers a broad picture of the Latin in medieval Britain, albeit again a partial one, complex and focused on vocabulary. Following the completion of this dictionary the chapters in this book aim to elaborate this picture of usage with consideration of questions of context. However, it is worth reflecting on some of the reasons why the widespread use of Latin in medieval Britain has been somewhat neglected as a topic of study in its own right, because they point to reasons why it deserves greater attention.

[85] Worthy of mention, though, is Sharpe (1997), though only for named writers. Dinkova-Bruun (2011), whose chapter is in essence a precis of Stotz (1996–2004), briefly acknowledges the existence of medieval Latin in Britain. Stronger on medieval Latin in general and that of Britain in particular are Janson (2004: 85–148, esp. 96–100) and, above all, Sidwell (1995).

[86] For example, Trotter (2000); Burnett & Mann (2005); Carruthers (2015).

[87] Certainly in a number of general volumes on the culture of medieval, especially post-Conquest, Britain (e.g. Wogan-Browne *et al.* 2009, Galloway 2011), mention of Latin has been surprisingly limited, with attention given instead to the nature and role of French and English in British medieval society: as we have argued above, it is not possible to make a sharp distinction between written and oral, Latin and vernacular, educated and uneducated, etc, and despite such volumes' focuses on French or English, more attention to the extent of Latin in the context would be illuminating. Although writers often introduce their research in this area by stating that Britain was a bilingual or trilingual society—Welsh rarely gets a proper mention (but see Smith 2000)—the question of the nature and role of Latin within the mix of languages is frequently then downplayed or ignored in what follows.

In §2 we pointed to the fact that the high status attached to classical Latin literature has often served to undermine the value of Latin considered not to conform to its linguistic and stylistic standards. This stubbornly held viewpoint goes back a long way, no doubt reinforced by the revolutions of the Renaissance and the Reformation, this latter having a particular influence in Britain, where so much of medieval culture was swept away in the course of the 16th century primarily for religious reasons: the Latin that remained was that admired by the Renaissance writers. Since this time Medieval Latin, being identified with the Catholic church and with non-adherence to classical Latin norms, has fallen between the cracks. The recent limited resuscitation of Latin from its near-total demise in the British school curriculum in the mid-20th century has nevertheless perpetuated the earlier more or less exclusive association of the language with classical antiquity. Thus those who have some (often good) knowledge of Latin are left unexposed to, and even unaware of, the later use of the language on British shores in daily contact with the multicultural mix of Celtic, Germanic, Romance, and Scandinavian.[88] Certainly the Medieval Latin texts that might be considered 'purely' literary have little to no role in the current curriculum for Latin in Britain, understandable in view of it being effectively a field within Classics. Of literary post-Roman Latin perhaps the only significant attention among Classicists is paid to works from the Renaissance and later, more or less in the Classical tradition, examined within the growing field of reception studies within Classics. Even here, and often in other areas of scholarship too, interest in works of literature in Latin from after the Roman era is focused on those authors who also composed vernacular works. For Britain, the Latin works of authors such as John Milton attract greater attention than Latin works by earlier British poets, and John Gower is more studied for his vernacular poetry, by students of English and French, than his Latin verse.

But even before deciding how far students of Latin, as opposed to Classics, should interest themselves in Medieval Latin use for itself, it is certain that classicists themselves need to grapple with the medieval language and context in order to appreciate the linguistic differences that post-Classical Latin developed and the difference in the copyists' cultural context from the original authors' so as to be alert to their potential effects on the copying of the earlier classical texts: many classical Latin texts survive solely from copies made during this period, and we may be sure that those who made the copies

[88] Classicists ought, of course, to be far more aware of this kind of multilingual context even for their own material of the Roman era, when so many of the most-revered classical authors came from outside Rome, many from outside Italy, not all of whom were native speakers; moreover, those authors' contemporary audience was clearly familiar with other languages used across the Roman world. Classicists therefore should be well placed to approach this kind of situation for the later language.

