David Trotter, 2009, Stuffed Latin: Vernacular Evidence in Latin Documents. in J Wogan-Browne (ed.), *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain: The French of England c.1100-c.1500.* York Medieval Press, pp. 153-163.

11

'Stuffed Latin':
Vernacular Evidence in Latin Documents

David Trotter

'Stuffed Latin', or 'latin farci', is a term used for the incorporation of vernacular elements in Latin documents in (especially) southern France during the tenth, eleventh, and early twelfth centuries.[1] A number of the Latin documents from this period contain isolated words, or more importantly, phrases, and also proper names in Occitan. This is in some respects a curiosity: northern France does not exhibit the same pattern, although it has been associated with other Romance-speaking areas, and, in general, it is considered that this is a north–south divide, with the south following the practice and the north eschewing it.[2] Explanations of the phenomenon have not always been entirely charitable: Clovis Brunel comments thus: 'les rédacteurs des actes ont d'abord employé la langue vulgaire au milieu de phrases latines, quand leur ignorance ne leur permettait pas d'exprimer autrement leur pensée'.[3] Nowadays, we would probably see this as a manifestation of perfectly normal language mixing rather than an illustration of linguistic or educational inadequacy.

The ways in which the Romance languages (including, in this case, Occitan) emerged greatly facilitated processes of this type. Occitan, like any other Romance variety, is very largely a direct linear descendant of Latin. Syntactically, to some extent morphosyntactically, and certainly in terms of a shared alphabet and lexis, a process essentially of combination of the two languages into a mixed language text is especially straightforward. Long before the tenth century, Latin coexisted with Romance varieties that were emerging in speech. Thus we have, broadly speaking, a situation where a written language (Latin) is still in use in an area where a vernacular (Romance), itself a derivative of Latin, is being spoken. It is hardly surprising, then, that certain elements of the vernacular should begin to creep into written Latin, as a precursor to the emergence of a fully fledged vernacular writing tradition in Romance.

This is of course something of a simplification of a process that must have been quite complicated, and which will undoubtedly have been quite different

---

[1] C. Brunel, 'Les premiers exemples de l'emploi du provençal dans les chartes', *Romania* 48 (1922), 335–64; J. Belmon and F. Vielliard, 'Latin farci et occitan dans les actes du XIe siècle', *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 155 (1997), 149–83.

[2] Belmon and Vielliard, 'Latin farci et occitan', p. 149.

[3] Brunel, 'L'emploi du provençal', pp. 337–8.

following local traditions, education and indeed tastes. Nevertheless, my contention is that this pattern is by no means as geographically limited as is often supposed and, at any rate, that the underlying method of analysis that we use when dealing with it in southern France can usefully be transferred to other areas. It is perhaps stretching the definition of 'latin farci' to apply it to medieval England, but it is important nevertheless to recognize just how widespread comparable processes were.

Let me first of all comment briefly on an example of the pattern in Latin and Occitan (its home territory). This is text (A), a tenth-century document concerning the bishop of Rodez and preserved in a fourteenth-century cartulary (it is assumed that the cartulary is a faithful transcription):

(A) Preparatus sit Gardradus, filius <u>Gardradus</u>, si Deusdet episcopus et mater sua <u>Adalaiz</u> mortui fuerint ante illum, quod illo Castello Marino in fidelitate et in opus Sancte Marie de Ruthenis teneat, sine deceptione sancte Marie, suo sciente. Et ille episcopus qui post mortem Deusdet <u>episcopo</u> et <u>Adalaiz</u> matri sue, primus episcopus fuerit, de Sancte Marie de Ruthenis quindecim mansos donet Gardrado, filio <u>Gardrado</u>, de Ruthenis usque ad Biaur in casmansos donet Gardrado, filio Gardrado, de Ruthenis usque ad Biaur in <u>castellania</u>. Et ipse Gardrado, filius Gardrado, talem firmitatem faciat de ipso episcopo de sua vita et de sua membra et de sua terra et de illo Castello Marino et de illa <u>castellania</u> superius scripta per que illum in eum se fidare posceat et debeat: **et de illo Castello Marino no.l decebra** <u>ipso episcopo</u> **nec no lo li vedara, ne no lo li tolra.** Sicut superius scriptum est, **si ho tenra et si ho atendra** ipse Gardradus de sua parte, suo sciente, si ille fuerit, **fors quantum** ipse Deusdet episcopus **l'en absolverat.**[4]

Here there are clearly features that could by no stretch of the most elastic imagination be regarded as Latin. Underlined elements are doubtful (place-names, personal names, a technical term *castellania*) but there can be no doubt about the phrases in bold. They are clearly Romance.

