THE STUDY OF MEDIEVAL LATIN
PAST, PRESENT, FUTURE

FAREWELL LECTURE OF CHRISTINE A. E. M. MOHRMANN

Farewell lecture, given on Saturday, November 10, 1973, by Christine Mohrmann upon her retirement as professor of Vulgar Latin, Old Christian Latin, and Late Latin at the University of Amsterdam.

Dear Audience,

It was in 1938 that the Utrecht medieval scholar Oppermann spontaneously asked a young private lecturer, after delivering her inaugural lecture, entitled "The Structure of Old Christian Latin," whether she would also be willing to take on the teaching of Medieval Latin. With the optimism characteristic of youth, which I now find incomprehensible, the aforementioned private lecturer accepted this suggestion, and thus her licentia docendi was soon expanded to include Medieval Latin. After a few years, the private lectureship at Utrecht University was converted into a lectureship. Thus, Medieval Latin was taught ex professo as an examination subject at a Dutch university, based on a special teaching assignment.

The late Oppermann, a man who made such great contributions to the practice of medieval studies in our country, with this act sided with his distinguished German compatriots Wilhelm Meyer, Ludwig Traube, Paul von Winterfeld, Paul Lehmann, and others, who had introduced the study of Medieval Latin as an autonomous philological science. That Oppermann was right in his desire to give medieval Latin education its own place is proven, among other things, by the subsequent development of the subject at our universities: today, 35 years later, almost every Dutch university has a chair in medieval Latin, whether or not it is connected to Early Christian Latin. Institutes for medieval Latin are becoming hallmarks of the practice of a subject that is slowly but surely gaining its place in education and scholarship in our country as well.

Without going into details, one can conclude that the Netherlands now holds an honorable place among the countless practitioners of medieval Latin in Europe and overseas, both through its education and research. For this—in its philological form—npg young science shows evidence of great vitality: one is gradually realizing that Classical and Early Christian Latin, in their literary form, find their natural, yet very specific, continuation in Medieval Latin, and that these three—essentially forming a unity in multiplicity—cannot be ignored from our cultural pattern.

Although from the outset, more general works on the phenomenon of Medieval Latin and Medieval Latin literature appeared in considerable numbers, and Ernst Robert Curtius, in his masterpiece: European Literature and Late Middle Ages (first edition, Bern 1948), also made a significant attempt at a literary synthesis from antiquity to modern times, it seems to me that in recent decades a certain preference has been given to specialized, detailed issues in the fields of codicilology, paleography, philology, and—especially—the much-needed textual criticism. I see this, first and foremost, as a symptom of the seriousness with which our studies are approached. People are unwilling to indulge in general speculation before laying a solid foundation through detailed study. But the incomprehensibility of the mass of Latin texts left behind by the Middle Ages, which is often referred to with the—not always adequate—label of "Medieval Latin literature," also plays a role. This mass is currently difficult—if not impossible—to approach systematically, and so people resort to detail. One must not forget that, regarding the volume of surviving texts, there is a significant difference between Classical and Late Latin literature and Medieval literature. Classical Latin literature as it has come down to us forms a closed—comprehensible—corpus. As a result of a choice—often conscious, sometimes also more coincidental—this corpus is limited. This choice is partly determined by educational tradition, partly by a judgment of value; what was deemed worthy of being copied onto expensive parchment? Medieval Latin literature, however, was never actually subjected to such a sifting. Hence this unmanageable mass of texts - which arose on a very extensive territory - which has been inventoried with great care and patience in a handbook such as that of Manitius and his successors, but which has hardly yet been assessed for their value or worth. In his L'essor de la littérature latine au XII siecle (2 vols., Paris 1946), De Ghellinck attempted to approach the exceptionally rich - and generally high-quality - Latin heritage of the twelfth century from a literary perspective, but due to a one-sided classicist assessment, he is still too much stuck in the tradition of Traube and co.