did not confine their use of Latin to such copying. Classicists who edit texts from medieval manuscripts must be vigilant for the possibility of medieval interventions, whether accidental or deliberate, resulting from the copyists' use of Latin in other contexts, but even those merely reading the edited texts should perhaps be similarly attentive to the possibility of other such interference overlooked by an editor. By way of example of some of the problems that the medieval life of Roman texts might throw up, we might consider the quotations from classical texts in Osbern of Gloucester's *Derivationes*. He regularly quotes examples from authors such as Plautus and Virgil, and though the readings of the texts he has are usually those accepted in modern critical editions, they are sometimes quite different: *dicimus quoque favius, -a, -um, i. levis et inponderosus; unde Plautus* [*Cur.* 56]: '*quae vult cubare, pandit saltum favium* [modern edd.: *qui … saviis*]' (Osb. Glouc. *Deriv.* 224). His interpretations of these and other, correct, readings are similarly relevant here, as, for instance, his interpretation (ibid. 110 and 292) of *incomitiare* as 'to accuse in the *comitium*' (cf. Plaut. *Cur.* 401 and Paul. *Fest.* 107M). Osbern's readings and interpretations may on occasion be too implausible or fanciful for the classicist to take serious note of, but he serves as one example of a medieval reader and writer engaging with the Roman texts with which he came into contact. We find a different kind of example of potential for interference in the co-option of ancient terms such as *consul* and *satrapa* to designate medieval officers or ranks (Sharpe, this vol., ch. 11, §8): insofar as these found their way into medieval texts, they had the potential both to shape and to reflect contemporary understanding of these terms when encountered by medieval readers and writers in the original context of classical texts.

If the more literary texts of our corpus fall into the cracks between Latin as part of Classics and later literature as being primarily vernacular, other types of text have suffered neglect for similar reasons: lack of facility with the language or content that no longer holds its own in the modern world. Latin seems often to be regarded as a necessary evil for would-be medieval historians, acquired with difficulty—and sometimes still only at a very basic level—as a tool for accessing the past, largely through chronicles and legal and administrative documents, of which the content holds more interest for such readers than the form or context. If classicists, despite their linguistic training and literary interests, are put off by the different and varied nature of Medieval Latin, the unfamiliar content and context of the texts, and the huge number of extant texts for which there are no commentaries—or, in many cases, even editions—to bridge these gaps, historians may simply be put off grappling with original texts by the linguistic demands made on them by having to read Latin in the first place.[89] This is compounded by most access to training in

[89] See also Adams *et al.* (2005: 26–36).

Latin now being through the medium of the Classical literary language: aiming for an ability to read Virgil or Tacitus can seem a very roundabout or unhelpful way to achieve what is needed for dealing with, say, Exchequer documents, though it is obviously more relevant for literary historical texts (e.g. William of Malmesbury, N. Wright, this vol., ch. 3). Similar points might be made in a more nuanced way about philosophers and theologians, for whom the medieval period produced important thinkers across Europe and from them many works in Latin: for philosophers the content holds the key to any interest in these texts, and many of the areas (and indeed approaches) of philosophy current in the medieval corpus are far from the concerns of present-day philosophers.

Finally, there are the scholars of other languages and literatures and of comparative and historical linguistics who are likely to come across Latin in their research into the medieval period, but who regularly react by ignoring the Latin element, or at best taking it for granted. A symptom of this is the fact that, although Insular Latin is listed as one of its five subject areas and despite the notable work in this field that has emanated from its affiliates, the Department of Anglo-Saxon, Norse, and Celtic at Cambridge University does not mention Latin in its title. Admittedly, scholars of medieval French and English, as well as historians, are increasingly aware of medieval Britain as being at least a trilingual rather than bilingual society, as indeed the members of that society were themselves aware; yet even then their research usually omits anything but the most general and superficial information about the nature and role of Latin despite the fact that its extensive use shapes the context of the use of the vernaculars, especially in writing. It is to the attention of such scholars that we consider it essential also to bring the realisation that Latin texts are a scarcely explored mine of information for the vernacular traces they contain, and indeed that the Latin of medieval Britain itself contains many vernacular words in their earliest attestation, which are vital evidence for those who study the history of European vernacular languages.

