Technical Vocabulary and its Identification in Medieval Celtic Latinity

Several years ago in Prague, at a previous gathering of the editorial teams of the various territorial dictionaries dealing with the Latin of the Middle Ages, I had the privilege of outlining the methodology being followed by the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from Celtic Sources* (DMLCS) project. The key point was that the lexicographical work involved had been established upon a searchable, full-text database of the sources in question. That database was and is the *Archive of Celtic-Latin Literature*, or *ACLL* (of which, by the way, a new, developed and much expanded edition has subsequently been published digitally). Though, if well designed, such a database, once published, will immediately lend itself also to other applications, its primary role is of course precisely to provide words and citations for the compilation of a dictionary. In the DMLCS case the first constituent volume of such a dependent dictionary was duly produced, and was published at the end of 2005 by Brepols in their renowned *Corpus Christianorum* series; it covered letters A to H (effectively the first half of the alphabet) for all the words in the project’s corpus that were not to be found in the standard Oxford dictionary of Classical Latin. As explained in Prague, the DMLCS plan (as agreed with Brepols) is to complete

---

2 Anthony Harvey, Angela Malthouse (ed.), *Royal Irish Academy Archive of Celtic-Latin Literature*, second edition, on line at Brepolis since 2010.
3 In the case of *ACLL*, among Latin texts long included were the original, 5th-century compositions of St Patrick himself. This prompted the building around them of a multi-medium digital resource for the further investigation of the writings of this the patron saint of Ireland: the result, funded by Cycle 4 of the Irish government’s Programme for Research in Third-Level Institutions (PRTLI), is Anthony Harvey, Franz Fischer (ed.), *The St Patrick’s Confessio Hypertext Stack*, available gratis on line since 2011 as http://www.confessio.ie.
and publish this lexicon in book form, but then also to issue it in an electronic version, grafted onto the full-text Archive. Thanks to the unified coding-system adopted for both publications this should mean that scholars reading a Celtic-Latin text from the Archive on their computer screen, and wishing to know the definition of (or some other information concerning) a word that they encounter therein, will be able to click on the word in question, and the Lexicon’s entry for that word will appear in a window on the same screen. Dictionary and database, which have always been the twin pillars of the DMLCS project, will thus finally have combined as a self-interpreting compendium of Celtic latinity.

In the years that remain until this objective is achieved, the DMLCS editorial team finds itself in a somewhat privileged position: unlike anyone else at present we already have access to the electronic version of our Lexicon, since we are preparing this pari passu with (and in fact as part of the same process as) our compilation of the book version. This means that, up to the point that our lexicographical work has reached in the alphabet, we already enjoy the key scholarly advantage described in Prague as accruing to researchers who have access to an electronic version of a dictionary. This advantage is the ability quickly and systematically to interrogate such a work – and not just by headword, which is the only way that a hard-copy dictionary can be searched (because, of course, in a book headwords alone have been systematically arranged, namely by alphabetical order). With a digitized dictionary, by contrast, one can also search by any of the other fields of information within the articles, to the extent that these have been consistently entered. Examples were given in Prague of the results of electronically searching our Lexicon by two such fields, namely by definition (so as to produce a compendium of all the Latin terms that dealt with tides of the sea), and by author (so as to produce a bespoke glossary of the non-Classical vocabulary coined by one particular Celtic-Latin writer, abbot Adomnán of Iona). Since that time the potential of such multi-dimensional electronic searching has continued to be exploited, for example to compile glossaries of the peculiar usages of other specified authors (namely the 7th-century Hiberno-Latin writers Virgilius Maro Grammaticus and Muirchú macu Machthéní5). But also, by means of a search conducted instead on the field of etymology, the necessary data have been extracted for a paper about the lexical influences of other languages on the medieval Latin of the Celts, as published by our Spanish colleagues in the proceedings of the conference that they recently ran so excellently in León6. Again, with the electronic version of our Lexicon one can search on the field of geographical provenance since, thanks to the DMLCS

coding system, this is an item of information that is embedded within each citation. Using this it has been possible systematically to compare, on the one hand, the kinds of medieval Latin neologisms coined by authors from Celtic territories that had been under Roman rule in Imperial times with, on the other hand, those generated by writers from Gaelic-speaking areas, which never had been in the Empire. The result actually seems quite surprising and significant, with important implications for the linguistic situation of post-Roman Britain that had not been anticipated.\footnote{Anthony Harvey, « Cambro-Romance? Celtic Britain's Counterpart to Hiberno-Latin », forthcoming.}

