

Dear Colleagues,

First of all, I would like to apologize for not being with you today. This is due to an unpredictable inconvenience cautiously forcing me to stay at home. Despite that, I am honoured to take part into this symposium with my paper, which will be read by Prof. Velizar Sadovski. I deeply thank him for it, and I also want to show my gratitude to all of you, to Prof. Hans Christian Luschützky and to the Members of such prestigious scientific institutions as the Institute of Iranian Studies of the *Wiener Sprachgesellschaft* and the Vienna Linguistic Society.

The pages that are about to be read relate to a field of my current research that may be less consistent with the main topics of our symposium. However, I hope I can give my contribution, in order to build up the *varietas* that enriches the science of languages in its plurality of contents and methodological perspectives.

My short talk involves the notion of *derivatio*, that grammarians of the Middle Ages inherited from their Roman ancestors as an aspect of their reflection about the Latin word and its structure and about the possible relations among words in the lexicon.

As many scholars showed¹, the concept of *derivatio* is quite present in the Roman grammatical thought, but it is not treated in a systematic way and, above all, it does not necessarily coincide with what we, according to our current categories, can ascribe to derivation as a morphological strategy and a word formation process. An important exception can be seen in Varro², whose doctrine is a coherent system in which inflection and derivation are defined through the distinction between *declinatio a natura* and *declinatio a voluntate*, and in which the *genus compositivum* clearly emerges. Late Roman grammarians, anchored to a didactic and taxonomic idea of *derivatio*, that was strongly dependent on their Greek models, ignore Varro's contribution, and, in their technical approach, the notion of *derivatio* actually includes several different phenomena highlighting several relationships synchronically existing between *dictiones*.

Also the metalinguistic term *derivatio* may be used with a more restricted meaning that could be closer to that of the derivation as we can conceive it today, even though it doesn't coincide with

¹ After Ludwig Jeep, Roswitha Klinck, Vivien Law, Pierre Flobert, Chantal Kircher, and Jaana Vaahtera, among others.

² As Jean Collart and Daniel Taylor showed.

it³; consequently, *derivatio* may refer to the truly derivative relationship between *mons* and *montanus*. However, *derivatio* can also be used in a wider sense, and may be used to refer to something else: the processes of compounding and inflection, the interlinguistic relationship leading to word loans, the translation of words from one language into another, and, eventually, the area of phenomena labelled as *etymologia*.

A more limited meaning given to *derivatio* started to be more evident and to be used by Priscian, but only partially, in his classification of the accidents of the *partes orationis*, where he categorizes the property of *species* both for the *nomina propria* and the *nomina appellativa* into a *principalis species* and a *derivativa species*⁴. Priscian's classification marks a meaningful step when compared to the categories used by Donatus in the IV century, but the two meanings of *derivatio*, the broader and the narrower one, continue to be used by grammarians.

Nevertheless, Priscian's taxonomy is destined to be very fruitful and will affect the so called Medieval 'elementary grammars' as well as the commentaries on Donatus's works and on Priscian's *Institutiones grammaticae* produced starting from the pre-Carolingian era up to XII and XIII centuries. It is actually in these contexts that we witness the beginning of instances of categorization and further clarification of the *derivatio*, both in terms of how it operates and in terms of delimitation of its epistemic boundary, when compared to other kinds of analysis.

This innovative step is just one of the stages of a path that is destined to end only some centuries later. It is known that several factors prevented the development of an idea of derivation and of derivational rules as conceived by modern linguistics nowadays. For obvious reasons, it is not possible to talk about them here. One of these factors, for example, is related to the status of some lexical categories as the adjective, which is not, or not yet, conceived autonomously from the category of noun. Another factor that must be briefly outlined is the perception of an architecture binding elements in a linear sequence of combinations (*littera - syllaba - dictio -*

³ Cfr. *ThLL* VI.1, coll. 634-635 s.v. *dērivātio* (and *ivi*, s.vv. *dērivātivus*, *dēriō*); S. Schad, *A Lexicon of Latin Grammatical Terminology*, Pisa - Roma, Serra, 2007 ("Studia erudita" 6), s.v. *derivatio*; see L. Jeep, *Zur Geschichte der Lehre von den Redetheilen bei den Lateinischen Grammatikern*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1893, p. 143, 145-158; M. Amsler, *Etymology and Grammatical Discourse in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, Amsterdam - Philadelphia, Benjamins, 1989; J. Vaahtera, 'Derivatio'. *Greek and Roman Views on Word Formation*, Turku, Turun Yliopisto 1998 ("Annales Universitatis Turkuensis" 229).