So if historians and students of modern languages and linguistics feel that they cannot deal with Latin since they are not trained as classicists, and if classicists feel that Medieval Latin would take them out of their comfort zone in respect of either content or language, this vital subject suffers in spite of the fact that all these scholars depend on the writing and cultural tradition transmitted by Latin during the Middle Ages for the material of their studies.

Despite all the uncertainties of interpretation and the various linguistic complexities, what is clear is that medieval Britain produced an amount of material in Latin unrivalled in any other European country, much of which has been preserved to the present day as the result of the particular conditions and structure of its society: further study of this Latin cannot but illuminate the history of the language from earliest times, the classical cultural tradition,

the study of language contact in medieval Britain, and the history of the development of French and English, as well as assisting historians in understanding the sources vital for their depiction of medieval Britain.

5. Concluding Questions

Throughout the studies in this volume there is a strong sense of Latin continuity on the one hand matched with its adaptation to circumstance and context on the other. Between these two poles users of Latin steered a course that suited their own needs and those of their intended audience. Much of the discussion centres around matters of vocabulary, reflecting the genesis of this collection and its association with the *DMLBS*, but it is in adopting this level of detail, looking at specific words—how and why they were used, taking account of who was using them for what in what circumstances—that the richness of the surviving British Medieval Latin heritage comes across so strongly. Collectively, these studies illustrate the extent of the body of material in Latin in the medieval world and demonstrate that it is worthy of study in its own right, not just for its scale or content (as literature, historical record, contribution to science, philosophy, etc) but also for being the product of its particular situation. Furthermore, they show that within that broad use of Latin across Europe, the Latin of medieval Britain merits especial study. Part of what makes this Latin so interesting is the complex diversity of the situations of its use, and the questions they raise about the relationship for its users between Latin and the various alternative languages they had available to them.

While previously the study of Medieval Latin has often been focused on comparisons with its Classical ancestor—and we agree that this is not a comparison that should be neglected, insofar as some medieval writers, consciously or unwittingly by dint of their training or tradition, aimed at that Classical model—failing to look beyond comparison with Classical Latin, whether in terms of grammar, vocabulary, or content, is to close the door to more apt considerations of contemporary medieval concerns. The approach adopted in this collection is offered as a step forward in opening up the questions of what medieval users were trying to achieve in their use of Latin, how they used their language to do it, and to what extent they succeeded in their aims. We hope that this, together with the aid of the completed *DMLBS* as a tool, will heighten the awareness of all who have interest in Latin or the medieval period and spur them to look more broadly than the material directly related to their own area of interest.

References

Ann. Ang. & Scot. *Annales Angliae et Scotiae*, in *Chronica monasterii S. Albani*, 7 vols in 12, Rolls Series 28 (London, 1863–70), ii. 371–408.

Bacon *CSPhil.* Roger Bacon, *Compendium studii philosophiae*, in *Fr. Rogeri Bacon Opera inedita*, Rolls Series 15 (London, 1859), 393–519.

Bede

Egb. *Epistola ad Ecgbertum episcopum*, ed. C. Plummer, *Baedae Opera Historica* (Oxford, 1896), i. 405–23 [by ch.].

HE *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum,* ed. B. Colgrave & R. A. B. Mynors, Oxford Medieval Texts, (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1969) [by bk & ch.].

TR *De temporum ratione*, ed. C. W. Jones, *Bedae Opera de Temporibus* (Cambridge, MA, Medieval Academy of America, 1943), 175–291 [by ch.].

