111. From Latin to Romance

1. Introduction

2. General overview

3. Composition

4. Derivation

5. Conversion

6. Minor processes

7. References

Abstract

This article provides a succinct overview of the evolution of central aspects of word-formation from Latin to Romance, in particular Romanian, Italian, French, Catalan, Spanish, and Portuguese.

1. Introduction

This article deals with the principal tendencies in the evolution of word-formation – be it losses, surviving features, phenomena of restructuring, or the emergence of new structures – which took place during the transition from Latin to Romance. As the common ancestor of the Romance languages is not classical Latin as it is known from a great variety of written testimonies, but its spoken counterpart (Lausberg 1976: 1: 97-99; cf. Buchi 2010), or rather its counterpart pertaining to "communicative immediateness" (Koch and Oesterreicher 2008: 2575), called *Proto-Romance* (or sometimes *Vulgar Latin*), the starting point of our account

should ideally be Proto-Romance word-formation as it can mainly be reconstructed from the Romance languages. Indeed, the results of this reconstruction converge partly with what is known about word-formation in classical Latin, but they also assign some originality to the common ancestor of the Romance languages within global Latin. For instance, whereas there was a great deal of allomorphy for the Latin prefix *dis-*, its Proto-Romance correlate */dɪs-/ does not seem to have had any of it (Buchi 2009: 152). But apart from the noteworthy exception of Hall's *Proto-Romance Morphology* (Hall 1983), work in the field of Proto-Romance word-formation – as opposed to classical Latin word-formation, which has received a great deal of attention, as well as philology-inspired "Vulgar Latin" word-formation (Cooper 1895; Olcott 1898) – is scarce (see however Heidemeier 2014 on */-'ani-a/, */-'aki-/ ~ */-'iki-/ ~ */-'uki-/, */-'agin-/ ~ */'igin/ ~ */-'ugin-/, and */-kl-/). For this reason, we adopt here a double, classical Latin *and* Proto-Romance, starting point, represented in the dual form *dis-* ~ */dɪs-/; a scientifically more convincing approach would be to go back precisely to the common ancestor of the Romance languages, but such an ambitious enterprise is still at least a generation away.

(Classical) Latin word-formation is fairly well covered by a range of trustworthy standard works (Leumann 1963; Kircher-Durand 2002; Weiss 2011: 266-324); the same holds for comparative Romance word-formation (Meyer-Lübke 1895; Anderson and Rochet 1979; Lüdtke 1996; 2007; Bauer 2011). Some individual Romance languages dispose as well of comprehensive reference works, be they of synchronic (Pascu 1916 on Romanian, Grossmann and Rainer 2004 on Italian, Siller-Runggaldier 1989 on Ladin, Jochems 1959 on Romansh, Adams 1913 on Occitan, Rohlfs 1931 on Gascon, López del Castillo 2002 and Bruguera 2006 on Catalan, Rainer 1993 and Bosque and Demonte 1999 on Spanish, Sandmann 1986 on Portuguese) or diachronic essence (Rohlfs 1954 and Tekavčić 1967 on Italian, DRG Registerband 1998: 82-93 on Romansh, Nyrop 1908 and Rainer 2004 on French, Ronjat 1937 on Occitan, Badia i Margarit 1994 on Catalan, Pharies 2002 on Spanish, Williams 1962 and Viaro 2014 on Portuguese). We will consider this set of titles, as well as Hall (1983) for Proto-Romance, as our default bibliography: they will not be cited below under the different headings. In addition, this handbook provides detailed articles on synchronic and diachronic aspects of word-formation in most of the Romance languages.

2. General overview

Rainer (2002; 2008) offers a synthetic overview of convergence and divergence in the word-formation of the Romance languages. What differentiates word-formation of the various Romance languages is often semantics, suffixes of a common origin which present different meanings (see Rainer 2005a for some theoretical thoughts on semantic change in word-formation). Moreover, phonetic evolution gave way to much more allomorphy in (at least some of) the Romance languages than in the proto-language. Many suffixes were borrowed from (classical, medieval, and modern) Latin and from other Romance languages. This massive borrowing gave way to something one could call morphological Europeanization (Schmitt 2000), a phenomenon which exceeds Romance.

One of the most important differences between Latin and Romance word-formation lies in the development, during the 20th century, of a wide range of "affixoids". However, this and other modern phenomena like re-Latinization tendencies will not be treated in this article, which focuses on the transition from Proto-Romance to early states of Romance languages.

3. Composition

The role of composition in Latin and Romance word-formation (cf. Giurescu 1975; Lindner 1996; Moussy 2005) is relatively marginal. Romance languages have conserved some Latin compounds, but they have mainly developed this mode of formation on their own. The Latin modifier-head order is conserved in the rare N+N Latin compounds that have been maintained: *aquaeductus* ~ */akue'dʊkt-u/ ~ */akui'dʊktu/ 'aqueduct' > It. *acquidotto*, OFr. *avidotz*, Sp. *aguaducho*, but the opposite order prevailed in later formations: Lat. *comes stabuli* ~ */komes'stabol-i/ 'earl of the stable' > It. *conestabile,* Fr. *connétable*, Sp. *condestable*, Port. *condestavel* and the semantic relationship between the two elements is marked, in modern formations, by a preposition: It. *infortunio sul lavoro* 'work accident', Fr. *accident de travail*, Sp. *accidente de trabajo*, Port. *acidente de trabalho*. For the noun-adjective compounds, the Latin order adjective + noun survived in ancient formations: *mediu die ~ media die ~* */'mɛdi-u 'di-e/ ~ */'mɛdi-a 'di-e/ 'midday' > Rom. *miazăzi*, It. *mezzodì*, Fr. *midi*, Sp. *mediodía*, Port. *meiodia*. Later on, the reverse order prevailed: It. *cassaforte* 'safe; lit. box strong', Fr. *coffre-fort*, Sp. *caja fuerte*, Port. *caixa-forte*. Another type of composition

