

1-2003

Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters, 2: Bedeutungswandel und Wortbildung

Scott Gwara
University of South Carolina - Columbia

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/engl_facpub



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Publication Info

Published in *Speculum*, Volume 78, Issue 1, 2003, pages 267-270.

Gwara, Scott. (2003). Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters, 2: Bedeutungswandel und Wortbildung. *Speculum*, 78 (1) 267-270.

©Speculum 2003, Cambridge University Press

This Book Review is brought to you by the English Language and Literatures, Department of at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact digres@mailbox.sc.edu.

isolation. She suggests, for example, that the *Vitas patrum Emeritensium* can shed light on the obstacles encountered by the bishops gathered at III Toledo.

Stocking shows that evolving notions of consensus were a key component of the early-medieval political imagination and anatomizes the manifold tensions that shaped the Visigothic world. By situating the canons of councils in broader contexts, she helps us to understand complex negotiations between central authorities and local communities, between Arian and Orthodox, between Roman and Goth, and between *regnum* and *sacerdotium*. We see how authorities struggled to reconcile competing visions of consensus and how councils often failed to achieve their objectives. The careful crafting of canons and the broad search for authority rarely guaranteed unity and occasionally even provoked conflict. The book affords a rich portrait of Visigothic Spain and in doing so touches on key themes in the historiography of Spain more generally, such as the distinctive evolution of Iberian institutions, the (at times) ill-fated quest for spiritual and political unity, and varieties of religious intolerance. In Stocking's account we see the interface of venerable legal and intellectual traditions, on the one hand, and the rough-and-tumble contours of power in Visigothic Spain, on the other; we see that the story of these councils is the story of lofty hopes that were often thwarted and often renewed.

JEFFREY A. BOWMAN, Kenyon College

PETER STOTZ, *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters, 2: Bedeutungswandel und Wortbildung*. (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, 2/5/2.) Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 2000. Pp. xxvi, 482.

Working backwards from volumes 3 and 4, the industrious Peter Stotz continues to augment his *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters* with volume 2 (in two sections), dedicated to semantic change and morphology in late and medieval Latin. Much of the theoretical matter of the book is embedded in its discursive lexical entries, although the foreword lays out intricacies observed in the treatment of individual words. As Stotz acknowledges in the introduction to section 5 ("Bedeutungswandel"), "Was mit den folgenden Seiten beabsichtigt ist, ist nicht eine Auseinandersetzung mit den grundlegenden Fragen um den Problembereich der Semasiologie und mit den Antworten, welche die unterschiedlichen sprachwissenschaftlichen und philosophischen Schulen dazu bereithalten." Given the "intuitiv-pragmatischer Ansatz," the reader will not find, for example, serious discussion of "Name" and "Sinn"—or even much of a survey of the category "semantic change." Such omissions can be excused if the reader is prepared to supply theoretical analyses suggested by the abundant data or to handicap the unintentional paradigms implied in the arrangement of material.

Stotz's book provides encyclopedic entries on vocables grouped by part of speech, time period, and semantic family. Here are his special categories of lexical (semantic) amplification ("Bedeutungserweiterung"): "Wegfall eines negativen Konnotates . . . Neue Veranlassungs- und Bewirkungsverben . . . Bedeutungszuwachs durch Ellipse . . . Zusatz: Wortgruppenlexeme . . . Nicht-gesteuerte Emanzipation von Wortbedeutungen aus Syntagmen . . . Bedeutungszuwachs durch metaphorischen Wortgebrauch . . . Zur Verwendung des Begriffs 'übertragene Bedeutung' . . . Rückübertragung von Bedeutungen . . . Bedeutungszuwachs durch metonymische Wortverwendung. . . ." The encyclopedic précis frequently cover Latin through fifteen hundred years of development and often disclose lexical connections in semantic families. For example, in early Christian lexis the term *ethnicus* (< Greek ἔθνικός), more or less equivalent to *gentilis* ("gentile"), became a semantic equivalent to *paganus* ("Heide, heidnisch") by the middle of the fourth century. The meaning of *paganus* advances from *pagus* ("Land[gegend], Dorf") to "ländlich," thence to "Zivi-

