Diachronic Applications in Hispanic Linguistics

Diachronic Applications in Hispanic Linguistics

Edited by

Eva Núñez Méndez

Diachronic Applications in Hispanic Linguistics

Edited by Eva Núñez Méndez

This book first published 2016

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

Language is the archive of history
—Ralph Waldo Emerson

This book was developed as the result of a conference panel organized for the Pacific Modern Language Association in 2013 in San Diego, California. The panel was titled *Diachronic Applications in Spanish Linguistics,* and its theme caught the eye of one of the editors of Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Stephanie Cavanagh, who later contacted me to propose a volume under this line of research. It was only when I considered her idea that I realized what a vast and important theme this opened up, yet it is one that was largely absent from general knowledge and from other books in the field. We are very grateful to Stephanie for giving us the opportunity to publish our academic contributions to the field under this quality peer-reviewed publisher.

The volume focuses on applying a diachronic perspective to specific topics in the field of Hispanic Linguistics. These topics are based on the evolution of the lexicon and Arabisms, phonetic changes like the bilabial confusion and the origins of *seseo*, topics in dialectology regarding the influence of Andalusian Spanish in the Americas, the process of *koineization* of colonial Latin American Spanish, diachronic syntactic changes, and semantic changes in verbs such as *ser, estar,* and *haber.* The target audience for this volume comprises students of Hispanic Linguistics, as well as general readers and scholars with an interest in the field. Each chapter presents the relevant information of its topic (data, concepts, theories, etc.) in a clear, succinct, and accessible fashion, suitable for the general reader and pedagogical purposes. Because of this, technical terminology has been kept to a minimum. Where specialist terms have been introduced, they are explained in the glossary of the chapter.

Diachronic Applications in Hispanic Linguistics falls into nine chapters, written by ten contributors. The first chapter seeks to illustrate and discuss the co-existence of lexical retentions and innovations in the

history of the core segment of the Spanish vocabulary inherited from spoken Latin. Dworkin provides unique Latin lexical survivals in Ibero-Romance that failed to survive outside the Iberian Peninsula or that have survived only in lateral or marginal linguistic areas of the former Roman Empire.

The second chapter explores many Arabic borrowings in Castilian (Old Spanish) that were lost since the fifteenth century onwards in the development of a standardized variety of Spanish. Giménez investigates the trajectory of lexically synonymous pairs of words, one of Arabic descent and another of typically Latin origin, from the semantic field concerning professions and trades. Lexical losses or substitutions for Arabisms will be studied in line with the official and socio-historical perspective of creating an emerging Spanish nation with its own language without vestiges of the Arab world.

The third chapter presents vocabulary change under the framework of the advent of printing in the Iberian Peninsula in the late fifteenth century. This pivotal moment in the production and transmission of texts creates one of the highest peaks of lexical growth in the history of the Spanish language. Early modern Spanish experienced a linguistic transformation, and limiting the scope to the area of vocabulary, Tejedo explains lexical elaboration and loss through the examination of the printed editions prepared by scholars closely connected to the court circles, such as the Alfonsine *Siete Partidas*, first edited in 1491 under the patronage of the Catholic Monarchs.

Chapter four analyzes the origins of the confusion between the bilabial sound [b] and the labiodental sound [v] from the beginning of Castilian Spanish to its modern realizations, using medieval texts and testimonies from grammarians and authors from the fifteenth century and after. In modern Spanish there is not a phonemic difference between the bilabial and labiodental sounds; this ambiguity dates back to Roman times, when the Iberian population could not pronounce or differentiate Latin verbs such as BEBERE 'to drink' from VIVIRE 'to live'.

Chapter five describes *seseo* from a chronological perspective, going back to the pronunciation of sibilants in medieval Spanish, and its development in modern peninsular Castilian and transatlantic Spanish. It also describes *yeísmo* with its geographical distribution and chronological spread. Kania tracks the historical development of both *seseo* and *yeísmo* from their peninsular origins in medieval Spanish to their modern distribution in Spanish-speaking areas using textual documentation and a sociolinguistic framework, taking into account

factors such as dialects in contact, social networks, the prestige register, and lexical diffusion.

Chapter six discusses the origins of the Andalusian variety of Spanish, taking into account the role of prestige norms in Madrid and Seville. The development of the Andalusian variety can be traced to the patterns of repopulation that occurred during the Reconquest in the Iberian Peninsula. On the other hand, the *andalucista* theory holds that the similarities between Andalusian and American Spanish are due to the direct influence of that peninsular variety in the Americas throughout the period of colonization. Spaniards setting out for the Americas converged in Andalusia, creating a linguistic situation of leveling, simplification and koineization. Kauffeld looks to the surviving written documentation from the period to resolve the question of the relationship between Andalusian and American Spanish. She contextualizes dialect development while incorporating sociolinguistic sources such as social factors, prestige norms, and migratory patterns, as well as theories regarding dialects in contact.

Chapter seven is aimed at contributing to a more socio-historically nuanced understanding of the diachrony of Latin American Spanish. It studies verbal paradigms in colonial varieties of Spanish to explain the outcome of dialectal mixture in Spanish American colonies where koineization emerged. The original early colonial simplified variety of Spanish was developed from the leveling of phonetic and morphological variation brought by the first Iberian settlers. This new variety became progressively more differentiated locally depending on the degree of influence from specific peninsular dialectal norms. Sanz includes factors such as dialectal mixture, demographic weight, the effect of acquisition tendencies of children in multilingual environments, the presence of speakers of Spanish as a second language, and the inherent internal instability of the morphological system of Spanish to prove his theory on dialectal variation and koineization.

Chapter eight offers a series of syntactic structures from the earlier period of Latinate writing that already exhibited clear, Old Spanish grammatical patterns and, therefore, demonstrates the syntactical continuity with Romance writing around the 13th century. Both Blake and Sánchez provide data on the development of object pronouns, possessive and demonstrative pronouns, the personal *a*, and a now archaic possessive structure composed of article plus possessive adjective plus noun.