Brakelond Jocelin of Brakelond, *Cronica de rebus gestis Samsonis abbatis monasterii S. Edmundi*, ed. H. E. Butler, Nelson's Medieval Texts (Edinburgh, Thomas Nelson, 1949) [by f.].

Building in Eng. L.F. Salzman, *Building in England Down to 1540, A Documentary History* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1952).

DC S. Paul. RentAc Dean & Chapter of St Paul's Cathedral, London, Rental & Accounts: London Metropolitan Archive, CLC/313/L/D/001/MS25125 [by roll no.]

G. S. Alb. *Gesta abbatum monasterii S. Albani*, 3 vols, in *Chronica monasterii S. Albani*, 7 vols in 12, Rolls Series 28 (London, 1863–70), iv.

Gir. Giraldus Cambrensis, *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera*, 8 vols, Rolls Series 21 (London, 1861–91):

EH *Expugnatio Hibernica*, v. 205–411 [by bk & ch.]

GE *Gemma Ecclesiastica*, ii. 3–364 [by dist., ch., & p.].

RG *De rebus a se gestis*, i. 3–122 [by bk & ch.].

KR Records of the Exchequer, King's Remembrancer: MS TNA: PRO

Ac Accounts, various, E 101.

AcCust Customs Accounts, E 122.

M. Par. *Maj.* Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, 7 vols, Rolls Series 57 (London, 1872–83).

Osb. Glouc. *Deriv.* Osbern of Gloucester, *Liber Derivationum*, ed. F. Bertini, V. Ussani *et al.* (Spoleto, Fondazione Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 1996) [by p. of ed. A. Mai (1836)].

Peckham *Ep.* *Registrum epistolarum fratris Johannis Peckham*, 3 vols, Rolls Series 77 (London, 1882–5) [by no.].

Sea Terms *Middle English Sea Terms*, ed. B. Sandahl, i– (Upsala, Lundequistska Bokhandeln 1951–).

W. Fitzst. *Thom. prol.* William Fitzstephen, *Vita S. Thomae, prologus* (*Descriptio Londoniae*), in *Materials for the history of Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury*, 7 vols, Rolls Series 67 (London, 1875–85), iii. 1–13 [by ch.].

Adams, J. N. (2003), *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).

Adams, J. N. (2007), *The Regional Diversification of Latin 200 BC–AD 600* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).