As can be seen, the initiatives just outlined are resulting in the appearance of major articles in a number of peer-reviewed publications. Though the effort involved takes time away from dictionary compilation it is, I think, worthwhile to compose such pieces since, as our fellow lexicographer the internationally-known linguist Manfred Görlach has written, « It happens too often in the history of dictionaries that ... general statements which could have been put forward by the compilers, after many years of dedicated research, are never put together in coherent form »\footnote{Manfred Görlach (ed.), \textit{English in Europe}, Oxford, 2002, p. 1.}. DMLCS experience suggests that their potential to address this deficit is a further reason why our projects generally should embrace electronic media: for, just as digitizing our sources makes our lexicography sounder and less subjective, so, in turn, digitizing the dictionaries that we compile from those sources enables us to produce much more systematic and illuminating syntheses and surveys of the treasures that those dictionaries hopefully contain. The current paper represents an attempt to give a further example of how one may make concrete use of such opportunities, on this occasion using electronic means to identify, in line with the theme of the Munich symposium, the technical vocabulary in the medieval latinity of the Celts. To achieve this the field of the search was changed again, this time to the various abbreviated indications as to genre with which DMLCS had labelled many of its entries (or parts of them) during compilation.

Since we had generated such labels as we went along according to need, to list them is itself to give an initial indication of the principal kinds of technical vocabulary that are found in Celtic-Latin literature. The accompanying graph shows what they are: namely those dealing with matters astronomical or astrological, botanical, ecclesiastical, geometrical, grammatical, logical, mathematical, medical, metrical (that is, the technical vocabulary used to analyse poetry), monastic, musical (that is, the terminology of music), philosophical, rhetorical, and zoological. It is interesting to see to what extent these same word-fields emerge as distinctive in the work of our sister projects; but as regards the appearance of the labels designating them in our own output, some points need to be made.
First, DMLCS has never made any attempt to allocate all, or even most, of its citations to one or other of these word-fields. As one can work out by totalling the columns in the graph, the fourteen labels just listed, taken together, appear in about 430 of the entries contained in the published volume of our *Lexicon*; but this is not much more than 7% of the nearly 6000 entries to be found there. This is because we have often only applied them in order to draw attention to the presence of a high degree of specialization in a particular word or usage (which we have then duly labelled appropriately), as opposed to instances having a more general application (which have not been so labelled). This selectivity means that there are categories of vocabulary which, though objectively technical, have not been assigned a label since, in the contexts in which they were turning up, they did not stand in contrast with more generalized nomenclature. (Here there springs to mind the terminology, peculiar to Celtic latinity, for territorial units of administration in Wales or Ireland, such as the word *cantredus*.

---

9 This and all other lexemes mentioned in this article are given in the forms under which they have been alphabetized and dealt with in *NCLCL*; therefore, closer identifications of the works in which they appear, the editions from which these were digitally captured, the location of the words’ occurrences therein, details of etymologies, meanings etc. are in each case most handily pursued further by consulting *NCLCL* in the first instance. The words may be viewed in their settings in the original texts by means of appropriate electronic word-searches conducted on
for such a unit consisting notionally of 100 hamlets, or the genitive commoti – we only have it in oblique cases – for the « commote », a Welsh territorial subdivision of a « cantref » \(^{10}\). Categories like this not being labelled, a survey such as this will largely miss them; nevertheless, in another way our selectivity in labelling constitutes an advantage, in that it helps the researcher to avoid being swamped with data \(^{11}\). Taking for example the label « zool. », the presence of this in the entry for albignantes is what shows us, without any need to refer back to the source-text, that the 9th-century Breton-Latin author Bili has coined this plural form to refer to white-fronted geese in a fairly precise zoological way \(^{12}\).