Chapter nine deals with the semantic evolution of frequently used verbs in Spanish such as *ser, estar,* and *haber*. Díaz goes back to their

original meanings in Latin and documents their changes in medieval and modern Spanish and in other Romance languages. She also explains the origins of the periphrastic passive voice and its first uses in old Castilian.

Persisting through the ages, our language is both part of a cultural continuum and our history. The faculty of language makes us human and symbolizes our identity, linking our past to the present. Languages maintain our memories as powerful tools to explain our ancestral heritage and thoughts to present generations. Studying a language from a diachronic perspective allows us to envision peoples' perception of the world, their traditions and beliefs in a gradually changing reality. It is the analysis of diachronic stages of one language that helps us to explain the past and recognize the present of a linguistic community. This book aims to offer a wide range of topics in Spanish historical linguistics to provide the general reader a background in understanding modern Spanish's place in the world.

I would like to express my gratitude to all the contributors for their support and development of the book. Their remarks and suggestions have contributed to the present outcome of this volume. The journey to complete it has incurred other debts, especially to those attentive readers who have given their time, corrected errors, and shared their insights and generously clarified details. I am sincerely grateful to them all.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Arag.	Aragonese
Ast.	Asturian
Auto.	*Auto de los Reyes Magos*. 1170. Anonymous
Bearn	Bearnais
Cal.	Calabrese
Cal.	*Calila y Dimna*. 1251. Anonymous
Cat.	Catalan
Cel.	*La Celestina*. 1499. Fernando de Rojas
Cent.	century
Cid.	*Cantar de Mio Cid*. 1200. Anonymous
Conj.	conjugation
Fr.	French
Friul.	Friulian
Gal.	Galician
Gasc.	Gascon
Ger.	German
Der.	derived
Doc.	document(s)
Engad.	Engadine, one of the varieties of Romontsch
Faz.	*Fazienda de Ultramar*. 1220. Almerich Malafaida
H.	high register, *bajo latín*
Id.	Idem, identical
Ind.	indicative
It.	Italian
L.	low or vernacular variety with no written attestation
Libro.	*Libro Rimado de Palacio*. 1378-1403. Pedro López de Ayala
Lit.	literally
Luc.	*El Conde Lucanor*. 1330-1335. Don Juan Manuel
Mil.	*Milagros de Nuestra Señora*. 1260. Gonzalo de Berceo
Ms.	manuscript
n.d.	no date
non-st.	non standard
Occit.	Occitan
OOccit.	Old Occitan
OFr.	Old French

OPtg.	Old Portuguese
OSp.	Old Spanish
Ptg.	Portuguese
p.	person
pl.	plural
r. / v.	*recto*, front / *verso,* back
Rum.	Rumanian
Sard.	Sardinian
Sic.	Sicilian
sing.	singular
Sp.	Spanish
st.	standard
subj.	subjunctive
S.V.	*sub voce*, under a word or heading, as in a dictionary
S.P.	*Siete Partidas*
v. / r.	*verso*, back / *recto*, front
v.	verb
Vegl.	Vegliote
VV. AA.	various authors
*	not documented
/ /, /b/	phoneme, bilabial plosive voiced
[ ], [b]	sound, bilabial plosive voiced
<b>	grapheme, letter b

CHAPTER ONE

UNIQUE LATIN LEXICAL SURVIVALS
IN IBERO-ROMANCE:
A DIACHRONIC APPROACH

STEVEN N. DWORKIN

1. Categories of Romance Lexical Survival

Throughout his productive career, the late Romanist Arnulf Stefenelli
devoted much of his research to the question of lexical stability and shared
lexicon in the Romance languages. In his important *Das Schicksal des
lateinischen Wortschatzes in den romanischen Sprachen* (1992), he divides
the inherited lexicon of the Romance languages into three broad
categories:

(1) Latin words that have survived in (almost) all the Romance
    languages,
(2) Latin words that have left descendants in a majority of the
    Romance languages, and
(3) Latin words that live on in only one or two Romance languages.

He used the German labels *panromanisch*, *intrarromanisch*, and
teilromanisch to designate these three categories. The reader who prefers
to consult Stefenelli in English can turn to his (posthumously published)
chapter in volume 1 of the *Cambridge History of the Romance Languages*
(Stefenelli 2011). Pan-romance survival does not necessarily mean that the
word has survived the transition from Latin to early Romance in every
documented variety of Romance. It is sufficient that the word has survived
in some varieties found in each of the linguistic regions into which one can
divide Romance-speaking medieval Europe:

- Gallo-Romance,
- Ibero-Romance (including Catalan),
- Italo-Romance,
- Rhaeto-Romance (which I am using here as a cover label for Dolomitic Ladin, Romontsch, and Friulian, without taking any stand on the polemical question of whether these three varieties actually form a linguistic unit),
- Vegliote (also known as Dalmatian),
- and Daco-Romance.

I also consider as pan-Romance an item that is found everywhere except Daco-Romance, a region in which the first texts come from the sixteenth century. In the more than one thousand years separating the loss of the Province of Dacia from the Roman Empire, speakers of proto-Romanian came into contact with speakers of Slavic languages, varieties of Greek, Turkish, and Hungarian, a situation which may have led to many instances of the loss and replacement of inherited Latin vocabulary by loanwords. The existing corpus of Vegliote is too exiguous for us to draw significant conclusions about the absence of documentation of a lexical item from that language. A significant number of Latin lexical items have survived in such languages as Croatian and Albanian, which may well indicate their presence in the region at the time of the Roman Empire.

Specialists studying the history of lexical stability in the Romance languages from a comparative perspective have tended to stress the first category, as can be seen in the articles published online or in preparation for the ongoing *Dictionnaire Etymologique Roman* (www.atilf.fr/DERom; see also Buchi and Schweickard 2014), which has set as its goal the study of the pan-Romance inherited Latin lexicon of the Romance languages, a topic also treated in Dworkin (in press). I shall examine here, with specific regard to the Romance languages of the Iberian Peninsula, the other side of the coin, namely the lexical items inherited from Latin that seem to have survived in Spanish, Portuguese, and Catalan only. The analyst can never be absolutely certain that a given lexical item does not live on in some other Romance regional varieties with which he/she is not familiar. Obviously, the study of lexical stability and survival depends on a large, accurate, and reliable etymology base.

