4-2003

Duo glossaria. Anonymi Montepessulanensis dictionarius: Le glossaire latin-français du MS. Montpellier H236

Scott Gwara
University of South Carolina - Columbia

ANNE GRONDEUX, ed., *Duo glossaria. Anonymi Montepessulanensis dictionarius: Le glossaire latin-français du MS. Montpellier H236;* BRIAN MERRILEES and JACQUES MONFRIN, eds., *Glossarium Gallico-Latinum: Le glossaire français-latin du MS. Paris lat. 7684.* (Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaeualis, Series in-4o, 2; Lexica Latina Medii Aeui, 2.) Turnhout: Brepols, 1998. Paper. Pp. 269; 3 black-and-white plates.

This volume comprises two editions of Latin-French glossaries, about which the editors declare: "Ces deux lexiques témoignent de plusieurs efforts faits vers la fin du moyen âge pour donner au français une place plus importante dans le domaine linguistique" (p. 5). Anne Grondeux edits Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine, MS H236, a glossary chiefly derivative of William Brito's *Summa Britonis* (*Expositiones uocabulorum Biblie,* ca. 1250) and Evrard de Béthune's *Graecismus* (from the first decades of the thirteenth century). The Montpellier glossary boasts 4,825 entries (although the manuscript is defective), approximately one quarter of which are rendered in Picard French. Paleographically and phonologically datable to the fourteenth century, this vocabulary comes in three parts: an alphabetical glossary, a lexicon of verbs, and a marginal "instrument de travail" functioning as a French-Latin index to the Latin-French glossary. The reverse index never had any diffusion outside of this manuscript and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 7684, also edited in this volume. Grondeux supplies an admirably thorough and concise analysis of the manuscript and text history. She makes a solid case for the origin of the vernacular in northern France, specifically Picardy.

Grondeux points out that the Montpellier text took little from the most celebrated Latin "dictionaries" of Papias (eleventh century) and Ugutio (ca. 1200). The known sources are rarely mentioned, and the compiler has selectively enlarged Brito's *Expositiones,* adding, for example, 61 percent more words under *A* and 32 percent more under *R* (p. 16). Grondeux mentions that the Latin lemmas are alphabetized by phonological principles, except in the case of *U/V,* for which the graph is nonvocalic (p. 17). Some minor displacements are noted. Grondeux observes that terms in the section on verbs will frequently preserve grammatical commentary, such as "caret supino" under *adquiesco* and "preterito caret" under *lecturio* (p. 20). Without offering any specific morphology of the glosses as a whole, Grondeux does provide examples of semantic annotations in a section called "Le mot et sa signification."

Grondeux has analyzed the French with considerable learning. She observes some fascinating etymologies, among which we find mnemonic acronyms (p. 22): "porcus . . . Portans Orridum Rostrum Cloacarum Verces Stercora" (a pig: a swine bearing a stinking snout, the turds of the sewer [Grondeux does not record the error *verces* for *verres;* cf. pp. 24 and 73]). And "Hec fokapis .pis, gallice tarte per etimologiam litterarum: Flos, Ova, Caseus, Aqua, Piper, Ignis, Sal" (a pie: in French a tart, by etymology of [first] letters: flour, eggs, cheese, water, spice, heat, salt). Grondeux has no explanation for the semantic development of *flos,* from which French "fleur" derives, whence "flour" (the flower of the grain) and "flower" in Middle English. I was unaware that this phenomenon was also paralleled in the Latin.

The "glossaire inverse" presents an alphabetical list of the French terms in the main glossary alongside an index of coordinates to letters and sections there. Grondeux shows how confusions arose in the reverse glossary, not only in the alphabetization but also among long phrases rendering the Latin. Of course, the orthography greatly frustrates systematic alphabetization, since aspirated words, for example, can be spelled without initial *h.* Grondeux nicely summarizes: "le but du premier auteur est de faire comprendre le sens d'un mot à l'aide de plusieurs autres termes, mais l'anonyme du glossaire inverse présuppose pour chacun une équivalence parfaite entre eux et le mot qu'ils expliquent" (p. 29). Elsewhere, she wittily exposes a problem the anonymous indexer could not obviously accom-

modate (p. 28): "qui aura jamais besoin de traduire en latin 'prenderes de dons', 'cose qu'on peut sentir sans plus', 'lentille que keval monge', ou encore 'nient contre, ne respondant a chou que aucuns dist'?"

A curious product of a bilingual environment, the Montpellier glossary is a rich mine for Romance philologists. On the one hand, it mixes obscure vocables with common ones, setting *anima, arbiter,* and *aratrum* alongside words like *apophoretum, anthropoformita,* and *anaglyphus.* This word list could have been useful to a mixed audience of beginners and advanced learners. It makes sense that the vernacular *interpretamenta* consistently render the most recherché lemmas, especially those of Greek derivation. Even around 1300, French remained orthographically proximate enough to its Latin roots that thousands of Latin words were easily decipherable, at least graphically. Consider for a moment some examples from the second glossary edited in the volume: "chatellain: castellanus, chastel: castellum, chastier: castigo . . . chaste: castus . . . chasteté: castitas" (p. 192). While only a century younger than H236, the Paris manuscript preserves translations for the easiest words with obvious derivations. Yet at times the reverse index in H236 suggests that French was refined enough at the time for equivalents to be essential in translating some common Latin terms.