The same label makes it clear that, when the anonymous, probably 15th-century Hiberno-Latin Tractatus de declinationibus Latinis glosses the neologism coquilla with the Gaelic definition faechóg beg, « a periwinkle or some other kind of small shellfish », it is in the context of making what we should nowadays consider to be a zoological classification \(^{13}\). Likewise again, when Gerald of Wales in the year 1188 coins a Latin ablative plural erminis from Old French (h)ermine to denote ermines or stoats he is speaking precisely \(^{14}\), and our Lexicon duly denotes the corresponding entry as a specifically zoological one.

Other times, though, the distribution of labels of specialization in the Lexicon should sound a note of mild caution. Thus the neologism cercella in the same, 12th-century Giraldian text means a teal, which is a kind of bird; our Lexicon does label this as a zoological term, but here I suspect that we have been motivated slightly differently in providing the label, namely in order to indicate the word-field to which our definition belongs (since the English word teal would itself not be immediately familiar to many of our readers). I say this because other, equally zoological terms coined by Gerald have not been specifically flagged as such: here one thinks of further avian names from the same text such as aurifrisius, an existing Latin word for gold-embroidered cloth which Gerald

\(^{10}\) These words are found in books by Gerald of Wales, writing in the decades on either side of the year 1200, and in 13th/14th-century Latin texts of the Welsh laws attributed to king Hywel Dda. The specific works concerned have been captured on ACC as texts A52-A55, A61 and A69 (Gerald), and A150 and A152-A153 (the Laws), respectively; along with details of editions etc. these are catalogued using the same numbering system in Michael Lapidge, Richard Sharpe, A Bibliography of Celtic-Latin Literature, Dublin, 1985 (henceforth BCLL).

\(^{11}\) On this syndrome see Harvey, « From Full-Text Database to Electronic Lexicon », p. 482-484.

\(^{12}\) The text is the prose section of the Vita S. Machutis (ACLI/BCLL text no. D825); Bili’s compatriot the anonymous author of the Vita II S. Samsonis (ACLI/BCLL text no. D951) is his sole follower in the usage.

\(^{13}\) The Tractatus is ACPI/BCLL text no. B337.

\(^{14}\) The text is ACPI/BCLL no. A52, Gerald’s classic Topographia Hiberniae.
has inventively diverted to designate the osprey\textsuperscript{15}; \textit{hobelus} for the hobby, a kind of small falcon; and \textit{gruta} to designate the grouse. The same applies to the several species of fish that Gerald identifies\textsuperscript{16}; in none of these cases does our \textit{Lexicon} display the specific zoological label, the reason being that in some cases our readers will immediately know what the English definition refers to (since words like \textit{falcon} and \textit{osprey} are commonplace), while in others we have explicitly included the word \textit{bird} or \textit{fish} in the definition, and to have added the zoological label on top of this would have seemed unnecessary to the point of being patronizing.

So it must be admitted that, in surveying our \textit{Lexicon} for technical vocabulary by means of searching for the fourteen labels, one will inevitably miss some of the relevant words and usages. I mention this as a \textit{caveat} to apply to what now follows but also because, as a consideration of more general lexicological interest, it may apply to the eventual electronic output of other dictionary projects besides our own. When one adds such genre-specifying labels, what point is one actually trying to make? Are we really including them for classificatory purposes, or is our primary intention simply to clarify or disambiguate our definitions? I suspect that the latter motivation will have been to the fore among lexicographers until very recently, since the ability systematically to search for such labels (which alone is what makes them useful in classifying one’s lemmata) has only come about with digitization. Upon analysis our own, DMLCS usage is seen to have been a hybrid of the two, hence any lacunae in the results presented here. Nevertheless, to proceed in the manner outlined still seems likely to be the most fruitful approach for surveys of this kind; in the present case, short of scouring the entire \textit{Lexicon} manually, it will probably still provide the most objective results. And one can always apply serendipity (as, for example, by assessing adjacent entries for relevance having initially had one’s attention drawn to a particular one as a result of searching for a label).