A second text (B) comes from León. Classed by Menéndez Pidal as an example of 'latín vulgar leonés' (a formulation that neatly combines localization and a claim to continued Latinity, even if it is spoken *latín vulgar*), it is analysed by Roger Wright[5] as a Latin graphical representation (i.e. retaining traditional Latin graphies) of an underlying Romance text, and transcribed by him (phonetically) as such, in a rendition which has nonetheless been sharply criticized.[6] The following is an excerpt:

---

[4] Aveyron, 961–97, preserved in cartulary of bishop of Rodez [s. XIV]; Belmon and Vielliard, 'Latin farci et occitan', p. 157.

[5] R. Wright, *Late Latin and Early Romance in Spain and Carolingian France* (Liverpool, 1982).

[6] H. and W. Berschin, 'Mittellatein und Romanisch', *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 102 (1987), 1–19.

(B) In Dei nomine. Ego Splendonius tiui Fredesinde In Domino salutem. Ideo placuit mici atque conuenit, nunlliusque cogentis Inperio neque suadentis articulo set probria mici acesi uoluntas ut **uinderem tiui** Iam dicte Fredesinde terra In uilla Uiasco **suber Illa senrra domniga lloco** predicto Agro **rrodundo**.[7]

Wright[8] describes this as 'a kind of hybrid between Latin and vernacular' and notes that it 'contains both legal terminology and Romance elements'.[9] I am (fortunately perhaps) concerned less with pronunciation (though I agree with Wright that there is no need to postulate an intermediate spoken *latín vulgar leonés*) than with whether individual words are nearer in form to Romance than to Latin. Those that are in bold type are phonetically apparently at least some way to being Romance (*tiui, vinderem, suber*) or frankly already Romance (*senrra, domniga, lloco, rrodundo*). For me, then, this is simply another piece of *latin farci*, albeit with a stuffing that follows a Leonese, not an Occitan, recipe. For there is, as we shall see, more than one way not just to skin a cat, but (in this case) to stuff a goose.

Analysis of multilingual material of this type is rarely problem-free. Above all, we lack any real information about contemporary perceptions, and about metalinguistic conceptions of what was meant, for example, by the separated-ness of languages, which we take for granted. Within what one might term the Latin–Romance continuum, there are additional complications. In the first place, since Latin is patently the ancestor of Romance, then, to put it another way, Romance is an evolved form of Latin. That means that we are dealing not with two languages that coexist, or even two varieties of one language that sit side by side, but with one (possibly, but not certainly, distinct) language that is in a sense a continuation (or possibly other variant form) of the other. The written tradition was almost exclusively what we would think of as Latin, and thus there is by definition virtually no documented point of comparison for the emergence of Romance and the continuation of Latin. Even the early glossarial evidence, sometimes thought of as representing the early forms of spoken Romance, could be interpreted as simply indicating variant or proscribed forms of written Latin. So, in (for example) the *Appendix Probi* of c.700,[10] the forms listed could simply be part of an attempt to correct written Latin, and to fend off newfangled Romance-influenced forms.

