The Inflection of Latin Feminine Proper Names in the *Old English Martyrology*

Esaúl Ruiz Narbona [iD]
University of Seville

This paper focuses on the inflections of Latin feminine names in Old English. Whereas most Latin loanwords are perfectly integrated and behave like Old English words as far as their morphology is concerned, like scientific loans, names can take inflectional endings from both Latin and Old English. Ruiz Narbona (2023) has shown that, in the case of masculine names, the distribution of both types of inflections followed certain clear patterns. Following the model of that study, the analysis of the 125 tokens from the *Old English Martyrology* shows that certain rules can also be established in the case of feminine names. In general terms, the inflections of these names are modelled after Old English weak *n*-stems, although nominative inflections are invariably Latin. The case with the more widespread variation is the genitive, where both Old English and Latin inflections are consistently used. The latter, however, are heavily restricted to introductory sections and function solely as post-modifiers.

Keywords: Inflectional morphology; proper names; Latin loanwords; Old English; Latin; variation

1. Introduction

This paper concentrates on feminine proper names that entered Old English via Latin, independently of their ultimate origin, be it Greek, as in the case of *Eugenia*, or Latin, as in the case of *Lucia*. The fact that these names are foreign entails some linguistic peculiarities with regard to their morphology.

As in any language with a relatively rich nominal morphological system, names of Anglo-Saxon origin follow the same morphological rules as common nouns in Old English. Thus, their inflectional endings are modelled after one of the different declensional types available in Old English. See Colman (2014) and Okasha (2011) for a detailed account. The same is the case with Latin. Names such as *Livia* or *Octavius* follow the inflectional paradigm of the declension they belong to, in this case 1st and 2nd, respectively, just as common names like *porta* 'door' or *dominus* 'lord, master'. However, when they function in Old English, the morphology of these Latin names poses some difficulties. The most remarkable one is that, as Campbell (1959, 219) puts it, they may retain their original Latin inflectional endings, although not necessarily in all grammatical cases and in all contexts. Consequently, it is possible to find a given Latin name that has a Latin inflection in one attestation, but an Old English one in another. For example, the genitive forms of *Felicitas* have a Latin inflection *-is* in (1) but an Old English one, *-an* in (2).

(1) *On ðone   seofoðan dæg ðæs   monðes   bið ðara   haligra*
On the.ACC seventh   day the.GEN month.GEN is   the.GEN holy.GEN
wifa   gemynd   sancta   Perpetuan   ond
women.GEN commemoration.NOM saint.GEN Perpetua.GEN and
sancta   Felicitatis
saint.GEN *Felicitas*.GEN
'On the seventh day of the month is the commemoration of the holy women St. Perpetua and St. Felicitas' [MART.039.001.016][1]

(2) *hi   wæron ðære   mæran   wudewan   suna   sancta*
They   were   of.GEN noble.GEN widow.GEN sons.NOM saint.GEN
Felicitan
Felicitas.GEN
'They were sons of the noble widow St. Felicitas' [MART.125.002.008]

Although Latin influence on Old English vocabulary features prominently in major studies, Latin proper names are rarely discussed in any depth. Even if some studies, such as Baker (1998, 198) and Rodríguez Ledesma (2016), do take them into account, some of the most relevant works on vocabulary tend not to refer to them (Kastovsky 1992, 2006; Gneuss 1993). In some other cases, authors prefer to discard them given their specific idiosyncrasy (Durkin 2014, 11 and fn7).

This paper follows the main lines established in Ruiz Narbona (2023) and endeavours to provide an analysis of the inflectional system featured by Latin feminine proper names in the *Old English Martyrology*. The main objective of this paper is to clarify how these names are adapted into the Old English system, if they are adapted at all. This leads to a better understanding of the dynamics of noun morphology at this stage and how both the Latin and Old English systems interact. Additionally, the analysis in this paper casts light on wider issues related to nominal morphology in Old English such as the drastic decline of productive declensions (Hogg 1992, 124 and 137–38).

The rest of this paper is divided into four main sections. Section 2 presents the theoretical background and discusses previous works on Latin loanwords and their morphology in Old English. Section 3 focuses on methodological issues. It provides a general outline of the *Old English Martyrology* and explains the design of the corpus. Section 4 concentrates on the main results of the study. Finally, section 5 gathers the main conclusions and considers possible further research.

2. Latin loanwords in Old English

One of the major concerns of scholarly works on Latin loanwords in Old English has been chronological in nature. Three periods are usually distinguished: 1) the Continental period, 2) the Anglo-Saxon settlement period and 3) Christianization (see Cole and Laker 2022, 6–7, with references). Other authors such as Campbell (1959, 200), Wollmann (1990) or Durkin (2014, 105) prefer to distinguish two periods only: early and late, with Christianization as its boundary.

---

[1] This number makes reference to the ParCor Number of the name in question. This number identifies every register in ParCorOE: The Parallel Corpus of Old English-English (Martín Arista et al. 2021). See section 3.2 below.

Even if the threefold system is favoured, Christianization marks the clearest limit as far as the nature of loans is concerned (Kastosvsky 1992, 305). The church, with its rituals and organization becomes the primary source of Latin words into Old English from its introduction onwards. Eventually, more of these borrowings enter Old English via the written rather than the oral medium, and consequently, from Classical rather than Vulgar Latin. This tendency becomes especially strong after the Benedictine Reform (late 9th–early 10th century), which is considered a sub-grouping within the wider Christianization period by Kastovsky (1992, 307; 2006, 221–22). The most representative loans of this period are scientific and scholarly words that are not integrated into the Old English morphological system as seamlessly as previous ones (see Funke 1914; Strang 1970, 314; Durkin 2014, 103).