⁴ In this way, for example, a *nomen appellativum* as *mons* is assumed to be a *dictio principalis*, while *montanus* is assumed to be a *dictio derivativa*. In a complementary way, Priscian also adds the distinction of the property of *figura*, concerning the formation of the nouns, and creates the three categories of *verba simplicia*, *composita* and *decomposita*. See M. Amsler, *ivi*: «to establish both the order of grammatical description and the order of rules governing compounding and derivation».

oratio), which does not imply neither the notion of stem, nor that of affix. **It is well-known that these notions will be extended to the analysis of Latin and of Romance languages only thanks to the metalinguistic description of Hebrew and Arabic shared, in multilingual contexts, in Humanistic Europe.**

It is true that the absence of a structural word analysis, able to isolate the lexical and functional word components, has a strong relevance. It explains why the criterion of the *terminationes* was used to identify inflectional classes, and also it explains why the area conferred to *derivatio* kept on being wide. For a long time, there will be the dominant idea of the existence of a supposed 'primary word', that is a base bearing a lexical meaning and from which a 'secondary word' is formed, thanks to a plurality of possible strategies and not only through an affixal element with this precise derivative function and status.

Actually, the main effect produced by this concept of *derivatio* is to build lexical constellations starting from a base word, and to organize lexical fields that can correspond to the fields of the extralinguistic world and that, at the same time, absolve the function of mnemonic and pedagogical tool for the acquisition of the lexicon of Latin as a second language. It is not by chance that the XII century saw the surprising development of the *disciplina derivationis*, which gives rise to lexicographic collections such as the *Derivationes* by Osbern of Gloucester and by Hugh of Pisa. Here, the semantic criterion as well as the reference to the *res denotata* overcome the formal criterion, with the aim to identify possible relations between words.

However, during its long Medieval wave, the notion of *derivatio* underwent further elaborations. The XII-XIII centuries represent an important stage of this reflection, a stage that, despite being, obviously, still pre-scientific, sees an enrichment of the doctrinal panorama with new perspectives and also revisited observations about this topic. In this period these perspectives are expressed by the representatives of a theoretical approach to language based on philosophical and ontological premises - the *Modistae* -, but also by the representatives of the *grammatica practica*, teachers who, in schools or in universities, were also open to suggestions transcending their didactic and prescriptive purposes. In these pedagogical environments, instances of epistemic delimitation and of stronger precision of the *derivatio* were expressed and accepted, and they concerned not only its operational modalities, but also its differentiation from the *compositio*, the *translatio*, and from an euristic practice such as the *etymologia*.

The first outstanding instance is more taxonomic and static. It is represented by the classification of *derivatio* as a procedure by which *derivantur partes a partibus*. This classification depends on

the different combinations of two criteria belonging to the Latin grammatical doctrine: *sensus* and *litteratura*⁵. The former is semantic and refers to the meaning of a primary word and the ones derived from it⁶; the latter is formal and refers to the *signifiant* and to a canonical series of mechanical operations which may manipulate it (i.e. *adiectio*, *detractio*, *mutatio*, *transmutatio* of *litterae* or *syllabae*, commonly known as *quadripertita ratio*). These two criteria can work both together and independently, in order to testify the existence of a relationship between lexemes, and they give rise to a taxonomy of three types: *sensus et litteratura*, *sensus et non litteratura*, *litteratura et non sensus*, this last one including several strategies of manipulation of the *signifiant*.

I will not insist on this aspect, already investigated (by me), but I simply remind you that this taxonomy is the result of the comments both on Donatus's *Artes* and on Priscian's *Institutiones grammaticae*, written for the first time in the Pre-carolingian age by the Irish grammarians and Anglo-saxon ones, who were active on the British Islands and, later, in Europe.

As a matter of fact, in the mid XI century, this classification can be found in the lemma *derivatio* of the *Elementarium doctrinae rudimentum* by Papias (see point 1 in the Handout)⁷. The model offered by Papias will be used as reference for those who, during the XII-XIII centuries, will continue classifying *derivatio*, sometimes with different results, but still depending on the combination of the *sensus* and the *litteratura* criteria. I am referring to Petrus of Isolella⁸, Osbern of Gloucester⁹, John of Garland¹⁰ and, above all, to the Dominican monk John Balbi of Genua, who in his *Summa quae vocatur Catholicon* offers the most organic formulation of the *modi derivationis*.

