



A FEW THOMAS' NEOLOGISMS (FROM THE *COMMENTARY ON JOHN*) NOT REGISTERED IN LEXICONS. A CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDY OF THOMAS' LANGUAGE AND MEDIEVAL LATIN LEXICOGRAPHY

Pablo Cavallero [Conicet - Universidad de Buenos Aires - Universidad Católica Argentina]
[pablocavallero@uca.edu.ar]

Abstract: Our objective is twofold: 1) to point out the convenience of incorporating some possible neologisms or other words found in Aquinas' *Commentary on John* in future editions of lexicons or in new works devoted to Medieval Latin; 2) to reflect on the problems that a non-specialist reader may face when consulting the common Latin dictionaries.

Keywords: Thomas Aquinas - lexicon - neologism - *Commentary on John*

Quelques néologismes de Thomas (*Commentaire sur Jean*) pas enregistrés dans les dictionnaires. Une contribution à l'étude du langage thomiste et à la lexicographie latine médiévale

Résumé: Nous avons deux objectifs: 1) souligner la convenance d'incorporer quelques possibles néologismes et d'autres mots que nous avons trouvés dans le *Commentaire sur Jean*, à l'occasion de faire de nouvelles éditions des dictionnaires ou de nouvelles oeuvres dédiées au latin médiéval; 2) réfléchir sur les problèmes qu'un lecteur non spécialisé dans Thomas peut avoir quand il consulte les dictionnaires courants de Latin.

Mots Clé: Thomas d'Aquin - dictionnaires - néologismes - *Commentaire sur Jean*

Unos pocos neologismos de Tomás (del *Comentario a Juan*) no registrados en diccionarios. Una contribución al estudio del lenguaje tomista y a la lexicografía latina medieval

Resumen: Nuestro objetivo tiene dos aspectos: 1) destacar la conveniencia de incorporar algunos posibles neologismos u otras palabras halladas en el *Comentario a Juan* del Aquinate en futuras ediciones de diccionarios o en nuevas obras dedicadas al latín medieval; 2) reflexionar sobre los problemas que un lector no especialista puede enfrentar al consultar los diccionarios comunes de latín.

Palabras-clave: Tomás de Aquino - diccionario - neologismo - *Comentario a Juan*

As a natural outcome of our Spanish translation of Aquinas' *Commentary on John*¹, we have published a short book with this title: *El Comentario a Juan de Tomás de Aquino. Rasgos de latín me-*

1 The translation was made from the edition of CAI (1952) whose numeration we follow.

*dieval y actitudes filológicas*². In its first chapter, we have analysed the different characteristics of the Late and Medieval Latin present in the text, paying special attention to the morphological and syntactical aspect, as well as the lexical one. Regarding the vocabulary, we have noticed that it is possible to make a humble contribution about Thomas' language in several aspects³.

2 CAVALLERO (2014).

3 The studies on Thomas' language are numerous; cfr. for example fr. HUBERT (1949), where the author points out the influence of the Classical, Biblical and Patristic traditions, the influence of Boethius, of the Aristotelian translations; Hubert says: «Les solutions souvent hardies adoptées en ces cas par les grands maîtres qualifient le latin médiéval comme une langue philosophique authentique et originale» (p. 225); CHENU (1950), who refers to Thomas' Latin as «le latin 'barbare' du moyen âge» (p. 87) but praises the «vivacité créatrice» of the scholastic language (p. 97); the same expression is used by HUBERT (1949: 231), who points out that in Thomas «la langue est consubstantielle à la pensée» (p. 104); HUBERT (1952); HUBERT (1956); HUBERT (1957-1969); HUBERT (1984); BUSA (1983-1985). HUBERT, with great erudition, was concerned with the sense of some terms or turns (*ianae, unicornis / cattus, restautario gemmarum*), he was also dealt with the tool-words that aid to mark punctuation or that give an expositive order; and he considered the words that are not registered in lexicons (*deiectivus*); but he did not consider the words that we include here. General studies are, for example, CHENU (1927) and CHENU (1952).

In vol. 47 of *Thomae Aquinatis Opera omnia iussu edita Leonis XIII, Sententia libri Ethicorum* (Romae, ad Sanctae Sabinae, 1969), I *praefatio* 191*-201*, one can find linguistic characteristics of Thomas' *scripta*, similar to those we have pointed out about the *Comm. in Iohannem*: terms «rariora», autograph forms that have non-classical morphology, proper nouns with strange form, Greek words badly adapted

In order to determine the possible novelties existent in this corpus, we have looked up in classical and Medieval Latin dictionaries whether the terms were listed and, if so, with what (different/new) senses⁴; if the terms did not appear therein, we paid special attention to the specific dictionaries of the Late Middle Ages⁵. We have verified if these entries were consistent with those of the *TLL* and with those of the *LLT*⁶, since these

to Latin or that reflect the Byzantine pronunciation, grammatical changes (desinence, comparatives, pronouns, agent form, indefinite use of *homo*, no genre or number concordances, change of verbal regimen, change of connectives, apodosis with «logical future», *protasis* with subjunctive or indicative, mixture of verbal modes, general use of *quod*, duplication of *quod, ut, ideo*, anacoluthon, changes in citations, omission of words.

4 With the expression «dictionaries of Medieval Latin» (we consider that the Middle Ages start in 476 a.C.) we make reference to: BLAISE (1967²); FORCELLINI (1864-1871); ARNALDI (1939-1964. Italian Latin until 1050 a.C.), ARNALDI-BLATT-UAI (1957-); SOUTER (1949, until 600 a.C.); the *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* until 600 a.C. Cfr. the next note.