In inflectional languages loanwords tend to adopt the inflectional endings of one the different paradigms available in the target language (Gneuss 1996, 3–4). Old English is no exception to this rule (Durkin 2014, 123–24). Despite the wide range of noun declension types in Old English (see Campbell 1959, 222–60), three major inflectional types dominate its nominal inflectional system, as Hogg explains (1992, 137–38). These are the so-called *a*-stems, *ō*-stems and *n*-stems, exemplified in Table 1. The predominance of these declensions is not based solely on the fact that most Old English nouns follow one of these paradigms. More importantly, they attracted nouns that previously took different minor declensions, while transfer from these declensions to others was rare. As Gneuss (1996, 4) points out, a good indicator of the relative dominance of certain noun paradigms is its ability to incorporate loanwords. This is one of the characteristics of these three declensions, since apart from the names of certain nations (see Campbell 1959, 208; Brunner 1965, 215), loanwords in Old English follow the paradigms presented below as shown in Körber's figures (1982, 149–51).

Table 1. Singular paradigm of the *a*-stem *hlāf* 'loaf', the *ō*-stem *giefu* 'gift' and *n*-stem *tunge* 'tongue'.

	a-stem *hlāf*	*ō*-stem *giefu*	*n*-stem *tunge*
Nominative	*hlāf*	*giefu*	*tunge*
Accusative	*hlāf*	*giefe*	*tungan*
Genitive	*hlāfes*	*giefe*	*tungan*
Dative	*hlāfe*	*giefe*	*tungan*

Campbell (1959, 208–9 and 218–19) and Gneuss (1996) give detailed information concerning the morphological adaptation of Latin loanwords into the Old English inflectional system. Generally, 1st declension feminine nouns are adapted as *ō*- stems, for example *strǣt* 'street' (cp. Latin *(via) strata*; or as *n*-stems as *carte* 'document' (cp. Latin *charta*). As the period progresses, *n*-stems take over as the preferred model for these loans (Gneus 1996, 7). Most 2nd declension nouns, mainly masculine nouns, although with some feminine nouns among them, appeared as *a*-stems in Old English regardless of their gender, as exemplified by *disc* 'dish' (cp. Latin *discus*, masculine), and *seonoþ* 'synod' (cp. Latin *synodus,* feminine). Independently of their gender or their origin, whether consonantal stems or *i*-stems, 3rd declension nouns are assimilated as *a*-stems too: e.g. *munt* 'mount' (cp. Latin *mons*), or *torr* 'tower' (cp. Latin *turris*). However, Latin *n*-stems, such as *pavo* 'peacock' (genitive *pavonis*), normally follow the *n*-stem model in Old English (cp. *pāwa* 'peacock').

The rules described above apply generally. Nevertheless, scholars such as Pogatscher (1888, 154–65), Funke (1914, 131–34) and Campbell (1959, 207–10) draw attention to the fact that *a*-stems can attract all type of loans independently of their original class in Latin, a phenomenon that is not exclusive of Old English, as explained by Welna (1978, 1980). In fact, this predominance affected Old English words as well, since *a*-stems ended up becoming the main declension type in later periods (Hogg 1992, 137–38).

Although the majority of Latin loans from the 7th century onwards tend to follow these patterns, some loanwords need to be treated independently, as they pose certain problems with regard to their morphological adaption. I refer specifically to the approximately 150 scholarly and scientific loans that began to enter Old English during the Benedictine Reform era (see Strang 1970, 314); they normally keep their Latin inflections.

Funke (1914) investigated these loans thoroughly. He made a distinction between scholarly words, with Latin morphology, which he called *Fremdwörter* 'foreignisms', and *Lehnwörter* 'loanwords', whose morphology follows native Old English patterns. With this distinction in mind, words such as *acolitus* 'acolyte', which has Latin inflectional endings in all of its attestations, would be classified as a 'foreignism'. This word type is of special interest for the purpose of this study and raises several relevant questions. Durkin (2014, 124–27), for example, calls into question their status as Old English words, arguing instead that they could be regarded as an example of code-switching. Thus, these so-called loanwords could be better described as Latin words embedded into Old English sentences, as is frequently the case with scientific Greek words in Latin texts. Additionally, these words are often accompanied by meta-textual indications of their meaning, or by a close Old English equivalent (see (3) and (4) below, from Durkin (2014, 125)). This seems to highlight the fact that they are not an integral part of Old English native vocabulary.

(3) *Acolitus is seþe tapor byrd æt Godes þenungum*
    'An acolyte is one who bears a light at God's services'
    ÆLet 2 (Wulfstan 1) [0099 (100)]

(4) *Sanctus Siluester cwæð: ne sceal nan acolitus, þæt is huslþen, forsecgan nanne subdeacon;*
    'St. Silvester said: 'No acolyte, that is to say, assistant at the administration of the sacrament, shall accuse a subdeacon''
    ChrodR 2 [0001 (83.1)]

The classification of a loan as a 'foreignism' on the basis of its inflectional endings, however, is not as straightforward as it may seem. Some of these words do not always display their original Latin endings in all attestations. They may also take Old English ones. This group of mixed loans is acknowledged by Funke (1914, 144), who specifies that a number of loans may present Latin nominative inflections but Old English ones in the rest of grammatical cases. However, as Durkin (2014, 127–28) demonstrates, the paradigm of these mixed forms is not as orderly or consistent as implied by Funke. The word *cometa* 'comet' serves to illustrate this point. Whereas it is true that its nominative form is always Latin-like, *cometa,* and that its oblique forms tend to have the *-an* ending

typical of *n*-stems, its nominative plural form can take either the Latin inflection -*e* as in ÆTemp [0212 (9.13)] or the Old English -*an* as in ChronD [0089 (729.1)][2].