⁵ Or, alternatively, *vox* or *superficies*.

⁶ However, between the two, the semantic criterion is more important than the other since, if - as Marc Amsler says - «grammatical discourse specifies language's proper signification in order to recover the nature of things», the semantic strategy of explanation is the most suitable one to determine a word origin.. See Marc Amsler, *Etymology and Grammatical Discourse in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, Amsterdam - Philadelphia, Benjamins, 1989, p. 76. And: «the idealized language implied by technical grammar is one in which words are isomorphic with the real world of things».

⁷ Cfr. also Papias, *Ars grammatica*, 1.7.3 p. 57 Cervani.

⁸ Petrus of Isolella, *Grammatica*, cap. XVII Fierville: *Septem modis fit derivatio in arte grammatica, scilicet, voce et sensu, ut ab amo, amator; voce, non sensu, ut ab anguis anguilla; sensu et non voce, ut ab uno semel ...*

⁹ Osbern of Gloucester, *Derivationes*, Prologus, I, p. 9.24 Bertini: *Innotescendum est in primis partes latiales aliquando secundum litteram tantum aliquando secundum sensum tantum, aliquando autem secundum litteram et sensum, nonnumquam vero per antifrasi aut per sincopam derivari.*

¹⁰ Johannes de Garlandia, *Compendium Grammaticae*, II, 371-377 Haye: *Sex attende modos, si derivare necesse est: / Sensus et vocis est derivatio; / vocis / Non sensus; alius delinendo reperitur. / Quartum constituit interpretatio, quintum / Lucifer ostendit, quem componentia ponunt / Adiciunt quedam sensu, non voce creari, / Ut bonus et melior, sed sic collatio fiet.*

The second outstanding instance I will focus on today is more ‘dynamic’, in the sense that it aims at specifying and delimiting that broader meaning of *derivatio* which still included facts that are different in nature and that refer to different areas of morphology, to the interlinguistic dimension, to the translation, and to the etymological interpretation. This last method, in particular, results to be so inclusive and crucial to become an over-ordinated category turning *derivatio* into a method of etymological discourse, as Isidore shows when he affirms that some etymologies *etiam facta sunt ex nominum derivatione, ut a prudentia prudens*¹¹.

It is actually in this context that we witness the effects of a debate also involving the representatives of that *grammatica practica* I was talking about before. In particular, John Balbi is the one paying specific attention to this topic in his *Catholicon*, completed in 1286.

Actually, Balbi’s considerations, regarding *derivatio*, contain instances of epistemic clarifications of this notion fostered by the echo of debates born with the *grammatica speculativa*. This makes the *Catholicon* an unavoidable turning point for the history of the medieval linguistic thought. Thus, I am offering you some still preliminary considerations which, in my intention, should be part of a future more systematic work on Balbi’s linguistic ideas¹².

Before dealing with the description of the *partes orationis* and of their accidents, Balbi insists on a series of observations proposed in the form of *quaestiones*, which should solve *dubitabilia circa derivativam speciem*. You can find the *incipit* of each *quaestio* at **point 2 in the Handout**¹³.

¹¹ Isid. *Origines*, I, 29.3 Lindsay.

¹² I thus apologise for the limitation and incompleteness of the material offered, which is still at a beginning stage of study.