One might reasonably expect that words that have survived in only one or two Romance domains (Stefenelli's *teilromanisch* category) are found more often in isolated regions of the former Roman Empire, e.g. Romania, the Alpine regions of Switzerland, and northern Italy, or in areas colonised in the earliest days of Roman expansion, such as Sardinia and the Iberian

Peninsula, both territories that have preserved some vocabulary from earlier chronological layers of Latin, while rejecting many (though certainly not all) of the linguistic innovations from the central linguistic regions of the Empire. Such marginal or lateral territories were too distant from the centres of linguistic innovation for many such innovations to reach them. Many of the relevant Latin bases listed here as orally transmitted lexical relics of the Iberian Peninsula entered other Romance languages later (usually through written transmission) as medieval or early modern Latinisms.

2. Lexical Survivals from the Earliest Layers of Hispanic Latinity

The earliest layers of Hispanic Latinity must have contained words that fell into disuse and were replaced over time in those provinces of the Empire where Latin arrived several centuries later, and which were located closer to such cultural centres of linguistic diffusion in the later Empire as (to use their modern names) Milan, Lyons, and Trier. A small number of these items have cognates only in Sardinian, Sicilian, and/or central and southern Italo-Romance, all territories where Latin was introduced only two or so decades before the arrival of the Romans in the Iberian Peninsula in 218 BCE. Obviously, I am not including here words from the various pre-Roman substratal languages that became part of the regional and/or social varieties of the spoken Latin of the Iberian Peninsula. Occasionally, a word of this type did spread from the regional Latin of the Iberian Peninsula to the language of the broader Empire, e.g. PLUMBUM "lead," which, in addition to Sp. *plomo* and Ptg. *chumbo*, lives on as Fr. *plomb*, It. *piombo*, and Rum. *plumb*.

2.1. Brief Case Studies

I shall begin by presenting four etymologically controversial words that possibly continue early Latin vocabulary found nowhere else in the Roman territories, namely:

- the Spanish and Portuguese verbs *tomar* "to take" and *matar* "to kill,"
- the Spanish and Portuguese nouns *colmena*, *colmeia* "bee-hive,"
- and the OSp. triad *comblueça*, *combrueça*, and *comborça* "concubine."

In all four cases, specialists do not agree on the underlying etymon; indeed, with regard to *colmena* and *comblueça*, *combrueça*, *comborça*, the *DCECH* has proposed pre-Roman Celtic etymologies.

Tomar "to take"

Two main hypotheses have been proposed to account for *tomar*. Raina's hypothesis (1919) that Lat AUTUMARE "to declare, affirm" (a verb used frequently by Plautus, but rarely by later Classical writers) underlies *tomar* gained a number of prestigious adherents, such as Jud (1925) and, with some initial reservations, the *DCECH* s.v. *tomar*. Oral transmission of AUTUMARE would have yielded **atomar* (cf. *agosto* < AUGUSTUS), or perhaps **otomar*. Raina's conjecture fails to account for the semantic gap between the base and *tomar*, a task undertaken by Jud (1925) who claimed that the apheresized (AU)TUMARE was a relic of the Latin juridical lexicon and expressed the meaning "to take, claim." Malkiel (1990) offers his readers a critical survey of previous attempts to identify and explain the origin of *tomar*. He concludes his essay by repeating a proposal he had made fifteen years earlier (1975), namely that *tomar* is the local reflex of the archaic Latin AESTUMARE "to evaluate, appraise" (the forerunner to AESTIMARE), which speakers jokingly segmented as AES "copper, money" and a verbal base **TUMARE* "to take away as tax." This innovative **TUMARE* would have lived on only in the spoken Latin of the Iberian Peninsula, long after AESTUMARE gave way to AESTIMARE, which left its own progeny throughout the former Roman Empire except in Rumanian (see *REW*₃ #246; *LEI*, s.v. AESTIMARE). The innovative AESTIMARE appears not to have left any orally transmitted reflexes in Spanish or Portuguese—OSp. *asmar*, *esmar*, OPtg. *osmar* are Gallicisms, whereas *estimar* is a Latinism. To judge by the pan-Romance information available in *REW*₃, *FEW*, and *LEI*, neither AUTUMARE or AESTUMARE left reflexes outside the Iberian Peninsula. Although the widespread PRAEHENDERE gained a foothold in the Iberian Peninsula, its local reflex, *prender*, never ousted *tomar*. Both verbs co-exist in Spanish and Portuguese, but with different semantic ranges.

Jud (1925) proposed a similar analysis as local retentions of Roman legal terminology for Lat. PERCONTARI "to obtain information" altered to PERCUNCTARI under the influence of CUNCTARI, and for PERSCRUTARI "to examine." Both verbs left reflexes only in the Romance languages of the Iberian Peninsula, namely Sp. *preguntar*, Ptg. *perguntar* (< older *preguntar*; also Sard. *percontare*, older *precontare*; see *DES*. 2, 245–6), and the referentially-similar OSp., OPtg. *pescudar*. Although seldom

found in medieval texts, *pescudar* turns up frequently in early sixteenth-century novels of chivalry and is documented sporadically through the seventeenth century. The evolution of MANCIPIUM "legal formal possession of a thing" merits some attention in this context. The Latin base, attested as early as the Twelve Tables (ca. 450 BCE), lives on in varieties of Gallo-Romance, e.g. Occit. *mancip* "clerc de notaire," *mascip* "employé" *masip* "domstique, serviteur" (*FEW*, 6, 137–8), whereas Sp. Ptg. *mancebo* "young person," orig. "slave, servant," presupposes a remade *MANCIPUS.

