

VIGINTI QUATUOR SUNT IUNCTURÆ

ANDRÁS CSER

Elméleti Nyelvészeti Tanszék
Nyelvészeti Intézet
Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem
Egyetem utca 1.
H–2087 Piliscsaba
cser@btk.ppke.hu

The purpose of this paper is to present a recently published medieval Latin grammatical text, whose manuscript location is Bibliothèque National Lat. 16670 ff 19vb–21vb, and whose edition is Cser (2000). Texts of this type occur in great numbers and great variety in the last centuries of the Middle Ages. They summarise the rules of Latin syntax, interspersed occasionally with morphological information, in twenty-odd points.

First we give short and typical sections of the text with some explanatory notes. Then we give an English translation of the selected sections, finally we discuss some aspects of the text as a whole.

1. SPECIMENS OF THE TEXT

Viginti quatuor sunt iuncture per quas fit congrua latinitas

1. Constructio appositoria. Prima iunctura est suppositi cum apposito ut homo currit. Homo est suppositum currit uero appositum. Et requiritur in-terea idem numerus et eadem persona et quod casus rectus substantiue signi-ficatiuus correspondeat modo finito et modus finitus casui uerbo.

Versus: Supositum uerbi uult quod sint quatuor in se.

Stet per se primum quia sit rectusque secundum.

Denuo persone concordia sit numerique.

Cum uerbo cuius supponens hoc datur esse.

Note: The meaning is clear, though not the wording at the end of the para-graph: *et modus finitus casui uerbo*. *Recto* instead of *uerbo* would be logical, but unlikely as a scribal error.

3. Constructio relatoria. Tercia iunctura est relatiui cum suo antecedente ut homo currit qui disputat. Homo est antecedens qui uero relatiuum. Et requiritur interea idem genus idem numerus et quandoque idem casus. Et hoc est quando reguntur ex eadem parte uerbi et ex eadem ui.

Versus: Eiusdem generis sit cum preeunte relatum.
Et numeri casum quandoque licet uariare.

11. Constructio possessoria. Vndecima iunctura est genitiui cum suo constructibili. Et requiritur quod omnis genitiuus regatur a dictione sibi immediate precedente ut liber Rasonis ex ui possessionis.

Versus: Illud quodque prius fuerit regitur genitiuus.

Et notandum est quod quando duo nomina substantiua ad diuersa spectantia ueniunt similiter sine medio tunc ultimum uult esse genitiui casus. Sed quando pertinent ad idem tunc sunt eiusdem casus. Et regitur genitiuus ab illo quod proxime precedit sibi in constructione exceptis genitiuis istorum quis qualis quantus cuius cuias quotus et quot. Nam ista posita relatiue uel interrogatiue preponuntur dictioni a qua reguntur.

Versus: Quis qualis quantus cuius cuias quotus et quot
Missa relatiue penitus preponere debent
Obliquos uerbo preiunges missa rogando.

Note: The term *constructibile*, which means ‘word in a construction’, occurs only once more in the text, in *Constructio infinitoria* (19). It is apparently not used consistently in this text, though it was current in late medieval, especially modistic grammar. It was not yet used in the first half of the Middle Ages.

20. Constructio retorsitoria. Vicesima iunctura est prepositionum deseruientium utrique casui scilicet accusatiuo et ablatiui ut in, sub, super et subter. Vnde datur talis regula quod quando iste prepositiones construuntur cum uerbis uel participiis significantibus motum ad locum seruiunt accusatiuo casui ut uado in templum. Sed cum construuntur cum uerbis uel participiis significantibus quietem uel motum in loco seruiunt ablatiui casui ut sum in templo, ambulo in scolis.

Versus: In campo curris si sis bene dicis in illo
Si sis exterius in campum sit tibi cursus.

23. Constructio. Vicesimatertia iunctura est dictionum significantium plenitudinem uel uacuitatem optineri uel deesse. Vnde talis datur regula quod omnis dictio significans plenitudinem uel uacuitatem optineri uel deesse constructitur cum genitiui uel cum ablatiui ut plenus uini uel uino, uacuuus aqua uel aque, diues auri uel auro, egenus ueste uel uestis.