¹³ Johannes Balbus, *Summa quae uocatur Catholicon*, Moguntiae 1460; republished by Gregg International Ltd, Farnborough, 1971): “quomodo sumantur ista vocabula primitivum et derivativum”; “Quero etiam an etymologia sit species derivationis”; “De compositis etiam consuevit dubitari an a suis componentibus deriventur”; “Similiter dubitatur an principale derivetur a sumpto”; “Queritur insuper si fiat derivatio tantum significatione”; “Adhuc queritur si ex formatione semper proveniat derivatio”; “De illa etiam derivatione que fit per antiphrasim idest per contrarium dubitatur”; “De translatione similiter queritur an semper faciat derivationem”. Cfr. I. Rosier-Catach, *Quelques textes sur l’étymologie au Moyen Âge*, in C. Buridant (éd.), *L’étymologie de l’Antiquité à la Renaissance*, cit., pp. 223-224; trad. ingl. in R. Copeland - I. Sluiter, *Medieval Grammar and Rhetoric*, cit., pp. 360-364. In order: which is the origin of the two *species nominum*, *primitiva* and *derivativa*; if the *etymologia* can be considered a type of *derivatio*; if a compound word can be considered a derived from the constituents of the composition; if the complex word *albedo* is primary compared with the simple word *albus*; if it is possible to have *derivatio* terms only through the *sensus*; if the genitive case can be considered derived from the nominative; if the explanation *per antiphrasim* can be considered a type of *derivatio*; finally, if the translation can create the *derivatio*. In order: which is the origin of the two *species nominum*, *primitiva* and *derivativa*; if the *etymologia* can be considered a type of *derivatio*; if a compound word can be considered a derived from the constituents of the composition; if the complex word *albedo* is primary compared with the simple word *albus*; if it is possible to have *derivatio* terms only through the *sensus*; if the genitive case can be considered derived from the nominative; if the explanation *per antiphrasim* can be considered a type of *derivatio*; finally, if the translation can create the *derivatio*.

Balbi follows two main cooperating perspectives. On the one side he precises the status and the boundaries of *derivatio* in its relationship with other procedures, on the other side he gives more attention to the taxonomy concerning the types of *derivatio*.

For what concerns the first perspective, Balbi shows to have perceived the need to put limits to the plurality of etymological paths that Antiquity had let them coexist and passed on in the Middle Ages, and, consequently to distinguish among the *etymologia*, conceived as an hermeneutical practice and a *locus inveniendi*, and the *derivatio* and *compositio*. All these instances had already come up and discussed by representatives of *grammatica speculativa* such as Petrus Helias in the first half of the XII century, and the anonymous masters related to Ralph of Beauvais 'circle', who, in the second half of the century, had written the glosses *Promisimus* and *Tria sunt*.

I don't get into the analysis of these texts and into the contribution that they give us, because of the fundamental studies of Richard W. Hunt, Roswitha Klinck, Karen M. Fredborg.

As a matter of fact, the gloss *Tria sunt* (**see point 3a in the Handout**) shows the coexistence of a wider and more inclusive idea of *etymologia* that, following Isidore, covers a variety of procedures, *ut amplectatur etiam expositionem que fit per compositionem vel per derivationem vel per aliam linguam iuxta litterarum similitudinem*, and a different and more limited idea of *etymologia*. This second idea consists in a *simplex expositio alicuius vocabuli per aliam vocem vel per plures*, and it aims to interpret the meaning of a word in accordance with the *rei proprietas*, that is the essence of the designated thing, and with the *litterarum similitudo*. The gloss *Promisimus* (**see point 3b in the Handout**) illustrates these two procedures in their own different approach to the word *amicus*: according to the simple expounding of the word, *amicus* is *animi custos*, whereas according to the *derivatio* the same word seems to be related to the verb *amo*¹⁴.

A century later, Balbi confirms the necessity to keep *derivatio* and *compositio* separate from other procedures and also one from the other.

Probably Balbi reports¹⁵ the ideas about it given by Petrus Helias in the chapter *De voce* of his *Summa super Priscianum* (**see point 4 in the Handout**). Here Petrus says that *etymologia* is an

¹⁴ Hunt 1958, p. 272.

¹⁵ Cfr. John of Garland, *Poetria nova* (ed. G. Mari, «RomForsch» 13, 1902, p. 892): «Quid inveniatur in ethymologiis. In ethymologiis locum habemus inveniendi: ut si aliquis intendat laudare dominum papam, dicat: "vere dominus papa piissimus pater"; dicitur "pater patrum", quod ipsius nominis ethymologica expositio manifestat, et dicitur a "pape" grece, quod est "admirabile" latine; unde papa sacerdos admirabilis, quod in eo ex prerogativa vite et scientie declaratur».

expositio of a word that is different both from *derivatio* and *compositio*, and from *interpretatio*, that, for him (as also for Balbi, later), coincides with the *translatio de una loquela in aliam*¹⁶.