of which first examples already appear in Latin is that of compounds formed by V+N, in which the verb appears as a stem form. A lot has been written about this type of formation (for the history of the debate cf. Villoing 1999), which has been treated either as an innovation coming from Proto-Romance or as following a Latin model (Bork 1990). The oldest attestations are nicknames that have corresponding forms in the Romance languages, such as the following type, existing in Italian, Romansh, French, Occitan and Catalan: *Bevilacqua*, *Bebelagua*, *Boileau*, *Boilesve*, *Beulaigue* (Badia i Margarit 1991: 54-65; 84-85; 103-104; 131-132). However, it is as names for professions or functions (It. *porta-bandiera* 'standard bearer', Fr. *porte-drapeau* [> Rom. *portdrapel*], Sp. *portaestandarte*, Port. *porta-bandeira*) and, in the modern age, especially as names for instruments or machines that this type has given rise to many new terms, numerous loanwords being formed on the same mode of formation: Rom. *portavion* 'aircraft carrier', It. *porta-aerei*, Fr. *porte-avions*, Sp. *portaviones*, Port. *porta-aviões*; It. *cavatappi* 'corkscrew', Fr. *tire-bouchon* [> Rom. *tirbuşon*], Sp. *sacacorchos*, Port. *saca-rolhas*. For the compounds of the same type as Sp. *bocacalle* 'entrance into a street; lit. mouth street', cf. Dardel (1999), for the type Lat. *aurifer* 'gold-bearing', cf. Rainer (2003).

4. Derivation

4.1. Nominal derivation

4.1.1. Denominal nouns

Latin had in place a range of several types of patterns for the production of abstract nouns derived from personal names. Examples of such formations can be found in Romance languages, but the models, with some exceptions, have not been maintained.

In a few cases, it is the nominal base that has been lost. Nominal derivatives in *-tās, -tātis* ~ */-'tate/*, such as Lat. *civitās* 'the citizens who constitute a town, a city' (← *civis* 'citizen') or *societās* 'society' (← *socius* 'partner'), have survived, but this type of derivation has been abandoned in favour of derivation from the adjectival base. In the same way, derivatives with the suffix *-tia* ~ */-'ɪtia/* on a nominal base, such as *amīcitia* (← *amīcus* 'friend), or *pueritia* (← *puer* 'child'), disappeared in favour of the derivation from an adjectival base (see section 4.1.2). Derivatives in *-tūra* denominating an action parallelled by

4

an agent noun in *-tor* (*quaestor* → *quaestūra*) have not survived, unlike the action nouns derived on a verbal base (cf. section 4.1.3.).

Most of the time, this type of suffixation itself disappeared. A derivative in *-tūs, -tūtis* has survived, e.g., *virtūs* 'virtue', but the model itself disappeared with the disappearance of the base (*vir* 'male human being'). The derivation in *-ium* has suffered a similar fate, even though, for example, the derivative *iūdicium* 'judgement' and its base *iūdex* 'judge' have been widely retained. A derivative formed with *-mōnium*, i.e. *testimōniun* 'testimony', maintained itself, but neither the base *testis* 'witness' nor its derivational model survived. The derivation model in *-ia* disappeared and the corresponding lexemes in the Romance languages are borrowings from Lat. *adulescentia* 'youth', *custōdia* 'act of guarding', *militia* 'profession of a soldier' etc.

The case of the suffix *-ātus* ~ */-'atu/ forming status nouns is slightly different. Roman institutions corresponding to this derivation, e.g., *consulātus* 'consulate', *principātus* 'principate' (← *princeps* 'prince'), died out with the Roman Empire. But the Church has adopted this model of derivation for its own institution and several examples have followed, more or less directly, in a few Romance languages; thus, from *clēricātus* 'state of a cleric' (← *clēricus* 'clerc'), we have It. *chiericato* and Fr. *clergé*, and from *episcopātus* 'episcopate' (← *episcopus* 'bishop'), It. *vescovado*, Fr. *évêché*, Sp. *obispado*, Port. *bispado.* During the High Middle Ages, the political administration followed the same model and built upon it Lat. *comitātus*, the denomination of the function of the *comes, -itis* 'earl', from which Fr. *comté*, Occit. *comtat*, Cat. *comdat*, Sp. Port. *condado* and, following the same model, It. *marchesato*, Sp. Port. *marquesado* for the function of a marquis. Nevertheless, the use of this type of derivation has been fairly limited though it was eventually expanded with scholarly borrowings from classical or medieval Latin: the ecclesiastical or academic denominations of the function of the dean (Lat. *decānus*) are often borrowed directly from the Medieval Latin *decānātus*, e.g., Rom. *decanat*, It. *decanato*, Fr. *décanat*, Sp. *decanato*, Port. *decanado*, rather than being loan-translated, as Fr. *doyenné* (< *doyen*), Port. *deado* (< *deão*). The formation of denominative nouns has been widely replaced by the nominalization of denominative adjectives in *-ārius* ~ */-'ariu/ and *-āticus* ~ */-'atiku/ (cf. section 4.2) or by deadjectival nouns in *-ia* ~ */-ia/ (cf. section 4.1.2.).