The inflections of Latin personal names have similarities with this group of mixed loans in that they too can retain their Latin inflections in whole or in part (Campbell 1959, 219). Ruiz Narbona (2023) analysed the inflections of Latin masculine names in the *Old English Martyrology* and concluded that, although basically modelled after *a*-stems, the inflections of these names are a result of the combination of the Latin and Old English systems. Whereas one language dominates certain case inflections, Latin the nominative and Old English the dative, the dominant genitive inflection consisting of a thematic vowel + -*s* results from the fusion of inflections in both languages, on the one hand, Latin 3rd declension -*is* and 2nd declension -*us*[3], and on the other, the Old English genitive inflection -*es*. Additionally, although accusatives may take unmarked nominative-like inflections as Old English *a*-stems, or Latin -*m* forms, names in the accusative are consistently distinguished from their nominative counterparts through syntactic means, namely by the Old English determiners *ðone* and *ðisne*.

3. Data and methodology

3.1 The Old English Martyrology

The source of the names under study in this paper is the *Old English Martyrology*. The result of a remarkable effort of abridgment, compilation, and adaptation of hundreds of Latin texts (Rauer 2003; 2013, 3), the *Martyrology* contains the narratives of the lives and miracles of hundreds of saints and martyrs throughout Christendom following a calendrical arrangement. Given the large number of saints it presents, this text stands out as a major source of information on Latin proper names. Most notably, contrary to what is the case with lists of kings and similar sources, names appear in a variety of different syntactic contexts, thus offering insightful information to researchers. This late-ninth-century text survives in seven different manuscripts, ABCC*DEF (Herzfeld 1900, xxxii and Rauer 2013, 2–3). Of these, C* is an Early Modern copy. Taken together, they cover martyrs from practically the entire year, except for a gap extending over a month—25th January to 27th February. There is a significant variation in the length of manuscripts, though. Manuscripts B and C are the lengthiest and include most of the year. B is normally regarded as closer to the original text and, therefore, is the basis of most modern editions, such as Herzfeld (1900), Kotzor (1981) and Rauer (2013). Alternative readings, corrections, and amendments in C, however, are often included and commented upon in these editions too. In contrast, A and E are made up of some short extracts; and D and F, though longer, were fragmented during transmission.

As for the language of the text, Kotzor (1981) was the first scholar that offered a systematic and thorough analysis of the text, even if previous studies had been carried out by Sievers (1884) and Herzfeld (1900). Kotzor (1981) described the text as predominantly Anglian from a dialectal perspective, with traces of Kentish and West-Saxon. However, the dominating role of this variety in the later part of the Old English period became patent in more modern copies, as illustrated by manuscript C, copied

---

[2] References given according to the *Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus* (diPaolo et al., 2009).
[3] The canonical Latin inflection for 2nd declension Latin genitive singular is -*i*. However, nominative -*us* features prominently as a 2nd declension genitive inflection in proper names (see Baker 1998, 195–6, 198; Ruiz Narbona 2023, 16).

during the 11th century and manifestly West-Saxon as far as dialectal variation is concerned. Despite all the linguistic studies on the *Martyrology*, however, more work needs to be done in order to determine the definite place of composition and dialect of the text as pointed out by Kotzor (1981, 445–46).

3.2 Corpus design and analysis of the data

The data analysed in this study were compiled using ParCorOE, the Parallel Corpus of Old English-English (Martín Arista et al. 2021). This tool compiled at the University of La Rioja and available openly online, consists of an annotated corpus of 109,985 words. Among its texts one can find the most widely known exemplars of Old English prose—such as Herzfeld's (1900) edition of the *Old English Martyrology*. The text is not available in its entirety, however. Therefore, the examples of feminine names from the 16th of September onwards were collected manually from Herzfeld's (1900) text.

The complete sample of examples is made up of 125 tokens, 71 different names. As for the analysis, nine categories have been considered. The majority of these categories are available in the aforementioned corpus. These six categories are: the lemma of the name, the form of the name in the attestation in question, the fragment where the token is found, the Present-Day English translation of the fragment, and finally, references. Additionally, I accounted for information on three parameters that are not directly accessible through ParCorOE, namely, information regarding the inflectional ending of each token, data concerning possible alternative inflections in other manuscripts—this was taken from Herzfeld (1900) and Rauer (2013)—, and also the original Latin class these names belong to. When the data in the *Martyrology* did not allow for an unambiguous classification, I consulted other texts, especially *Bede's Martyrology,* in The Library of Latin texts online.

Example (5) below serves to illustrate the information of each of the nine categories in the sole attestation of the name *Simphorosa.*

> (5) Lemma: *Simphorosa*
> Word form: *Simphorosan*
> Case: *Genitive*
> Inflectional ending: *-an. Old English weak declension*
> Alternative inflectional ending: *NO*
> Latin declension: *1st*
> Fragment: *On ðone eahtategeðan dæg ðæs monðes bið ðære wudewan tid sancte   Simphorosan, seo ðrowade martyrdom for Criste mid heora seofon sunum.*
> Fragment translation: *On the eighteenth day of the month is the festival of the widow St. Symphorosa, who suffered martyrdom for Christ with her seven sons.*
> References: *MART.131.001.012*

4. Results of the analysis

4.1 Nominative

The nominative case is the most widely attested one in the corpus with a total number of 65 tokens and 47 types. Most names are attested only once, although nine of them appear multiple times. These are the following: *Affra* (2x), *Anna* (2x), *Basilla* (2x), *Cristina* (2x), *Eua* (4x), *Maria* (8x), *Marina* (2x), *Natalia* (2x) and *Theodota* (2x).

The great majority of names in the nominative case belong to the Latin 1st declension. This group is made up of 61 tokens and 44 types. As far as their inflectional endings are concerned, 1st declension feminine names in the *Martyrology* present three possibilities, namely, -*a*, -*e* and -*æ*.

The ending -*a* is by far the most common one. 52 different tokens and 35 types have this inflectional ending, including *Anna, Eusebia, Romana,* or *Valeria* to name but a few. See (6) below for an example in context. This is to be expected, given that this is the most common Latin 1st declension nominative inflection. Thus, in general terms, nominative 1st declension feminine names seem to follow the Latin model.