In accordance with Petrus Helias, Balbi (**point 5 in the Handout**) affirms that *etymologia* is a mere creative paraphrasis that *alludit ... significationi, trahendo argumentum per litteras, vel sillabas aliunde*, as he shows for *deus* and its meaning 're-created' through an acronym: *quasi dans eternam vitam suis*. Balbi also points out the fact that the explanation of *Roma* as *quasi radix omnium malorum avaricia* or *sincerus* as *sine carie* doesn't mean that these two words are derived or compounded from the words through which their etymologies are formed. This assertion is meaningful, because it shows that for him *compositio* is to be considered only as a *plurium dictionum ad unam dictionem faciendam adiunctio* - as *Promisimus* says ⁻¹⁷, i.e. a combination of lexical words, not of their portions, as it occurs in *cadaver 'caro data vermibus'* or in *celebs 'celestium vitam ducens'*.

In addition to that, he denies that these kinds of descriptive paraphrasis such as *Deus dans eternam vitam suis* are equal to *derivatio*. On the contrary, they might be qualified merely as a *quasi-species* of *derivatio*, since they are allusive to the characteristics of the denoted thing, thanks to the manipulation and to the free segmentation of the 'signifiant' of the word, *trahendo argumentum per litteras vel sillabas aliunde*. Furthermore, the categories of the *accidentia* illustrated by Priscian allow Balbi to assert that *derivatio* concerns the *species* of a word, either *primitiva* or *derivativa*, whereas *compositio* concerns the *figura*, either *simplex* or *composita*. And since the two accidents are different and not stackable, Balbi, at this stage, can definitely state that a compound word can't be considered deriving from its constituents.

The second Balbi's perspective can be well illustrated by the *quaestio* where he disputes about the relationship between Priscian's *anomala*¹⁸ *unus* and *semel* and its possibly derivational nature (**point 6 in the Handout**). Here, in fact, Balbi proposes an interesting scalar concept of *derivatio*, that, on the basis of the combination of the well-known *sensus* and *littera* criteria, allows him to

¹⁶ Petrus Helias does not distinguish between an endolinguistic etymology (cfr. the use of *sepius*) and *interpretatio*.

¹⁷ Ap. Hunt 1958, p. 272: *Compositio est plurium dictionum ad unam dictionem faciendam adiunctio* On the contrary, following Isidore's conception, the gloss *Tria sunt (ivi)* says: *Nam quandoque fit per compositionem, ut celebs celestium vitam ducens, cadaver caro data vermibus; quandoque per derivationem et hoc vel cum affinitate vocis et rei, vel cum affinitate vocis et non rei, sed similitudine contrarii, ut dux a ducendo, lux/lucus a lucendo, quandoque utroque, ut lapis ledens pedem, homo ab humo.*

¹⁸ Cfr Prisc. *Inst. GL III*, 88.11-22.

state that *recta et propria derivatio debet ymaginem vocis et significationis sui primitivi habere, sicut rivus sui fontis aquam redolet et saporem.*

In this way, Balbi distinguishes three different degrees of *derivatio*. A prototypical one, where the *derivativa dictio* corresponds to its *primitiva* at both formal and semantic levels, i.e. *voce et significatione, sicut filius legitimus et naturalis*. As for what concerns the other ones, in the *spuria derivatio* the correspondence between *dictio primitiva* and *dictio derivativa* is limited only to the 'signifiant', and the type is *voce tantum* as for a *filius naturalis tantum*. In the *adoptiva derivatio* only a semantic similarity is shown, and the type is *significatione tantum* as for a *filius legitimus qui dicitur adoptivus*. Furthermore, it is interesting how Balbi alludes to the fact that there are restrictions to the possibility to combine word classes and that the *derivatio* has its own limit in the rules of the *ars*, so that *semel* can be considered derived from *unus*, because *ars requirit quod a nominibus numerabilibus trahantur adverbialia numeralia*.

I am obliged not to get through other aspects of Balbi's doctrine, such as the nature of *translatio* or the relation *per antiphrasim*, because there is no time left for it. I will focus on one more point.

We saw in the above mentioned *quaestio* that similes and metaphors help Balbi to express his analysis of the *derivatio*. Let me now conclude by illustrating the role of a single metaphor belonging to an ancient and prestigious tradition that for Balbi becomes an effective, and not just ornamental, hermeneutical key.