Versus: Plenus inops casum da(n)t istum siue secundum.

Item notandum quod nomina partitiua numeralia ordinalia suppositionem uel superpositionem significantia regunt genitiuum ut quilibet istorum, duo illorum, primus istorum, alter eorum, pater illius, frater istius.

Note: In the verse, *istum* refers to the ablative, *secundum* to the genitive. The terms *suppositio* and *superpositio* are also from Priscian (and, ultimately from Apollonius Dyscolus) and seem to mean simply words with relational meanings. The relevant passage is Inst. Gr. XVIII. 25–26:

Aequiperantia etiam quomodo et verba... et subiecta uel superposita... quae tamen et ipsa ad aliquid sunt dicta... *subiecta* uero uel *superposita* dicuntur, quod licet ea et subicere et praeponere, ut *pater filii* uel *filio est pater* et *filius patris* uel *patri est filius*, similiter *dominus:seruus*, *imperator:miles*, *tyrannus:armiger*, *satelles:rex*, *erub:famulus*, *cliens:patronus* licet quouis ordine per utrumque casum [ie. genitive and dative] proferre; *similis* quoque et *dissimilis*, *par:impar*, *aequus:iniquus*, *amicus:inimicus*, *comes:socius*, *affinis:cognatus*, *propinquus:uicinus*, *commilito:contubernalis*. Terentius in Eunucho: ‘Quid tibi ego plura dicam? Domini similis es’- Iuuenalis in II: ‘non similis tibi Cynthia’...

2. TRANSLATION OF THE SPECIMENS

1. Predicative construction. The first combination is that of a subject with a predicate, as in *homo currit* ‘man runs’. *Homo* ‘man’ is a subject, whereas *currit* ‘runs’ is a predicate. And it is required that they be of the same number and person and that the nominative case with a nominal meaning correspond to the finite mode and the finite mode [of the verb correspond] to the nominative case.

Verse: The subject of a verb requires four to be present in itself:

first, that it stand by itself, second, that it be in the nominative case, finally, that there be agreement of person and number with the verb whose subject it happens to be.

3. Relative construction. The third combination is that of a relative pronoun with its antecedent, as in *homo currit qui disputat* ‘The man, who is arguing, is running’. *Homo* ‘man’ is the antecedent whereas *qui* ‘who’ is the relative pronoun. And it is required that they be of the same gender, number and sometimes of the same case. And this is when they stand in the same relation to a verb and are governed by virtue of the same meaning.

Verse: Let the relative pronoun be of the same gender and number as its antecedent.

But case may sometimes differ.

11. Possessive construction. The eleventh combination is that of a genitive with its constructible. And it is required that every genitive be governed by

the word immediately preceding it as in *liber Rasonis* ‘the book of Raso’ by virtue of the meaning of possession.

Verse: What comes first governs the genitive.

And it is to be noted that when two nouns with different referents are adjacent, with nothing between them, then the second of them should be in the genitive case. But when they have the same referent they are in the same case. And the genitive is governed by that which precedes it immediately in the construction with the exception of the genitive of these words: *quis* ‘who’ *qualis* ‘like what’, *quantus* ‘how much’, *cuius* ‘whose’, *cuias* ‘from where’, *quotus* ‘which [=ordinal]’, and *quot* ‘how many’. For these, when used as relative pronouns or interrogative words, are put before the word by which they are governed.

Verse: When *quis qualis quantus cuius cuias quotus* and *quot* are used as relative pronouns, their oblique cases must be put at the front; when used as question words, before the verb.

20. Construction of prepositional government. The twentieth combination is that of prepositions governing both cases, namely, accusative and ablative, as *in*, *sub*, *super* and *subter*. Here the rule is given that when these prepositions are construed with verbs or participles meaning motion to a place, they govern the accusative case, as in *vado in templum* ‘I go into the church’. But when they are construed with verbs or participles meaning rest or motion within a place, they govern the ablative case, as in *sum in templo* ‘I am in the church’, *ambulo in scolis* ‘I am walking about in the school’.

Verse: You say correctly that you are running within the camp if you are in it, If you are outside, you shall run into it.