And this brings me to the actual topic of this afternoon, which is not of a literary-historical nature, but of a philological-linguistic nature. How should we assess Medieval Latin as a linguistic phenomenon? To what extent is there unity or diversity

here? Should one speak of evolution or merely of change? And first of all: what is the status of the chronological fixation of what is called 'sloppy' Medieval Latin? These are all questions that were addressed, especially in the earliest studies of Medieval Latin, but to which no definitive answers have yet been given. This remains a major task for the present and the future. I would like to make some general remarks about these problems, more as a pointer to tasks to be accomplished than to provide any definitive answers. My swan song may thus also be aimed at the future.

Generally, there is agreement on the standard that must be applied to determine whether a form of Latin can be classified as Medieval Latin. Medieval Latin was not the everyday language of an ethnic community; it was not passed down from mother to child, nor did it develop as a national language of everyday life. Instead, it was passed down through education and schools, used by an intellectual elite. It transcended national boundaries to gradually become the higher language of culture in what would one day be Western Europe. Through education and tradition, it played its role as the vehicular language of what is called the respublica litterarum. From this description, it follows that "Medieval" in this context is not a chronological designation in the strict sense of the word. How to classify such a phenomenon linguistically is a much-discussed problem, to which I will return.
The survival of Latin in this special form was made possible by several factors: first, by the emergence and centuries-long persistence of the classical literary language and style, which—following the Greek example—was strongly normatively determined, passed down through an almost constant school tradition until the end of antiquity. The existence—and teaching—of these literary normative language and stylistic forms has, on the one hand, hindered the development of the Latin colloquial language, but on the other, as the gap between colloquial and literary language widened, it has also facilitated the autonomous survival of a literary language across large areas. The survival of the classical literary tradition, with secular classical literature as its norm and center, was fostered and ultimately made possible during the fourth and fifth centuries by Christians' acceptance of the ancient school system and by Christian writers' faithfulness to the ancient literary tradition and its stylistic devices, despite the uniqueness of their language. Augustine—and others with him—considered knowledge of ancient secular literature and its time-honored stylistic devices useful, even for Christians. While it is true that since Augustine, the study of ancient literature and classical stylistic processes has increasingly been considered a kind of propaedeutic for Christian biblical study, a view that would find an influential advocate in Cassiodorus in the sixth century, this Christian attitude created the possibility for the survival of the Latin literary tradition. It has rightly been said that the decisions that enabled the survival of Latin in the centuries to come were made in the fourth and fifth centuries. Yet, it would be inappropriate to think solely of this literary development here: it goes hand in hand with the Western Church's acceptance of Latin as the language of liturgy, Scripture, and all forms of "institutional" church life. This explains why the first expansion of Latin as "Medieval Latin," i.e., as a non-national, higher-level language of communication, occurred as a result of missionary activities. Latin initially expanded its territory by preaching Christianity to peoples who had had no contact with Latin culture in antiquity. The first, Roman, expansion of Latin was marked by the sword, the second, Christian, by the cross. But expansion by the sword generally displaced the indigenous national languages, while the cross allowed them the freedom to maintain their own native language.
We first see this expansion of Latin in Ireland, so isolated and barely touched by ancient culture. I cannot here enter into a discussion of the problems associated with the Christianization of Ireland, nor concern myself with all the mysteries surrounding the controversial figure of the apostle of Ireland, St. Patrick. I have commented on this elsewhere. It is well known that the last word on this subject cannot yet be spoken. 1. But whether one considers Patrick's preaching the absolute beginning of the Christianization of the Green Isle, or believes he had predecessors, or whether one places the beginning of his missionary work around 431 or 461, it is certain that Latin was brought to Ireland along with Christianity. In my opinion, Patrick's Latin shows clear traces of fifth-century Latin in Central Gaul and perhaps has some affinity with the dying Celtic Latin of Britain. However this may be, after the episcopal Church of Ireland, shortly after Patrick's mission, had developed into a form in which an extremely rigorous monastic system, perhaps a Christian interpretation of the ancient clan system, had taken over the leadership of the church, monastic schools emerged in Ireland. There, a Latin was practiced that, in its bizarre artificiality, bears all the marks of a school language, drawn from