(6) *ða   wæs sancta Marina   for Criste   beheafdad;*
    then was saint   Marina.NOM for Crist.DAT beheaded
    'Then St. Marina was beheaded for Christ's sake' [MART.124.021.004]

There are eight exceptions to this general rule, though. Seven tokens in the corpus present the inflectional ending -*e*. These are *Columbe, Cyriade, Darie, Eufenisse, Eugenie, Maximille* and *Tecle*. Notice also that *Theodota* (MART.147.001.016) also has the -*e* ending, *Theodote,* in Manuscript C, though not in B. This inflection is common in post-classical Latin 1st declension nouns in the genitive and dative cases (Baker 1998, 196), but not in the nominative. This choice of ending might seem puzzling at first. However, a close look at the contexts where these names appear offers interesting insights. Four of the seven tokens are found in contexts where there is either a possessive or a neighbouring genitive phrase, as in (7) below. As Baker (1998, 195) points out, these morphological genitives in places where a nominative is expected are not uncommon in martyrologies and calendars. He suggests that the frequent use of introductory formulae such as the one in (7) may have influenced the scribe's choice. These formulae may have led scribes to perceive that these genitives are the 'unmarked', nominative forms. This phenomenon is also detected in masculine names (Ruiz Narbona 2023, 10). If Baker's hypothesis is correct, and -*e* forms might be taken as unmarked, we would also expect to find -*e* nominatives outside these restricted contexts. This is confirmed by three names: *Columbe, Eugenie* and *Tecle*, which appear in contexts with no nearby genitives, for example (8).

(7) *ond ðæs   Egeas   broðor,   se   wæs on naman*
    and the.GEN Egeas.GEN brother.NOM he.NOM was in name.DAT
    Stratohles,   ond Egeas   wyf,   ðære   nama
    Stratohles.NOM and Egeas.GEN wife.NOM the.GEN name.NOM
    wæs Maximille [...]
    was Maximille.NOM

'The brother of this Egeas, Stratocles by name, and the wife of Egeas whose name was Maximilla […]' (Herzfeld 1900, 214-216)

(8) *Tecle   wæs swa myhtigu   fæmne   ðæt* […]
Tecla.NOM was so   powerful.NOM woman.NOM that
'Thecla was such a powerful woman that […]' (Herzfeld 1900, 176)

Lastly, the remaining 1st declension nominative name, *Anthiæ,* has the classical Latin genitive *-æ* ending. As several of the names discussed above, *Anthiæ* [MART.065.001.021] is close to a genitive phrase, which seems to have influenced it. In this case the scribe opted for the classical ending, rather than the post-classical one. Notice, however, that the scribe in manuscript C, preferred to use *-e* (Rauer 2013, 82).

In addition to Latin 1st declension nouns the corpus includes two 3rd declension names, e.g. *Felicitas* (2x) and *Virgo*, and an indeclinable one, namely, *Zoe*. The latter keeps its Latin form in Old English (MART.120.001.018). As for the 3rd declension names, *Virgo* has the expected Latin nominative form. *Felicitas*, however, is attested twice, as *Felicitas* (MART.039.004.004) and as *Felicita* in (Herzfeld 1900, 210). The former is the corresponding Latin form. As for the latter, it could correspond to an analogical form modelled after the 1st declension nominative ending *-a*. It could also be taken as a mistake—although see Baker (1998, 195) with regard to mistakes—since evidence shows that *Felicita* is a 3rd declension name, as suggested by its inflectional ending *-is*, *Felicitatis*, a few lines above in the text (MART.039.001.016).

All in all, the analysis of the nominative data show that, in general terms, scribes in the *Martyrology* follow Latin models. The only major variation to this pattern, the ending *-e*, can be explained through the influence of nearby genitives, as Baker (1998, 195) proposed.

4.2 Accusative

Feminine names in the accusative case are barely attested in the *Martyrology*. The whole text only includes four names, all of which belong to the Latin 1st declension. These are *Chonie*   (MART.059.008.013)*,   Agapan*   (MART.059.008.011)*,   Marian* (MART.159.003.015) and *Marinan* (9).

(9) *ða ferde Olibrius   se   gerefa   to Antiochia*
then went Olibrius.NOM the.NOM prefect.NOM to Antiochia.DAT
ceastre; *ða geseah he   Marinan   ðæt   mægden.*
town.DAT; then saw   he.NOM Marina.ACC the.ACC girl.ACC
'When the prefect Olybrius passed on his way to the town of Antioch, he saw the girl Marina' [MART.124.005.012]

With the exception of *Chonie*, the names in this group have the inflectional ending *-an*. This is the typical accusative marker of the Old English weak *-n* declension, which includes native words such as *cirice* 'church' as well as many Latin loans (see section 2 above). Contrary to the nominative case, which followed Latin models, names in the accusative seem to have been adapted to a native Old English pattern. However, due to the scarcity of the data, general conclusions must remain tentative.

As for *Chonie*, there are several hypotheses that may explain this unexpected ending. Firstly, *-e* could be taken as an example of the Latin dative inflection. As Baker points out (1998, 188), the use of a Latin dative inflection where an accusative inflection is expected, or vice versa, is not uncommon in Old English, even in the case of reputed scholars such as Ælfric. The fact that the other accusative attestations and all dative ones except *Elizabeth* (see 4.3 below) follow the weak declension pattern does not make this explanation attractive. Secondly, *-e* might be a reflection of the accusative ending of the Old English ō-stem declension, as in *lufu* (nominative), *lufe* (accusative, genitive and dative). Evidence in the *Martyrology*, however, suggests that this is not the case. None of the names under study seems to follow this declension. More importantly, *Chonie* is adapted to the weak declension elsewhere in the text as the genitive form *Chonian* (MART.061.004.022) implies[4]. Thirdly, a close examination of the context where the accusative *Chonie* appears offers insights with regard to the *-e* ending (10). As shown in the discussion of nominative examples, syntactic context seems to play a relevant role in the choice of inflection in the *Martyrology*. *Chonie* is the only accusative attestation that appears as a second element of a coordinated noun phrase. Notice, also, that the first name, *Agapan,* is morphologically marked as an accusative. If as discussed above, names ending in *-e* could be used as unmarked forms, it might be the case that in a coordinated noun phrase where the first element is overtly marked as accusative, the scribe saw no need to mark the second element and preferred an unmarked form. This hypothesis is supported by several examples of masculine names in the *Martyrology*, like (11), where the first name in the coordinated noun phrase is overtly marked as genitive, *Simonis,* while the second name, also a genitive, syntactically speaking, has an unmarked nominative form, *Thaddeus.*