Medieval grammarians frequently express linguistic notions also thanks to conceptual metaphors. Over the centuries, and with different outcomes, the increasing awareness of the fictive nature of the metalanguage of the grammar, that in the Middle Ages comes from the idea that *ars* is *imitatio naturae*, guarantees the survival of the Ancient metaphorical models and, at the same time, it promotes their revision. This is possible thanks to a more conscious re-reading and re-elaboration of the original motivations underlying the inherited metaphors - in part already dead and opaque - to which Medieval masters gave new efficacy and transparency.

Balbi does the same also in relation to *derivatio*, mirroring the pedagogical aim of his *grammatica practica*, but with the help of the *grammatica speculativa*. He uses a copious number of metaphors showing his intentional re-reading: one of them belongs to the field of the *res naturae* and concerns the running water from the source.

The high degree of salience of this natural fact explains its wide diffusion in the conceptual and metalinguistic grammatical panorama. Varro, as well, categorizes morphological phenomena by interpreting them by means of the source domain of water. Daniel Taylor has illustrated how Varro conceptualized the two *verborum principia* of *impositio* and *declinatio* as *fons* and *rivus*¹⁹. Even though the Varronian idea is unknown in the Middle Ages, and even though the concept of running water from a spring keeps to be ‘silent’ and conventionalized in the uses of such words as *derivare* and *derivatio*, the cognitive force of this metaphor allows a rethinking of the image of *fons* and *rivus*.

Before Balbi, the first step of this rethinking occurs thanks to Carolingian grammarians and it concerns the above mentioned topic of the property of *species*, in order to illustrate the relationship between *dictio primitiva* and *dictio derivativa*. **For example (point 7 in the Handout), in the IX century, Murethach illustrates, in terms of an “iconicity of construction” of the *signifiant*, the increasing number of syllables that can be observed between a *derivativum nomen* and its *primitivum*. It occurs by means of the image of a *rivulus* bearing far more water than its *fons*. Similarly, Sedulius Scottus is affected by the same image about the *nomina appellativa* qualified as *derivativa*.**

In the XII century this metaphor comes up more frequently in the works of the authors of *Derivationes*, such as Osbern of Gloucester and Hugh of Pisa. **In Osbern it is possible to find it as an extended metaphor that gives life to expressions describing the synchronic relations among the words in the lexicon. From the Prologue of his *Derivationes*, Osbern speaks about *derivandi scaturigo* concerning the birth of what he calls *partes Latinae*²⁰, and he also speaks about the *partium rivus Latialium* which *profluet in uverrimum pelagus*²¹.**

An additional figure comes out of the masters of *grammatica speculativa*²², the anonymous author of *Promisimus* (see point 8 in the Handout). By commenting on the Prologue of Priscian’s

¹⁹ Varro, *De lingua Latina*, VIII, 2.5 Goetz-Schoell: *Duo igitur omnino verborum principia, impositio <et declinatio>, alterum ut fons, alterum ut rivus.*

²⁰ Osbernus, *Derivationes*, I, A, p. 8.16: *... in hac volo contione partes Latinas normaliter et digestim propalare, quo dumtaxat intellectu acceptas, vel ex qua derivandi scaturigine esse constat elicitas.* Cfr. I, p. 1.3-4; C, p. 103.2. See R. Copeland - I. Sluiter (eds.), *Medieval Grammar and Rhetoric, cit.*, p. 343: “Language is presented as a stream from which rivers and rivulets branch off. The metaphor of streaming and flowing, both for thought processes and for products of language, is prominent in Osbern’s work as well as in that of Joannes Balbus”.

²¹ Osbernus, *Derivationes*, I, P, p. 498.1: *Nunc, filii, nunc diligentius attendite: en partium rivus Latialium iamiam profluet in uverrimum pelagus ...*

²² The image is present also in the comment of William of Conches on Priscian (I, 2), and in his pupil Petrus Helias (*Summa super Priscianum*, I, 114.5-6 Reilly): *Derivare compositum est a ‘de’ et ‘rivo’. Derivare namque proprie est ‘rivum de fonte ducere’ et inde methaphorice translatum est ad dictiones.* See ap. Reilly, *ad loc.*

Institutiones, he condemns the allography of *derivare* and *dirivare* that he finds in the manuscripts, by supporting that it hides the different meaning of these verbs. The graphic shift between <e> and <i> was very common in the Middle Ages for the compounds prefixed with *de-* and *di(s)-*, thanks to their phonetic proximity and also to their partial semantic affinity. Both of them produced synonymic pairs as *derationare/di(s)rationare*²³ and *definire/diffinire*²⁴.