list.” Stotz follows some charming misconceptions about the meaning of *paganus* from the sixteenth century, disclosing how usage of the word as a “Bezeichnungsmotiv” caused scholars to mistake it as evidence of urban Christianity or to understand *pagani* in contrast to the *militia Christi*. The lack of citations makes it hard to appreciate just how this sociolinguistic process happened, but the abundant footnotes (sometimes irritatingly telegraphic) make up for any deficiencies. One wonders ultimately whether popular exegetes or translators can “engineer” semantic shifts of this sort or whether the phenomenon represents a slow social process.

One linguistic operation that Stotz observes is faintly metonymic, as in the words *hypocrita* and *tropaeum*. The loanword *hypocrita* from Greek ὑποκριτής (“Schauspieler oder Rezitator”) denotes an actor or rhetorician, at least in Quintilian and Suetonius. In Terullian and *Vetus Latina* versions of the Bible, it comes to mean hypocrite or dissembler, someone who acts out a role. Is the transferred sense a catachresis, a wrenching of denotation: a professional entertainer for a liar or practiced dissembler? Perhaps the usage is explicable as pejoration (“politician” is one such word in English). A *tropaeum* in Latin means a victory memorial (giving rise to “trophy”) or, in a transferred sense, victory (e.g., “U.S. wins the gold”). By metaphorical slippage in early Christian texts (chiefly poetic) *tropaeum crucis*, or “crucifixion, literally, victory of the cross,” applies to any martyrdom, so that *tropaeum* means martyrdom, certainly not the kind of triumph imagined by Roman legionnaires.

Stotz describes as well the interference in Romance of Latin etymons belonging to the same semantic group. The term *iocus* (French *jeu*) meaning “joke, pastime, game” comes to denote a “play, public entertainment” by association with *ludus*, and both terms were widely associated. As a result of this verbal contamination, *iocarire*, *iocularare*, *iocularis*, *iocista*, and other terms in the same word-family adopt meanings of comparable signification. One wonders whether the same could be true of other Latin words like *scurra*, “jester,” related to “scurrilous.”

Learned or recherché vocabulary earns somewhat more extensive treatment. We discover that *pelagus* (“Meer”) from Vergil’s *Aeneid* comes to mean “an expanse of water,” either in surface or depth: *aquarum abundantia* or *profunditas aquarum*. One can accept the poetic license (“dichterischer Freiheit”) as grounds for the semantic shift, when it seems that πέλαγος was not clearly understood and the sense narrowed to “open sea.” Poetry strikes me as a strong influence in language change, especially when the native language (Greek or Hebrew) was not well understood.

Stotz’s second section catalogues a host of morphological formulations, many of which I have never encountered before. Among them the hyperaccurate *ristrix*, “eine, die (gerne) lacht,” the unpronounceable abstraction *distinctionalissimitas* (Raimundus Lull), and the profoundly rakish *haecceitas*, “Diesdaheit,” will raise the hackles of classicists. Surely many of the forms in this section are nonce words, showing ingenious morphological habits. By the age of *haecceitas* Latin had become artificial enough for such self-conscious neologisms.

In this section of the book, readers will discover the Christian Latin equivalents of Greek “theological” terminology, since a standard language was essential for biblical scholarship to flourish: “Für das Wortpaar σαρκικός / πνευματικός ‘fleischlich’ / ‘geistlich’ hat man *carnalis* . . . / *spiritalis* in Gebrauch genommen, für ἄφθαρτος ‘unvergänglich’ *incorruptibilis* . . . für παλιγγενεσία ‘Wiedergeburt’ *regeneratio*, für ἀπαίδευτος ‘zuchtlos,’ ἀπαίδευσία ‘Zuchtlosigkeit’ *indisciplinatus* bzw. *indisciplinatio*, u. a. m.” Loan translations abound. They differ from the preceding examples by being rendered morpheme by morpheme into Latin, as in Cassiodorus’s witticism *superinspector* for ἐπίσκοπος (regularly transliterated *episcopus*). Latin words with Greek prefixes (*archi-*, *poly-*, *proto-*, *pseudo-*, for example) are treated here. *Pseudo-* seems to have two meanings, a false pretension or hypocrisy (*pseudo-sanctus*, *-praesul*, *-urbanus*) or the promotion of falsehood