(10) *ðyssa   fæmnena   twa   Sissinius   se   gesið*
These.GEN women.GEN two.ACC Sissinius.NOM the.NOM prefect.NOM
het   sendan on fyr,   Agapan   ond Chonie, […]
ordered send   to fire.ACC Agape.ACC and Chonia.ACC
'Two of these virgins, Agape and Chionia, the thane Sisinnius ordered to be thrown   into the fire […]' [MART.059.008.013]

(11) *On ðone   eahta ond twentegðan   dæg   ðæs   monðes*
On the.ACC eighth and twentieth.ACC day.ACC the.GEN month.GEN
bið ðara   apostola   tid   Simonis   ond Thaddeus.
Is the.GEN apostles.GEN time.NOM Simon.GEN and Thaddeus.GEN
'On the twenty-eighth day of the month is the festival of the apostles Simon and Thaddeus' (Herzfeld 1900, 196–97)

By way of summary, evidence suggests that, as far as the accusative is concerned, Latin feminine names have been adapted into the Old English system and get native inflectional endings, particularly from the weak declension. Additionally, exceptions such as *Chonie*, apparently influenced by context, cannot be ruled out. However, these results should be taken with caution due to the scarcity of the data.

---

[4] This name is also attested with the genitive form *Chonie* (MART.059.001.020). The inflection -*e* in the genitive is dealt with in the corresponding section 4.4.

4.3 Dative

The dative data are very similar to the accusative ones both from the quantitative and qualitative point of view. Five names are attested in the dative case: *Agnan* (12), *Faustan* (MART.192.002.018), *Marian* (MART.009.008.007) and (MART.055.001.016), *Perpetuan* (039.002.002) and *Elizabethe* (MART.111.007.015).

> (12) [...] *seo wæs afeded   mid   sancte   Agnan,   ðære*
> She.NOM was raised with saint.DAT Agnes.DAT the.DAT
> *halgan   fæmnan,*
> holy.DAT woman.DAT
> '[...] she was brought up with St. Agnes, the holy virgin'
> [MART.032.001.019]

Except for *Elizabethe,* all names are 1st declension names in Latin. As was the case in the accusative, all of them have the inflectional ending *-an* typical of the Old English weak declension. Even if the data is scarce, the consistency of these results, as well as the ones discussed above, support the fact that Latin 1st declension names are well integrated into the Old English morphological system, at least as far as oblique cases are concerned.

As with the accusative *Chonie,* exceptions to this general pattern can be found. *Elizabethe* (13) has a dative *-e* inflection. This ending may be taken as a reflection of the post-classical Latin 1st declension dative inflection *-e*. However, *Elizabeth* is an indeclinable name in Latin and preserves this form throughout its paradigm. It is difficult then to think that scribes in the *Martyrology* chose to use this ending based on Latin morphology. Another possibility, which I find more attractive, is that scribes are creating a morphologically marked dative form for *Elizabeth* modelled after ō-stems such as *lufe* 'love'. The fact that, with very few exceptions, masculine names in the *Martyrology* invariably have the native Old English dative inflection *-e*, rather than Latin inflectional endings, (Ruiz Narbona 2023, 14) seems to support this view, since this would show that Old English was the only source of nominal inflections as far as the dative case is concerned.

> (13) [...] *ða   sancta   Maria   eode in*
> [...] then saint.NOM Mary.NOM went in
> *to his meder   Elizabethe;*
> to his mother.DAT Elizabeth.DAT
> '[...] when St. Mary came in to his mother Elizabeth'
> [MART.111.007.015]

In conclusion, data show that the dative forms of feminine names in the *Martyrology* are dominated by Old English inflections. While the weak declension paradigm is clearly the preferred one, as supported also by the accusative data, the strong ō-declension seems to have served as a model in one of the examples under study.

4.4 Genitive

Together with names in the nominative, names in the genitive are the most widely attested in my corpus. They are also the most heterogeneous group as far as morphology

is concerned, since it is the only grammatical case in which there is a clear alternation between Latin and Old English inflectional endings. All in all, the group of genitive examples is made up of 50 tokens and 34 types. The majority of the names in this group, 48 tokens and 33 types, are originally 1st declension names, for example *Cecilian* (Herzfeld 1900, 208), *Marinan* (MART.124.001.011), *Petronellan* (MART.095.001.011), *Anastasie* (MART.002.001.011) or *Fausta* (Herzfeld 1900, 172), to name but a few. Most of these names are attested just once, except for *Agnan* (2x), *Eugenian* (3x), *Lucian* (3x) and *Marian* (9x). The two remaining tokens, *Felicitan* (MART.125.002.008) and *Felicitatis* (MART.039.001.016), are two instances of the same 3rd declension name *Felicitas*. The above examples offer a quick overview of the different genitive inflections that Latin feminine names may take in the *Martyrology*. Overall, names in the genitive can be divided into two classes: On the one hand, the Old English inflection -*an* and on the other, Latin inflections -*e* and -*a*, as well as -*is*.