Matar "to kill"

As early as 1853, in the pioneering edition of his *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der romanischen Sprachen*, Friedrich Diez linked *matar* to the archaic Latin verb MACTARE "to kill or offer as a sacrifice." Although this etymology is satisfactory on the semantic side, the regular evolution of this Latin base would have yielded *meitar* in Portuguese and *mechar* in Spanish. Consequently, specialists sought other solutions to the origin of the verb in question, even proposing an Arabic base or suggesting some genetic connection with the family of the Italian *ammazzare* "to beat with a cudgel" and *mazzo* "cudgel, mace" (for details and bibliography, see Dworkin 2003). However, the semantic fit between MACTARE and *matar* and their phonetic similarity make it counterintuitive to separate these two forms genetically.

Given the antiquity of MACTARE in Latin, it may be reasonable to propose that early colonists from Italy in the Iberian Peninsula, perhaps speakers of basolectal varieties of Latin, may have pronounced the verb as [mat:are], the form which remained in the Latin of the Iberian Peninsula and underlies *matar*. This (perhaps risky) hypothesis assumes that other bases that appear in written Latin with medial –CT- retained the cluster /-kt-/ in everyday pronunciation. This cluster later developed to the prepalatal affricate /tʃ/, orthographic –*ch*-. The various Latin verbs that expressed the meaning "to kill" do not seem to have taken root in the spoken Latin underlying Spanish and Portuguese. Elsewhere, the Latin OCCIDERE survived as OFr. *occire*, OOccit. Cat. *aucire*, It. *uccidere*, Rum. *ucide*. The semantic evolution of TUTARE "to extinguish, snuff out" > "to kill" that underlies the genesis of Fr. *tuer* is limited to Gallo-Romance. Lat. NECARE underlies OSp. *anegar*, with the narrower meaning "to drown, suffocate"; cf. Fr. *noyer* "to drown."

Colmena "bee-hive"

Malkiel (1984) presents quite convincing evidence that the Sp. *colmena*, Ptg. *colmeia* continue Lat. CRUMENA (var. CRUMINA) "a small money-purse or bag." Although CRUMENA is documented from Plautus through Ventianus Fortunatus, it is not included in any Romance etymological dictionary, and seems to have not enjoyed currency in the spoken varieties that underlie the Romance languages. The analysis of CRUMENA as the source of *colmena*, *colmeia* is strengthened by the presence of *cormena* "beehive" (an intermediate stage between the proposed etymon and the current Spanish and Portuguese nouns) found in conservative northern Asturian and Aragonese dialects.

Comblueça, *combrueça*, *comborça*, and *comcubina* "concubine"

Malkiel (1985) offers a novel solution to the etymological puzzle of *comblueça/combrueça/comborça* forms, which became obsolete in the early modern language. Rejecting all earlier hypotheses (which he critically surveys on pp. 253–63), he claims that OSp. *comborça* is the variant closest to the starting point, which he identifies as *CONVORTIA, a derivative based on the documented stem VORTERE, the ancestor of classical VERTERE. This proposal implies an evolutionary sequence *comborça* > *combrueça* > *comblueça*. The earlier base VORT- lived on in Latin items such as the noun DIVORTIUM and the adverb DEVORSUM (the source of OSp. *yuso*, It. *giu*). Writing at almost the same time as Malkiel, Meier (1984) sought to link these nouns to a base *CONVORSA, a forerunner of CONVERSUS, based on the past participle VORSUM ← VORTERE.

Tovar (1968a; 1968b; 1969a; 1969b) has identified—in Latin texts written in the first two centuries of the Roman presence in Spain, by authors who spent time in the Iberian Peninsula—several lexical items that rarely appear in Classical Latin and which, in the framework of the Romance languages, have left reflexes, in many instances in only Spanish and Portuguese. Tovar (1968a; 1969a) notes that the *De Agricultura* of Cato the Elder, who arrived in Hispania in 195 BCE, contains such technical terms as LABRUM "basin, tub," MUSTACEUS "must-cake," POCILLUM "small cup," TRAPETUM "olive mill," and VERVACTUM "fallow field," ultimately the source of Sp. *lebrillo* "washbasin, deep pan," *mostachón* "type of small sugar bun," *trapiche* "olive mill" (also present in southern Italian dialects and Sicilian), *pocillo* "vessel sunk in the ground in oil mills and wine presses," and *barbecho*, Ptg. *barbeito* "fallow field"

(also Log. *barvattu*). Cato also employs MATERIA with its original meaning "wood," a sense preserved today only in Sp. *madera*, Ptg. *madeira*, as well as in medieval Gallo-Romance; see *FEW*, fasc. 78, s.v. MATERIA. The Roman satirist Lucilius (180–103 BCE), who was present in Hispania at the siege of Numantia (134 BCE), employs ROSTRUM "snout, beak," the source of Sp *rostro* "face," in an insulting way to refer to the human face, GUMIA, which survives as Spanish *gomia* "bogeyman; glutton," and DEMAGIS, the source of Sp. *demás*, Ptg. *demais*, Cat. *demes*, PASSUS, past-participle of PANDERE, and source of the OSp. adverb *paso* "slow; in a low voice," and of the noun *pasa* "raisin" < UVA PASSA (Tovar 1969b).

Certain older words typical of Hispanic Latinity that have survived into the Romance vernacular turn up in later Roman writers of Spanish origin, e.g. Seneca (54 BCE–39 CE), a native of Cordoba, and Columella (4–70 CE), born in Cádiz: APTARE > *atar* "to bind" (Tovar 1968b), VULTURNUS "south wind" > *bochorno* "extreme heat," BIFERA "bearing fruit twice a year; twofold" > *breva* "early fig," MANCIPIUM "legal formal possession of a thing" (Tovar 1968b), and TRITICUM > *trigo* "wheat." All these words survive only in the Romance languages of the Iberian Peninsula (or, occasionally, in neighbouring southern Gallo-Romance).

3. Inherited Lexical Items Unique to Spanish and Portuguese

The following is a list of selected Spanish lexical items that, for the most part, lack cognates outside the Iberian Peninsula. In almost all cases, specialists agree on the identification of the underlying Latin base. I am not including here the words listed above.