(*pseudosuggestor*). I must mention the delightful “Haplogie in der Wortbildung,” in which Stotz shows how learned (unlearned?) back-formations have generated alternative word pairs: *sorditas/sordiditas*, *maditas/madiditas*, *calitudo/caliditudo*, *clericus/clericidium*. I would be curious to know whether each term could develop independently, like English person/parson, skirt/shirt, scrub/shrub.

Loan translations from other languages are not neglected. Without being comprehensive, Stotz nevertheless conveys the richness of this Latin substrate vocabulary in more than a few examples. Terms found in Anglo-Saxon laws (“II Cnut”) seem to have been contextually translated in the early-twelfth-century Latin *Quadripartitus*: *superaudire* (“oferhieran”), *supervidere* (“oferseon”), *superauditio* (“oferhiernes”), *superconfidere* (“ofertruan”). I am somewhat more skeptical of the *Quadripartitus* translator’s understanding of Old English as well as the function of *Lehnübersetzungen* like these. More convincing are calques like *superhabere* (“to have in excess”) and *superdicere* (“to say in a preceding locus”), allegedly modeled on Anglo-Saxon verbs *oferhebban/ofer habban* and *for(e)secgan* respectively. Nevertheless, this section on interference finely delineates many of the principles of word formation in quite a few national Latin idiolects. One will be surprised to find examples of Latin based on Old Dutch, among other exotic tongues.

Much of the remaining morphology section supplies lists of words with common endings, all catalogued by ending: *-tio*, *-itas*, *-ismus*, *-or*, *-edo*, etc. Each section constitutes a tour de force of lexical precision. For example, Stotz gives the grammatical/rhetorical and medical contexts for nouns terminating in *-ismus* (< Greek $-\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$), such as *barbarismus*, *schematizmus*, *spasmus*, and then moves through the late Latin *indaismus* and *christianismus* to neo-Latin *Luther(an)ismus*! What I find interesting here is the application of the suffix to non-Greek roots, which nevertheless betray some (perceived) phonological contours of Greek. In some respects, the derivations of these medieval Latin words have echoes in English: one says “violinist” but not “violinier,” “fiddler” but not “fiddlist,” depending largely on the origin of the radical. Of course, in the same way that English builds words by affixation, such as “in-express-able-ness,” different parts of speech can be derived from the Latin affixes, too, as in *barbarismatice*, “in sprachlicher Hinsicht entstellend.”

Among adjectives the termination *-(a)ticus/-(a)ticum* produces some exceptional by-forms. We recognize certain taxation terms, like *piscaticum* or *cenaticum*—but *barganaticum* (“Handelsabgabe”) or *bancaticum* (“stallage”) or *basaticum* (a betrothal kiss due to the bridegroom)? Of course, the word *viaticum* has undergone a semantic shift, from “wayfarer’s tax” to “host.”

Adverbs and verbs close out the morphology component of Stotz’s volume. The adverbs are quite briefly treated, but they run the gamut from the first- and second-declension forms (including passive participles), to those terminating in *-tim* (*denariatim*, *togillatim* [*< Tongilius!*]), *-iter* (*dulcifluite*, *tuater*, *pentecostaliter!*), and *-tenus* (*possetenus!*). One most commonly finds newly minted first-conjugation verbs, including those based on proper names: *helenare*, *polyphemare*. Like English, medieval Latin had productive and nonproductive grammatical categories. The most productive verb types seem to be those terminating in *-izare* and *-ficare/-facere*. Of course, looking to the very end of this section, we find the expected exoticisms: infinitives deployed as nouns (*habere*, *dormire*), which, as in the case of Vulgar Latin *habere* (= *avere*), even boast inflections: *haberum* (accusative), *habero* (ablative), *haberis* (genitive).