(14) *on ðone   teoðan   dæg   ðæs   monðes   byð*
On the.ACC tenth.ACC day.ACC the.GEN month.GEN is
sancta   Eulalian   ðrowung   ðære   fæmnan,
saint.GEN Eulalia.GEN passion.NOM the.GEN woman.GEN
'On the tenth day of the month is the passion of the virgin St. Eulalia'
(Herzfeld 1900, 216)

The Old English inflection -*an* is the most commonly attested one. 36 out of the 50 tokens under study, e.g. *Basillan* (MART.091.001.009), *Coronan* (MART.088.001.015) or *Eulalian* (14), take this genitive ending. These results are in line with the accusative and dative data. The fact that -*an* is the most widespread inflection in the genitive too, seems to reinforce the idea that feminine names behave just like native Old English feminine weak nouns with regard to their morphology. Even if this is the case, the relatively high appearance of Latin inflectional endings in the genitive calls for an explanation.

A total of 14 tokens in the corpus, 28% of all attestations, take a Latin genitive inflection rather than the Old English weak ending. Not all of these follow the same pattern. Latin genitive inflections can be divided into two groups. The first one consists of names that show their corresponding Latin genitive inflectional ending, namely -*e* in the case of 1st declension names and -*is* in the case of 3rd declension ones. Nine different tokens belong to this group. These are: *Agape* (MART.059.001.017), *Anastasie* (MART.002.001.011), *Chonie* (MART.059.001.020), *Emerentiane* (MART.032.001.013), *Prisce* (MART.024.001.011), *Rubine* (MART.127.001.011), *Sabine* (MART.172.001.010), *Secunde* (MART.127.001.014), and *Felicitatis* (MART.039.001.016).

In contrast, five tokens take the inflection -*a*, typical of the nominative case, even if they are clearly functioning as genitives from a syntactic point of view as, in (15) below. These are *Alexandrea* (MART.071.001.15), *Eufemia* (15), *Fausta* (Herzfeld 1900, 172), *Hirena* (MART.059.001.023) and *Trifonia* (Herzfeld 1900, 188).

(15) *On ðone   sextegðan   dæg   ðæs   monðes   bið*
On the.ACC sixteenth.ACC day.ACC the.GEN month.GEN is
ðære   fæmnan   ðrowung   sancta   Eufemia,
the.GEN woman.GEN passion.NOM saint.GEN Eufemia.GEN

‘On the sixteenth day of the month is the martyrdom of the virgin St. Eufemia’
[MART.190.001.012]

Once these data have been presented, and before attempting to give an explanation for the Old English and Latin variation, variation within Latin genitive endings will be commented on. Bearing in mind that, as discussed in the introduction, Latin names in Old English can retain their original inflections in whole or in part, it is not surprising to find examples such as *Anastasie* or *Emerentiane* mentioned above. However, genitive -*a* endings seem anomalous in such contexts. Baker (1998, 195 and 198) offers two insightful hypotheses that help to clarify this. Firstly, he mentions that Latin nominative forms in contexts where other grammatical cases would be expected are not rare in Old English. As he puts it, they seem to work as a kind of default form that can work in a variety of syntactic contexts. This is supported as well by the results in Ruiz Narbona (2023, 12), where nominative forms in *-us* were found in practically any syntactic function. Secondly, Baker (1998, 198) offers a phonological explanation for this variation. He argues that scribes may have felt that the spelling -*a* was a more faithful rendering of the sound represented by Latin -*æ* than the spelling -*e* which may have had similar qualities to the vowel schwa.

As for the Old English versus Latin variation in the genitive, the data in the *Martyrology* offer sufficient evidence to determine the rules that underlie this apparent free choice between the two systems. One of the working hypotheses of this paper was that the use of one specific inflection might be name dependent. The data show this not to be the case. Several of the names in this study may appear with the Old English -*an* inflection in one passage of the text and with the corresponding Latin inflection in another. Such is the case with *Agapa* and *Chonia*, for example. They take the Latin inflection -*e* in (16), but the Old English ending -*an* in (17).

(16) *On ðone   ðriddan   dæg   ðæs   monðes   bið*
On the.ACC third.ACC day.ACC the.GEN month.GEN is
ðara   haligra   fæmnena   gemynd [...]   sancta
the.GEN holy.GEN women.GEN commemoration.NOM [...] saint.GEN
Agape ond sancta Chonie ond sancta Hirena.
Agape.GEN and saint.GEN Chonia.GEN and saint.GEN Irene.GEN
 ‘On the third day of the month is the commemoration of the holy virgins [...] St. Agape and St. Chionia and St. Irene’ [MART.059.001.020]

(17) *ond hire lichoma   resteð on Thessalonica   ðære   ceastre,*
And her body.NOM rests in Thessalonica.DAT the.DAT town.DAT
ðær   hire   swestra   lichoman   sindon,
where her.GEN sisters.GEN bodies.NOM are
Agapan   ond Chonian
Agape.GEN and Chonia.GEN
‘and her body rests in the town of Thessalonica, where the bodies of her sisters Agape and Chonia are’ [MART.061.004.022]

Once the name dependency factor has been ruled out as an explanation for variation, a close analysis of all genitives names with Latin inflectional endings reveals that they all

share a common feature, namely, the context they appear in. All Latin inflected genitives in this study are exclusively attested in the introductory passages of each section, where a given martyr or saint is introduced, as in (18). Thus, the use of Latin inflections in genitive names in the *Martyrology* could be described as formulaic and only suitable for a very restricted context. As expected, these results agree with those presented in Ruiz Narbona (2023, 15–16), which showed that the same restrictions apply to masculine names.

(18) *On ðone   eahtateoðan   dæg   bið ðære   halgan*
On the.ACC eighteenth.ACC day.ACC is   the.GEN holy.GEN
fæmnan   tid   sancte   Prisce;
woman.GEN time.NOM saint.GEN Prisca.GEN
'On the eighteenth day of the month is the festival of the holy virgin St. Prisca'
[MART.024.001.011]

It is important to note, however, that although Latin genitives are confined to introductory sections, martyrs' names in these contexts do not necessarily take Latin inflections. Old English *-an* genitives can indeed appear in such contexts, as can be seen in (19) below, where *St. Lucia* is introduced for the first time in the text.