The remainder of this paper, then, goes through some of the other thirteen categories labelled in the DMLCS \textit{Lexicon}, and picks out examples, to every occurrence of which the label in question is applicable. In many cases, of course, the labels designate international words that were always only used in technical senses, both inside and outside the Celtic corpus of latinity; and these, given space constraints, have had to be ignored. By contrast, what attention will specifically be paid to is instances of the specialized use by Celtic authors of Latin words that, internationally, had more general definitions: in looking at these, we shall also note cases of the contrary phenomenon, namely the occasional employment of words that elsewhere had a technical meaning but were here being used innovatively in a despecialized, general sense. And of great

\textsuperscript{15} Gerald sees \textit{aurifrisius} as the etymology of the Old French word for that bird, \textit{orfrai}; in fact, the latter comes from Classical Latin \textit{ossifraga} «bone-breaker».

\textsuperscript{16} See Harvey, «Lexical Influences», p. 68.
significance also are genuine neologisms that are original to Celtic latinity: our authors will often have coined these because they needed them in order to be able to describe some feature of their world which the Latin language, as they had received it, had not previously encountered, and for which as far as they knew it therefore provided no existing word. This applies, for example, to most of the zoological words already mentioned. Such coinings, almost by their nature and certainly by their individual rarity, will be apt to appear as «technical» within the context of the Latin language viewed as a whole, and consequently will be likely to have attracted one of the labels that indicate this.

Beginning with botany, it is once more Gerald of Wales who gives us castanus for the sweet chestnut tree, as well perhaps as the (in practice, unlabelled) noun alnetum for an alder-grove, while the anonymous, possibly 7th-century Hiberno-Latin Prouerbia Grecorum¹⁷ had much earlier produced the similarly-formed betuletum to denote a birch-grove. If the dating for the latter is right then the coining is contemporary with the corresponding adjective bituleus for made of birch, also of Hibernian origin since it is first (and exclusively) found in the A-text of the so-called Hisperica famina¹⁸. It is in any case picked up in the 9th century by another Irish author, Sedulius Scottus, who in his Liber de rectoribus Christianis himself gives us a further botanical term (though used metaphorically), namely the verb <acrescere> «to become sour or revert to uncultivated kind»¹⁹.

In ecclesiastical terminology, baculosus occurs uniquely in the 13th-century D-recension of, once again, the laws attributed to the Welsh king Hywel Dda; it applies to one having a crozier as a mark of ecclesiastical rank. In the realm of specialized terms for different forms of ecclesiastical office-holding it was the great Gildas, whose Latin writings transformed the face of Celtic christendom from the 6th century onwards²⁰, who first coined the term conabbas to designate a fellow-abbot (as well as modifying the existing term coepiscopus into conepiscopus in the sense of a fellow-bishop); while bishops of the contemporary or even earlier church in Brittany were much exercised by the existence of so-called conhospitae, women who administered the chalice, even to the laity, at mass²¹. A similar fondness for the prefix co- or con- (com-) is found among the terms used in Irish inscriptions not later than the 8th century²² to designate ecclesiastical successors, namely comorbanus and conuerbius (though with each of these we should compare Old Gaelic comarbae). At the other end of

¹⁷ ACLL/BCLL text no. B344.
¹⁸ ACLL/BCLL text no. B325.
¹⁹ The two Sedulian works involved here are ACLL/BCLL texts C686 and C685 respectively.
²⁰ Gildas De excidio Britanniae and his fragmentary Epistola are ACLL/BCLL texts A27 and A28 respectively.
²¹ A letter about this from Licinius and other bishops to the priests Louocat and Catihern (ACLL/BCLL text no. D823) has been dated to the period 509-521.
²² Such inscriptiones Hiberniae are gathered in ACLL/BCLL text no. B637.
our period that prefix is found again in the Welsh laws’ use of *comminister* to refer to a fellow-servant or fellow-office-bearer, though this time not in Church, but in the royal court. This last is an instance of the despecialization of what had otherwise been a technical (in this case specifically ecclesiastical) term.