Adams, J. N. (2011), 'Late Latin', in J. Clackson (ed.), *A Companion to the Latin Language* (Malden, MA, and Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell), 257–83.
Adams, J. N. (2013), *Social Variation and the Latin Langauge* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).
Adams, J. N., Lapidge, M. & Reinhardt, T. (2005), 'Introduction', in T. Reinhardt, M. Lapidge & J. N. Adams, *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*, Proceedings of the British Academy 129 (London, British Academy), 1–36.
Adams, J. N. & Swain, S. (2002), 'Introduction', in J. N. Adams, M. Janse & S. Swain, (eds), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Word* (Oxford, Oxford University Press), 1–20.
Allen, W. S. (1989), *Vox Latina: A Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical Latin*, 2nd edn, rev. (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).
Ashdowne, R. K. (2010), '"ut Latine minus vulgariter magis loquamur": The Making of the Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources', in C. Stray (ed.), *Classical Dictionaries: Past, Present and Future* (London, Duckworth), 195–222.
Ashdowne, R. K. (2014), 'Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources', *British Academy Review*, 24: 46-53.
Ashdowne, R. K. (2015), 'Dictionaries of Dead Languages', in P. Durkin (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Lexicography* (Oxford, Oxford University Press), 350–66.
Barrau, J. (2011), 'Did Medieval Monks Actually Speak Latin?', in S. Vanderputten (ed.), *Understanding Monastic Practices of Oral Communication (Western Europe, Tenth–Thirteenth Centuries)* (Turnhout, Brepols), 293–317.
Baxter, S. (2011), 'The Making of Domesday Book and the Languages of Lordship in Conquered England', in E. M. Tyler (ed.), *Conceptualizing Multilingualism in Medieval England, c.800–c.1250* (Turnhout, Brepols), 271–308.
Blake, N. (1992), 'Introduction', in N. Blake (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language.* Vol. II 1066–1476 (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press), 1–22.
Bonnet, G. (2013), *Abrégé de la grammaire de Saint Augustin*, Collections des universités de France. Série latine 405 (Paris, Les Belles Lettres).
Bourgain, P. (2005), *Latin médiéval* (Turnhout, Brepols).
Brand, P. (2000), 'The Languages of the Law in Later Medieval England', in D. A. Trotter (ed.), *Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain* (Woodbridge, D. S. Brewer), 63–76.
Brooks, N. (2013), 'Latin and Old English in Ninth-century Canterbury', in M. Garrison, A. P. Orbán & M. Mostert (eds), *Spoken and Written Language: Relations Between Latin and the Vernacular Languages in the Earlier Middle Ages* (Turnhout, Brepols), 113–31.
Burnett, C. & Mann, N. (eds) (2005), *Britannia Latina: Latin in the Culture of Great Britain from the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century* (London and Turin, Warburg Institute and Nino Aragno Editore).
Carruthers, M. J. (ed.) (2015), *Language in Medieval Britain: Networks and Exchanges: Proceedings of the 2013 Harlaxton Symposium* (Donington, Lincs, Shaun Tyas).
Clackson, J. (ed.) (2011), *A Companion to the Latin Language* (Malden, MA and Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell).
Clackson, J. & Horrocks, G. (2007), *The Blackwell History of the Latin Language* (Malden, MA, and Oxford, Blackwell).

Clanchy, M. T. (2012), *From Memory to Written Record: England, 1066–1307*, 3rd edn, (Oxford and Malden, MA, Wiley-Blackwell).

Crick, J. (2011), '"The English" and "The Irish" from Cnut to John: Speculations on a Linguistic Interface', in E. M. Tyler (ed.), *Conceptualizing Multilingualism in Medieval England, c.800–c.1250* (Turnhout, Brepols), 217–37.

Dickey, E. & Chahoud, A. (eds) (2010), *Colloquial and Literary Latin* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).

Dinkova-Bruun, G. (2011), 'Medieval Latin', in J. Clackson (ed.), *A Companion to the Latin Language* (Malden, MA, and Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell), 284–302.

Dolan, T.P. (1989), 'English and Latin versions of FitzRalph's sermons', in A. J. Minnis (ed.), *Latin and Vernacular: Studies in Late-medieval Texts and Manuscripts* (Woodbridge, D. S. Brewer), 27–37.

Ferguson, C. (1959), 'Diglossia', *Word*, 15: 325–37.

Filppula, M. (2010), 'Contact and the Early History of English', in R. Hickey (ed.), *The Handbook of Language Contact* (Malden, MA, and Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell), 432–53.

Fishman, J. A. (1965), 'Who Speaks What Language to Whom and When?', *La Linguistique*, 1: 67–88.

Fishman, J. A. (1967), 'Bilingualism With and Without Diglossia, Diglossia With and Without Bilingualism', *Journal of Social Issues*, 23: 29–38.

Fulton, H. (2011), 'Negotiating Welshness: Multilingualism in Wales Before and After 1066', in E. M. Tyler (ed.), *Conceptualizing Multilingualism in Medieval England, c.800–c.1250* (Turnhout, Brepols), 145–70.

Galloway, A. (ed.) (2011), *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Culture* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).

Gardner-Chloros, P. (2009), *Code-switching* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).

Godden, M.R. (1992), 'Literary Language', in R. M. Hogg (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language.* Vol. I The Beginnings to 1066 (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press), 400–535.