5 BLAISE (1975); even though the author states that this work is not exhaustive in the Scholastic field (p. vi), nevertheless he usually cites Thomas' words; NIERMEYER (1976), although it is also oriented primarily toward historical texts and documents until c. 1150; DU CANGE (1678). This last work, although outdated, can contain the words we are concerned with. Cfr. ROQUES (1951-2). In addition, it is possible to check the *édition augmentée* de FAVRE (1883), «aucta pluribus verbis aliorum scriptorum».

6 *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*; Brepols' *Library of Latin Texts*.

corpora allow for a more reliable and trustworthy access to the sources⁷. In the case of Thomas, another advantage of these corpora is the possibility to look up the specific works about his language⁸, and the *Index Thomisticus*⁹, works that excel over any other previous production¹⁰.

Our goal now is to reconsider our earlier approach in order to make some new observations about the situation of the dictionaries in relation to Thomistic language. But we must warn the reader that the goal of this work is to a certain extent hypothetical, for several reasons: a) we do not have a critical edition of the

Commentarium, and, therefore, we cannot control the textual variants¹¹; b) this commentary was made by Thomas in Paris between 1269-1272 and we conserve a Latin version that a student wrote based on Thomas' oral exposition and that was revised by Reginald of Piperno (something similar to the situation of the texts of Aristotle or Ferdinand de Saussure). These notes would form a *reportatio* or *lectura*; but Tolomeus of Luca reports that the first five chapters were dictated by Thomas and the rest was corrected by Reginald on the base of the pupil's notes: the result is, then, an *ordinatio* or *expositio*¹². Therefore, some questions arise: is this language Thomas' or is it a 'Universitary' language? The revision suggests Thomas' style, but we cannot claim it. Thus, we must take these results as a hypothetical advance.

7 We have checked the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British sources* (= DMLBS), which was very useful, and the *Glossaire du latin philosophique* de l'Institut de Recherche et Histoire des Texts (= GLPh): <http://gestion-fiches.irht.cnrs.fr/>. These "fiches" include only *aliqua*liter, *explicita*, *participative*, *conditionalis* and *grossities* amongst the words we consider here. Cfr. MICHAUD-QUENTIN (1958), MERLE (1979-1980), VERBEKE (1978), HAMESSE (2010). HABEL-GRÖBEL (1989) has no citation for the meanings of the listed words. We had no access to the *Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch* nor to Peter STOTZ, *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters*, 1996-2004.

8 *i.e.* DEFERRARI-BARRY-MCGUINNESS (1948-1949). Later, DEFERRARI-BARRY (1956).

9 BUSA (1974-1980), 56 voll. Cfr. <http://www.corpusthomicum.org/it/index.age>.

10 de BERGAME (1497), and other editions; SCHÜTZ (1881), with reprints. Cfr. the « Indices » in vol. XVI of *Thomae Aquinatis Opera omnia iussu edita Leonis XIII* (Romae, ad Sanctae Sabinae, 1948) but there is no *index verborum*. HUBERT (1956) p. 258, in his critic consideration of these works, says that none of them secures a «dépouillement complet».

11 The Leonine edition does not include the text of *Super Iohannem*. Cfr. LUNA (2005). DAHAN (2005), p. 13 compares some *loci* of Thomas' *John* with the text of the Weber's edition of the *Vulgata* and the citations of Hughes de Saint-Cher. See also DAUPHINAIS-LEVERING (2005), where we can find studies about *Super Ioannem*: the Theological role of the Fathers, the speculative doctrine of the Trinity, the relation between *theologia* and *oikonomia*, the Creation, eternity and time, divine Providence, the concept of life, Christ as teacher, Jesus' human knowledge, anti-docetism, the influence on the *Summa* about Christ's resurrection, the Church militant, wisdom and Eucharist and the role of the Apostles. About the chapter 14, cfr. BAGLOW (2005).

12 TORRELL (1993), p. 496 says «Il paraît peu probable que Thomas ait revu lui-même le texte». Cfr. KEATING-LEVERING (2010), p. ix. See also TORRELL (2005), p. 199.

False neologisms

First of all, in our research on the *Comm. on John* we identified some terms that appeared in the Medieval Period (as from the 6th century) and we focused particularly on those which pertain to Aquinas' time, viz., 13th century. We have noticed that there are words, which, though already in use in his time, acquire a new meaning in Aquinas' texts¹³. Nevertheless, if the reader consults the *DMLBS* or the *LLT*, he finds that, for some of these words, the meaning used by Thomas appears as present already in earlier authors. In addition, a non-specialist reader of Thomas' work who searches these words in other dictionaries, can be led to think that the meanings that appear there are valid for Thomas Aquinas, when this is not the case¹⁴.

13 HUBERT (1956), p. 262 has affirmed that Thomas did not use Medieval senses of Classical words.

14 This is the case of words that were used by Ildephonsus Toletanus, 7th century, *praeparatiuus* (1836: the number refers to Thomas' paragraph of the *Commentary on John*), «preparatory» (*LLT*); Johannes Scotus Eriugena, 9th century: *connexim* (1793), «transitively, accordingly» (*LLT*), that Busa lists apparently as a *hapax legomenon*; Guillelmus a Sancto Theodorico, 1080-1148: *uiuificatiuus* (744, 780, 914, 959, 1118, 1471, 1516), «revitalizing, life-giving» (*LLT*); Ranulphus de Glanville, 1112-1190: *acceptio* (102) «meaning» or «semantic value of a word», according to the *DMLBS*; Johannes de Salisbury, 1120-1180: *conformitas* (748), «harmony between members», according to the *DMLBS* (NIERMEYER provides the meanings «analogy, similarity,» without examples); Gualterus Mappus, 1140-1210: *alterabilis* (1801), «changeable» (*DMLBS*); Innocentius III, 1161-1216: *concomitantia* (1876), according to the *LLT*;