The reduced amount of Latin diminutive formations in the Romance languages is due to the fact that only accented suffixes, such as *-ellu, -ella* ~ */-'ɛllu/, */-'ɛlla/, -iculu, -icula* ~

5

*/-'eklu/, */-'ekla/, *-īculu, -īcula* ~ */-'iklu/, */-'ikla/, *-uculu, -ucula* ~ */-'ʊklu/, */-'ʊkla/, *-eolu, -eola* ~ */-'iɔlu/, */-'iɔla/, maintained their function as morphemes and stayed productive. During Late Latinity, suffixes such as *-īnu, -īna* ~ */-'inu/, */-'ina/ and new formations built on *-tt-* */-'attu/, */-'atta/, */-'ettu/, */-'etta/, */-'ɔttu/, */-'ɔtta/ developed a diminutive value and eventually became the main formations. For the history of diminutive formations in Romance languages, see Hakamies (1951), Hasselrot (1957), and Dębowiak (2014).

4.1.2. Deadjectival nouns

It is not surprising that an unproductive suffix such as *-monia* (e.g., *acer* → *acrimonia*) disappeared. But the *-tūdin-* derivation, though productive in Latin and forming common words derived from adjectives (cf. *magnus* 'great' → *magnitūdo, -inis* 'greatness', a far more common derivative than *magnitas* and *magnitiēs*), stopped being active in Romance languages. Its decline must have been early, considering the limited number of surviving formations of this type coming from the Latin period. Furthermore, the result of *-tūdin-* may have been conflated with that of *-ūmen*, like in the case of the derivative formed on the past participle of *consuescere* 'to accustom', *consuētūdine(m)* 'custom', which gave rise to It. *costume*, Fr. *coutume*, Sp. *costumbre*, Port. *costume*. However, the scholarly language reintroduced many Latin formations: the derivative of Lat. *longus* 'long', *longitūdo, -dinis* 'length', for example, became a geographical term (Rom. It. *longitudine*, Fr. *longitude*, Sp. *longitud*, Port. *longitude*).

The *-ia* ~ */-i-a/ suffix (e.g., Lat. *superbus* 'arrogant' → *superbia* 'arrogance') did not maintain itself in the Romance languages. Its atonicity made it unidentifiable and the link between the derived noun and the adjective has been loosened. Either the adjective did not survive, as is the case in Lat. *verecundus* 'shy' → *verecundia*, where only the latter is preserved in It. *vergogna*, Fr. *vergogne*, OSp. *vergüeña*, Sp. *vergüenza*, OPort. *vergonha*, Port. *vergonça*; or if the adjective continued to be used like Lat. *minūtus* 'small', that became Rom. *mărunt*, It. *minuto*, Fr. *menu*, Sp. *menudo*, Port. *miudo*, the derived noun, Lat. *minutia* 'small things, small details' (especially used in the plural), subsists only with specialized and concrete meanings, such as It. *minugia* 'gut', Fr. *menuise* 'small wood pieces; small lead shots; small fish', OSp. *menuza* 'division; small piece of something', OPort. *miunças* pl. 'small dimes'. As a noun describing a quality, it has been replaced by borrowings: It. *minuza*,

Fr. *minutie*, Sp. *minucia* 'meticulousness', or by internal creations: Rom. *mărunţiş*, Port. *miudeza*. Nevertheless, this type of derivation was still productive during the Proto-Romance period. From the adjective *crassus* 'thick; fat', Latin derived the nouns *crassitūdo*, *crassitās* and *crassitiēs* meaning 'thickness; consistency', of which none have survived. It is a derivative, */ˈkras-i-a/, that is at the origin of the Romance lexemes: It. *grasce* f.pl. 'subsistences, provisions', Romansh *grascha* sg. 'manure', Fr. *graisse* 'greasy substance', OCat. *graixa*, Cat. *greix* m., Port. *graxa* 'polish'. This type of formation gave more long-lasting products in the Gallo-Romance domain, where Lat. *lātus* 'wide' > */ˈlat-i-a/ 'width' has survived as Fr. *lé* m. 'width (of a piece of fabric, of wallpaper)', which is a nominalization of the Old French adjective *lé* 'wide', and *laize* f. 'width (of fabric, of paper)'. The same situation obtains in Lat. *districtus* 'tight, narrow' and */dɪˈstrɪkt-i-a/ 'narrowness' which have resulted in Fr. *détroit* m. 'a narrow inlet', nominalization of OFr. *destroit* 'narrow', and *détresse* f. 'anguish'. Here again, the semantic links between the bases and the derivatives are loosened, thus showing the obsolescence of this type of derivation.

The parallel derivations *-itia* ~ */-ˈiti-a/ and *-itiēs* ~ */-ˈiti-e/ coexisted in Latin and had the possibility to compete with each other (*dūrus* 'hard' → *dūritia* f. 'hardness' and *dūritiēs* f.). However, the second suffix was older and regained new popularity at a later stage. It had only a marginal influence on the spoken language, as shown by the fact that it is only conserved in a few dialects from Southern Italy (Rohlfs 1954: § 1153) and especially in Spanish and in Portuguese (e.g., Sp. Port. *rápido* 'fast' → *rapidez* 'speed'). It is its rival, the *-itia* suffix, that has generally been conserved. The early vitality of this suffix can be seen in the fact that it replaced *-tūdin-*, for example, in the quality noun corresponding to *altus* 'high', viz. *altitia* 'height' (which replaced *altitudo*), from which It. *altezza*, Fr. *hautesse*, Sp. Port. *alteza*. It remained productive in some Romance languages, in which we can find, as derivatives from different representatives of the Latin adjective *teneru(m)* 'tender; young', Rom. *tinereţe*, It. *tenerezza*, Fr. *tendresse*, Sp. *terneza,* while the derivatives *teneritās* and *teneritūdo*, attested in Latin, have left no trace. In this case, the learnèd language also reintroduced a form of the suffix closer to the original, but almost exclusively limited to borrowings (e.g., Rom. *justiţie*, It. *giustizia*, Fr. *justice*, Sp. *justicia*, Port. *justiça*, borrowed from Lat. *justitia* 'justice, compliance with the law'). These formations can coexist with the derivatives formed from the other suffix, but with the meaning 'correctness' (e.g., Rom. *justeţe*, It. *giustezza*, Fr. *justesse*, Port. *justeza*). The scholarly influence must have come very early, since the phonologically regular form is rarely attested in French (e.g., *riche* → OFr.