According to *Promisimus*, in *derivare* and *di(s)rivare* the difference between *e* and *i* acquires a semasiological function and it conveys a semantic distinctiveness that returns *de-* and *dis-* to their original etymological value. Consequently, this operation, involving phonetics, morphology and semantics, leads to a more precise formulation of the relationship between Latin and Greek, that the Roman linguistic thought represented through the rooted idea according to which Latin was derived from Greek and it was even considered a Greek dialect²⁵. *Promisimus* says that *Sicut enim ex fonte riuus deriuatur, sic ex Grecismo deriuata est Latinitas*. The same operation is apt to support also its considerations involving lexical *derivatio*, because *deriuare est riuum de fonte deducere, diriuare riuum in diuersas partes trahere*.

At the very beginning of the XIII century, in fact, we find the verbs *derivare* and *dirivare* used by Hugh of Pisa both for the relationship between Greek and Latin, and for the relationship between *dictio primitiva* and *derivativa* (see point 9 in the Handout). This circumstance testifies the increasing interest in the notion of *derivatio* at this time, because Hugh shows a more expanded and complex use of the verbal pair *derivare* - *dirivare*. In fact, their semantic difference offers two opposite perspectives through which he illustrates the cultural archetype of the dependence of *Latinitas* from *Graecismus*: for the former, *latinitas derivatur a graecismo*, as the river from its spring; for the latter, *dirivatur grecismus in latinitatem*, as the source that splits into a stream. Furthermore, in the case of the *species* of a word, the image of a *riuus* that springs out of its source and flows stands for *derivare* and for *dictio derivativa*. On the contrary, *dirivare* and *dictio primitiva* stand for the *fons* that splits its water into several streams.

²³ See B. Löfstedt, *Studien über die Sprache der Langobardischen Gesetze*, pp. 294-297, che osserva che la posizione davanti alla consonante sonora *r* contribuiva a rendere simili le articolazioni vocaliche, and P. Stotz, *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters*, III. *Lautlehre*, München, Beck, 1996, § VII.14.2-4 (p. 19: "Etwa *derivare* '(Flüssigkeit) ableiten' (samt Ablg'en) ist in der Überlieferung der antiken Literatur und im ganzen MA überaus häufig mit *dir-* geschrieben worden"), and II. *Bedeutungswandel und Wortbildung*, 2000, § VI.116-117 with more bibliography.

²⁴ Guillelmus Brito, *Summa Britonis*, I, p. 194: "diffinire ... definire idem significat"; ap. Stotz, op. cit., III, p. 20 note 126.

²⁵ Prisc. *Inst. GL* II, 1.1-4: *Cum omnis eloquentiae doctrinam et omne studiorum genus sapientiae luce praefulgens a Graecorum fontibus derivatum Latinos proprios sermone invenio celebrasse et in omnibus illorum vestigia liberalibus consecutos artibus video ...*

Probably, Balbi borrows the same content from Hugh (see points 10a and 10b in the Handout), both in the lemma *derivo*²⁶, and in the first of his *quaestiones*, in which he speculates about *species nominis* and about the metaphorical values (*transsumptive*) of the adjectives *primitivus* and *derivativus*, that he finds in the ancient grammatical doctrine, for him represented by Priscian.

Nevertheless, only Balbi extends the image of *fons* and of *rivus*, and gives birth to a metaphorical field through which he may interpret the architecture of the language and the nature and role of grammar. The content of his mapping is self-evident (see point 10c in the Handout). I will only give some hints: *dictio primitiva* and *dictio derivativa*, *oratio* and *grammatica* become linguistic correlates of the four elements belonging to the target domain of water: *fons*, *rivus*, *flumen*, and *mare*. The *primitivum* originates from the *fons*, from which water comes to surface after an underground path - *veniens per occultos meatus* -²⁷, and it is released as a *rivus* whose *decursus* gives birth to other *rivi*.