In order to appraise this important issue, it is worth noting that dictionaries that sometimes cite theologians and, specifically Thomas, do not include some terms or omit Thomistic

Robertus Grossetestis, c. 1170-1253: *influentia* (86) «influence»; *causalitas* (38, 76, 84, 88, 94) «causality» (*DMLBS*); *cognoscitiuus* (443 *et alii*), «cognoscitive» (*DMLBS*); *incompossibilis* (2051), «mutually impossible», according to *DMLBS*; *quidditas* (603), technical term (cfr. *Summa I* 3,4 ob.2 etc.), «essence, nature of a thing» (*DMLBS*); *tristabilis* (2503), «that which causes sadness» (*DMLBS*); FAVRE (1883) p. 187 registers it in letters of the fourteenth century, but we have found it in the *Aristoteles latinus*, translation of Guillelmus de Moerbeke (1215-1286) and many later authors like Iohannis Peckham (1230-1292); besides, *lenitiuus* (1599), «softening» (*DMLBS*); *praemiatio* (485), «prize, award» (*LLT*). Rodericus Ximenius de Rada, 1170-1247: *alietas* (1912), «otherness», according to the *LLT*; Gervasius Tiburensis, 1177-1222: *dispensatiue* (551) «in the way of an exemption, leaving the law aside», according to the *DMLBS*; Guillelmus Alvernus, 1180-Paris 1249): *mititas* (923), «suavity» (*LLT*); this word is registered by BLAISE (1975), without examples, as a synonym of *miticitas* and of *mititia*. Alexander Halensis, 1185-1245, who died in Paris the same year when Thomas visited this city: *certitudinaliter* (1554, 2531), «with certainty»; *consiliatiuus* (1656), «reflexive», according to the *LLT*; *imaginatiuus* (1742), «able to imagine» (*LLT*); *immutatiuus* (366), «that which causes change, which has the power to transform» (*LLT*); *notionaliter* (753 etc.) (*LLT*); *summarie* (575), «concisely, briefly» (*LLT*); *artificiatum* (1142), «mechanism, device» (*LLT*); *impeditiuus* (2036), «impeding, stopping» (*LLT*); *praedominor* (706), «to prevail» (*LLT*); *promotiuus* (1732), «that which moves forward, promoter» (*LLT*); Balduinus de Forda and Bartholomaeus Exoniensis, 12th century: *infallibilitas* (2203), «infallibility» (*LLT*); this noun could seem a Thomas' neologism *apud* BLAISE'S *Lexicon s.v.*; Eberhardus Bethuniensis, 12-13th century: *expositiue* (2360), «explanatorily» (*LLT*).

specific usage, which could make the reader think that a term is a neologism, when it is not. Other words are not considered to be Thomas' neologisms, although, in some cases (e. g. *consiliatius*), the sense could be new. Thus, the word *acceptio* appears in the 12th century, according to Niermeyer; Blaise (1975) gives the sense «acceptation (d'un mot)» without examples; but Deferrari-Barry does not register the sense «meaning» or «semantic value of a word» which is the one used by Thomas (cfr. 8-9); in addition, Deferrari-Barry does not include *impossibilis* (2051), «mutually impossible», and presents *artificiatum* (1142), «mechanism, device», only as an adjective. As we can see, in many cases dictionaries can be deceptive and mislead the reader.

‘Possible’ neologisms

There are words that appear in authors who are contemporary to Thomas. We are not sure, then, if they were coined by Thomas himself. We say that these are “possible” neologisms, because Busa and Deferrari cite authors who were born after Thomas Aquinas (and in some cases –we highlight that–, the word is not registered in Deferrari). In addition, the date of the writing of the works is usually uncertain. It is impossible, therefore, to determine with accuracy the first use of the word.

This is the case of:

- *ablutius* (1748), «that which washes», that appears in Albertus Magnus (*LLT*);

- *accessorie* (896), «in an accessory way»; it is listed by Blaise's *Lex*. without examples. Deferrari-Barry does not include this word. Busa registers this Thomas' *locus* and only one usage that occurs in Petrus de Alvernia (1240-1304); in the Du Cange *édition augmentée*, the manuscript text of the *Constitutiones ordinis Cluniacensis* is cited, but without date. The *LLT* adds 3 cases of Sigerus de Brabantia (1240-1280). The *DMLBS* registers the word in documents of the 13th century;
- *aliquahter* (1681 *et alii*), «in some way», registered by the *LLT* already in Albertus Magnus (1206-1280), in Bonaventura, Thomas' schoolmate, and Rogerus Bacon;
- *exaltatius* (1732, 1734), «that which extols», is registered by the *LLT* only in the two *loci* of *Super Iohannem*, but we found that the adjective already appears in Thomas Vercellensis or Gallus (1200-1246)¹⁵;
- *explicite* (580), «explicitly»: the *LLT* adds some uses by contemporary authors like Albertus Magnus, Bonaventura, Augustinus de Dacia († 1285);
- *participatiue* (1460 etc.), «participatively», adverb used –according to *LLT*– by Albertus Magnus, Rogerus Bacon, Bonaventura.

15 Cfr. *Venerabilis Thomae Vercellensis Commentarius hierarchicus in Canticum canticorum*, in PEZ (1721), II p. 612. Later, in Philippus Aranda (1642-1695), cfr. ARANDA (1694), p. 581 A.