- *acechar* (OSp. *assechar*), Ptg. *asseitar* "to lie in wait for, to ambush" < *ASSECTARE (Cl. ASSECTARI "to attend to, follow, accompany"),
- *ajeno*, Ptg. *alheio* "of another" < ALIENUS "other,"
- *asar*, Ptg. *assar* "to roast" < ASSARE "id.,"
- *atar* "to bind" < APTARE "to fit, accommodate, adjust,"
- *ave*, Sp. Ptg. *ave* "bird" (also OCat. *au*, Sard. *ae* "eagle") < AVIS "bird,"
- *barrer* "to sweep" < VERRERE "to scrape, sweep, brush, scour,"
- *cabeza*, Ptg. *cabeça* "head" < CAPITIA "hole in a tunic through which the head passes,"
- *callos* "tripe" (found in such early Roman writers as Plautus and Nevius) < CALLUM "hardened thick skin on animal bodies,"

- *centeno*, Ptg. *centeio* "rye" < CENTENUM "a kind of grain" (see Adams 2007: 553–4) ,
- *cerraja* "corn sow thistle" < SARRALIA "type of wild lettuce" (Adams 2007, 239–40),
- *cieno* "mud, slime" < CAENUM "dirt, filth, mud,"
- *collaço* OSp. (mod. –*azo*) "type of farm labourer; child who shares a wet nurse with another" < COLLACTEUS "foster brother,"
- *comer* "to eat" < COMEDERE "to eat up entirely,"
- *cojo*, Ptg. *coxo*, "lame" < COXUS "id.,"
- *denostar* "to insult, offend" < *DEHONESTARE,
- *entregar* "to hand over" < INTEGRARE,
- *hablar* (OSp. *fablar*) "to speak" (mod. Sp. *hablar*), Ptg. *falar* < FABULARI "id.,"
- *feo*, Ptg. *feio* "ugly," < FOEDUS "repugnant,"
- *heder*, Ptg. *feder* "to stink" < F(O)ETERE "id.,"
- *hormazo* "heap of stones," *hormaza* "brick wall" < FORMACEUS (← FORMA),
- *lamer*, Ptg. *lamber* "to lick" (cf. Sard. *làmbere*) < LAMBERE "id.,"
- *lejos* "far" < LAXUS "loose; spacious,"
- *lindar*, Sp. Ptg. "to border on" < LIMITARE "to enclose within a boundary,"
- *loza*, Ptg. *loça* "fine earthenware pottery" < LAUTIA "magnificence, splendor,"
- *madrugar* (OSp. *madurgar)*, Ptg. *madrugar* "to get up early" < *MATURICARE (←MATURUS "early"),
- *medir* "to measure" < MÉTIRE (Cl. METIRI) "id.,"
- *pregón* "herald" < PRAECONE "id.,"
- *pierna*, Ptg. *perna* "leg" < PERNA "ham,"
- *porfía* "stubborness; dispute, challenge" < PERFIDIA "betrayal,"
- *quemar*, Ptg. *queimar* "to burn" (ultimately traceable to CREMARE?; cf. Arag., Cat. *cremar*),
- *recudir* OSp. "to respond, recount" < RECUTERE "id.,"
- *reo* orig. "accused," later "criminal" < REUS "defendant, prisoner,"
- *rostro,* Ptg. *rosto* "face" < ROSTRUM, "bird's beak; animal snout,"
- *seso*, Ptg. *siso* "sense, intelligence" < SENSUM,
- *trigo* "wheat" < TRITICUM "id.,"
- *vacío*, Ptg *vazio* "empty" < VACIVUS "id." (Adams 2007: 392–3),
- *yengo* OSp. "free" < INGENUUS.

A careful etymological analysis of the lexicon of the Romance varieties of Asturias, Leon, and Upper Aragon is sure to yield further lexical relics of the Latinity of the Iberian Peninsula.

I wish to stress here that, although the Spanish and Portuguese words listed above do not seem to have cognates in the Romance languages spoken outside the Iberian Peninsula, many of the Latin forms were widely used throughout the Roman Empire (to judge by the record of written Latin) and were not necessarily restricted to the Latin of the Iberian Peninsula. In the Imperial period, it is probably inaccurate to speak of a Hispano-Latin that lexically differed significantly from other contemporary regional varieties of Latin.

In addition, a small number of Latin words have survived in the Romance varieties of the Iberian Peninsula and in Rumanian. Some such items also left scattered traces elsewhere in the former Roman Empire. The Iberian Peninsula and Dacia represent the western and eastern extremes of the territories of the Roman Empire where Latin survived as a spoken language; they were the provinces furthest removed geographically from the centres of linguistic diffusion. Whereas the Iberian Peninsula was colonised very early in the history of Roman expansion, Dacia was not occupied until the first decade of the second century CE, and was among the first territories abandoned in the late third century by Rome as the Empire began to contract. The following selected examples illustrate this category of lexical items:

(a) Lat. AFFLARE "to blow or breathe on" > Sp. *hallar* (OSp. *fallar*), Ptg. *achar*, and Rum. *afla* "to find," as well as other items scattered in southern Italian dialects.

(b) Lat. ANGUSTUS "narrow" > Sp. Ptg. *angosto*, Rum. *îngust*.

(c) Lat. ARENA "sand" > Sp. *arena*, Ptg. *areia,* Rum. *arina*.

(d) Lat. FORMOSUS "shapely" > Sp. *hermoso* (OSp. *fermoso*), Ptg. *formoso*, Rum. *fRum.os* "pretty."

(e) Lat. FERVERE "to boil" > Sp *hervir* (OSp. *fervir*), Ptg. *ferver*, Rum. *fierbe*.

(f) Lat. HUMERUS "shoulder" > Sp. *hombro*, Ptg. *ombro*, Rum. *umăr*.

(g) Lat. CASEUS "cheese," > Sp. *queso*, Ptg. *queijo*, Rum. *caş* (as well as Sard., Sic. *casu*).

(h) Lat. EQUA "mare" > Sp. *yegua*, Ptg. *égoa*, Cat. *egua* "mare," Rum. *iap*ă (cf. also OFr. *ieve)*.