23. Construction. The twenty-third combination is that of words meaning fullness or emptiness, acquisition or lack. Here the rule is given that every word meaning fullness or emptiness, acquisition or lack, is construed with the genitive or the ablative, as in *plenus vini* or *vino* ‘full of wine’, *vacuus aqua* or *aquae* ‘devoid of water’, *dives auri* or *auro* ‘rich in gold’, *egenus veste* or *vestis* ‘lacking clothes’.

Verse: *Plenus* ‘full’ and *inops* ‘poor’ give this case or the second.

It is also to be noted that partitive pronouns, cardinal and ordinal numerals and words signifying “supposition” or “superposition” govern the genitive, as in *quilibet istorum* ‘any of them’, *duo illorum* ‘two of those’, *primus istorum* ‘the first of those’, *alter eorum* ‘the other of them’, *pater illius* ‘the father of that one’, *frater istius* ‘the brother of this one’.

3. THE SOURCES OF IUNCTURÆ

The sources that the text generally and often indirectly drew on seem to have been chiefly the three most popular grammatical works of this period: Alexander de Villa Dei's *Doctrinale*, Eberhardus Bethuniensis' *Graecismus* and Johannes Balbus of Genoa's *Catholicon*.

The *Doctrinale* (completed in 1199) was a comprehensive descriptive grammar written in hexameters and this form may well account for its immense popularity. As Reichling indicates in his 1893 edition of the text, it exists in more than two hundred manuscripts and nearly three hundred printed versions up to 1600. The two central parts of the work from which some of the rules in the *Iuncturae* were taken are those devoted to the *regimen* of cases (1074–1368) and *constructio* (1369–1532). In the *regimen*, cases are discussed one by one in terms of what words and word classes they can be governed by and what sort of meaning or function they bear in relation to them. In the *constructio*, word order and syntactic constructions are discussed in terms of combinations of words (what we now term phrases and clauses were generally not considered to be constituents in a structure). The two central notions of syntactic structure which define the regularities in this highly atheoretical and didactic treatise are government (= *regimen*) and agreement.

About half of the verse lines in the *Iuncturae* are taken from the *Doctrinale*, some of them strangely misplaced and mixed with lines from totally different contexts: this shows that the compiler of *Iuncturae* did not use Alexander as an immediate source, but was probably using compilations of a similar character without checking the original. Some *regimen*-texts and collections of rules similar to the *Iuncturae* only use verse illustrations from Alexander (or Ludolfus Florista, with whom we will not be concerned here).

The only borrowing from the *Graecismus* of Eberhardus Bethuniensis is a verse insertion of three lines in construction 22 (*Graec.* xv. 130–132). This work was probably published in 1212, is written in hexameters and pentameters, and is more concerned with individual words and etymologies than the *Doctrinale*. For this reason it left far fewer traces in works like the *Iuncturae*.

A third work, of much greater importance, is Johannes Balbus' *Catholicon* (1286). It is a lengthy prose exposition of grammar, much more theoretical than the previous two. The chapter that left its mark on works like the *Iuncturae* was *De regimine* to a greater extent than the chapter on constructions. It begins with the definition of *regimen*: "to govern is to make a word assume a certain case"; then general assertions follow: every part of speech can govern (but counterexamples are immediately given), most of them govern because of a certain *natura*; the conjunction and the interjection does not govern, and the verb is the only part of speech that can govern both what is before and what is after it. Then the government of coordinated or adjacent words of

the same category is discussed, followed by what I term “inheritance rules”, where one of them is, in fact, wittily refuted: oblique cases do not inherit the government of the nominative, because one cannot say *loquor de aliquo panis* ‘I speak about some bread’, with ‘bread’ in the genitive, in spite of the existence of *aliquid panis* ‘some bread’. The inheritance rule for verbs is accepted, the one for adjectives is not mentioned. For the significance of these rules for the *Iuncturae*, see below.