Some of these words, such as *ablutiuus*, *alterabilis*, *artificiatum* (sust.), *promotiuus*, are not registered in the «general» lexicons. The cases of *praeparatiuus* and *connexim* are significant because these adjectives are used already in the 7th and the 9th century respectively; then, they should have been registered in many Medieval Latin lexicons.

Thomas' neologisms

More important are the following cases. We argue that these should be considered 'Thomistic neologisms':

- *contristatiuus* (2078), «that which causes sadness;» Busa registers this adjective in 11 Thomas' cases, but does not mention it in other authors. The *LLT* gives 9 Thomas' loci;
- *irreuersibilitas* (438), «the condition of irreversible;». Busa finds this word once in *Super Iohannem* and once in *De ueritate*; he mentions no other authors. The *LLT* confirms Thomas' loci and adds no other. The word, then, seems to be a neologism¹⁶;
- *obumbrate* (1554), «secretly, stealthily»; Busa finds the adverb 6 times in Thomas' *Summa*, *Catena* and *Super Iohannem*; but in no other authors. The *LLT* lists 14 cases,

but these loci are forms of the feminine participle *obumbratae*. This adverb, then, seems to be Thomas' creation;

- *sputatio* (1309), «spit, sputum,» «the action of spiting»; Busa lists it in *Super Iohannem*, as a *hapax legomenon* and the *LLT* confirms it. But it is not a hapax: the word seems a Thomistic neologism embraced later by the Medical language¹⁷.
- *terdenarius* (880), «number of three tens»¹⁸; Busa lists this adjective in *Super Iohannem*, as a *hapax legomenon*. The *LLT* confirms it¹⁹.

17 We find that the word appears later six times in the medical treatise of Jacobus Hollery Stemanus (16th century), other times in a similar work of Antonius Constantinus (17th century), five times in Gerardus van Switen (1700-1772).

18 «Per triginta autem signatur perfectio novi testamenti, quae deerat legi: nam si ipsa quinque multiplicentur per sex, qui est numerus perfectus, consurgit numerus terdenarius».

19 It is interesting to stress that Martinus' *Lexicon philologicum* includes this word with the sense «τρισκαιδεκάς, numerus tredecim» (1655, *uide sub uoce* «triscadecás»), which is another sense. Accordingly, in *Explicación de la syntaxis de Torrella* it is stated that *terdenarius* means «thirteenth» and that the sense «thirtieth» is said *tricenarius*: TORRELLA (1777), p. 184; the author said it already in his *Syntaxis* (1761), p. 137; an identical concept is given by Marcos Márquez de Medina (1825), p. 194, to *terdenarius*. And the curious Richelet's Dictionary says «Treizain. *terdenarius*» (1702), p. 33): in these cases, the meanings are different from that of Thomas'.

16 We found the term in a modern text, a document of the Church teaching: BENEDICTUS XVI *Adhortatio apostolica postsynodalis* «*Sacramentum Caritatis*», N° 29.

New senses in Thomas' usage

There are some cases, which seem to have a new sense in Thomas' usage:

- *claria* (1826 «gloria enim dicitur quasi claria»), «praise, extolment» apparently this word is coined on the base of *gloria*, because it cannot be the plural neuter of *clarus* (*clara*): cfr. «nam gloria dicitur quasi claria», *Summa* II-2 q.103 a. 1 ad 3. Only Blaise's *Lexicon* gives the entry *claria*, but it designates an «uncovered carriage.» Deferrari-Barry links the word to the Greek «κληροία, glory» (158 a). Busa includes these two Thomas' *loci*; all the others are forms of the adjective *clarus*. The *LLT* lists these *loci* and texts with the adjective or with *Claria* as proper noun;
- *conditionalis*: Thomas employs it as a grammatical term (1285), a meaning that does not appear in the lexicons²⁰. Busa includes 155 cases (occurrences) in Thomas; many of them have the meaning of «adverbial conditional proposition in a text»; there are 41 cases in unknown authors, 3 in Leonardus Pistoriensis, 6 in Helvicus Theutonicus (14th century) and 1 in Cajetanus (15-16th century). But not all these usages, in Thomas and in the others, have the linguistic sense. The

unknown author of *Summa totius logicae Aristotelis* declares (VII 16): «Sed quia ex propositionibus conditionalibus et disjunctivis aliter fiunt syllogismi quam in propositionibus categoricis, ideo...», where there is an explicit reference to the linguistic meaning of this word;

- *grossities* (2549), «coarseness». As «fatness, thickness», it is registered by Niermeyer in the 12th century, but here it seems to have another meaning. Busa registers 40 cases in Thomas, including that of *Super Iohannem*, but all the others have the meaning of «thickness» or «width»; the unknown author of *De sacramento Eucharistiae* 3 says «Item tam longa est longitudo turris sicut ipsa turris, et tam lata quam lata est latitudo, et grossities ita grossa»; and Petrus de Alvernia says: «subtilitas autem et grossities sunt idem quod magnitudo et parvitas; subtile enim dicimus, quod est parvarum partium; quod enim multum extensum est per rarefactionem subtile est; tale autem est quod componitur ex corporibus parvis. Grossum autem est quod est magnarum partium»²¹. Thomas' usage here, then, seems to be new;
- *ministerialiter* (2542), «as an instrument, as a way or means». Blaise's *Lex.* registers this adverb with two meanings: «by virtue of

20 Blaise' *Lex.* gives no entry of the term; Niermeyer registers it as «1. conditional» without any example or clarification, «2. concerning servile status».