Moving on to the closely related field of monastic and ascetic terminology, interesting words specific to Celtic Latin include from the 6th century the possibly pejorative *clientella* for a wife who has been sexually abjured by monastic vow, and from the following centuries the variant *glantella* or *glandella* to denote a female servant or other member of the household. From the same period, a nice example of an otherwise general word’s having taken on a specialized use among the Celts is the Classical Latin noun *flexio* «a bending»: spelled with medial *ct* rather than the letter *x*, this was appropriated by the 7th-century Hiberno-Latin canon *De arreis* to refer specifically to ritual acts of prostration or penitential genuflexion; one Irish author, a biographer of St Patrick named Tírechán, analogously generated a neologism with this meaning, namely the ablative plural *flectenis*, with which we should compare the contemporary Gaelic *slechtan*. From as early as the 600s we know that Irish monks went about wearing *ficones*, a sort of simple, wrap-around footwear. In subsequent centuries such a monk might be classified by his contemporaries or successors as a *céile Dé*, a Gaelic phrase literally meaning a companion of God, but which underwent latinization in Norman times as *colideus*, under the influence of Classical *colere* «to worship». And all the time this monk and his like would be living against a background of *compulsatio*: not at all, one hopes, implying frequent disagreements or clashes (which is what this word would mean in standard Late Latin), but rather the regular ringing of a bell as a summons to divine service.

The field of grammar is one in which some members of the early Irish learned classes gave their clever inventiveness really full rein, and this applies to their coining of new Latin words to describe its technicalities. A seventh-century Irish author calling himself Virgilius Maro Grammaticus, already referred to, wrote two long Latin works that outline the grammar of the Latin language. This is largely done by means of invented quotations drawn from fictitious

---

23 These words are found in anonymous Hiberno-Latin penitential works (*ACLL/BCLL* texts B598, B602 and B614) as well as in material by the great Irish monastic pioneer St Columbanus of Luxeuil and Bobbio (C639-C640).

24 *ACLL/BCLL* text no. B603.

25 Tírechán’s *Collectanea de S. Patricio* is *ACLL/BCLL* text no. B301.

26 The earliest evidence appears to be that of the anonymous *Vita I S. Brigitae* (*ACLL/BCLL* text no. B352).

27 Gerald of Wales gives us the form, in *ACLL/BCLL* texts A52, A54 and A71.

28 The word is found in this sense in the anonymous 12th-century Hiberno-Latin *Vita S. Mochullei* (*ACLL/BCLL* text no. B370).

29 *ACLL/BCLL* texts B295–B296; these, and the substance of the remainder of this paragraph, are placed in more detailed context in Harvey, «Linguistic Method».
technical vocabulary and its identification

Not surprisingly, such a procedure has misled some into dismissing him out of hand. But in fact the concepts and substance of what he has to say are well worth considering, and the technical Latin words that he coins in doing so have been generated in a manner worthy of our respect. For example, to oppose the widespread grammatical term confirmatiuus « affirmative », he purloins the adjective <destructiuus> so as to mean, as it were, adversative. And one can hardly take exception to such clearly precise coinings of his as accumulatiuus for iterative, affectatiuus in the sense of (re)formed or extended by analogy, conaffigere for « to make a compound of », commutatiuus with the meaning « subject to heteroclitic alternation », hyperbaticus for asyntactic or parenthetic, and disyllaba (from the Classical Latin adjective disyllabus) for a disyllable, this item then going on to be used by Cruindmáel, a 9th-century Irish scholar at the Carolingian court. Virgilius uses the term dictura to refer to an utterance considered grammatically, whether this be a whole sentence or an individual word. That last coining is one of several that show Virgilius to have had real philological insight, others being terms that prefigure scientific usage in the genuinely modern sense, such as farium for a linguistic form or declinamentum to refer to what is clearly a lexeme or headword. In fact, some precise concepts are conveyed by Virgilius in single terms for which it is unfortunate that there are no one-word equivalents in technical modern parlance, such as expressorium for an adverb applied to a part of speech other than a verb – that would be useful (the English word very would be an example)! – or the ablative plural grammulis for characters or letters of the alphabet viewed as items to be learned. Again, the mainstream Latin word indicating the subjunctive mood, namely coniunctiuus, had always also conveyed such general senses as connective or joining. By adding a syllable, so as to get coniunctatiuus, Virgilius (or possibly some other 7th-century grammarian, but definitely in Ireland) carefully separated off the specialized grammatical usage by giving it a form of its own. And, by the way, the range of authors who then went on to use it elegantly reflects the extent and domain of the insular grammatical tradition, spreading as this word did from Virgilius and the anonymous writer to Cummian in 7th-century Ireland, to the continentally-based but still Irish author of the Ars ambrosiana in the 7th or 8th century, while continuing in use in Ireland with Malsachanus in his 8th-century Congregatio de uerbo and on the Continent in the 9th-century pages of the Irishman Donatus Orthigraphus. The Venerable Bede’s English contemporary Tatwine taps into this tradition, but no-one else seems to, and the subsequent loss of the useful distinction between coniunctatiuus and the mainstream word coniunctiuus afterwards led to a slump back into imprecision.