richoise 'wealth'), while the productive forms are innovations, for example OFr. *-ece*/Fr. *-esse*, as well as the suffix *-ise* (e.g., *sot* 'stupid' → *sottise*, *traître* 'treacherous' → *traîtrise*), which has been adopted by Italian in borrowings (e.g., It. *franchigia* < Fr. *franchise* 'franchise'; OIt. *cuvidigia*, It. *cupidigia* < OFr. *covoitise*, Fr. *convoitise* 'greed; envy') as well as in native formations (e.g., It. *altero* 'haughty' → *alterigia* 'arrogance').

The most productive derivation in Latin was the one using the suffix *-tās*, *-tātis* ~ */-'tat-e/*, and its productivity increased even more during Late Latinity. A good number of Latin formations have been conserved, such as *bonus* 'good' → *bonitās* 'goodness', which has been continued by Rom. *bunătate*, It. *bontà*, Fr. *bonté*, Sp. *bondad*. This is also the case of later derivatives like */amiki'tat-e/*, reconstructed from the cognates OFr. *amisté*, OOccit. *amistat*, Cat. *amistat*, Sp. *amistad*, and Port. *amizad* 'friendship'. This derivation kept being productive, as is attested by parallel formations derived from the equivalent of Lat. *lēgālis* 'legal', such as Fr. *loyauté*, It. *lealtà*, Cat. *lleyaltat*, Sp. *lealtad*, Port. *lealdade* 'loyalty', which have been formed on the model of Medieval Latin *legalitas*. A confirmation of this productivity can also be seen in derivatives coined within the different Romance languages, like the ones derived from the descendants of Lat. *misellus* (e.g., Rom. *mişel* 'poor' → *mişelătate* 'misery'), Lat. *rēgālis* (e.g., Fr. *royal* 'royal' → *royauté* 'royalty'), or Lat. *curtus* (e.g., Romansh *cuort* 'court' → *cuortadad*) etc. However, the inherited model has been remodelled by the introduction of Latinisms in the scholarly language. These have introduced variations of the suffix: Rom. *propriu* 'own' and *proprietate* 'property', It. *proprio* and *proprietà*, Fr. *propre* and *propriété*, Sp. *propio* and *propiedad,* or It. *caro* 'expensive' and *carità* 'charity', Fr. *cher* and *charité*, Sp. *caro* and *caridad*, Port. *caro* and *caridade*. These variants became autonomous and the only ones to stay productive: It. *ovvio* 'obvious' → *ovvietà*, *goloso* 'gluttonous' → *golosità*, Fr. *net* 'clean' → *netteté*, *frivole* 'frivolous' → *frivolité*, Sp. *solo* 'alone' → *soledad*, *bárbaro* 'barbaric' → *barbaridad*.

The Greek suffix *-ία* was first rendered as *-ia* ~ */-i-a/* in borrowings, Greek ἐκκλησία becoming Lat. *ecclesia*, with the accent placed on the last syllable of the stem, as in its Romance representatives It. *chiesa*, Fr. *église*, Sp. *iglesia*, Port. *igreja* 'church'. But the Greek accentuation */-'i-a/* imposed itself in the scholarly language, and the suffix became productive in Latin, to the point of being conserved in Romance languages, as can be seen in the parallelism between It. *cortese* 'courteous' → *cortesia*, Fr. *courtois* → *courtoisie*, Sp. *cortés* → *cortesía*, Port. *cortês* → *cortesia*. But this is not the only environment in which the suffix has been productive: it was also, very early, combined with nouns, as can be seen in

formations such as Late Lat. *abbas* 'abbot' → *abbatia* 'abbey', continued in It. *badia*, Fr. *abbaye*, Sp. *abadía,* Port. *abadia.* This type of derivation became common in Romance for the formation of lexemes designating a quality or a function: It. *signoria* 'lordship', Fr. *seigneurie*, Sp. *senhoría*, Port. *senhoria*, which constitute derivatives from the descendants of Lat. *seniore(m)*, or It. *borghesia*, Fr. *bourgeoisie*, Sp. *burguesía*, Port. *burguesia* (see 4.2 for the base). This suffixation has particularly been used in combination with nouns ending in *-ārius*; thus, on the Late Latin noun *caballārius* 'stable boy', that became the name for a warrior riding a horse, the name corresponding to his function was formed: It. *cavallaria*, 'chivalry', Fr. *chevalerie*, Sp. *caballería*, Port. *cavalaria.* This combination of suffixes has gained autonomy ending up as a complex suffix *-aría*/*-ería* /*-erie*, that is used to form nouns which designate places where a certain activity is carried out: from the descendant of Lat. *lacte(m)* 'milk', for example, are derived Rom. *lăptărie* 'place where dairy is sold', It. *latteria*, Fr. *laiterie*, Sp. *lechería*, Port. *leitaria*.