21 *De caelo et mundo continuatio* III 9. The same sense we find in other five *loci* of Petrus de Alvernia, one of Petrus Iohannis Olivi, one of Helvicus Theutonicus and three of unknown authors.

his ministry,» III Hispanic Council, without date; and as a synonym of *instrumentaliter* («instrumentale-ment, comme un instrument, un moyen») opposite to *per auctoritatem* or *auctoritatiue* or *principaliter* (= «à la façon d'un auteur, d'un maître»), and this value appears in Thomas, *Summa* III 8: 1 ad 1²²; Busa registers 12 cases in Thomas, 2 in unknown authors and 1 in Johannis Michaelis (17th century).

The verb *ueneo* has no new meaning, but in N° 1602 Thomas points out that this verb is equivalent to the passive form of the active verb *uendo*, also a classical one²³; this indication suggests that back in his time the verb *ueneo* was unusual or its meaning was obscure²⁴.

22 Thomas himself makes the synonymy in *Summa* III q. 8 a.1 ad 1: «Augustinus autem negat Christum, secundum quod est homo, dare Spiritum Sanctum per auctoritatem. Instrumentaliter autem sive ministerialiter, etiam alii sancti dicuntur dare Spiritum Sanctum».

23 It is glossed by Aquinas as «unguentum non uenit, idest uenditum est» (cfr. *Johannes* 12: 5); this verb had an active form with passive sense («to be sold, to be put on sale»).

24 Blaise's *Dict.* glosses it as *uendo* but cites only Hilary of Poitiers; in Niermeyer's it is not included and the Medieval *Lexicon* refers to the *Acta* of the Holy See. The *DMLBS* provides no entry of this word. HUBERT (1956) p. 262, n. 1, has affirmed that Thomas did not utilise active verbs made from Classical deponent verbs. Thomas also employs the turn of phrase *de nouo* «miraculose de nouo creat vel format» («he creates miraculously or he forms something new», 2598), which indicates object, not a point of departure.

There are some theological neologisms that have succeeded in time²⁵. In addition to this, it is evident that there is a trend to make adjectives with the suffix *-iuus*²⁶ and to create adverbs finished in *-e*²⁷, and this trend is confirmed, if we consider other terms coined in the 12th and 13th centuries that are not Thomas's.

Besides the words *accessorie*, *con-nexim*, *exaltatiuus* and *incompossibilis*, only three neologisms are not included in Deferrari-Barry: *irreuersibilitas*, *sputatio*, *terdenarius*.

The additions of Antoine Thomas²⁸ do not include any of the words that have been considered in these tables. On his behalf, Arnaldi includes only *acceptio* and *aliquilater*. How-

25 *causalitas*, *quidditas*, *cognoscitiuus*, *praedominari*, *uiuificatiuus*, *imaginatiuus*, *alterabilis*, *praeparatiuus*, *infallibilitas*.

26 *cognoscitiuus*, *uiuificatiuus*, *lenitiuus*, *consiliatiuus*, *promotiuus*, *exaltatiuus*, *imaginatiuus*, *ablutiuus*, *praeparatiuus*, *impeditiuus*, *contristatiuus*. Cfr. HUBERT (1957), p. 291, about *deiectiuius*, where the author mentions the classical suffix as a frequent one in Thomas (*primitiuius*, *affirmatiuus*, *manifestatiuus*, *aestimatiuus*, *dillusiuius*, *determinatiuus*, *productiuius*, *potestatiuus*). BAUTIER-DUCHET-SUCHAUX (1983-1985), p. 48, mention «le grand succès au Moyen Âge des adjectifs en *-iuus* (*maiestatiuus*, *minoratiuus*). Il s'agit des créations si naturelles qu'un oeil non exercé n'en décele pas toujours immédiatement la nouveauté».

27 *summarie*, *explicite*, *accessorie*, *participatiue*, *obumbrate*, *expositiue*. Cfr. BAUTIER-DUCHET-SUCHAUX (1983-1985), p. 49-50. The authors mention the examples *maternerne*, *mediate*, *meditatiue*, *palinodiace*, *maledice*.

28 Cfr. ROQUES (1951-1952).

ever, the *DMLBS* does not include many terms²⁹ because –it seems– they are absent in British sources. But this tool incorporates earlier registers of *causalitas*, *impossibilis*, *lenitiuus*, *quidditas* and *tristabilis* in Grossetestis, who was ten or fifteen years older than Alexander Halensis: these words, then, could be his creations. Regarding the other words, the *DM-LBS* provides examples extracted from documents or authors of the 13th century or later³⁰.

With this study we aim at calling the lexicologists' attention to the fact that some of the terms just mentioned do not appear with the new sense that is found in Thomas or his contemporaries in the lexicons that we have mentioned. We observe, therefore, that, in works that sometimes incorporate terms used by Thomas, some words are missing or the meanings

are incomplete, even those included among those senses that are identified specifically as of this author. This does not only limit the information available to the reader, but it can also create methodological problems. The clarification expressed in this work is not intended to censure these texts, but serves as an indication or warning to the scholar or the reader interested in Medieval Latin. If he is not a specialist in Thomas or has no access to Busa's or Deferrari's works or to the *GLPh*, when he searches a word in the common dictionaries, he could be misled.

Conclusions

What would we contribute, then, to Thomas' Lexicography and to Medieval Latin Lexicography?

- 1) The words that seemed neologisms according to the « general » dictionaries' entries must be considered:
 - 1.a. Creations of other earlier authors, according to the data items of databases³¹. These words, then, are not Thomas' creations.
 - 1.b. «Possible» Thomas' neologisms, because the words appear also in other authors, contemporary to Thomas: i.e. *ablutiuus*.