glossaries and late antique textbooks: a pseudo-learned language adorned with foreign, often Greek or pseudo-Greek words, with neologisms, such as "prosator" for "creator," and with Hebrewisms like "iduma" for "manus." As strange as all this may seem to us, here—at a time when Latin was still very much alive in the late antique world—we are dealing with the oldest form of Medieval Latin. This Latin tradition would soon also have a stimulating effect on our own native language: a phenomenon we will find again in the Germanic regions.

The isolation of Irish Latin culture has been somewhat broken by the peregrinationes to the continent and thus by contact with Anglo-Saxon Latin culture. Yet the Irish remained faithful to their own tradition for a long time, which drew primarily from their Christian Latin past and manifested itself in a bizarre predilection for rhetorical flourishes. I have delved into this early, in many ways enigmatic, Irish Medieval Latin in some depth, firstly to demonstrate how artificial its initial beginnings on non-Roman soil were, and secondly to clarify that Medieval Latin did not—as many still believe—begin with the Carolingian Renaissance.

The course of events in Anglo-Saxon Britain was again different. The Roman occupation of the island, once populated by Celts, had not led to complete Romanization. When the Roman armies withdrew at the beginning of the fifth century, the Latin tradition gradually disappeared. And when the Germanic—still pagan—Angles and Saxons occupied the country in the mid-sixth century, the only partially Romanized population was pushed back to the western fringes. There, the ancient Latin tradition languished for some time in the Celtic monasteries. It was there that Gildas described the downfall of Celtic Britain, and it was also in these monasteries that a certain contact with the monastic culture of Ireland was established.

As for the Anglo-Saxons, they were—as is well known—converted to Christianity by a well-organized Roman mission sent by Pope Gregory the Great. At the same time, Christianity was also preached among the newly settled Germanic population from the north by Irish monks. The Irish educational system was brought to the Anglo-Saxons from Irish monasteries like Lindisfarne and Whitbey. However, after an initial conflict between "Romans" and "Irish," the Roman movement gained the upper hand. This was the result of direct contact with the still-existing late antiquity civilization. When Pope Vitalian sent Theodore, born in Tarsus and raised in the Greek East, along with the monk Hadrian, originally from North Africa and educated in the ancient Roman school system, both familiar with ancient and Christian literature, to the Anglo-Saxons, contact was re-established with the ancient cultures after Augustine's preaching. This contact would determine the development of Anglo-Saxon Latin culture for the foreseeable future. Although the connection with the Irish tradition was not broken, the arrival of Theodore and Hadrian, if we are to believe Bede's testimony, opened up a new world. In the schools of Canterbury, the Roman educational tradition was reconnected. And thus, the foundations were laid for a new beginning. But it was above all the generation following Theodore and Hadrian who, through continued contact with the late remnants of ancient civilization, would make Britain a treasure trove of much that was in danger of being lost in the ancient world. But wherever instruction was given, it drew from the two sources of Antiquity and Christianity, as once recommended and taught by Augustine of Hippo. In Northumberland, a foundation of Benedict Bishop, the double monastery of Wearmouth and Jarrow, would be filled with, first of all, of manuscripts brought from Rome by the tireless "Rompilger." Then, in his diligent work as compiler and author of schoolbooks, and simultaneously as a gifted historian of his people, Bede would lay the foundations for a tradition that, as—in the cycle of culture—would reconnect the ancient, once Romanized continent with the treasures of the Latin past.