At a late stage, Latin developed, for the suffix Lat. *-or, -ōris* ~ */-'or-e/*, a formation on an adjectival base, while before the base had solely been verbal. In parallel with Lat. *calere* 'to be warm' → *calor* 'warmth', appeared, since the Classical period, *calidus* 'warm' → *caldor* 'warmth'. This model prevailed in Romance, where there are still formations dating from Late Latinity, such as *albus* 'white' → *albor* 'whiteness' > Rom. *alboare* f. 'weak light', It. *albore* m. 'whiteness; dawn', OFr. *abor* f. 'dawn', Sp. *albor*. On the model of these formations words designating qualities have been created, like It. *biancore* m. 'whiteness', Fr. *blancheur* f., Sp. *blancor* m.; these formations are most frequent in the Gallo-Romance territory.

4.1.3. Deverbal nouns

A c t i o n   n o u n s . – Latin possessed several possibilities for the derivation of action nouns from verbal bases, and these would meet different fates. Romance formations follow from these possibilities; however, the system has been remodelled, following changes in the morphology of the verb.

The Latin suffix *-tiō, -tiōnis* ~ */-'tione/*, attached to a verb stem, was the most productive pattern for abstract nouns and has maintained itself in Romance, but the range of derivations has become limited (cf. Burdy 2013). Formations based on a stem without a thematic vowel are inherited: *cantiōne(m)* > It. *canzone* 'song', Fr. *chanson*, Sp. *canzón*.

Only the formation based on a stem with a thematic vowel has remained productive, but its regularity has been restricted. While, for example, in Old Occitan, the suffix's form is dependent on the conjugation class (e.g., *donar* 'to give' → *donazon*, *batre* 'to beat' → *batezon*, *garir* 'to heal' → *garizon*), in Italian the suffix allomorphs are reduced to two, *-agione* and *-igione*, and in French only the terms formed with *-aison* persisted, except for a few exceptions. After the 16th century, almost only the scholarly forms, like It. *-zione*, Fr. *-tion*, Sp. *-ción*, are productive.

Of the two related suffixes Lat. *-men*, *-minis* and *-mentum*, *-menti* ~ */-'mɛnt-u/, which could generate doublets such as *medicāre* 'to heal' → *medicāmen* and *medicāmentum* 'medication', only the latter, which was preferred in oral language, has been maintained in Romance. Since the Latin era, it is seen to compete with other formations, especially with the derivatives coined with *-tiō, -tiōnis*. For example, to the older derivatives from *fricāre* 'to rub', viz. *fricātus* m., *fricātio* f. and *fricātūra* f., *fricāmentum* n. was added in a later period. The high productivity of this type of derivation in Romance, which has not been discontinued in the contemporary period, can be inferred from the fact that, for example, as an action noun derived from Latin *iūrāre* 'to swear, make an oath', *iūrātio* has no equivalent in Romance, while Lat. *iūrāmentum* does have them: Rom. *juramînt*, It. *giuramento*, Fr. *jurement*, Sp. *juramento*. The suffix is added to a stem with a thematic vowel, which closely corresponds to the conjugation class of the verb. Thus, for the three conjugation classes of Proto-Romance *cominitiāre* 'to begin', *accrēscere* 'to increase' and *consentīre* 'to agree', Old Occitan has *comensamen*, *acreisemen*, *consentimen*, while Italian reduces the thematic vowels to two (cf. *cominciamento* vs. *accrescimento*, *consentimento*), and French generalises the first conjugation (cf. *commencement*, *accroissement*, *consentement*). The concrete metonymic senses of abstract nouns, already known to Latin (e.g., *vestīre* 'to dress' → *vestīmentum* 'clothes'), continue in Romance: It. *armamento*, Fr. *armement*, Sp. *armament* can either refer to the action of arming, or to the concrete means involved.

The derivation in *-tūra* ~ */-'tur-a/, also productive in Latin, even if later and on a more reduced scale, survived in the Romance languages. In this case as well, the lexemes without a thematic vowel are residual (e.g., *consuere* 'to sew' → */ko-su-'tur-a/ [cf. *sūtūra* 'sewing'] > It. Sp. Port. *costura*, Fr. *couture*), in opposition to the formations with a thematic vowel, which have become productive: Rom. *țesătură* 'weaving', It. *tessitura*, Fr. *tiss(e)ure*, Sp. *tejedura*. However, as is the case in Latin, this derivative pattern has developed, in parallel to the original sense, metonymic senses, notably the one designating the result of the

action. It. *lavatura* and Sp. Port. *lavadura*, for example, present both senses, 'act of washing' and 'water used to wash', while French *lavure* only conserved the second sense, as is also the case for the inherited lexeme Rom. *lătură*. Where there was competition with another derivational type it is, most of the time, the concrete meaning that has prevailed: It. *cancellatura* 'erasure' vs. *cancellamento, cancellazione* 'cancellation', Fr. *raclure* 'scrapings' vs. *raclement* 'act of scraping off'. Since the Latin era, derivatives of this type maintain a closer relationship with the nouns of the same lexical family than with the verb. Thus, Latin *armātūra* is not the action noun of the verb *armāre* 'to arm', but is linked to *arma* 'weapons', with the collective meaning 'weaponry', which has been maintained in Romance (Rom. *armătură*, It. *armatura*, Fr. *armure*, Sp. *armadura* etc.). From the concrete meaning of the suffix a new function has developed, that of forming denominal collective nouns, such as It. *dentatura* 'teeth', Fr. *denture*, Sp. Port. *dentadura*.