29 *ablutiuus*, *artificiatum*, *claria*, *connexim*, *exultatiuus*, *irreuersibilitas*, *obumbrate*, *praedominor*, *sputatio*, *terdenarius*.

30 Before the conclusions, we would like to add a mere clarification. Thomas could have utilised also the verb *poteo*, as a regularization of *possum* according to VÄÄNÄNEN (1968) § 31; cfr. § 315, 320; this verb would have had a short *-e-*, although –it is clear– in Aquinas' time it was no longer possible to perceive the vocalic quantity or length: in the N° 1449 it appears the form *poterunt*, which would be a third person plural of the perfect tense, instead of the classical *potuerunt* (§ 31); but the context would prefer a sense of present or, better, the regular and classical future of *possum*, because in this *locus* Thomas makes reference to Origen who thinks that the saints who are in glory will be able to sin (cfr. *Principia* II 3.3, PG 11: 190-2). It is not, then, a Medieval feature.

31 *alietas*, *causalitas*, *cognoscitiuus*, *impossibilis*, *quidditas*, *tristabilis*, *concomitantia*, *mititas*, *expositiue*, *infallibilitas*, *certitudinaliter*, *consiliatiuus*, *imaginatiuus*, *immunitatiuus*, *notionaliter*, *summariie*.

- 1.c. Thomas' neologisms, because of their sense.
- 2) The words that had no entry in «general» dictionaries but have it in Busa's and Deferrari's lexicons could be broken down as follows:
- 2.a. Words that were coined by very earlier authors³² or by few earlier authors (second half of 12th century)³³. These terms are medieval creations that in many cases Thomas has spread.
- 2.b. Words that are «possible» neologisms, because they appear in authors contemporary to Thomas, many of them in Albertus Magnus³⁴;
- 2.c. Words that seem to be really Thomas' neologisms.
- 3) Among the words that are not included in Deferrari-Barry, we can find:

- 3.1. A term that is a medieval creation: *connexim* (Eriugena, 9th century);
- 3.2. A term that could be coined slightly earlier in time: *exaltatiuus* (Thomas Vercellensis, 1200-1246);
- 3.3. Some terms that seem to be Thomas' neologisms.

We stress that Busa or the *LLT* are not exhaustive in some cases³⁵. In addition, the adjective *praeparatiuus* (Ildephonsus Toletanus, 7th century), and the adverb *connexim*, (Eriugena, 9th century), ought to be included in many Early Medieval Latin lexicons.

Then, we point out:

- 1) That the following words seem to be Thomas' neologisms: a) because of their sense: *claria*, *conditionalis*, *grossities*, *ministerialiter*, *ueneo*; b) because they appear in Thomas for the first time: *contristatiuus*, *irreuersibilitas*, *obumbrate*, *sputatio*, *terdenarius*, even though they are not *hapax legomena* of the *Commentary on John* (and, in this case, the other uses claim the authenticity of Thomas' words)³⁶. These words

32 Ildephonsus Toletanus (*praeparatiuus*), Gualterus Mappus (*alterabilis*), Guillelmus a Sancto Theodorico (*uiuificatiuus*).

33 Robertus Grossetestis (*lenitiuus*, *praemiatio*) or Alexander Halensis (*artificiatum*, *impeditiuus*, *praedominor*, *promotiuis*), etc.

34 *accessorie*, *aliquialiter*, *explicite*, *participatiue*. It is not strange that so many words that Thomas utilises appear early in Albertus Magnus. As HUBERT (1952), p. 244, has said, it was very important « pour la langue de saint Thomas », « celle du pionnier de la science, du maître de notre auteur, Albert le Grand ». Cfr. also as general framework, de GHELLINCK (1946); BLATT (1958). About the use of rhetoric in the University, cfr. WARD (1996). See also WEISHEIPL (1974).

35 As in the registers of *ablutiuus*, *exaltatiuus*, *impeditiuus*, *lenitiuus*, *sputatio*, *uiuificatiuus*.

36 About the neologisms in Medieval Latin, cfr. BAUTIER-DUCHET SUCHAUX (2005) and the complete volume 63, 2005, of *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevii*. These words are not registered in HABEL-GRÖBEL (1989) either.

confirm Thomistic novelty, even if Hubert considers that «S. Thomas est le plus classique de ses contemporains»³⁷. These words would be kept in mind in a global study on Thomas' neologisms.

- 2) That the following words are «possible» Thomas' neologisms, because they are used also by coetaneous authors: *ablutiuus*, *accessorie*, *aliqua-liter*, *explicite*, *participatiue*.
- 3) That it would be desirable to incorporate the terms that Blaise's *Lexicon* has not included, as an appendix in future editions (like it was made in LSJ, for example), keeping in mind that Blaise's *Lexicon* includes many of said words, attributing them to Thomas or to «theol.» This incoherence cre-

37 Cfr. HUBERT (1956), p. 263. Hubert points out that Thomas could learn his classicism in Monte Cassino; and he makes an effort to demonstrate it comparing the epigraphic Christian vocabulary collected by KNOTT (1956), especially in 72 ff, with the work of Deferrari-Barry. Cfr. also BUSA (1983-1985) where he laments that in this time some works similar to his *Index Thomisticus* did not exist: it was not possible to make a certain study about Thomas' linguistic originality, but it was possible to «mettre en évidence quelques qualités de sa langue et quelques contenus de sa linguistique» (p. 66). He points out the Classical morphology of Thomas, but «le latin de ST est un autre latin» (p. 69); also the philosophical vocabulary is «très large et en quelque mesure encyclopédique». About the vocabulary, he emphasizes four aspects: the words that do not exist in FORCELLINI; the terms that Thomas did not write; the hapax; the progressive appearance of the words in his different works (cfr. p. 70 and Tables 14, 27, 29 in vol. 10 of the *Index*).