In early medieval England, the situation is undoubtedly more complex. Not one, but two vernaculars are in operation. One of them (Anglo-Saxon) is radi-cally different from Latin, so that much of what I have just said about the relative

7 Document from León, from the year 908; Berschin, 'Mittellatein und Romanisch', p. 5, and Wright, *Late Latin and Early Romance*, p. 166.
8 Wright, *Late Latin and Early Romance*, p. 165.
9 Wright, *Late Latin and Early Romance*, p. 167.
10 M. Iliescu and D. Slusanski, *Du latin aux langues romanes. Choix de textes traduits et commentés (du IIᵉ siècle avant J.C. jusqu'au Xᵉ siècle après J.C.)* (Wilhelmsfeld, 1991), p. 103.

ease of transition between two genetically related languages no longer applies. Against that must be set the fact that, prior to the Norman Conquest, a lengthy tradition of writing in the vernacular also existed, so that Anglo-Saxon and Latin had for some time been used to being side-by-side not only in speech, but also as written languages. The addition of Anglo-Norman to this mixture brings with it an added dimension: a Romance vernacular, again without, at that time, a tradition of being used in writing in those areas of France from which it came. There were, it is true, isolated examples of texts in Romance, but they remain just that,[11] and there is little evidence of a sustained, widespread use of northern Gallo-Romance in literary or non-literary texts anywhere before the Norman Conquest. That, in itself, generates an evidence problem that I shall return to later.

I shall, for the purposes of the insular (British) element of this discussion, be looking at three separate sources of information. The first of these (C) is not really a text at all, but the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* (DMLBS). I think it is worth drawing attention to the DMLBS in this context simply to emphasize the extent to which any worthwhile dictionary of medieval Latin is by definition riddled with vernacular evidence. The point, I believe, is important: it is sometimes overlooked, just as French specialists are wont to overlook the fact that the *Middle English Dictionary* (MED) is itself an excellent dictionary of medieval French. It is hardly surprising that a dictionary of medieval Latin should contain vernacular elements, since, clearly, it is in part the contact with the vernaculars that caused medieval Latin, and for that matter non-classical Latin across the Empire, to be modified, expanded, and developed to meet the particular requirements of local societies and according to differences in the natural world. The extent to which this was already true during the Empire is brilliantly demonstrated in Jim Adams's far-ranging study of *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*.[12] With the advent of a second written vernacular after the Norman Conquest, and the continuation of Anglo-Saxon, it comes as no surprise (or should come as no surprise) that the DMLBS contains a substantial amount of information about the history of those languages. Indeed, it is certainly the case that (at least as far as Anglo-Norman is concerned) the DMLBS often preserves evidence before it is to hand in written, Anglo-Norman sources. The same, of course, is true of the MED, notably, but by no means exclusively, in the case of English surnames of Anglo-Norman provenance. These are often found long before the words that underlie their frequently Latin manifestations are attested in French documents on either side of the English Channel. In other words, as I have tried to indicate elsewhere,[13] we need to look at written evidence often in the 'wrong' language,

---

[11] M. Pfister, 'Die sprachliche Bedeutung von Paris und der Ile-de-France vor dem 13. Jh.', *Vox Romanica* 32 (1973), 217–53.

[12] J. N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge, 2003).

[13] D. A. Trotter, 'The Anglo-French Lexis of the *Ancrene Wisse*: A Re-evaluation', in *A Companion to* Ancrene Wisse, ed. Y. Wada (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 83–101; idem, '"Not quite what it says on the tin": Mining the National Archives for Multilingual Documents', World Universities Network video-seminar (University of Bristol, March 2007).

in order to unearth the subterranean manifestations of as yet unwritten (or as yet unattested, or lost) vernacular evidence.

The other two documents I want to look at are part of the borough customs of Leicester (D) from 1196, and what is perhaps the most complicated of my three texts, the earliest, the law code known as IV Aethelred (E), from an early twelfth-century manuscript of (perhaps) an early eleventh-century text.

The DMLBS is an exemplary dictionary and it provides an exemplary record of multilingual Britain, filtered through what was always its principal language of record, medieval Latin. Table 11.1 shows (from a couple of pages within the letter 'H') a number of clearly non-Latin lexical items nevertheless preserved in Latin texts and thus recorded in (C), a dictionary of Latin.