(i) Lat. MENSA "table" > Sp., Ptg. *mesa*, Rum. *mas*ă.

(j) Lat. PETERE "to seek" > Sp., Ptg. *pedir* "to ask for, request," Rum. *peţi* "to woo, seek in marriage."

(k) Lat. ROGARE > Sp., Ptg. *rogar*, Rum. *ruga* "to beg" (also OFr. *rover*).

Although some of the phonetic details require further study, it seems reasonable to claim that Sp. *bostezar* (OSp. *bocezar*) "to yawn" goes back to Lat. OSCITARE "to open the mouth wide, to gape," which has survived in Rum. *uşta* (see Walsh 1997, *REW*₃ s.v. OSCITARE).

If these Latin bases survived at the extreme geographical ends of the Roman Empire, they must have existed in the spoken Latin of its central regions as well.

4. Lexical Conservation and Innovation in Hispano-Romance: Some Lexical Vignettes

In formulating his controversial areal norms (*norme spaziale*) that characterise the neolinguistic approach to the historical study of the Romance languages, Bartoli (1925) stated that marginal or lateral areas (such as the Iberian Peninsula, southern Italy, and Dacia), far removed from the centres of cultural and linguistic innovation, tend to preserve earlier linguistic stages. In his view, innovations from the linguistic centres of the Empire failed to penetrate these lateral areas to a significant extent.

Some of these innovations indeed entered the spoken Latin of the Iberian Peninsula, but failed to dislodge their long-entrenched lexical rivals. In what follows, I shall examine some selected examples of the rivalry in the Iberian Peninsula between older Latin lexical bases and their possible neologistic rivals.

Hablar "to speak"

The preservation of Lat. FABULARE, FABULARI "to speak, converse" (found often in Plautus) as Spanish *hablar* (OSp. *fablar*), Ptg. *Falar*, is often cited as an example of lexical conservation, as this verb was displaced elsewhere by descendants of PARABOLARE "to make comparisons, to tell tales" (← PARABOLA "comparison"). The *FEW* (3, s.v. FABULARI) records the Old Occitan *hapax*, *faular*, as a descendant of FABULARI and it remains uncertain whether to classify the Old Bolognese *fablança* "word" as a member of this word family. The *FEW* (3, s.v. FABELLARI, 341) analyses OFr. *faveler*, OOccit. *favelar*, Vegl. *faular*, Friul. *favelá*, and Sard. *faveddare* as descendants of FABELLARI, documented only in glosses. The verb PARABOLARE seems to have not struck root in Spanish and Portuguese (but cf. Cat. *parlar*). Nevertheless, the family of this neologism

must have reached the Iberian Peninsula, as can be seen in Sp. *palabra* (older *paraula*, *parabla*), Ptg. *palavra* (older *paravoa*), and Cat. *paraula*. The Spanish verb *parlar*, attested as early as Juan Ruiz, is in all likelihood a Gallicism, as is (probably) Ptg. *palrar*, despite García Arias's attempt (1988, 294) to explain Ast. *parllar* as a native development of the Latin base.

Miedo "fear"

The noun METUS "fear," attested as early as Ennius (ca. 239–169 BCE) and Naevius (ca. 270–201 BCE), lives on in Sp. *miedo*, Ptg. *medo*, and neighbouring Gasc. *met* (*FEW* 6: 2, s.v. METUS). This same source also lists the northern Italian (Piedmont) *mei*. In other Romance languages, METUS appears to have given way in the spoken language to descendants of PAVOR (OFr. *paor*, modern *peur*, It. *paura*, Prov., Cat. *por*) and TIMOR (Rum. *teamă*, Sard. *timore*, *timori*, OOccit. *temor*, rare OFr. *temor* in *FEW* 13: 1, 333). Although the spoken Latin of the Iberian Peninsula retained METUS, it also welcomed PAVOR and TIMOR, as can be seen in Sp. *pavor* and *temor*, both abundantly attested in the medieval language.

Feo "ugly"

The Latin adjective FOEDUS "foul, repugnant, loathsome, ugly" (in the physical and moral senses) lives on only in Sp. *feo* (OSp. variant *hedo*), and Ptg. *feio*. Wagner classifies Sard *féu* as a borrowing from Spanish (*DES*: s.v. *féu*). Elsewhere, FOEDUS and its synonyms were replaced by neologisms or by other internal innovations. In Gaul and the northeast corner of the Iberian Peninsula, a Germanic base *LAID displaced its Latin rivals, resulting in Fr. *laid* (OFr. *lait*, borrowed into Old Spanish as *laido*, documented throughout the medieval period; see Dworkin 1990), OOccit. *laid* (a borrowing from Old French), and Cat. *lleig*. The standard Italian *brutto*, of disputed origin, early on became the term for "ugly"; Rumanian chose to adapt as its adjective for "ugly" *urît*, the participle of the verb *urî* "to hate" (cf. the typological parallel offered by Ger. *hässlich* "ugly" ← *hassen* "to hate"). The semantically related Latin TURPIS "ugly, unsightly, unseemly, foul" survived only in the Iberian Peninsula as Sp., Ptg. *torpe*, but with the semantic change to "awkward." Specialists are unsure whether there is a genetic connection between FOEDUS and the verb FOETERE "to stink, be fetid." Regardless of the answer to that question, did speakers perceive a connection between the verb and the adjective synchronically? In the Romance languages, Lat. FOETERE survived only in

Sp. *heder* (OSp. *feder*), Ptg. *feder*, Bearn. *hedi* "to stink" (*FEW* 3, 676), *hedienti* "bad smelling," Sic. *fetiri*, *fitiri*, and Cal. *fitiri*. Elsewhere, reflexes of PUTERE, *PUTIRE gained the upper hand (Fr. *puer*, Ofr. *puir*, Sard. *putire*, *pudire*, Rum. *puţi*, Occit., and Cat. *Pudir*).