Gwara, S. (1998), 'Second Language Acquisition and Anglo-Saxon Bilingualism: Negative Transfer and Avoidance in Ælfric Bata's Latin *Colloquia*, ca. A.D. 1000', *Viator*, 29: 1–24.

Haugen, E. (1966), 'Dialect, Language, Nation', *American Anthropologist*, 68: 922–35.

Herman, J. (2000), *Vulgar Latin* (University Park, PA, Pennsylvania State University Press).

Herren, M. (2013), 'The *Cena Adamnani* or Seventh-century Table Talk', in M. Garrison, A. P. Orbán & M. Mostert (eds), *Spoken and Written Language: Relations Between Latin and the Vernacular Languages in the Earlier Middle Ages* (Turnhout, Brepols), 101–12.

Hexter, R. J. & Townsend, D. (eds) (2012), *The Oxford Handbook of Medieval Latin Literature* (Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press).

Higham, N. J. (2011), *Bede as an Oral Historian*, Jarrow Lecture 2011 (Newcastle upon Tyne, St Paul's Parish Church Council).

Hogg, R. M. (1992), 'Introduction', in R. M. Hogg (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language.* Vol. I The Beginnings to 1066 (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press), 1–25.

Hogg, R. M. & Denison, D. (2006), *A History of the English Language* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).
Howlett, D. R. (1997), 'A Polyglot Glossary of the Twelfth Century', in S. Gregory & D. A. Trotter (eds), *De Mot en Mot: Aspects of Medieval Linguistics* (Cardiff, University of Wales Press), 81–91.
Howlett, D. R. (2008), 'Insular Latin and Vernacular Literatures', in R. Wright (ed.), *Latin vulgaire—latin tardif* (Hildesheim, Zürich, New York, Olms-Weidmann), 42–44.
Hunt, T. (1991), *Teaching and Learning Latin in Thirteenth-century England*, 3 vols, (Cambridge, D. S. Brewer).
Ingham, R. (2013), 'Language-mixing in Medieval Latin Documents: Vernacular Articles and Nouns', in J. A. Jefferson & A. Putter (eds), *Multilingualism in Medieval Britain (c. 1066–1520): Sources and Analysis* (Turnhout, Brepols), 105–21.
Janson, T. (2004), *A Natural History of Latin* (Oxford, Oxford University Press).
Koch, P. & Oesterreicher, W. (2001), 'Langage parlé et langage écrit', in G. Holtus *et al.* (eds), *Lexicon der romanistischen Linguistik* (Tübingen, Max Niermeyer), i. 2. 584–627.
Langslow, D. R. (2002), 'Approaching Bilingualism in Corpus Languages', in J. N. Adams, M. Janse & S. Swain (eds), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Word* (Oxford, Oxford University Press), 23–51.
Lapidge, M. (1993), *Anglo-Latin Literature, 900–1066* (London, Hambledon Press).
Lapidge, M. (1996), *Anglo-Latin Literature, 600–899* (London, Hambledon Press).
Lapidge, M. (2005), 'How 'English' is Pre-Conquest Anglo-Latin?', in C. Burnett & N. Mann (eds), *Britannia Latina: Latin in the Culture of Great Britain from the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century* (London and Turin, Warburg Institute and Nino Aragno Editore), 1–13.
Lapidge, M. (2010), 'Colloquial Latin in the Insular Latin Scholastic *Colloquia*?', in E. Dickey & A. Chahoud (eds), *Colloquial and Literary Latin* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press), 406–18.
Law, V. (2003), *The History of Linguistics in Europe: from Plato to 1600* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).
Mortensen, L. B. (2011), 'Roman Past and Roman Language in Twelfth-century English Historiography', in E. M. Tyler (ed.), *Conceptualizing Multilingualism in Medieval England, c.800–c.1250* (Turnhout, Brepols), 309–20.
Myers-Scotton, C. (1993), *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching* (Oxford, Oxford University Press).
Myers-Scotton, C. (1997), 'Code-switching', in F. Coulmas (ed.), *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (Oxford and Cambridge, MA, Blackwell), 217–37.
Myers-Scotton, C. (2001), 'The Matrix Language Frame Model: Development and Responses', in R. Jacobson (ed.), *Codeswitching Worldwide II* (Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter), 23–58.
Myers-Scotton, C. (2002), *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes* (Oxford, Oxford University Press).
Myers-Scotton, C. & Jake, J. L. (1995), 'Matching Lemmas in a Bilingual Competence and Production Model', *Linguistics*, 33: 981–1024.