Bede's Latin, in its sometimes monumental, sometimes naive simplicity, deviates sharply from the baroque style of the Irish tradition. It undoubtedly draws more on the late antique Christian tradition than on the ancient classical one. But however "natural" and "evolving" this early Anglo-Saxon Latin may be, here too, as among the Irish, the vernacular, alongside Latin, will soon play its role as a literary language. Even in the North Germanic regions later Christianized by the Irish-Anglo-Saxon mission, people would be aware of the evident bilingualism, and soon—following the example of Latin—the vernacular would also assert its rights in written form. This clear awareness of bilingualism, which already early stimulated the vernacular languages, clearly distinguishes the Celtic-Germanic regions from the old Latin cultural regions.

For there, development was different. First and foremost in Italy: here, the continuity in linguistic awareness undoubtedly persisted for a long time. People lived in the old literary tradition there and accepted the distinction between vernacular and literary language as normal within the context of a centuries-old

tradition. Thus, the development of the language towards Romance also occurred more slowly and gradually than elsewhere. In Italy, the cities also retained a certain importance as cultural centers, although it is unclear to what extent the old lay schools—following the ancient pattern—were able to maintain themselves here and there. Contact with the Byzantine world also had a conservative effect. And a certain literary tradition undoubtedly survived in the monasteries. In Italy, for example, the linguistic situation seems to have long been perceived as a continuation of the ancient dualism between a normative literary language and a freer vernacular. People here are far removed from the bilingualism of the Celtic and Germanic countries, but they also haven't experienced the shock therapy that, abruptly and imposed from above during the so-called Carolingian Renaissance, brought about a kind of restoration of the literary tradition. The so-called Eden of Capua from 960 is generally considered the first literary text in what one might call the, now Romance, vernacular of Italy. 2 But a chronicle, written shortly after 974 by a monk from Salerno and generally considered Medieval Latin, demonstrates how close the two linguistic forms still were. Be that as it may, during the tenth century, evidence emerged demonstrating an awareness of bilingualism. In 915, the Senate complimented Berengarius at his coronation with "patrio ore" (in Latin), while the people did so with "nativa voce" in the vernacular. And Pope Gregory V, who died in 999, was praised for his trilingualism in his tomb inscription: "Usus francisca, vulgari et voce latina instituit populos eloquio triplici." 3

Developments in the other major Mediterranean Latin-speaking country, Spain, initially ran more or less parallel to those in Italy. Just as Cassiodorus and Boethius reflected on the Latin heritage under Ostrogothic rule, Visigothic Spain underwent a similar, though somewhat more Renaissance-tinged, development. More than in Italy, Visigothic Latin literature was marked by a classicist-retrospective normativism. The world of Isidore of Seville, Braulio of Saragossa, Eugene of Toledo, and others is a typically classical, "schöngeistige" world, but one that still has some contact with everyday language. This is not (yet) Medieval Latin. 4

The Arab invasions, at least externally, do not seem to have immediately broken literary continuity. Classical verses were still being written 150 years after the beginning of the invasions, but by then the character of literary Latin had become so artificial and the distance from the vernacular so great that these products may be considered part of Medieval Latin literature. The Spanish diplomata and charters, the oldest of which date from the eighth century, display a remarkable parallel with similar documents from the Merovingian world, and they may lead us to conclude that already then—in contrast to Italy—the separation between vox nativa and Latin had taken place. Linguistic development in Spain, too, therefore, exhibits its own characteristics. 5

This is even more true for the development in Gaul, which would culminate in the so-called Carolingian Renaissance. I can say a little about this. So much has already been written about this phenomenon that the general outlines can be considered well-known and clear. Gaul, which can be considered an ancient Latin cultural country, had suffered more from the invasions than the two major Latin peninsulas. 6 In Aquitaine and Provence, a certain literary culture persisted for some time—thanks to the continued existence of a few urban centers, but even more so to the culturally preserving activities of the inhabitants of the large estates and the bishops who emerged from these circles. But elsewhere, under Frankish rule, the ancient school system, which until then had perpetuated a certain literary culture, disappeared. With the disappearance of the ancient school—around the middle of the seventh century—the conservative literary influence on language use also disappeared, and the structural change: the transition from Latin to Romance, occurred rapidly. The scant instruction in Latin provided by the clergy to future clerics, primarily with a view to the—still officially Latin—liturgy, could not halt this development. Merovingian diplomats and charters demonstrate how people still tried to make do institutionally with Latin—but what kind of Latin—using fixed formulas and fragments of traditional word combinations. These documents demonstrate that people always felt the need for a Latin written language, but also their inability to master it according to traditional norms. 7 The reforms, primarily orthographic, of Pepin the Short could not rectify the chaotic situation. 8 Finally, through the energetic intervention of Charlemagne and his followers, an intervention that was primarily politically determined, a conscious restoration of Latin was achieved. This is a different situation than the introduction of Latin among the Irish, Anglo-Saxons, and Northern Germans as a result of a Christianization process; It is also far removed from the gradual development in Italy. After the chaotic conditions of the Merovingian era, a