30 Cruindmáel’s Ars metrica is ACLL/BCLL text no. C668.
31 Apart from Virgilius’ the texts mentioned here are BCLL items B331, C750, B306, and C667 respectively. The first and third of these have so far been captured on ACLL.
Turning to the technical terminology of metrics, one is struck by the contrast: our corpus contains hardly any Latin neologisms by Celtic authors at all. But this is hardly because they were not interested in the matter: rather, because poetry in their own vernaculars is, was, and always had been famously strong, the Celts had also long been accustomed to deploying their own languages as the medium in which it was discussed; and they readily extended this to the analysis of Latin poetry as well. But as far as using the Latin language for the purpose of discussing metrical questions goes, the Irish only seem to have become active at the time of the Carolingian renaissance. One context in which phenomena that are interesting for present purposes may then emerge is when we see our authors struggling with their sources: thus we find John Scottus Eriugena, confronted with what looked like a neuter adjective arithmon, defining it under the influence of Greek ἀριθμός as numero carens, when all the time his reading should have been the standard Late Latin arrhythmon «lacking in rhythm». We also encounter once again the opposite side of the coin to technical usage: that is, the despecialization by a Celtic author of a term that, to others, had had genre-specific connotations. Thus Classical Latin had duly used the plural of elegus as a substantive to mean elegiac verses, but we find Cruindmáel (and, later, bishop Patrick of Dublin) generalizing it by metonymy into an adjective simply meaning sad or miserable.

Medical coinings in Celtic latinity include bocium for a swelling or lump, but this is presumably borrowed from Old French boce since it occurs only in a post-Norman life of St Laurence of Dublin. Four centuries earlier, at the Carolingian court, Eriugena had been more of a purist in his Latin word-coining when he constructed from thoroughly Classical roots the medical terms circumrubescere for «to become inflamed» and fellifer to characterize that which contains or secretes bile. And, once more, Celtic authors give us

32 Particularly to a latinist readership the point can scarcely be made too often that, already by the 7th century of our era, Gaelic was a fully developed, written language, with as detailed an intellectual apparatus, as wide a range of registers, and as technical a vocabulary as had Latin itself; in terms of quantity, Gaelic-language literacy constituted the earliest and, for its day, by far the largest body of non-Classical written material in Europe. For a very brief introduction to these matters see Anthony Harvey, «Latin and Old Irish Literacy», in James S. Donnelly, Jr. et al. (ed.), Encyclopedia of Irish History and Culture, 2 vol., Detroit, 2004, I, p. 378-380.


34 The context is Eriugena’s compilation, in 859 or 860, of a set of Annotationes (ACLL/BCLL text no. C704) on Martianus Capella De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii.

35 The carmina attributed to Patrick are grouped as ACLL/BCLL text no. B310.

36 The anonymous Vita S. Laurentii (ACLL/BCLL text no. B491) was composed not before 1225.

37 Both terms occur in ACLL/BCLL text no. C698, Eriugena’s Latin translation of Gregory of Nyssa De imagine.
nice examples of despecialization: these include, in (again) the 12th-century Hibernian Vita S. Mochullei, the use of the verb *fomentare* (meaning to bathe with warm water) in the context of luxury rather than in that of medical care, while Eriugena’s near-contemporary the Breton-Latin author Lios Monocus had earlier taken the noun *curamen*, which in international Late Latin was similarly a physician’s term only, and had employed it in the sense simply of more general care or attention 38.