Novikoff, A. J. (2013), *The Medieval Culture of Disputation: Pedagogy, Practice and Performance* (Philadelphia, PA, University of Pennsylvania).

O'Brien, B. (2011), 'Translating Technical Terms in Law-codes from Alfred to the Angevins', in E. M. Tyler (ed.), *Conceptualizing Multilingualism in Medieval England, c.800–c.1250* (Turnhout, Brepols), 57–76.

Peersman, C. (2012), 'Written Vernaculars in Medieval and Renaissance Times', in J. M. Hernández-Campoy & J. C. Conde-Silvestre (eds), *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics* (Malden, MA, and Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell), 639–54.

Putter, A. (2010), 'Multilingualism in England and Wales, c. 1200: The Testimony of Gerald of Wales', in C. Kleinhenz & K. Busby (eds), *Medieval Multilingualism: The Francophone World and its Neighbours* (Turnhout, Brepols), 83–105.

Richter, M. (2000), 'Collecting Miracles Along the Anglo-Welsh Border in the Early Fourteenth Century', in D. A. Trotter (ed.), *Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain* (Woodbridge, D. S. Brewer), 53–62.

Richter, M. (2013), 'Trace Elements of Obliterated Vernacular Languages in Latin Texts', in M. Garrison, A. P. Orbán & M. Mostert (eds), *Spoken and Written Language: Relations Between Latin and the Vernacular Languages in the Earlier Middle Ages* (Turnhout, Brepols), 1–9.

Rigg, A. G. (1992), *A History of Anglo-Latin Literature, 1066–1422* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).

Romaine, S. (2000), *Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. 2nd edn, (Oxford, Oxford University Press).

Rothwell, W. (1980), 'Lexical Borrowing in a Medieval Context', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 63: 118–43.

Rothwell, W. (1994), 'The Trilingual England of Geoffrey Chaucer', *Studies in the Age of Chaucer*, 16: 45–67.

Rothwell, W. (2000), 'Aspects of Lexical and Morphosyntactical Mixing in the Languages of Medieval England', in D. A. Trotter (ed.) *Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain* (Woodbridge, D. S. Brewer), 213–32.

Schendl, H. (2000), 'Linguistic Aspects of Code-switching in Medieval English Texts', in D. A. Trotter (ed.), *Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain* (Woodbridge, D. S. Brewer), 77–92.

Schendl, H. (2012), 'Multilingualism, Code-switching, and Language Contact in Historical Sociolinguistics', in J. M. Hernández-Campoy & J. C. Conde-Silvestre (eds), *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics* (Malden, MA, and Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell), 520–33.

Schendl, H. & Wright, L. (eds) (2011), *Code-switching in Early English* (Berlin and Boston, MA, De Gruyter Mouton).

Schiffman, H. F. (1997), 'Diglossia as a Sociolinguistic Situation', in F. Coulmas (ed.), *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (Oxford and Cambridge, MA, Blackwell), 205–16.

Schrijver, P. (2002), 'The Rise and Fall of British Latin: Evidence from English and Brittonic', in M. Filppula, J. Klemola & H. Pitkänen (eds), *The Celtic Roots of English* (University of Joensuu), 87–110.

Sharpe, R. (1997), *A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540* (Turnhout, Brepols).