Comer "to eat"

A highly irregular paradigm, some members of which clashed with that of ESSE "to be," as well as a lack of phonetic substance, may have combined to doom EDERE "to eat" in the spoken language. Some speakers reinforced the verb through the addition of the preverb COM-, creating COMEDERE, orig. "to eat up," attested as early as Plautus and Terrence, which has survived only as Sp., Ptg. *comer*. Elsewhere, speakers altered the semantic range of MANDUCARE (var. MANDICARE) "to chew," giving it the broader meaning "to eat," with which it came into many of the Romance languages other than Spanish and Portuguese (Rum. *mănînc*, *mînca*, Vegl. *manonka*, Sard. *man(d)igare*, OIt. *manducare*, *manicare*, Fr. *manger*, OOccit. *manjar*, Cat. *menjar*). The Spanish and Portuguese noun *manjar* "snack, delicacy" is a medieval Gallicism, as is It. *mangiare*. Whereas Meyer-Lübke (*REW*₃: #5292) classes the Catalan verb as a borrowing from medieval French, Coromines (*DECat*) views it as a native form.

Lejos "far, distant"

The Latin adjective LAXUS "wide, roomy, ample; loose" seems to live only in Spanish as *lejos* "far, distant." As the accusative would have given *lejo*, scholars have offered two explanations for the final –*s* in *lejos*. Some experts view it as an adverbial –*s* as in *mientras < mientra*, *mientre*, whereas the *DCECH* s.v. *lejos* takes the neuter comparative LAXIUS as the starting point for the Spanish form. Meyer-Lübke (*REW*₃ #4918) claimed that LAXUS lived on as metathesised *LASCUS, the source of OIt. *lasco* "sluggish, slow, inert," Fr. *lâche* "weak, loose," and OProv. *lasc* "id." The *FEW* rejected this reconstructed base as a source of the Gallo-Romance forms, analysing *lâche* and *lasc* as derivatives of the verbs *lâcher, lascar* < LAXICARE, itself in the long run a derivative of LAXUS. The *DEI* derives It. *lasco*, first attested only in the sixteenth century, from the verb *lascare* < LAXICARE.

Hallar "to find"

Among the earliest substitutes for the Latin verbs REPERIRE and INVENIRE "to find" is AFFLARE "to breathe upon" (a prefixed derivative of FLARE "to breathe"), which may have acquired its new meaning through reference to the way hunting dogs follow the scent of their prey. This verb, so used, survived in isolated areas of the Roman territories as Sp. *hallar* (OSp. *fallar*), Ptg. *achar*, Sit. *acchiare*, *asciare*, and Rum. *afla*. In the spoken Latin of Gaul there arose an innovation that underlies Fr. *trouver* (OFr. *trover*), and Occit. *trobar*. Scholarly opinion is divided as to whether TURBARE "to disturb the waters (as a fishing technique)," cf. Sard. *trubare* or *TROPARE "to compose verses," underlies the Romance forms; the latter hypothesis implies that the use of *trobar* "to compose verses" precedes its use with the meaning "to find." Regardless of the solution to this etymological crux (summarised, with ample bibliography, in *DELI*₂, 1746–47), this innovation failed to penetrate the spoken Latin that underlies Spanish and Portuguese. OSp. *trobar* (found mainly in Aragonese sources) is a Gallicism. The status of It. *trovare* and Cat. *Trobar*, as native words or as Gallicisms, remains unclear (Rohlfs 1979, *DELI*₂, s.v. trovare, *DECat* 8, s.v. *trobar*).

Queso "cheese"

A similar rivalry between a well-entrenched Latin word and an innovation created in Gaul characterises the history of the descendants of CASEUS "cheese." This base lives on in Sp. *queso*, Ptg. *queijo*, Sard. *casu*, It. *cascio*, Sit. *casu*, (*LEI*, fasc. 108, Vol. 12, cols. 1041–76), and Rum. *caş*. However, in Gaul, speakers coined the phrase CASEUS FORMATICUS, which underwent a process of reduction or lexical condensation by which the adjective FORMATICUS substantivised and took on the meaning of its original head noun. The resulting OFr. *formage*, *fromage* diffused to Occit. *fromatge*, Cat. *formatge*, It. *formaggio*, as well as several northern Italian varieties beginning with *form-*, *furm-* (Rohlfs 1979). The two examples of *formage* in medieval Hispano-Romance (*Viaje de John de Mandeville*, Villasandino in the *Cancionero de Baena*) are Gallicisms.

Arder, *quemar* "to burn"

The Latin verbs that expressed the notion "to burn," namely intransitive ARDERE and transitive CREMARE, have lived on in the Iberian Peninsula. The etymology of Sp., Ptg. *arder* is transparent. Although the phonetic

evolution does pose several problems that have not been satisfactorily resolved, it seems reasonable to view Sp., *quemar* and Ptg. *queimar* as descendants of CREMARE "to burn," and as cognates to Arag., Cat. *cremar*. The earliest examples of *quemar* are found in the Navarro-Aragonese *Vidal Mayor*, a late-thirteenth-century text that also employs *cremar*. The Latin verb left reflexes in OFr. *Cramer* and Occit. *cremar*, as well as in scattered varieties of northern Italo-Romance (*REW*₃ #2309; *FEW* s.v. CREMARE). The spoken Latin of Gaul and the Italian Peninsula seems to have widened the semantic scope of the verb USTULARE "to scorch, singe," and employed this verb's reflexes to express "to burn," as seen in Fr. *brûler*, OOccit. *bruslar*, *brulhar*, It. *(br)ustolare* (whose *br-* has not been convincingly explained). It. *bruciare* seems to require a separate solution. Regardless of the ultimate solution to the origin of the French and Italian verbs at issue, the underlying Latin base did not displace the progeny of the older CREMARE in the Iberian Peninsula.