Table 11.1: Sample non-Latin lexical items

DMLBS + date	Meaning	MED	OED	DEAF (= OF)
hobelarius a 1124	'light horseman'	a1325	1308	c.1160
hobelus a 1217	'hobby, small hawk'			end 12th c.
hobeus 1306	'hobby, small hawk'	1440	1440	c.1195 hobé
hobinus c.1276	'hobby, small horse'	1298 (in Latin text)	1375	1305
hitha Domesday	'landing place'	1176 (place-name)	c.725	
hogaster 1128 ('pig', earlier than 'sheep')		AL & AF a1400 (earliest is 'sheep')	1420 sense 1, 1175 sense 2 but same cit. as DMLBS	< OE/ME 1270, AN SeneschO
hokum 2 1195; cf. hoga 6 1199	'spit or strip of land (?in bend of river)' (same sense for both hokum 2 and hoga 6	1300 but this sense in place-names only; = hoga (place-names only), c.1125	1600 this sense, OED says < Du. hoek; hoe c.700	hoge c.1140 < ME hough; hoc < Frk. *hôk

The first four words listed in this table are Anglo-Norman, transparently Latinized.

Hitha is a Latinized survival of the long-standing Anglo-Saxon term (hence, for example, Rotherhithe).

Hogaster is Anglo-Norman.

Hokum/hoka exemplify the complexities of multilingual etymology. The OED suggests Dutch hoek as the source of hokum, found in 1195 in Latin; but this sense is found only (in ME) in place-names, and from 1300; hoga, also exclusively in toponyms, is found in ME from 1125. The DEAF has a much earlier (c.1140) hoge, apparently from ME hough (which may be the same word) and hoc, from a Frankish *hôk, which, to the uninitiated, looks as if it is cognate with Dutch hoek. Anglo-Norman sources preserve forms that seem to be transmogrifications of hough.

Hogaster is similarly entangled: meaning (variously) a boar or a sheep, in

its third or second year, as the case may be, and the oldest DMLBS attestation (from 1128) is for a pig; the MED and OED can offer nothing as early, and their first offerings are for sheep not pigs; in Anglo-Norman, the first attestation is in Walter of Henley's *Seneschalcie* (DEAF: SeneschO) of *c*.1270.

The key point regarding *hogaster* is that the Latin evidence, although not quite for the same sense, is conspicuously earlier than the vernacular data, but this is a word that ostensibly originated in the vernacular and then made its way into Latin. The evidence, in short, is back to front. This – like many another – is a muddle that cannot be monolingually resolved because it has not been monolingually generated.

My next example (D), from the borough records of Leicester,[14] is later but (or indeed, perhaps because of that) no less confusing. Here we have a predominantly Latin text (some would say: a Latin text, full stop) from 1196, which has been infiltrated by Romance elements. The Leicester records were discussed by William Rothwell in a paper delivered in Sheffield in 1995; but apart from that, in the main, they have received little attention, and certainly not the attention that from a (socio)linguistic perspective they undoubtedly deserve. Below I reprint a section from the First Merchant Gild Roll, from Wednesday, 9 October 1196, a list of those who entered the guild and of their sponsors (underlining in the text here indicates marking for deletion in the original manuscript). Because the opening section of the record is provided in a facsimile which accompanies the edition, I have been able to provide (for crucial sections) a reproduction, albeit at one or two removes, of the manuscript.

Item Isti intrauerunt in Gildam **Merchatoriam** die festi beati Dionisii primo post aduentum comitis in Angliam post deliberacionem suam de capcione sua in Francia: soluunt de introitu & de tauro & de ansis et tantum debent: [...]
S. Galterus de Nicol[ia]: quietus de Introitu et de hansis. Eius plegii: Wilke Waterman, Rob. de Burg[o]. [...]

Galfridus de Eitona teintor. Eius plegii: Rob. halleknaue Radulfus francus teintor [*ed.*: tinctor]: dedit viiis. et debet iis.
S. Rob. Halleknaue iiis. iiiid. Eius plegii: Galf. teintor de Eitona, Rad. tinctor francus: quietus.
Taurus. Rad. teintor francus vid. Eius plegii.