Sidwell, K. C. (1995), *Reading Medieval Latin* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).
Smith, L.B. (2000), 'The Welsh and English Languages in Late-medieval Wales', in D. A. Trotter (ed.), *Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain* (Woodbridge, D. S. Brewer), 7–21.
Stephenson, R. (2011), 'Byrhtferth's *Enchiridion*: the effectiveness of hermeneutic Latin', in E. M. Tyler (ed.), *Conceptualizing Multilingualism in Medieval England, c.800–c.1250* (Turnhout, Brepols), 121–44.
Stotz, P. (1996–2004), *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters*, 5 vols (Munich, C. H. Beck).
Sylvester, L. M. (ed.) (2014), *Medieval Dress and Textiles in Britain: A Multilingual Sourcebook* (Martlesham, Suffolk, Boydell & Brewer).
Tomlin, R. S. O. (2002), 'Writing to the Gods in Britain', in A. E. Cooley (ed.), *Becoming Roman, Writing Latin? Literacy and Epigraphy in the Roman West*, JRA Suppl. Ser. 48 (Portsmouth, RI, Journal of Roman Archaeology), 165–79.
Townend, M. (2012), 'Contacts and Conflicts: Latin, Norse, and French', in L. Mugglestone (ed.), *The Oxford History of English* (Oxford, Oxford University Press), 75–105.
Trotter, D. A. (ed.) (2000), *Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain* (Woodbridge, D. S. Brewer).
Trotter, D. A. (2009), 'Stuffed Latin: Vernacular Evidence in Latin Documents', in J. Wogan-Browne *et al.* (eds), *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain: The French of England c1100–c1500* (Martlesham, Suffolk, Boydell & Brewer), 153–63.
Trotter, D. A. (2010), 'Language Labels, Language Change, and Lexis', in C. Kleinhenz & K. Busby (eds), *Medieval Multilingualism: The Francophone World and its Neighbours* (Turnhout, Brepols), 43–61.
Varvaro, A. (2013), 'Latin and the Making of the Romance Languages', in M. Maiden, J. C. Smith & A. Ledgeway (eds), *Cambridge History of the Romance Languages. Vol. II Contexts* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press), 6–56.
Versteegh, K. (2002), 'Dead or Alive? The Status of the Standard Language', in J. N. Adams, M. Janse & S. Swain (eds), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Word* (Oxford, Oxford University Press), 52–74.
Weijers, O. (2002), *La 'Disputatio' dans les facultés des arts au môyen âge* (Turnhout, Brepols).
Weijers, O. (2015), *A Scholar's Paradise: Teaching and Debating in Medieval Paris* (Turnhout, Brepols).
White, C. (2015), 'The Latin of the Fathers', in K. Parry (ed.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Patristics* (Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell), 472–86.
Winford, D. (2010), 'Contact and Borrowing', in R. Hickey (ed.), *The Handbook of Language Contact* (Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell), 170–87.
Winterbottom, M. (2010), 'Conservations in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*', in E. Dickey & A. Chahoud (eds), *Colloquial and Literary Latin* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press), 419–30.
Wogan-Browne, J. *et al.* (eds) (2009), *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain: The French of England c1100–c1500* (Martlesham, Suffolk, Boydell & Brewer).
Wright, R. (1982), *Late Latin and Early Romance in Spain and Carolingian France* (Liverpool).

Wright, R. (2002), *A Sociophilological Study of Late Latin* (Turnhout, Brepols).
Wright, R. (2011), 'Abbo of Fleury in Ramsey (985–987)', in E. M. Tyler (ed.), *Conceptualizing Multilingualism in Medieval England, c.800–c.1250* (Turnhout, Brepols), 105–20.
Zacher, S. (2011), 'Multilingualism at the Court of King Æthelstan: Latin Praise Poetry and *The Battle of Brunanburh*', in E. M. Tyler (ed.), *Conceptualizing Multilingualism in Medieval England, c.800–c.1250* (Turnhout, Brepols), 77–103.