Though the productivity of the Latin suffix *-or, -ōris* ~ */-'or-e/* had already faded during Latinity, it has nevertheless survived in Romance, especially in deverbal action nouns. The gender of its derivatives, which was masculine in Latin, tended to align itself to the feminine gender of the other action nouns, notably in Romanian, in the dialects of Northern Italy, in Romansh and in Gallo-Romance. But the Romance derivatives are either exceptional, like It. *bollire* 'to boil' → *bollore* 'boiling', *sentire* 'to hear' → *sentore* 'knowledge', or perceived as old or outdated, like OFr. *trembler* 'to tremble' → *tremblor* 'fear' or Fr. *sentir* 'to smell' → *senteur* 'smell'. This can be explained by the fact that the deadjectival formations that have appeared since Latin times have outnumbered the action nouns.

The *-ntia* formations, known at any time in Latin, experienced a great development in the post-classical oral language and have continued in Romance. Taking its origin in the present participle, these derivatives are constructed with *-antia* ~ */-'anti-a/* for verbs with an *-āre* ending and with *-entia* ~ */-'enti-a/* for the other verbs. Both of these types of derivatives have survived, but Romanian has not conserved the first suffix, while French has generalized it: It. *speranza* 'hope', Fr. *espérance*, Sp. *esperanza*; Rom. *credinţă*, It. *credenza*, Fr. *créance/croyance*, Sp. *creencia*.

A particular case concerns a derivative pattern of one Romance language which has spread to the others. The Latin suffix *-āticu* ~ */-'atik-u/* was used to form, on a nominal base, adjectives and neutral nouns to denote a relationship. It became *-age* in French, where its function changed: in the modern era it is used only to form deverbal action nouns. A noun

such as OFr. *passage* m. 'place where sb. passes' can be referred to *pas* m. 'place where sb. passes' as well as to the verb *passer* 'to pass by', in which case it takes the meaning of 'action of passing'. In this sense Fr. *passage* has been borrowed as It. *passagio* and Sp. *pasaje*. In fact, many cases in other Romance languages are borrowings from French: Rom. *dopaj* 'doping', It. *dopaggio*, Fr. *dopage*, Port. *dopagem* f. But formations can be independent of a French model as well: It. *pestaggio* m. 'beating' (← *pestare* 'to beat'), Sp. *almacenaje* 'storage' (← *almacenar* 'to store').

Agent nouns. – Romance drastically reduced the range of processes available in Latin for forming agent nouns. It only kept the suffix *-tor*, *-tōris* ~ */-'tor-e/, which was the most productive one in Latin and has survived in all the Romance languages. In Latin, the suffix was added to the stem of the past participle. Stems fell into two classes, those without a thematical vowel (*docēre → doctor*, *vincere → victor*) and those which had one (*amāre → amātor*, *dēbēre → dēbitor*, *servīre → servītor*). As a noun of the first type we may mention *cantor* (← *canere* 'to sing', past participle: *cant-*), which was specialised in the ecclesiastical sense 'cantor' and only survived in Italian *cantore* and French *chantre*, while *cantātor* 'singer' (← *cantāre* 'to sing', past participle: *cantat-*) has descendants in all Romance languages. In some cases where the athematic stem has survived we observe a change in its form, as in Cat. Sp. Port. *pintor* 'painter', OFr. *peinteur,* whose stem has been remodelled partially on the present tense of *pinguere* 'to paint', in opposition to It. *pittore*, which continues */pɪk'tor-e/. Most of the time such formations have been abandoned in favour of formations conforming to the regular, thematic model: *victor*, for example, has been replaced by Rom. *învingător*, It. *vincitore*, Fr. *vainqueur,* Sp. *vencedor*.

Romance languages also present differences with respect to our suffix, where Romansh and Gallo-Romance, which conserve residues of the Latin nominal declension, maintain a double form of the suffix. Occitan has conserved the double forms in all three conjugations, as *-aire/-ador*, *-eire/-edor* and *-ire/-idor*; while in Old French the forms have been aligned on the first pair as *-ere/-(ë)eur*. After the loss of the syntactical value which they had in the old stages of the languages, the double forms nevertheless survived, with different varieties of a language choosing one or the other: thus, in Romansh, Vallader keeps the nominative forms (e.g., *chatscháder* 'hunter', *müráder* 'mason'), while Sursilvan preserves the oblique forms (e.g., *catschadur*, *miradur*). In Occitan, the forms of the nominative case *aire* and *-èire* have survived the best; however, in varieties that conserve both types, a distinction, unknown to Latin, has been established between the occasional agent and the

professional agent (e.g., *pescaire* 'person fishing' vs. *pescadou* 'fisherman'; cf. Ronjat 1980: § 697β). In French, on the contrary, nominative forms are maintained only in a few examples that no longer constitute a typical derivative pattern (e.g., *chantre, pâtre, peintre*); otherwise, only the oblique form *-eur* has remained productive. French therefore joins the languages which keep only the oblique form, such as It. *-tore*, Cat. Sp. Port. *-dor*, joined to the present stem. Romanian *-tor* is not the direct outcome of Latin *-tor*, but goes back to the oblique form *-tore(m)* via *-toare*.

Borrowings from Latin reintroduced formations that do not correspond to the patterns just described. The suffix can be either shorter (e.g., It. *-ore* and Sp. *-or* vs. *-tore* and *-dor*) or longer (e.g., Fr. *-ateur* vs. *-eur*). Occasionally, we also find formal doublets, with a different use or meaning: Fr. *liseur* vs. *lecteur* 'reader', It. *leggitore* vs. *lettore,* Sp. *leedor* vs. *lector.* The borrowed forms can be related to other derivatives, for example Fr. *lecture* 'reading', It. *lettura,* Sp. *lectura.* The importance of these relationships is revealed by the diffusion of agent nouns parallel to action nouns without a corresponding verb: Fr. *aviateur/aviation*, It. *aviatore/aviazione*, Sp. *aviador/aviación*.