14 M. Bateson, *Records of the Borough of Leicester*, Selden Society 1 (London, 1899), pp. 12–13.

[...]
S. Wchinus filius Willelmi filii Warini vid. Eius plegii: Ioh. Warin, Galterus pikenot: quietus de introitu et ansis per totum.

S. Ric. daunsel his. iiiis. iiid. quietus de introitu: eius plegii: Rad. cocus, Ioh. filius Estephani.

[...] S. Will. filius Geruasii folebarbe. Eius plegii: Hugo filius Cireth, Rob. Blund Garcifer fulconis filii Hugonis: quietus de introitu.

Taurus. Jacobus de flekeneige xxd. Eius plegii.
S. Will. Longus (deleted payments). Eius plegii: Jacobus de flekeneie: quietus de omnibus Rebus.

A number of words call for comment:

teintor (cf. parallel *tinctor*): the coexistence of the (Romance) form *teintor* and its Latin cognate (and etymon) *tinctor* is very striking in the relevant two lines of text, where the only logical conclusion to be drawn is that the two forms (or the forms in the two languages) are, for the author, interchangeable (and for that matter, palaeographically hard to distinguish when abbreviated forms like *teint'* are deployed):

S. Galfridus de Eitona teintor. Eius plegii: Rob. halleknaue Radulfus francus teintor [ed.: tinctor]: dedit viiis. et debet iis.
S. Rob. Halleknaue iiis. iiiid. Eius plegii: Galf. teintor de Eitona, Rad. tinctor francus: quietus.

halleknave: 1185 Willelmus Hallecnave MED; *waterman*: (as surname) from 1196 (in this text, cited MED) are two English words (occupational surnames).
pikenot: the meaning of this word is unclear although it does appear to be English.
daunsel = OF/AN 'young man'.
folebarbe: ME + AF hybrid, 'full beard' [?] The sense is unclear but the word is obviously vernacular and probably a mixture of Anglo-Norman and Anglo-Saxon (Middle English).
garcifer: DMLBS, < cf. AN *garçun*, ME *garsoun*, 'servant, groom', an obvious Latinization of an Anglo-Norman word.

flekeneige, flekeneie = Fleckney (Leics.): chiefly remarkably for the two forms of the toponym.

Finally, there is the case of text (E), the legal text known as IV Aethelred. From my point of view, this source is problematic principally because of the history of its transmission, but also because it is (potentially) so early. I say 'potentially' because the text was apparently originally compiled in the early part of the eleventh century (that is, probably a half-century *before* the Norman Conquest), but it unfortunately survives only in what appears to be the last of five recensions of a twelfth-century reworking known by the title of *Quadripartitus*, a half-century *after* the Conquest. Critical to any analysis of the multilingual elements[15] in the text is, therefore, the attempt to determine which elements were in the original and which were added by the – naturally, anonymous – author whom Patrick Wormald refers to as 'Q',[16] and who seems every bit as mysterious as his namesake, the gadget man in the James Bond series. Disentangling the manuscript transmission in this regard at least seems to have defeated even the great Liebermann who is not, to a philologist, terribly enlightening on the lexis of the text nor the linguistic implications of its chronological evolution. Yet these are crucial: IV Aethelred, of which a portion is reproduced below, is potentially among the earliest evidence of Anglo-Norman that we have, and certainly constitutes a very early example of trilingual language contact. It is not by accident that it should feature (under the siglum *GAS*, *Gesetze der Angelsachsen*) at the beginning of so many DMLBS articles.

'IV Aethelred': Customs of Billingsgate, probably 1000–1035, preserved in Quadripartitus (more than a century later).

Item rex Lundonie
Ealdretesgate et Cripelesgate (id est portas illas) observabant custodes:
Ad Billingesgate si advenisset una navicula, I obolus tolonei dabatur, si maior et haberet siglas, I d..
Si adveniat ceol vel hulcus et ibi iaceat, quatuor d. ad teloneum.
De navi plena lignorum unum lignum ad tol'.
In ebdomada pañ teloñ lll diebus: die Dominica et die Martis et die Iovis.
Qui ad pontem venisset cum bato, ubi piscis inesset, ipse mango unum obolum dabat in telon., et de maiori nave unum d.
Homines de Rotomaga, qui veniebant cum vino vel craspisce, dabant rectitudinem sex sol. de magna navi et XX. frustum de ipso craspisce.