restoration could only be achieved with external help. This help came from the Irish-Anglo-Saxon and Italian traditions. Thus, Carolingian Latin bears—more clearly than elsewhere—the hallmark of Classical-Christian dualism. At the same time, the political ideal—a continuation of the tradition of the Roman Empire—led to a kind of humanistic idealism, which expressed itself at Charlemagne's court in a Renaissance interplay, a bizarre blend of biblical and classical tradition. In education and in the now flourishing literature, the restoration initially manifested itself in the form of a still convulsive, often slavish, classicism. But one already hears tones that seem to herald a new, different world. The Carolingian Restoration, in its conscious reconnection with both classical and Christian tradition, in its attempt to renew a literary-oriented monastic culture, and in its reorganization of the liturgy, presents a colorful and varied picture. But in assessing the value of this dynamic phenomenon, people too often mistake it for a distinct culture, which was merely the result of a primitive impulse to imitate.

What I have sought to demonstrate with this brief overview is that Medieval Latin in its first period, which lasted until around the year 1000,[9] is by no means a uniform phenomenon: that a clear distinction must be made here according to time and place, and that even the major dividing line between Celtic and Germanic areas on the one hand, and Romance areas on the other, does not adequately capture this diversity. In Gaul, centrally located in this new period of European history, as we have seen, after a crisis that threatened to sever the literary Latin tradition, the various elements of early Medieval Latin converged. There, a new pattern was woven, which, despite its modest—at times even childish—would be decisive for centuries to come. For although the Carolingian Renaissance has, in my opinion, wrongly been considered the beginning of Medieval Latin, it did leave its mark on later developments.

Clear lines emerge in the rise and fall of the following centuries: first, the expansion of the Latin territory—again under the influence of Western Christianity. Hungary, Poland, and the Scandinavian countries joined the already extensive Latin area. As in later antiquity, the unity of education—now based on secular and Christian literature—would also be a powerful fermentum unitatis. And so, the period progressed towards the high point of the Latin Middle Ages: the twelfth century. Decisive factors in this development include the rise of cities, with their trade and commerce, and the dynamic nature of the Middle Ages.

Western society, expressed, among other things, in the countless pilgrims who filled the roads of Europe and beyond, on their way to Compostella, Rome, Jerusalem, and the holy places. The opening up of the East through the Crusades strengthened contact with the Eastern world. The monastic reforms, which increasingly showed an international character, culminated in the lightning actions of a Bernard of Clairvaux: in the space of a generation or two, large parts of Western Europe were dotted with almost uniform monastic foundations, centers of strict asceticism, but also inspired by a new socio-economic ideal. 10

All this led to a rapid maturation of medieval man and to a greater need for education, even outside of church circles. The ancient cathedral and monastery schools could no longer meet the need for education. The great discovery of the twelfth century, the establishment of the licentia docendi, a teaching qualification independent of nationality and placed under papal authority, gave the free masters the right to teach here and there, thus confirming the international character of the respublica litterarum. The medieval universities in Italy and France would therefore see teachers and students from all parts of what would become the Western cultural world come together.