(19) *On ðone   fif and twentigoðan   dæg   ðæs   monðes*
On the.ACC five and twentieth.ACC day.ACC the.GEN month.GEN
bið sancta   Lucian   tid
is   saint.GEN Lucia.GEN time.NOM
'On the twenty-fifth day of the month is the festival of St. Lucia'
[MART.113.001.011]

The in-depth analysis of these introductory sections demonstrates that the use of Latin inflection is not solely related to context but is also connected to syntactic restrictions. Although both Latin and Old English genitive inflections may feature in introductory contexts, the former are preferred when the genitive name functions as a postmodifier, as in (18), where *sancta Prisca* is found after the name it modifies, namely *tid*. Old English genitives, on the contrary, are favoured when they premodify the head of its NP as in (19). The sole exception to this rule in the whole corpus is *Anastasie* in (20) below.

(20) [...] *godes   circean   arweorðiað sancte   Anastasie*
[...] god.GEN churches.NOM celebrate   saint.GEN Anastasia.GEN
gebyrd   ðæs   halegan   gesiðwifes,
birth.ACC the.GEN holy.GEN lady.GEN
'[...] the churches of God celebrate the birth of St. Anastasia the holy lady'
[MART.002.001.011]

In general terms, the genitive data support what has been shown throughout this paper, that is, that feminine Latin names in the *Martyrology* are well integrated into the Old English system and behave like other native weak nouns. The situation in the genitive is more complex, in that Latin inflections are also common. These were shown

to be quite restricted, however. Firstly, they can only appear in introductory sections and could, thus, be described as formulaic. Secondly, they are also restricted from a syntactic point view, as they only feature in postmodifying position.

5.   Conclusions and further research

In this paper I have analysed the morphology of Latin feminine names in the *Old English Martyrology*. The aim was to establish the underlying rules that govern the seemingly chaotic mixture of Latin and Old English inflections that these names display.

The evidence discussed throughout this investigation shows that, for the most part, Latin feminine names in the *Martyrology* are rather close to Funke's (1914) model of a prototypical mixed loanword, as far as their morphology is concerned. This means that, normally, they have a Latin nominative inflection, but Old English inflectional endings in oblique cases. Concerning the names under study, with only one exception, oblique cases are modelled after the Old English weak declension, which has the ending -*an* in the accusative, dative and genitive.

Even if the above-mentioned pattern is clearly predominant, matters are not so simple, and there are certain deviations from this model that call for explanation. The most outstanding anomaly from this pattern has to do with the genitive case. Though not as widespread as attestations with Old English -*an*, a substantial number of names in the genitive feature Latin inflectional endings, especially post-classical -*e*. It was demonstrated that this variation is not a result of free variation, but is limited by contextual constraints, since Latin genitive inflections only appear when a martyr is being introduced, and therefore, it could be considered as formulaic. Additionally, syntactic restrictions also play a role with regard to this choice of inflectional ending. While names in introductory sections can show either Old English or Latin inflections, the latter, with just one exception, can only postmodify their heads.

Context is also relevant concerning another exception in the prototypical paradigm described above. This involves the use of the Latin genitive inflection -*e* in contexts where the name in question is functioning as a subject. As the evidence suggests, this seems to be a consequence of the influence of neighbouring genitives, common in the introductory sections of texts such as the *Martyrology*, as explained by Baker (1998, 195).

Another remarkable departure from the main rule concerns the extensive use of names featuring a Latin nominative inflection, mostly -*a*, where another grammatical case would be expected. This was particularly well attested in connection with the genitive case, although the accusative form *Chonie* poses a similar problem. As Baker (1998, 195, 198) points out, however, strange as it may seem at first sight, this is a common occurrence throughout the entire Old English corpus. Evidence suggests that Latin nominatives seem to have worked as a kind of default unmarked form that could be used in a myriad of syntactic contexts. Additionally, phonological or spelling criteria could also be invoked as an explanation for the widespread use of -*a* as a genitive marker, as put forth by Baker (1998, 198).

The paragraphs above offer a concise overview of the morphological variation that can be found in Latin feminine names in the *Martyrology*. These general conclusions are also relevant in as much as they provide insights into how the Old English nominal inflectional system works. If, as Gneuss (1996, 4) proposes, loanwords may serve to assess the dominant status of a given declensional type in a language, together with the

strong -*a* declension, the weak -*n* declension is in a prevalent position. Results in this paper showed that, with almost no exception, already in an early text such as the *Martyrology*, feminine names can only be integrated into this class. Thus, bearing in mind the conclusions in Ruiz Narbona (2023, 17–9), as far as Latin loanwords are concerned, it is clear that already in the early Old English period, we find only two declension types that are dominant enough so as to attract loans. The general distribution of these names is likewise straightforward: while masculine names—mostly original Latin 2nd declension names—are integrated following the strong declension pattern, the paradigm of feminine names—predominantly from the Latin 1st declension— is modelled after the weak declension. The adaptation of 3rd declension names, however, are based on gender. This preference for a system with two dominant declensions already in the early Old English period seems to anticipate later stages of the language in which these two declensional types will be the only available ones (Lass 2006, 71).

Furthermore, this paper also set out to provide evidence with regard to the interaction of both the Old English and Latin inflectional systems. To a large extent, it was shown that interaction between both systems is practically non-existent as opposed to the case of masculine names (Ruiz Narbona 2023, 17–9). There are no examples of inflections that result from the mixture of endings in both languages or anything similar. Likewise, a syntactic interaction between accusative unmarked names and the compulsory use of determiners was not attested in this study. Although feminine names can take inflections from both languages, the slot that each of them occupies is clear and does not induce any fusions of any kind.