Arena "sand"

Latin employed (H)ARENA "(fine-grained) sand" alongside SAB(U)LUM "(large-grained) sand." The former lives on as Sp. *arena*, Ptg. *areia*, Rum. *arină* and other items in two dialect zones of Italy (*LEI*, fasc. 23, volume III). OFr. *Areine* and It. *arena* have been displaced by descendants of SAB(U)LUM, namely *sable* and *sabbia*, but live on with the secondary meaning "arena, amphitheater." OCat. *arena* (still heard in regional varieties) has given way to the local innovation *sorra*, originally a term employed by sailors (*DECat* 1, s.v. *arena*). Descendants of this base seem to not have taken root in Hispano-Romance. It is unclear whether OPtg. *sabro*, mod. *saibro* (today "gravel"), represent the native progeny of SABULUM (a view supported by Piel 1953) in the western part of the Iberian Peninsula or an adaptation of Fr. *sable* (an analysis possibly supported by the final vowel of Gal. *jabre*).

Medir "to measure"

Lat. *METIRE (Cl. METIRI) "to measure" survives only in Sp., Ptg. *medir* "to measure." Elsewhere, this Latin verb was displaced by the neologism ME(N)SURARE, formed on the noun ME(N)SURA, itself a derivative of the supine stem of METIRI. In this instance, the new verb must have taken root in the spoken Latin of the Iberian Peninsula, as can be seen in Sp. *mesurar* attested as early as the *Cantar de Mio Cid*. A semantic distinction has developed in Spanish between *medir* and *mesurar*. Whereas the former is

used with regard to physical extension or space, *mesurar* has taken on more abstract senses referring to human comportment.

Asar "to roast"

Sp. *asar* and Ptg. *assar* "to roast" (alongside Sard. *assare* and the Corsican derivative *assatóchju* "dried, roasted [chestnuts]"; see *DES*, I, 127; *LEI*, fasc. 27, col. 1777) are the sole vernacular reflexes of the Latin verb ASSARE (← ASSUS, itself an alteration of ARSUS ← ARDERE), a verb rarely attested in the literary language. Elsewhere, speakers turned to a Germanic base *RAUSTJAN to denote this cooking technique, OFr. *rostir* (mod. *rôtir*), It. *arrostire*, and Cat. *rostir*. Outside the future Catalan-speaking region, very few Germanic words entered the spoken Latin of the Iberian Peninsula as a result of direct language contact in late Antiquity (Dworkin 2012). Thus, the local reflexes of ASSARE did not face outside competition from the Germanic base that took root elsewhere as a neologism.

Trigo "wheat"

Latin TRITICUM (var. TRIDICUM) "wheat" (as a plant and as a commodity) has survived as Sp., Ptg. *trigo* "id.," Sard. *tridiku*, *tridigu*, *trigu* (*DES*, II, 516), Jud-Fr. *trige* (*FEW* 13:2), as well as scattered Northern Italian reflexes. Elsewhere, TRITICUM gave way to reflexes of FRUMENTUM "grain," the source of Fr. *froment*, It. f*rumento*, Cat. *forment*, Engad. *furmaint* or the Germanic *BLAD, which underlies Fr. *blé*, Cat. *blat*, and OIt. *biada* (a borrowing from Gallo-Romance?). It is possible that FRUMENTUM entered the spoken Latin of the Iberian Peninsula. Although I have been unable to authenticate OSp. *hormiento* recorded in *FEW* 3, 829, García Arias (2007, 222–3) records Ast. *formientu* "yeast," which may involve a blend of FRUMENTUM and FERMENTUM "yeast."

5. Unique lexical Survivals in Portuguese and Catalan

Within the framework of the Romance languages of the Iberian Peninsula, Portuguese and Catalan also contain lexical items that represent the sole surviving progeny of their Latin bases. Silva Neto (1952, 269f.) offers a handful of examples of words that live on through oral transmission only in Portuguese (and, in some cases, in neighbouring Galician and varieties of Asturian), e.g.:

(a) Ptg. *eido* < ADITUS,

(b) OPtg. *fornigar* "fornicate" < FORNICARE (also OSard. *forricare*,
      DES, I, s.v. *forricare*), OPtg. *forniço* < FORNICIUM (also OSard.
      forrithiu),
(c) Ptg. *colmo*, Ast. *cuelmo* "stem" < CULMUS "stalk, stem,"
(d) Gal. *domear* "tame" < DOMINARE (cf. Sp. *domar* "tame" <
      DOMARE),
(e) Ptg., Gal. *adro* "patio, churchyard" < ATRIUM "entrance room" (see
      also *FEW* 25, 689–91),
(f) Gal. *asomade*, *asemade* "suddenly, finally" < SUMMATIM "slightly,
      summarily,"
(g) Gal. *con* "large rock" < CONUS "cone," also
(h) Gal. *acio* "sour" < ACIDUS.

Colón (1976, 144f.) lists several Latin bases that, in his view, left orally
transmitted reflexes only in Catalan:

(a) CATARRHUS > *cadarn* "head cold" (also widespread throughout
      southern Italy, *LEI* 110, 1418–27),
(b) CONFIGERE > *confegir* "join together,"
(c) CONGEMINARE > *conjuminar* "arrange, adjust,"
(d) DELIRIUM > *deler* "strong desire,"
(e) IGNORARE > *enyorar* "miss, feel nostalgia for" (borrowed into
      modern Spanish as *añorar*),
(f) INDAGARE > *enagar* "incite,"
(g) ODIARE > *ujar* "tire,"
(h) PACIFICARE > *apaivagar* "pacify,"
(i) REPUDIARE > *rebutjar* "reject,"
(j) *tardatjone > *tardaó* "autumn" (alongside more common *tardor*,
      tardó; see *DECat*, 8, 309f).

The retention of specific items of the inherited Latin vocabulary only in a
given language or group of languages should not be taken to mean that the
language has a conservative lexicon. On this point, Bartoli (1925) argued
that the peripheral or lateral areas of the Roman Empire (the Iberian
Peninsula to the west, Dacia to the east), as well as isolated areas (such as
Sardinia and the Alpine regions), often retained lexical items that were
replaced by innovations arising in and spreading from the linguistic centre
of the Empire (Italy, Gaul). Linguistic areas deemed lexically conservative
also display numerous instances of lexical innovation in the form of
neologisms, be they borrowings or internal creations, and areas noted for
lexical innovations also retain words that have not survived elsewhere