---

[15] Liebermann observes that 'Das Latein des Werkes [...] wimmelt von unclassischen Wörtern aus des Verfassers Nordgallischer Muttersprache, aus dem Englischen, das er täglich hörte und in seiner Vorlage las, und aus dem Anglonormannischen Recht; nur für Anglonormannen war es überhaupt bestimmt und verständlich' (F. Liebermann, *Quadripartitus, ein englisches Rechtsbuch von 1114* (Halle, 1892), p. 33).

[16] P. Wormald, *The Making of English Law: King Alfred to the Twelfth Century*, vol. 1: *Legislation and its Limits* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 320–2.

Flandrenses et Ponteienses et Normannia et Francia monstrabant res suas et extolneabant.

Hogge et Leodium et Nivella, qui pertransibant (per terras ibant), ostensionem dabant et telon.

Et homines imperatoris, qui veniebant in navibus suis, bonarum legum digni tenebantur, sicut et nos.

Preter discarcatam lanam et dissutum unctum et tres porcos vivos licebat eis emere in naves suas.

Et non licebat eis aliquod forceapum facere burhmannis, et dare toll' suum et in sancto natali Domini duos grisengos pannos et unum brunum et decem libras piperis et cirotecas quinque hominum et duos caballinos tonellos aceto plenos; et totidem in pascha.

De dosseris cum gallinis I gallina telon., et de uno dossero cum ovis V ova telonei, si veniant ad mercatum.

Smeremangestre (que mangonant in caseo et butiro): XIIII diebus ante natale Domini unum den. et septem diebus ante natale (Domini) unum alium.

Si portireva vel tungravio compellet aliquem vel alius prepositus, quod teloneum supertenuerit, et homo respondeat, quod nullum tolneum concelaverit, quod iuste dare debuisset, iuret hoc se VII° et sit quietus.

Si cacepollum advocet, quod ei teloneum dedit, et ille neget, perneget ad Dei iudicium et in nulla alia lada.

There are a number of troubling problems in this text if it is to be read as Latin. It clearly contains a number of Anglo-Saxon words that may be the result of its production in the early eleventh century. That is not the only explanation since Anglo-Saxon continued to appear in post-Conquest documents. IV Aethelred's Latin displays partial abandonment of core principles of Latin morphosyntax in the form of inflexions – which would in due course be replaced by prepositional constructions and analytical word-order to compensate for the loss of synthetically conveyed grammatical information – but that is not an exclusively pre- or post-Conquest feature. It is endemic from the late Roman Empire across the Latin world. But the most challenging linguistic features here are the Anglo-Norman elements, whose status is the most complex of the three languages concerned, and whose presence in the text is most problematic in terms of the date, construction and transmission of the surviving text. This latter contains place-names that signally fail to comply with Latin morphosyntax: *Flandrenses et Pontejenses et Normannia et Francia; Hogge et Leodium et Nivella*. In terms of lexis, *ceol vel hulcus* demonstrates a contiguity of Anglo-Saxon and Latin (Liebermann thinks this is not a gloss, but cf. DMLBS cyula). Discarcare is the first DMLBS attestation of this verb (cf. carcare from 1166), which is attested in the much earlier *Lex Salica*.[17] There are Anglo-Saxon words: *forceapum* is the only citation sub DMLBS foreceapum < AS *foreceap* 'forecheap', 'forestalling (market)'; *burhmannis* is clearly Anglo-Saxon (*burhman*) with Latin inflexion; *portireva, tungravio* likewise.