ates confusion when consulting the *Lexicon* as a general work of Medieval Latin, even though the author advises about the scholastic vocabulary «dans ce domaine, il ne faut pas s'étendre outre mesure. Le plus important pour nous est sûrement le vocabulaire liturgique, théologique et ascétique» (p. vi; the highlight is ours). What is this limit or measure? Something similar could be said about Niermeyer's *Lexicon*, because the limit that the author establishes (c. 1150, cfr. «Avant propos» p. iii)³⁸ is not clearly declared or specified in the title «minus», as really do, for example, Souter and Arnaldi. In addition, there is no excuse to omit some words such as *praeparatiuus* or *connexim* in these dictionaries.

- 4) That it would be desirable that the Busa' and Deferrari-Barry's works be completed, since, provided they are specific works on Thomas or on Thomas and his time, they ought to give certain and reliable data for the specialist researcher; even though Deferrari-Barry tries to be complete only about the *Summa*, the expression «and selected passages of his other works» may create

38 «Aussi nous sommes-nous borné, pour la plupart des mots nouveaux et des acceptions nouvelles du bas Moyen Âge, à une simple indication de l'époque à laquelle ils apparaissent, en ajoutant, les cas échéant, la région à laquelle ils appartiennent. Nos citations se situent donc en grande majorité, dans les six siècles compris entre 550 et 1150».

confusion about what the reader can find, whether or not the word searched is Thomas'. Something similar could be said about the *LLT*, where some testimonies that introduce a different starting date of the usage of the word are omitted. If this tool were complete and easily accessible, it could supply –it is true– all the others; and it would be even more useful if it gave the data in strict chronological order.

- 5) It would be desirable to compile a more general and complete new lexicon about Mediaeval Latin, using the information or data provided by the modern databases, since said databases are very useful and more exact (accurate). If neither Blaise nor Niermeyer or Du Cange are complete and reliable lexicons, then, there would be a new one compiling all the results of the recent investigations, even if not giving all the text citations in each of the entries. This work would be a very useful tool for any person who would like to search the existence, the occurrence and the sense/s of a Medieval Latin word. It is obviously a hard and long task, because there are many medieval texts that are unedited and because we do not have, therefore, modern databases of all Medieval Latin literature. But we think –and we hope– that these works will be created over time, and that in the future one will have at his disposal a «general» dictionary that will say «this word exists»,

“this word means this”, “this word was used first by this author with this sense». We hope and we encourage the UAI to devote itself to this endeavour by providing here some simple clues.

Bibliography

- ARANDA, Ph. (1694). *In primam secundae sancti Thomae libri duodecim*, Caesar-Augustae.
- ARNALDI, F. (1939-1964). *Latinitatis Italicae Medii Aevi inde ab a. CDLXXVI usque ad a. MXXII lexicon imperfectum* (in IV voll., a cura di Franciscus Arnaldi, Paschalis Smiraglia), Union académique internationale, Bruxelles (cfr. Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2001).
- ARNALDI, F. - BLATT, F. & UNION ACADÉMIQUE INTERNATIONALE (1957-), *Novum glossarium mediae latinitatis ab anno DCCC usque ad annum MCC*, Hafniae-Bruxelles, Munksgaard.
- BAGLOW, Ch. (2005). *Rediscovering St. Thomas Aquinas as Biblical Theologian*, in *Letter & Spirit* 1; 137-146.
- BAUTIER, A. - DUCHET-SUCHAUX, M. (1983-1985), *Des néologismes en latin médiéval: approche statistique et répartition linguistique* in *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevii*; 55-45.
- BERGAME de, P. (1497). *Tabula aurea*. Venezia.
- BLAISE, A. (1967²). *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens*. Paris.
- BLAISE, A. (1975). *Lexicon Latinitatis Medii Aevi*. Turnholt.
- BLATT, F. (1958). *L'évolution du latin médiéval*, in *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevii* 28/2; 201-219.