Retrieving the motivation underlying this image, Balbi returns transparency to the entities of the target domain. He says that, as a *rivus* can generate another *rivus*, in the same way a *primitivum* can generate a *derivativum*, in its turn generating further *derivata*, endlessly enriching the lexicon. Furthermore, as the source and the running water contribute to feed a *flumen*, in the same way, both the 'primary' and the 'secondary' words also contribute to the building of the *oratio*, *quae potest dici quasi flumen* (a well-known Ciceronian *topos*)²⁸. Eventually, the fourth mapping entity is the *mare*, into which the *flumen* flows and from which it also comes from, without flooding, similarly to the *oratio* being part of *grammatica*.

Balbi expresses in this way his own idea of language as a complex and hierarchic system, arranged in different levels and entities, as exemplified by the canonical meronymy *littera*, *syllaba*, *pars*, *oratio*²⁹. This system, within its own boundaries, is also a dynamic circular path, *motus aquarum*

²⁶ John knows also the opinion exposed by Bene of Florence in his *Candelabrum*, 13.8 p. 16 about *derivatio*: "... et de greco maxime in latinum, quia sermo latinus fontem grecum quasi rivulus imitatur et in hoc multum veteres studuerunt".

²⁷ Isid. *Etym.* XIII, 21.5 Gasparotto: *caput ... aquae nascentis, quasi aquas fundens*. Cfr. Isid. *Diff.* 494 Arévalo (I, 494, pp. 465-466 Codoñer): *Inter rivum, fontem, torrentem et flumen: Rivus subito fit; fons caput est atque decursus in quem naturalis manat aqua ... fluvius aquae decursus generaliter*.

²⁸ Cfr. Cic. *Orator*, 53, p. 18: *flumen aliis verborum volubilitas que cordi est, qui ponunt in orationis celeritate eloquentiam ...*, 228, p. 91: *ne infinite feratur ut flumen oratio*; *Acad. priora*, 119, p. 86.31: *cum enim tuus iste Stoicus sapiens syllabatim tibi ista dixerit, veniet flumen orationis aureum fundens Aristotelis qui illum desipere dicat, ...* See E.R. Curtius, *Letteratura europea e medioevo latino*, 1995, p. 396 nt. 24 (*Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*, Bern 1948); cfr. *ThL IX.2*, coll. 876-892 s.v. *ōrātio*.

²⁹ ... *sicut oratio trahit originem a partibus et partes a sillabis secundum materiam uocis et sillabe a literis ...*

that Balbi³⁰ describes by invoking the biblical authority of *Ecclesiastes* (I, 7). By doing so, he shows also the crucial role of the *grammatica* as *principium* and *origo* of the *oratio/flumen* and of all other entities, and underlines its function in the circular and never ending flowing of water, which occurs without *redundantia*: *Omnia ... flumina exeunt a mari et in mare tandem redeunt et mare non redundat*. In this way, Balbi also highlights the *integritas* of the grammar: nothing can be added to it in as far as the *integritas* of the *ars* is concerned³¹.

Once again, the conceptual metaphor of the *fons* and of the *rivus*, which, ultimately, we could propose as *DERIVATIO IS WATER THAT SPRINGS OUT TO FLOW*, becomes a living metaphor, an investigation strategy aimed at interpreting and precisating a crucial metalinguistic notion, the *derivatio*, and, at the same time, it suggests a wide metaphorical field, in accordance with the pedagogical aims of the *grammatica practica*.

Thank you.

Laura Biondi

Dipartimento di Studi Letterari, filologici e linguistici

v. Festa del Perdono, 7 I - 20122 MILANO

³⁰ Io. Balbus, *Catholicon*: *Quia enim grammatica dicatur pelagus habemus a prisciano dicente in prohemio suo Quamuis ad herodiani scriptorum pelagus. Oracius quoque de isto fonte loquitur dicens Greco fonte cadent parte detorta. Idem etiam de flumine huius artis inquit Asciscet noua quae genitor produxerit usus Vehemens et liquidus puroque simillimus amni (anni sic) Dictiones enim quandoque fluunt et quandoque arescunt prout usus approbat vel recusat*. By using Horace, *Ars*, 52-53 (*et noua fictaque nuper habebunt uerba fidem, si / Graeco fonte cadent parte detorta*) and *Epist.* II, 2, vv. 119-121 (*asciscet noua, quae genitor produxerit usus. / uemens et liquidus puroque simillimus amni / fundet opes Latiumque beabit diuite lingua*) Balbi demonstrates the pedagogical goal of his work.

³¹ Cfr. Sluiter - Copeland, cit., p. 361.