Johannes goes on to discuss the government of the individual cases. The discussion is much more refined than that found in the texts we are concerned with and its elements did not find their way into them, with the exception of the expression *regit(ur) ex natura/vi...* ‘governs/is governed by virtue of (the meaning of)...’, which is common to most treatises on grammar in the second half of the Middle Ages; it is the organizing principle of several *regimen*-texts that seems to draw heavily on the *Catholicon* (e.g., Cambridge, Trinity Ms. 0.5.4. ff. 87v–88v). In the *Doctrinale*, however, it only occurs on one occasion, with reference to the accusative case (1247–50). In the *Iuncturae* it only occurs in four rules, and there seems to be no internal reason for its inclusion or omission.

In certain respects, *Iuncturae* shows affinity to another important work, the *Summa de modis significandi* of Michel de Marbais. More on this will be said below.

4. THE STRUCTURE OF THE RULES

There are two major discernible patterns in the structure of the individual rules. Schematically these are the following, with examples:

A. NAME OF RULE. NUMBER OF RULE *iunctura est* (of a) FIRST WORD CLASS *cum* SECOND WORD CLASS *ut* EXAMPLE WITH WORDS IDENTIFIED. *Et requiritur (interea) (quod)* RULE OF AGREEMENT, GOVERNMENT OR JUXTAPOSITION. *Versus*.

Rule 2:

CONSTRUCTIO ADIECTORIA. SECUNDA *iunctura est* ADIECTIUI *cum* SUBSTANTIUIO *ut* *HOMO ALBUS*. *HOMO* EST SUBSTANTIUM *ALBUS* UERO ADIECTIUM *et requiritur interea* IDEM GENUS IDEM NUMERUS IDEM CASUS.

Versus: Est adiectivum substantivum sociandum.

In simili genere casu simili numeroque.

Rule 8:

CONSTRUCTIO TRANSITORIA. OCTAUA *iunctura est* UERBI TRANSITIU cum ACCUSATIUI CASU SEQUENTE. *Et requiritur interea quod* OMNE UERBUM TRANSITIUUM CUIUS ACTUS TRANSIT IN REM RATIONALEM EXIGAT ACCUSATIUIUM CASUM POST SE. ET EIUS PASSIUIUM ABLATIUIUM MEDIANTE PREPOSITIONE *ut* AMO RASONEM *uel* AMOR A RASONE.

Versus: Uerbum quod transit quartum casum sibi iungit.
Passiuum uerbum casum retinet sibi sextum.

B. NAME OF RULE. NUMBER OF RULE *iunctura est* ⟨of a⟩ FIRST WORD CLASS *cum* SECOND WORD CLASS *ut* EXAMPLE. *Unde talis datur regula quod* / *Et est regula quod* RULE.

Rule 24:

CONSTRUCTIO. UICESIMAQUARTA *iunctura est* ADUERBIORUM A NOMINIBUS DESCENDENTIUM [the second word, the governed, is not mentioned here, only in the rule] *ut* A SIMILIS UENIT SIMILITER. *Et est regula quod* OMNE NOMEN ADIECTIUUM REGENS ALIQUEM CASUM FORMAT DE SE ADUERBIUM REGENS EUNDEM CASUM *ut* SIMILIS ILLI SIMILITER ILLI DOCTIOR ILLO DOCTIUS ILLO.

Versus: Nomina quos similes casus aduerbia poscunt.

The rules of the entire text pattern in the following way:

| | | |
|------|-----|-------|
| (A) | 1–5 | 7 |
| (Aa) | 6 | 8–19 |
| (B) | | 20–24 |

Significantly, it is only rules 20–24 that have format (B), which is understandable if we assume that they were taken from a different source and the compiler of *Iuncturae* made no effort to harmonise the whole work.

Rule 11 (possessive construction) shows obvious signs of the juxtaposition of the discussion of this construction from two entirely different texts without the least effort to harmonize them. The first half is a typical *regimen*-type description, as found in the *Catholicon* and texts drawing on it, where each case is discussed in terms of what it can be governed by and by virtue of what meaning; notice that this is one of the four rules in which the phrase *ex vi* occurs in the *Iuncturae*. The second half of the rule is a dissimilation-type rule, found in related texts (Lincoln, Remigius, Prague), but it ends in the subrule referring to *quis, qualis* etc., which is not placed here (or found at all) in the same texts, whereas it is normally found in *regimen*-texts as well as Alexander.