In the Montpellier text semantic groups are represented in batches, but not all of the terms in the batch will receive translations. Sometimes the reasoning underlying the vernacular could be inferred, as in *aquagium (conduit), aqualium, aqualis, aquaticulus, aqualicium (lavoir), aquariolus, aquatilis (evage)* (p. 37). Presumably, once added to the root *aqua,* the suffixes *-lium, -alis, -liculus,* and *-riolus* were transparent, but *-gium, -licium,* and *-tilis* may not have been. Of course, the local names of plants, animals, and tools are consistently glossed. Other kinds of fascinating data can also be extracted from the reverse glossary: the number of times the same French word glosses a different Latin word—how consistent are the renderings in the glossary?—or instances of simplification, such as "hic anger: gallice *mourdreres*" (p. 36).

I have no quibbles with Grondeux's text, except that she has retained dozens of spellings that I would have emended (see her "Problèmes de graphie," pp. 23–25); for example, *scerra* for *scetra* surely involves an orthographic blunder.

The second glossary published in this volume (called *Glossarium Gallico-Latinum* in an "étiquette de maroquin rouge," p. 145), comes from Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 7684, a paper document datable by watermark to 1415–40. Known for about two centuries, the work derives ultimately from the *Catholicon* by Jean de Gênes and is quite closely related both to the *Dictionarius* by Firmin Le Ver (1440) and to the *Vocabularius familiaris et compendiosus* by Guillaume Le Talleur (ca. 1490). In fact, the editors painstakingly trace many correspondences and divergences among the fifteenth-century analogues. There are two ex libris, one of which firmly localizes the manuscript to Chartreuse de Bellary, founded in 1209. An analysis of orthography places the text in central France, and, as the editors observe, "on sera frappé de la convergence de ces résultats avec ce que nous apprend la mention de possesseur de la Chartreuse nivernaise de Bellary" (p. 149).

Merrilees and Monfrin carefully describe the many ways words can be defined and supply such metalinguistic features as appear in the entries. Hence one can come across indications for parts of speech, etymology, inchoative forms, diminutives, declensions, exemplary usages (including common versus rare), and figurative meanings. Clearly, this lexicon is advanced in program. One fascinating section of the introduction lists neologisms in the three related glossaries mentioned above. The *Glossarium Gallico-Latinum* furnishes the largest number (42 percent) from the entire glossary family. Some are based on Latin: *fluctuant: fluctuans; inconsolable: inconsolabilis; sarmenter: sarmento; vicairerie: vicaria.* In fact, the editors point out that the *c* in *flectir: plecto* probably represents a learned back-

formation ("création partiellement 'savante,'" p. 178) based on Latin orthography, since *fletir* is attested from 1180 (p. 178). One finds the identical impulse in late Middle English, giving rise to pairs of words like *vitaille/victual, parfait/perfect, rime/rhyme*. Over time this process can alter pronunciation. Other neologisms show somewhat less reliance on the lemma: *recion: antecenium*. In a few instances at least some phonological contours are matched in lemma and gloss, as in the preceding example *recion: antecenium* and in *rageusement: rabide*. One can locate examples in the glossary itself: *batre le* coul: collafizo.

Merrilees and Monfrin present a fine, readable text. I find it significant for the history of Romance language glossaries that many words of obvious derivation are glossed. Could it be significant that *communion: communio* and *commun: communis* can be found in this work? Or *correctour: corrector; corne: cornu; fundacion: fundacio?* Since the pronunciation of French had diverged sharply from that of Latin by this time, the glossary likely reveals the necessity for phonological equivalences alongside orthographic ones.

Of course, this hypothetical social function does not mean the *Glossarium Gallico-Latinum* is free of the contextualisms that plague all glossaries. For example, one cringes to think how a reader might have imagined the device in this entry: "Clistere . . . instrument a uider le ventre." And *rostrum* has meanings other than the common "bec d'oisel." At other times, the glossator can express a fine discrimination: "Baisier—osculum .li nota quod osculum est religionis caritatis filiis, basium blandicie, suavium voluptatis scortis .i. meretricibus." Other kinds of generalities occur just as often. *Blanc/blonc* glosses *albus, bissus,* and *flavus; bouchier* can literally denote a *bovicidia* and figuratively a *carnifex.* A *biere a porter mors* is a *pharetra* in one section, but a *loculus* elsewhere, whereas *bon vin* is *falernum* in one place, *merum* in another. Finally, I would argue that *aler* inadequately renders both *migro* and *proficiscor,* as the *Glossarium* would have it. Interpreting the function of these "duo glossaria" must ultimately account for these semantic dislocations.

Just as they have claimed, the editors of this joint volume have presented texts of considerable interest for the history of medieval French. Now that so much grist has been carried to the mill, others may feel encouraged to winnow out the social contexts implicit in their many idiosyncrasies.

SCOTT GWARA, University of South Carolina

MARYVONNE HAGBY, *Man hat uns fur die warheit . . . geseit: Die Strickersche Kurzerzählung im Kontext mittellateinischer "narrationes" des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts.* (Studien und Texte zum Mittelalter und zur frühen Neuzeit, 2.) Münster: Waxmann, 2001. Paper. Pp. x, 360.

The anonymous German writer known as Der Stricker (fl. 1200–1250) created a large body of short didactic texts as well as the first German fabliaux, a version of *The Song of Roland,* and an apparently original Arthurian romance. Hagby's book is devoted to the didactic material, although it draws in certain fabliaux and other *mæren* as the need arises.

It has long been known that Der Stricker's fables and exempla are part of the vast "reservoir" of stories and interpretations passed down from classical and Christian writers, which were repeated and revised by many generations in response to particular contexts and occasions of use, and perhaps particular interests of patrons (Hagby uses the metaphor of the reservoir, e.g., on p. 339). Individual texts have been studied for their connections to others of the same or similar content, but until now no comprehensive study has been made that would attempt to show the place of this body of writing by Der Stricker in the panorama of medieval didactic narrative written in Latin.

Hagby has made this attempt, and it is well done—supported by impressive erudition, a somewhat ponderous but always clear academic style, and a finely discriminating, ana-