In the field of literature, this maturation manifested itself in an unusually rich and multifaceted Latin literature, which increasingly lost its strongly elitist character. A creativity now manifested itself that, according to some, culminated in poetry, but which, in my opinion, was equally present in prose: both in the humanistically oriented prose texts originating from the world of cathedral schools and in the more spiritual-mystical prose from the monastic world. And it also manifests itself in the more popular hagiographical literature, in pilgrimage reports, and in so many other forms.

Certain norms in language use are always observed, but it is certainly not the case, as Traube believed, that the now mature medieval person constantly looks back to Antiquity as an example and a standard. The connection with Classical and Christian Antiquity has certainly never been broken, but there is more awareness of continuity than of dependence.

And this brings me to the question, already frequently asked, how one should classify this Medieval Latin as a linguistic phenomenon.

The first practitioners of Medieval Latin philology were plagued by the recurring question of whether Latin was a living or dead language. 11 In my opinion, a terminological error is being made in this endless debate, which has not yet entirely died down. When one speaks of a dead language—a term still applied to Greek and Latin, but which, in my opinion, is best forgotten because it unintentionally acquires a pejorative nuance—one means a language that is no longer spoken here and now. A language we know only from a preserved, closed corpus of written documents. "Dead" here, therefore, refers to a situation as it presents itself to us. But this "dead" says nothing about the so-called "dead languages" themselves. These languages were, for those who once spoke them and also wrote the texts we still possess and from which we must draw our knowledge of them, just as alive as any contemporary language. In other words, the term "dead," linguistically speaking, says nothing about the nature and structure of the languages in question. Now, there can be no doubt that, historically speaking, Medieval Latin is just as "dead" for us as Classical Greek or Latin: that is, here too, we have only a closed corpus of surviving texts. But this was not what those who posed the question of "dead or living languages" with regard to Medieval Latin meant: they were asking whether Medieval Latin as such, for the medievalists who had learned this language in school and who created an extensive literature in it, was a dead or living language. It is remarkable that in the long discussion of this problem, this terminological "error" or this specific use of the term has never been pointed out.

Now, it is amusing to see how people have wrestled with this problem and how, in order to reach a satisfactory conclusion, they have tried to save the cabbage and the goat, to use a vulgar expression for once. Because people couldn't see a language learned at school, strongly oriented towards literature, as living, as a "real" language,[12] yet still felt the lifelike quality emanating from these texts, they were tempted to use the most unexpected metaphors. They speak of a corpse, from which nails and hair still grow (Traube); of a water nymph who, in her contact with a human, acquires a human soul (Vossler); of a wild animal in captivity (Lehmann), etc. Later scholars have separated the problem from the question of living or dead language, but these have often been replaced by simplistic or oversimplified designations. Strecker and Van de Woestijne see Medieval Latin as the normal continuation of Classical Latin, in the form it took in Late Latin writers. The great Latinist Einar Löfstedt also strongly emphasizes continuity in his last publications, seeing the transition from Late to Medieval Latin as a gradual process, in which Medieval Latin can be seen as a normal, organic language. This view, too, seems too simplistic to me. In my opinion, it may be valid for certain early phases of Medieval Latin, but it hardly does justice to the phenomenon as a whole. This theory of Löfstedt's can be explained by the fact that he specifically—and almost exclusively—concerned Late and Early Medieval Latin. 13

Franz Blatt defends a remarkable, and in my opinion untenable, view. He considers all of Latinity "from Cicero to Copernicus" as an organic unity. But within that unity, according to him, lies a major division and division between profane, non-Christian, and Christian Latin. Between Symmachus and Ambrose, between Claudian and Prudentius, there exists—as Blatt says—a clear antinomy, also in language, while there is an evident continuity between early Christian writers and most medieval writers. 14 Although I am deeply convinced of the uniqueness of Christian Latin and literature, I would certainly not endorse this opinion, for reasons of both linguistic and historical-cultural nature.