In Latin, the feminine gender of the agent was expressed by the suffix *-trīx*, *-trīcis,* where *-tr-* is the reduced degree of the masculine form. Some of these formations survived, but the pattern itself only very rarely remained productive, for example in Old Occitan (cf. Adams 1913: 51−54), where *-airitz* is the feminine equivalent of *-ador* (e.g., *balairitz* 'female dancer') and *-eiritz* the feminine of *-edor* and *-idor* (e.g., *defendeiritz* 'female defender', *menteiritz* 'female liar'). In Old French and Frioulan the suffix *-trix* was blended with the synonymous suffix *-issa* (e.g., OFr. *ameresse*, Frioul. *madrese* 'female lover'). But most of the new patterns were derived from the masculine form, the descendant of */-'tor-e/*, by adding a mark designating the feminine: the result can be seen in dialectal Italian *-tora* or in Sp. *-dora.* In Romanian, the feminine form originates from *-toria*, which resulted in *-toare.* Still another solution was to borrow the form of another suffix, as in Modern French, where the feminine corresponding to *-eur*, that is *-euse,* was originally the feminine form of the adjectival suffix *-eux.* Finally, the return to the Latin form *-trīx*, in parallel to the masculine *-tor*, is closing the cycle: It. *editrice* 'female editor', Fr. *éditrice,* vs. Rom. *editoare*, Sp. *editora.*

The Latin suffix *-ō*, *-ōnis* ~ */-'o/*, */-'on-e/* was used in the formation of numerous agent nouns, such as *caupō* 'innkeeper', *laniō* 'butcher', *lēnō* 'pander', which were typical of the popular language: some of them have survived, like Lat. *latrō, -ōnis* ~ */'latr-o/*,

*/la'tr-on-e/ 'bandit' > It. *ladro*, Fr. *larron*, Cat. *ladró*, Sp. *ladrón*, Port. *ladrão*. Where the suffix has survived as a means for forming personal nouns, it takes on a pejorative or augmentative connotation.

Instrument and place nouns. – There are different types of deverbal nouns to designate instruments in Latin. The ones that remained productive during the whole Latin era contained the following suffixes: *-culum* (e.g., *gubernāre → gubernāculum*, *vehere → vehiculum*), *-bulum/-bula* (e.g., *stāre → stabulum*, *mandere → mandibula*) and *-tōrium/-sōrium* (e.g., *dormīre → dormītōrium*). The least productive of these three suffixes was *-bulum/-bula*; it has become completely unproductive in Romance. The suffix *-culum* disappeared in Romanian and has only survived in the Western part of Romance by generalising *-āculum*, which contains the thematic vowel of the first conjugation. From the frequency of retention of certain lexical types it can be assumed that their formation can be traced back to Proto-Romance: It. *battaglio* 'tongue of a bell', OFr. *batail*, Sp. *badajo*, Port. *badalo* justify the assumption of an etymon */bat'(t)a-kul-u/. Formations specific to the Romance languages are either rare (e.g., It. *sputare* 'to spit' → *sputacchio* 'spittle', OSp. *legar* 'to link' → *legajo* 'wad of papers') or more numerous, but nevertheless form a closed stock, like in French (e.g., *éventer* 'to fan' → *éventail*, *fermer* 'to close'→ *fermail*). It is the third type of formation, which was also the most productive in Latin, that imposed itself in all Romance languages. The nominalization of the Latin suffix *-tōrius/-sōrius, -a* ~ */-'tori-u/, */-'tori-a/ / */-'sori-u/, */-'sori-a/, which forms adjectives corresponding to the agent nouns formed on *-tōr/-sōr*, was used to form instrument nouns, mainly neutral, more rarely, feminine ones. This type of formation has survived in Romance, both with masculine and feminine gender, with different productivity and uses: Rom. *-tor* and *-toare*, It. *-toio* and *-toia*, Fr. *-oir* and *-oire*, Sp. *-dero* and *-dera*.

As Latin neatly separated agent nouns and instrument nouns, the use of an agentive suffix in a few Romance languages to designate instruments has to be secondary. The suffixes It. *-tore*, Fr. *-eur/-euse*, Occit. *-dour*, Sp. *-dor* are used in numerous nouns referring to instruments, devices, machines, or workplaces and are identical to the results of *-tor*, *-tōris* ~ */-'tor-e/. However, this fact does not imply a tendency to use this suffix metaphorically: OFr. *ovreour* 'workshop', OOccit. Cat. Sp. *obrador* either must be representatives of */opera-'tori-u/, as in, for example, Occitan, Catalan and in some French dialects where */-'tori-u/ and */-'tor-e/ have the same result, or must be borrowings, as in Spanish (cf. Rainer 2005b; 2011).

14

4.2. Adjectival derivation

In Latin, adjectival derivation can use as bases verbs (e.g., *amāre* 'to love' → *amābilis* 'kind') or adjectives (e.g., *surdus* 'deaf' → *surdaster* 'a bit deaf'); both patterns remain in Romance. But it is predominately the denominal derivation which was and remains the most productive one in Romance languages, particularly for relational adjectives (cf. Lüdtke 1995). The suffix *-ōsu*, *-ōsa* ~ */-'os-u/, */-'os-a/ is widespread and attested early on; it has remained productive since Proto-Romance. Examples of this derivation include It. *amoroso* 'in love', Fr. *amoureux*, Cat. *amorós*, Sp. Port. *amoroso*, as well as modern formations such as Rom. *gazos* 'gaseous', It. *gassoso*, Fr. *gazeux*, Cat. *gazós*, Port. *gasoso*. The use of the three possessive suffixes *-ātu*, *-ītu*, and *-ūtu* was governed by the thematic vowel of the noun used as a base, but this distributional regularity has not prevailed. The variant *-ūtu*, *-ūta* ~ */-'ut-u/, */-'ut-a/ (e.g., It. *barbuto* 'bearded', Fr. *barbu*, Sp. Port. *barbudo*), whose use was limited in the beginning, witnessed a great development, as can be inferred from the fact that it competed with or even superseded the formations corresponding to classical Latin *barbātus* ~ */bar'bat-u/ 'bearded' (Rom. *bărbat* 'male human being', It. *barbato* 'bearded', OFr. *barbé*, Sp. Port. *barbado*).