As the accompanying graph shows, the label indicating philosophical usage accounts for a higher proportion of our designatedly technical vocabulary than does any other. But most of this is due to the prolific word-coining of one man, the great Eriugena. At our conferences in Barcelona and Prague I mentioned some of his specialist neologisms in this area 39, and it is easy to add any number of others: in his so-called *Periphyseon* 40 alone we find *circumponderare* for «to define», *coambire* for «to encompass or embrace», *deiformiter* meaning according to the likeness of God or divinely, *effectualiter* meaning resultantly, and *formificare* for «to lend shape to». Sometimes, he will coin a word and then deploy it both generally and technically: thus he uses his verb *circumspirare* intransitively of winds to mean to veer or back (that is, to change direction), but transitively in the philosophical sense of «to envelope spiritually, and so be that which animates» 41. Other times, Eriugena will coin a word and then use it in different senses each of which we have flagged as being technical: thus when he deploys his noun *confinitas* with the meaning «a concomitant, or that which is jointly caused» we have labelled it philosophical, but when it means a corollary, or that which is jointly implied, we have assigned it to the realms of logic (the distinction is arguably anachronistic 42). Or he will take a standard Latin word whose meaning is normally technical in one sense, and use it in another; thus the noun *adductio* was conventionally used medically, but Eriugena gives it philosophical force in the sense of a conducting or attraction from one plane of existence to another 43. And so on; as was pointed out in Barcelona, Eriugena was so inventive that whole conferences have been held on the subject of his thought and writings. However, what emerged on that occasion was that, even without him, the words generated within the Celtic tradition constituted an interesting and not unimportant part of the total medieval Latin word-store. The same may hopefully be seen from the present paper to apply to Irish

38 Lios’ usage is found in his *Libellulus sacerdotalis* (*ACLL/BCLL* text no. D829).
39 For the Barcelona contribution see Anthony Harvey, « The Non-Classical Vocabulary of Celtic-Latin Literature : An Overview », in Mary Garrison et al. (ed.), Spoken and Written Language : Relations between Latin and the Vernacular Languages in the Earlier Middle Ages, Turnhout, 2013, p. 87-100 (also available online as http://journals.eecs.qub.ac.uk/DMLCS/overview.pdf).
40 *ACLL/BCLL* text no. C700.
41 *ACLL/BCLL* texts C708 (intransitive) and C697 and C700 (transitive) respectively.
42 *ACLL/BCLL* texts C698 (philosophical) and C704 (logical) respectively.
43 *ACLL/BCLL* text no. C701.
writers’ generation, adaptation, and use of technical vocabulary. Indeed, only in the realm of specialized juridical terminology does Celtic latinity appear to lag in terms of innovation behind the other corpora represented at the Munich colloquium; and even this seems adequately explicable by the fact that, at least when it came to recording traditional secular law, recourse was naturally had instead to the technical vocabulary that was already available to Celtic societies within the medium of their own mother tongues, thanks to the highly developed literacy already enjoyed by these in the early Middle Ages.\footnote{The main texts of early Irish law, all in Gaelic, were already written down by the year 750; layers of commentary in the same language, accumulated in subsequent centuries, bulked out the total such that its modern publication has required the full six large volumes of Daniel A. Binchy (ed.), \textit{Corpus iuris Hibernici}, Dublin, 1978.}
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Abstract. — Originating as it did in the context of a conference of dictionary-makers, this paper surveys some problems that arise in the attempt to identify a sub-corpus of vocabulary as technical, before going on to discuss specific items of the sub-corpus so identified within the medieval Latin writings of the Celts.

Résumé. — Ce document, élaboré dans le cadre d’une réunion de lexicographes, donne un aperçu de certains problèmes qui se posent lorsque l’on tâche d’identifier un sous-corpus de vocabulaire technique, puis porte sur les rubriques spécifiques du sous-corpus ainsi identifié dans les écrits médiévaux latins des Celtes.