I do not wish to bore you further with a list of various, even recent, theories that very often refer more to the function of Medieval Latin than to its own nature as a linguistic phenomenon. Very recently, Professor Galabov of Salzburg devoted a study to Medieval Latin as a "supernational cultural language," in which he pointed out, as a very interesting parallel with Medieval Latin, Old Bulgarian (Church Slavonic), introduced in the East by King Boris as a "supernational cultural language" more than half a century after Charlemagne's reforms. 15

The question remains how Medieval Latin can be defined and understood linguistically. First of all, we must let go of the "entweder - oder" (living or dead). We must also be aware that a language learned at school—or otherwise secondary—can function as a real, living language in the mouths of the speakers who use it. The general human capacity for language is also active in a learned language. The problem of language acquisition, of the relationship between competence and performance, of the generative function of language, cannot simply be ignored by a phenomenon like Medieval Latin. Furthermore, the phenomenon of the 'second language,' so intensively studied in recent decades, as it currently exists primarily in Third World countries, shows striking parallels with the oldest Irish and especially Anglo-Saxon Latin.

Studies on 'second languages' can help us better understand the phenomenon of early Medieval Latin. 16 Regarding Medieval Latin in its mature form, as it presents itself to us in the greatest diversity in twelfth-century literature, one must consider, among others, the perspective of Roman Jakobson, who, following the Russian formalists, emphasizes the creative activities of language within the framework of its aesthetic function, what Jakobson calls 'literalité,' a full-fledged manifestation of human language. In this context, I might point to what I said earlier about Medieval Latin as a 'Kunstsprache', a stylized language form, in which the respublica litterarum fulfills the function of an ethnic linguistics. 17 I will leave it at this remark. In my view, there is every reason to reexamine Medieval Latin as a linguistic phenomenon in the light of our modern linguistic theories. It will then become increasingly clear that this form of Latin is not an epigonistically dead phenomenon, but a living linguistic form, emerging from the creative and generative linguistic capacity of medieval people, a means of communication for a society that, in conscious relation to the past, is evolving toward a new world and new cultural forms.

I would like to add a few practical observations to these considerations. Now that it is becoming increasingly clear that Medieval Latin, with the cultural world from which it emerged, is not a kind of channel from antiquity to modern times, but an autonomous phenomenon that has determined the development of the Western world for centuries, we must ask ourselves whether we can contribute to this phenomenon in education and research should not be given more attention than they have been. Or rather: whether the study of Medieval Latin, integrated into that of medieval culture in the broadest sense, doesn't deserve its own place in our academic education and, perhaps even more so, in our academic research. In other words, hasn't the time come for us, as the successor to a classical philology (in the sense of what the Germans call 'Klassische Altertumskunde'), to also create a fully-fledged academic subject: Medieval Latin philology (in the same broad sense)? Now that our entire academic system is in flux, this possibility would certainly be worth considering. For two reasons, I would certainly not want to sever the connection with classical philology: Medieval Latin philology can learn much from the methodology of classical studies. Furthermore, one must never forget that, despite all the autonomy of Medieval Latin, medievalists themselves never lost their awareness of its continuity with the ancient past. On the other hand, this—let's say, a sister or perhaps daughter science to classical philology—would bring it out of a certain isolation, which is still expressed, among other things, in the incorrect and derogatory term "dead languages."

Dear listeners,
For over 25 years, I have had the privilege of teaching a number of subjects at this university, which, despite their outward diversity, nevertheless formed a unity, and of which I have been able to highlight only one today—but one that has always aroused particular interest here.
In 1947, I gave my inaugural lecture as a lecturer; in 1946, I had already officially begun my teaching. But—perhaps I may mention this here—I had already met Amsterdam students before that. When, in the later years of the war, after the closure of the universities, some of my Utrecht students requested that I help them continue their studies at their hiding places in Amsterdam for two-week lectures, Amsterdammers spontaneously joined this group. They never actually asked my permission or approval to join the Utrecht group—they were there. Amsterdam students have always been quite outspoken. My first Amsterdam memories, for example, go back to the ever-changing attics of canal houses, to those small rooms on the fourth floor, sometimes also to more comfortable suites in the South, where the not-always-amusing curriculum of Vulgar Latin managed to establish a human connection that will always remain a highlight in my academic memory. Was it this very first, human contact that has maintained a sense of understanding connection with the Amsterdam students throughout the many years I taught here?