In all such excessively sophisticated or professional jargons, one has to ponder how the elevated register came across to readers, as when *Olympus* and *Tartarus* denote the Christian heaven or hell. Correspondingly, one wonders about the force of newly minted expressions like *se ierosolimizare*. The pretense suggests at least a taint of irony, if not absurdity. For example, if in reading an *explanatiuncula* you find that your favorite *pseudauctoristae* have been *contropatae*, can you sue? Do *archipraesules* ever betray the

merest *incredulitatiuncula*? Can postmodern feminists speak of the *transgrestrices*? “Declaring that Stotz’s book constitutes a magnificent work of immense learning, and essential reading for anyone serious about the Latin Middle Ages” is quite different from “asseverating that the Stotzianistical tome bespeaks erudition by its flammeous scintillations of astonishing perceptivity, not to mention its axiomatic cardinality to *medievalistae*.”

SCOTT GWARA, University of South Carolina

DENIS F. SULLIVAN, *Siegecraft: Two Tenth-Century Instructional Manuals by “Heron of Byzantium.”* (Dumbarton Oaks Studies, 36.) Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2000. Pp. xx, 339; black-and-white figures and 2 diagrams. \$35.

In the past decade or so there has been a welcome flood of works on middle Byzantine warfare, first on military writings (George T. Dennis, *Three Byzantine Military Treatises* [1985]; John F. Haldon, *Three Treatises on Imperial Military Expeditions* [1990]; Eric McGeer, *Sowing the Dragon’s Teeth: Byzantine Warfare in the Tenth Century* [1995]), but also monographs (John W. Birkenmeier, *The Development of the Komnenian Army* [2002]; Hans Joachim Kühn, *Die byzantinische Armee im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert* [1991]) and general works (Haldon, *Warfare, State and Society in the Byzantine World* [1999]).

To these works we can now add Denis Sullivan’s *Siegecraft*, a text, translation, and commentary on two tenth-century texts, the “Parangelmata Poliorcetica” and the “Geodesia.” These two texts make up Vatican Library, MS Vat. Gr. 1605, the basis of Sullivan’s edition. The work replaces the most recent editions of the “Parangelmata” (1908) and the “Geodesia” (1858), both from inferior manuscripts. The archetype was written in the tenth century, and so the new text, and more importantly, the illustrations, is perhaps only one stage removed from the original. No author is known, though Sullivan has kept the traditional ascription to “Heron of Byzantium”; both titles are modern suggestions. The translation is clear, though technical works rarely read well, even in their native language. Terms for weights and measures are helpfully left untranslated. The commentary is historically driven, with references both to the Anonymous’s sources and to other technical manuals, though it says little about the language.

The “Parangelmata” covers various types of siege engines, tortoises, rams, siege towers, and a variety of “funnies” but says little about artillery. It reflects the military problems of the tenth century, being concerned with offensive sieges. Much of the Anonymous’s text is based on the second-century A.D. Apollodorus of Damascus, though other classical sources are also widely used. He also adds his own ideas. The author was concerned that both his writing and his illustrations be accessible; these efforts were not always successful, in part because he did not always understand his sources (14–15), in part because his writing was not always clear, the result of the difficulties of the Greek and of technical manuals as a genre, regardless of language. The author did not copy his sources mechanically but rewrote them, to clarify what he thought they meant and to avoid archaisms (5–8). The clarity of the illustrations is well brought out by figure B, which contrasts illustrations of Hegetor’s ram from the Vaticanus with those from the Anonymous’s sources. The work contains virtually no contemporary allusions (except for two mentions of Agarenes), a feature that, combined with the lack of clear examples, suggests it was not written by a practicing engineer.

The “Geodesia” covers surveying techniques, needed for sieges, as well as other means of measuring and estimating areas and distances. As with the “Parangelmata,” it is heavily dependent on classical predecessors, in this case Hero of Alexandria’s “Dioptra.” The Anonymous’s main contribution is examples based on the Hippodrome and the Cistern of