---

17 E.g. XXVII: see Iliescu and Slusanski, *Du latin aux langues romanes*, p. 169.

161

Dosseris, dossero, 'pannier(-load)' is attested in DMLBS **dorsarium**, but the form looks as if it at least could be due to Anglo-Norman *dosser* (DMLBS: cf. AN *dosser* …); *ostensio* is attested from Classical Latin (cf. DMLBS), but the specific sense here (no. 10 in DMLBS: 'scavage, tax levied on foreign merchants') seems to be a translation of the Anglo-Saxon/Middle English *scauāge* (MED), Anglo-Norman *scawage* (AND) – cf. MED: 'AF **scawage, schawage** (cp. 16th-century NF **escauwage**) & AL **scawagium**; ult. English: cp. OE sceāwian & ME sheuen'.[18] Perhaps most intriguing of all is grisengos: DMLBS **grisengus** < Anglo-Norman *grisenc*, cf. DEAF **grisan** G1420,24 (cf. same page of DMLBS: **grisellus, grisillum, grismulettus**, all from Anglo-Norman). If it is Anglo-Norman, how is it in Latin before the Conquest, or what has happened to the documentary record? **Cacepollum** is similarly Anglo-Norman but in disguise: cf. OED2: '[a. med.L. *cacepollus*, ONF. **cachepol* = central OF. *chacepol, chacipol, chassipol*, in med.L. also *cachepolus, chacepollus, chacipollus, chassipullus* (Du Cange), lit. 'chase-fowl', one who hunts or chases fowls. The form of the word appears to indicate that it arose in Provençal, where it would be *cassapol*, or It., where it would be *cacciapollo*. The OF. was apparently adapted from Pr. or med.L.].'

In short, this is a text that eloquently demonstrates the level of language contact in the immediate post-Conquest period, while at the same time highlighting some of the difficulties in analysing documents whose literary and textual ancestry antedates that linguistic watershed. And this, in turn, raises the question of how real, and how marked, that watershed really was. It is perhaps worth stressing the extent of contact, at the highest level, between England and Normandy well before the Norman Conquest: indeed, the Norman Conquest, so-called, is a direct consequence of precisely those contacts, and of the negotiation between Edward the Confessor and Duke William, and even between the Normans and the ill-fated Harold. Those who promulgated a series of laws deriving from the authority of the Anglo-Saxon kings were in contact with Normandy well before 1066.[19] It is thus theoretically possible that any Anglo-Norman element in a twelfth-century recension of a pre-Conquest Latin (or for that matter, Anglo-Saxon) text, could be genuinely pre-Conquest. In the case of IV Aethelred, the case is not proven, but it *could* have happened in that way. At any rate what we have, beyond reasonable doubt, is a Latin text (itself a reworking of an Anglo-Saxon precursor) that preserves, in the early twelfth century, *grisengos*, the first attestation of a Latinized form of an originally Anglo-Norman word, *grisan*. This case, alone, calls into question the viability of (often undernourished) monolingual etymological

---

[18] See also N. Middleton, 'Early Medieval Port Customs, Tolls and Controls on Foreign Trade', *EME* 13 (2005), 313–58.

[19] See the essay by Tyler in this volume for some literary and cultural arguments against the definitiveness of the Conquest, also her 'Talking about History in Eleventh-Century England: The *Encomium Emmae Reginae* and the Court of Harthacnut', *EME* 13 (2005), 359–83.

investigations. One of the key points of multilingual texts, in this case in 'latin farci', is that they can and do feed several philologies at once.[20]

is

an

om

id-

[20] A further element in the linguistic jigsaw derives from those relatively few Anglo-Saxon words that have been transmitted into French. But this, too, is problematic, for the simple reason that the Anglo-Saxon words cannot be proven to have made their way into any form of French before the Norman Conquest, simply because there is almost no textual evidence in Old French of any sort (or from any area) at so early a date (cf. Pfister,'Die sprachliche Bedeutung'; Berschin 'Mittellatein und Romanisch', p. 8 and n.14). Indeed, the consensus for the most obvious among the Anglo-Saxon borrowings (the cardinal points of the compass: north, south, east, and west) is that they were transferred from Anglo-Saxon into Anglo-Norman, and thence made their way into continental French. While this is a pattern of transmission that seems in some respects to go against that which is normally presumed for the process of the evolution of continental French and the development of its offshore dialect cousin, Anglo-Norman, it is the only hypothesis that the current state of documentary evidence permits.