Dear Colleagues,
Circumstances have dictated that I have only ever been able to devote a small portion of my time and energy to teaching at this university. The diverse tasks placed upon me here were, especially in the first, staff-less period, very demanding. I have tried to fulfill them to the best of my ability. But in my quest to do my work of teaching and scholarship as effectively as possible, I decided early on to withdraw from other, more organizational and outwardly academic duties. You rarely saw me at faculty meetings, nor at academic ceremonies. You may be convinced that this was not

due to a lack of interest, but rather the result of weighing what, in my view, should be considered most important.
With gratitude and a certain nostalgia, I think back to the many Wednesday afternoons spent in the old—pseudo-solemn—professor's office in the Oude Manhuispoort. I will always remember with gratitude the human connections made there with colleagues, many of whom have since passed away. They enriched my mind, both humanly and scientifically.
Finally, I would like to thank you for the way in which you cooperated with my successor—with a wisdom and discretion that are sometimes lacking elsewhere. I am delighted that in my colleague Smit, whose qualities I have come to appreciate over many years of collaboration, I have found a successor who will be able to devote himself entirely to his duties in Amsterdam.
I would like to conclude by expressing my special thanks to the members of the Classics Department, among whom I—a somewhat unusual fellow—have always worked with such pleasure.
I have said.

Notes.
1: Christine Mohrmann, The Latin of Saint Patrick, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, Dublin 1961.
2: See A. Schiaffini, I mille anni della lingua italiana, Milan 1961, pp. 11 ff.
3: See Dag Norberg, Manuel pratique de latin médiéval, Paris 1968, with further references.
4: See J. Fontaie, Isidore de Séville et la culture classical in Spanish Wisigothic, 2 vols., Paris 1959.
5: For bibliographical information on Spanish Medieval Latin, see Dag Norberg, op. cit., pp. 38 ff.
6: See, among others, P. Riché, Education and culture in the barbarian Occident, Paris 1967, pp. 2, passim.
7: A differing, but in my opinion incorrect, assessment of the Merovingian texts can be found in: M.A. Pei, The language of the Eighth-Century Texts in Northern France, New York 1932.
8: Correct comments on this can be found in Pei, op. cit., pp. 364 ff.
9: It seems to me quite correct that Dag Norberg strongly emphasizes this chronological boundary in his cited textbook.
10: See F. van der Meer, Atlas de l'Ordre Cistercien, Paris 1965, p. 29.
11: For a detailed overview of this matter, see Christine Mohrmann, Etudes sur le latin des chrétiens II, Roma 1961, pp. 185 ff.
12: This is closely related to general linguistic considerations around the beginning of this century.
13: See, for example, his posthumous work Late Latin, Oslo 1959, pp. 59 ff.
14: F. Blatt in: Eranos Löfstedtianus, Eranos 43 (1945) p. 67.
15: Ivan Galabov, Das Altbulgarische und das Latein um Europäischen Mittelalter, Zum Problematik der übernationalen Kultursprache, Salzburger Universitätsreden 45, Salzburg-München 1971.
16: See e.g. Uriel Weinreich, Languages in Contact, New York 1953 and in connection therewith what I said about the bilingualism of Saint Patrick in The Latin of Saint Patrick, pp. 9 ff.
17: See Rev. des Et. Lat. 29 (1952) pp. 330 ff.; Latin vulgaire, latin des chrétiens, latin médiéval, Paris 1955, p. 36 ff., Etudes sur le latin des chrétiens II, Roma 1961, p. 194 ff.

Druk: Huisdrukkerij Universiteit van Amsterdam T-4186