- BREPOLS' *Library of Latin Texts*, cfr. http://www.brepols.net/publishers/pdf/Brepolis_Library_of_Latin_Texts_EN.pdf
- BUSA, R. (1974-1980). *Index Thomisticus: Sancti Thomae Aquinatis operum omnium indices et concordantiae*, Stuttgart.
- BUSA, R. (1983-1985). *L'originalité linguistique de Saint Thomas d'Aquin*, in *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 44-45; 65-90.
- CAI, R. (1952). *S. Thomae Aquinatis, Super Evangelium S. Ioannis Lectura*, cura P. Raphaelis CAI, O.P., editio V revisa, Taurini-Romae.
- CAVALLERO, P. (2014). *El Comentario a Juan de Tomás de Aquino. Rasgos de latín medieval y actitudes filológicas*, colección Textos & Estudios 12 (UBA). Buenos Aires.
- CHENU, M.D. (1927). *Notes de lexicographie philosophique médiévale*, in *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 16; 435-446.
- CHENU, M.D. (1950). *Introduction à l'étude de saint Thomas*. Montréal-Paris.
- CHENU, M.D. (1952). *Vocabulaire biblique et vocabulaire théologique* in *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 74; 1029-1041.
- DAHAN, G. (2005). *Les éditions des commentaires bibliques de saint Thomas d'Aquin. Leur apport à la connaissance du texte de la Bible au XIII^e siècle*, in *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 89/1; 9-15.
- DAUPHINAIS, M. - LEVERING, M. (2005). *Reading John with St. Thomas Aquinas Theological Exegesis and Speculative Theology*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press.
- DEFERRARI, R, BARRY, M.I. & MCGUINNESS, I. (1948-1949), *A lexicon of St. Thomas Aquinas based on the Summa theologia and selected passages of his other works*, Washington.
- DEFERRARI, R. - BARRY, M.I. (1956). *A complete index of the 'Summa Theologica' of S. Thomas Aquinas*. Washington.
- Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British sources* (1975). Oxford University Press & British Academy.
- DU CANGE, Ch. du Fresne, Seigneur (1678). *Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis*. Lutetiae Parisiorum.
- ESPARZA, M. de (1668), *Quaestiones disputandae de passionibus seu affectibus*, Pottendorff.
- FAYRE, L. (1883), *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae graecitatis*, version augmentée, Niort (ducange.enc.sorbonne.fr).
- FORCELLINI, E. (1864-1871). *Lexicon totius latinitatis*. Patavii.
- GHELLINCK, J. de (1946). *L'essor de la littérature latine au XIII^e siècle*. Louvain-Paris.
- HABEL, E. - GRÖBEL, F. (1989). *Mittellateinisches Glossar*. Paderborn.
- HAMESSE, J. (2010). *Le glossaire du latin philosophique médiéval de la Sorbonne: histoire, but et utilisation*, in G. Weijers – I. Costa – A. Oliva edd. *Les innovations du vocabulaire latin à la fin du Moyen Âge: autour du Glossaire du latin philosophique. Actes de la journée d'étude du 15 mai 2008*. Turnhout: Brepols; 9-20.
- HUBERT, M. (1949). *Aspects du latin philosophique aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles*, in *Revue des Études Latines* 27, 221-233.
- HUBERT, M. (1952). *Notes de latin médiéval*, in *Revue des Études Latines* 30; 309-317.
- HUBERT, M. (1956). *Vers une lexicographie thomiste*, in *Revue des Études Latines* 34; 254-267.

- HUBERT, M. (1957-1969). *Notes de lexicographie thomiste*, in *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 27, p. 5-28, 167-188, 287-292; 32, 1962, p. 227-253; 38, 1969; 59-108.
- HUBERT, M. (1984). *Éléments provisoires de linguistique thomiste. Mots outils et ponctuation dans les écrits de saint Thomas*, in *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 53; 57-63.
- IESU, L. a (1748). *Controuersiarum scholastico-polemico-historico-criticarum tractatus*, Mediolani.
- KEATING, D. - LEVERING, M. (2010). «Introduction» to *The commentary on the Gospel of John*, translated by Fabian Larcher and James Weisheipl, Washington, The Catholic University Press.
- KNOTT, B. (1956). *The Christian 'special language' in the inscriptions*, in *Vigiliae Christianae* 10/2; 65-79.
- LUNA, C. (2005). *L'édition léonine de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, in *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 89/1; 31-110.
- MÁRQUEZ DE MEDINA, M. (1825). *Arte explicado y gramático perfecto*. Madrid.
- MARTINUS, M. (1655). *Lexicon philologicum praecipue etymologicum et sacrum*. Francofurti ad Moenum.
- MERLE, H. (1979-1980). *Le Glossaire du latin philosophique médiéval*, in *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 42; 142-147.
- MICHAUD-QUENTIN, P. (1958). *Le Glossaire du latin philosophique médiéval*, in *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 28; 239-243.
- NIERMEYER, J.F. (1976). *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*. Leiden.
- PEZ, B. (1721). *Thesaurus anecdotorum nouissimus*, Augustae Vindelicorum.
- RICHELET, P. (1702). *Dictionnaire de rimes dans un nouvel ordre*. Paris.
- ROQUES, M. (1951-1952). *Additions et corrections d'Antoine Thomas au Glossaire de Du Cange*, in *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 22; 89-156.
- SCHÜTZ, L. (1881). *Thomas lexicon*. Paderborn.
- SOUTER, A. (1949). *A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 A.D.* Oxford.
- Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften (Latin texts from the classical period up to about 600 A.D.); cfr. www.degruyter.com.
- TORRELL, J.P. (1993). *Initiation à saint Thomas*. Paris: Cerf (reedited in 2004).
- TORRELL, J.P. (2005). *Saint Thomas Aquinas. The person and his work*, revised edition. Washington: The Catholic University Press.
- TORRELLA, J. (1761). *Syntaxis seu compendiararia partium orationis institutio*. Cervariae.
- TORRELLA, J. (1777). *Explicación de la syntaxis de Torrella*. Valencia.
- VÄÄNÄNEN, V. (1968). *Introducción al latín vulgar*. Trans. Manuel Carrión. Madrid.
- VERBEKE, G. (1978). *Lexicographie du latin médiéval et philosophie médiévale in La Lexicographie du Latin médiéval et ses rapports avec les recherches actuelles sur la civilisation du Moyen Âge*, Paris, Colloques CNRS; 261-287.
- WARD, J. (1996). *Rhetoric in the Faculty of Arts at the Universities of Paris and Oxford in the Middle Ages: a Summary of the Evidence*, in *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 54, p. 159-232.
- WEISHEIPL, J.A. (1974). *The Parisian Faculty of Arts in mid-thirteenth century: 1240-1270 in The American Benedictine Review* 25; 200-217.

Recibido: 31-08-2018

Evaluated: 11-09-2018

Aceptado: 12-09-2018