It must be born in mind too that the results discussed above are based on one text only. Although the number of tokens is not small, and the main tendencies of the morphology of names are apparent, some categories such as names in the accusative or dative cases are underrepresented. Additionally, similar studies such as Baker (1998, 190) show that alternatives to the system described above are possible. For example, the Latin inflection -*am* is common in his corpus for the accusative and the dative. Anomalous cases such as *Elizabethe* are also difficult to account for given the circumstances. Further research might fill in these gaps and could help to identify different scribal practices or alternative inflectional systems. As proposed by Baker (1998, 198), texts that feature a high number of names such as the translations of *Historia Ecclesiastica* or *Historia Adversus Paganos* could be interesting starting points. It would also be insightful to study later authors such as Ælfric since his texts might shed light on the later evolution of the morphology of Latin proper names. The widespread adjective *sanctus* also seems to feature a mixed Latin-Old English inflectional system. A thorough study of its inflectional behaviour may also serve to better understand how these mixed inflectional systems work. Besides, further research on common nouns, particularly scholarly loanwords, could be useful in increasing our knowledge of how Latin-Old English mixed morphological systems operated.

References

Baker, Peter S. 1998. "The Inflection of Latin Nouns in Old English Texts." In *Words and Works: Studies in Medieval English Language and Literature in Honour of Fred C. Robinson,* edited by Peter S. Baker, and Nicholas Howe, 187–206. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Brunner, Karl. 1965. *Altenglische Grammatik nach der angelsächsischen Grammatik von Eduard Sievers* (3rd edition). Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Campbell, Alistair. 1959. *Old English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cole, Marcelle, and Stephen Laker. 2022. "The Contact History of English." In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, edited by Mark Aronoff, 1–28. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Colman, Fran. 2014. *The Grammar of Names in Anglo-Saxon England: The Linguistics and Culture of the Old English Onomasticon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

diPaolo Healey, Antonette, John Price Wilkin, and Xin Xiang, comp. 2009. *Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus*. Toronto: University of Toronto.

Durkin, Philip. 2014. *Borrowed Words: A History of Loanwords in English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Funke, Otto. 1914. *Die gelehrten lateinischen Lehn- und Fremdwörter in der altenglischen Literatur von der Mitte des X. Jahrhunderts bis um das Jahr 1066*. Halle: Niemeyer.

Gneuss, Helmut. 1993. "Anglicae Linguae Interpretatio: Language Contact, Lexical Borrowing and Glossing in Anglo-Saxon England." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 82: 107–48.

Gneuss, Helmut. 1996. "Latin Loans in Old English: A Note on Their Inflexional Morphology." In *Language and History in Early England* (Variorum Collected Studies Series), edited by Helmut Gneuss, section VI, 1–12. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Herzfeld, Georg, ed. 1900. *An Old English Martyrology*. London: Early English Text Society.

Hogg, Richard, ed. 1992. *The Cambridge History of the English Language. Vol. I: The Beginnings to 1066*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hogg, Richard. 1992. "Phonology and Morphology." In Hogg 1992, 67–167.

Hogg, Richard and David Denison, eds. 2006. *A History of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kastovsky, Dieter. 1992. "Semantics and Vocabulary." In Hogg 1992, 290–408.

Kastovsky, Dieter. 2006. "Vocabulary." In Hogg and Denison 2006, 199–270. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Körber, Elisabeth. 1982. "Die Übernahme der lateinischen Substantiva in das altenglische Deklinationssystem unter Berücksichtigung des Genus." PhD diss., University of Munich.

Kotzor, G., ed. 1981. *Das altenglische Martyrologium* (2 vols.). Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: Munich.

Lass, Roger. 2006. "Phonology and Morphology." In Hogg and Denison 2006, 199–270. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Library of Latin Texts Online. 2022. Brepols Publishing. Accessed February 18, 2022. http://clt.brepolis.net.us.debiblio.com/llta/pages/Search.aspx.

Martín Arista, Javier, ed., Sara Domínguez Barragán, Laura García Fernández, Esaúl Ruiz Narbona, Roberto Torre Alonso, and Raquel Vea Escarza, comps. 2021. *ParCorOEv2. An Open Access Annotated Parallel Corpus Old English-English*. Nerthus Project. Universidad de La Rioja.

Okasha, Elisabeth. 2011. *Women's Names in Old English*. London: Routledge.

Pogatscher, Alois. 1888. *Zur Lautlehre der griechischen, lateinischen und romanischen Lehnwörter in Altenglischen*. Strassburg: Trübner.

Rauer, Christine. 2003. "The Sources of the Old English Martyrology." *Anglo-Saxon England* 32: 89–109.

Rauer, Christine, ed. 2013. *The Old English Martyrology: Edition, Translation and Commentary*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.

Rodríguez Ledesma, María Nieves. 2016. "*Dauides sunu* vs. *filii david:* The Genitive in the Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels." In *The Old English Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels: Language, Author and Context*, edited by Julia Fernández Cuesta, and Sara M. Pons-Sanz, 213–38. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Ruiz Narbona, Esaúl. 2023. "The Inflection of Latin Masculine Proper Names in the Old English Martyrology." *North-Western European Language Evolution (NOWELE)* 76 (1): 1–22.

Sievers, Eduard. 1884. "Miscellen zur angelsächsischen Grammatik." *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 9: 197–300.

Strang, Barbara M. H. 1970. *A History of English*. London: Routledge.

Welna, Jerzy. 1978. "Complex Gender in Old English Loanwords." *Acta Philologica* 7: 143–64.

Welna, Jerzy. 1980. "On Gender Change in Linguistic Borrowing (Old English)." In *Historical Morphology* (Trends in Linguistics 17), edited by Jacek Fisiak, 399–420. The Hague: Mouton.

Wollmann, Alfred. 1990. *Untersuchungen zu den frühen Lehnwörter im Altenglischen: Phonologie und Datierung* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur englischen Philologie 15). Munich: Fink.

Acknowledgments

Funding