5. REMARKS ON TERMINOLOGY

The first puzzle is the term *iunctura*, here translated as *combination*: it does not turn up in the related texts in the sense of “syntactic construction”. It occurs in Petrus Helias in the sense of “combination of syllables”, it is used with reference to the *figura* of verbs, soloecism is defined as *iunctura incongrua dictionum* and barbarism as *iunctura incongrua syllabarum*. The word (*ad/ con*)*iungere* naturally occurs in syntax elsewhere, but it is not a technical term (e.g., Alex. 1407: *quod iunges verbo iunges et participanti*, also in Priscian and the *Iuncturae*).

The next puzzle is the names of the constructions, which end in *-oria*, with the exception of *constructio interrogatiua*, *participialis*, *prophetica*, *supinorum* and constructions 22–24, again a feature not found in the texts *Iuncturae* has been compared to. However, eleven terms ending in *-oria* are used by Michel de Marbais: *appositoria*, *adiectoria*, *relatoria*, *prepositoria*, *specificatoria*, *transitoria*, *demonstratoria*, *interrogatoria*, *dispositoria*, *terminatoria* and *initiatoria*. The first seven of these also occur in the *Iuncturae*; *interrogatoria* is replaced by *interrogativa*, *dispositoria* is subsumed under *determinatoria* in the *Iuncturae*, *terminatoria* and *initiatoria* under *retorsitoria*, as they are subsumed under *retorsiva* by Michel de Marbais. It may well be the case that one of the sources the compiler of the text used was Michel de Marbais: this would perhaps explain why *appositoria*, *adiectoria*, *relatoria*, *prepositoria*, (*determinatoria*), *specificatoria*, *interrogat(iua)* and *transitoria* are the first eighth rules, in contrast to the eight general rules in texts of the same type (see below). It is possible that the compiler started with Michel de Marbais, and moulded the rest of at least the names of the constructions on the model provided by him.

One more little point that may additionally indicate the influence of Michel de Marbais, though not very important in itself, is the subclasses of verbs listed in the sixth construction (*constructio specificatoria*). Those verbs that require a double accusative in the active and double nominative in the passive and the active if they have no passive are referred to in the course of the thirteenth century and later as *uerba substantiua*, *uocatiua*, *adiectiua et eorum uim habentia*. The third category, missing from the *Iuncturae*, is omitted by Michel de Marbais as well, but it can be found in e.g., Eberhardus Bethuniensis’ *Graecismus*, while Alexander uses the terms *substantiua*, *uocans* and *appellans*.

The terms for government. There are three terms used for the governing relationship, if we disregard the verses: *regit*, *exigat* and *construitur cum*. There seems to be no difference in their meaning. Their distribution is the following (underlined rules have *regitur ex vi...*):

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------|
| <i>regit(ur):</i> | <u>3</u> , 6b, | 10, <u>11</u> , | 15, <u>16</u> , | 21b, <u>22</u> , | 23b, 24a |
| <i>exigat:</i> | | 8, | 13 | | |
| <i>construitur cum:</i> | | | | 20, 21a, | 23a |

The rest of the rules employ none of these terms, see *secunda iunctura* above.

Here again we can see that *construitur cum* only appears from rule 20 onwards, though the contrast is less striking since 21b, 22, 23b and 24a still have *regit(ur)*. Nevertheless, this may be considered additional evidence pointing to two sources, one of which underlies chiefly the last rules.

REFERENCES

- Cser, A. (2000): *Viginti quatuor sunt iuncturae. A Medieval Latin grammatical text with translation and a critical study*. Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem, Piliscsaba.
- de Marbais, M.: *Summa de modis significandi*. Frommann & Holzboog, Stuttgart & Bad Cannstatt. Critical edition with an introduction by Louis G. Kelly (1995). (*Grammatica Speculativa* 5).
- Reichling, D. (ed.) (1893): *Alexander de Villa Dei: Doctrinale*. (*Monumenta Germaniae Paedagogica* 12). Hofman, Berlin.