The Latin suffix *-ēnsis* ~ */-'es-e/ was originally added to city or country names, but then also spread to topographic nouns. Hence, from Late Latin *burgus* 'fortified castle; small town' and in parallel to medieval Latin *burgensis*, Romance formations like OIt. *borgese*, Fr. *bourgeois*, Sp. *burgés, burzés* (probably remade on the noun are It. *borghese*, Sp. *burgués*, Port. *burguês*); It. *forese* 'peasant', OOccit. *fores* 'foreigner'; Fr. *villageois* 'villager'; Sp. *montañés* 'montaineer', Port. *montanhês*. As can be seen in these examples, the adjectival formations were easily turned into nouns by conversion designating the inhabitants of a place or a country, but also the names of the languages (It. *francese* 'the French language'; cf. Malkiel and Uitti 1968).

The suffix *-ānus* ~ */-'an-u/, in addition to its ethnic role (e.g., *Rōma* → *Rōmānus* vs. *Ostia* → *Ostiēnsis*; Rom. *român*, It. *romano*, Fr. *romain*, Sp. *romano*, OPort. *romão*, Port. *romano*) has developed new functions. Very early, the derivational bases were extended to adjectives and adverbs: the Latin adjective *certus* 'decided, determined; certain' is the base for OIt. *certano*, Fr. *certain*, Occit. *certan*, Cat. *certà*, OSp. *certan*, Port. *certão* and the adverb *super* 'above' is the base for It. *soprano* 'situated above; sovereign', Fr. *souverain*,

OOccit. *sobran*, or, based on the Latin comparative form *superior*, *superius*, OOccit. *sobeiran*, Cat. *sobirà*, Sp. *soberano*. The nominal conversion has in a few cases superseded the adjectival function. Medieval Latin *cappellanus presbyter* m. 'priest attached to a chapel', whose adjective is derived from *cappella* f. 'chapel', is continued by the masculine nouns It. *cappellano* 'chaplain', Fr. *chapelain*, Cat. *capellà*, Sp. *capellán*, Port. *capelão.* The adjective derived from Latin *fons*, *-tis* 'spring', viz. Lat. *(aqua) fontana* 'spring (water)', has survived as a noun: Rom. *fântâna* f., It. *fontana*, Fr. *fontaine*, Cat. *fontana.*

The suffix *-ālis ~ */-'al-e/*, which was very productive in Latin, has survived in Romance, except in Romanian. Either the Latin derivations have been continued (e.g., Lat. *aequalis* 'equal' > It. *uguale*, OFr. *ivel*, Sp. Port. *igual*), or the learnèd language has reintroduced them. From a synchronic point of view, these two strands are difficult to distinguish. Without knowledge of the history of these words it is difficult to establish that It. *mortale* 'mortal', Fr. *mortel*, Sp. Port. *mortal* or It. *finale*, Fr. Sp. Port. *final* are descendants of Lat. *mortālis* 'mortal' and Lat. *finālis* 'final'. This suffix has also been chosen as a substitute when Latin derivatives were not ideal for adaptation, as with Lat. *colossēus*, *colossiæus*, *colossicus* (← *colossus* 'gigantic statue') turned into It. *colossale*, Fr. *colossal*, Sp. Port. *colosal* and even Rom. *colosal*. But there is no need for a Latin model in order to get parallel Romance coinages (e.g., It. *derivazionale* 'derivational', Fr. *dérivationnel*, Sp. Port. *derivacional*). Since Latin times, this type of adjective has been nominalized by ellipsis, as in Lat. *dies nātālis* that became *nātālis* m. 'day of birth', also the name of Christmas (e.g., It. *natale*, OFr. *nael*, Occit. Cat. *Nadal).* Most of the time nominalization yielded a neuter noun: Lat. *digitāle* n. 'thimble', for example, is continued by It. *ditale*, OFr. *deel*, Sp. Port. *dedal* and maybe Rom. *degetar* n., if this is not an internal derivation. This type of elliptic formation has given rise to numerous denominations of objects and places such as the derivatives from the descendants of Lat. *porta* 'door' (e.g., It. *portale* 'portal', OFr. OOccit. Cat. Sp. Port. *portal*) or the ones from the descendants of Lat. *mercātus* 'trade; market' (e.g., OIt. *mercatale* 'market place', OOccit. *mercadal*, Gasc. *mercadáu*, Cat. OSp. *Mercadal).*

Latin had a dissimilated variant of the suffix just discussed, *-āris ~ */-'ar-e/*, used when the base already contained a liquid consonant. Unlike for the previous suffix, its adjectival function has rarely been conserved (e.g., Lat. *albāris* 'white' > Sp. *albar* 'white', Port. *alvar* 'whitish'). Most of the time, this suffix appears in nouns formed by ellipsis (e.g., Lat. *collāre* 'neckband' > It. *collare*, OFr. *coler*, Sp. *collar,* Port. *collar*). From Gallo-Romance, we can adduce OFr. *auber* m. 'sapwood', Occit. *aubar* 'white willow'. Sp. *dedo*

pulgar and Port. *dedo polegar*, literally 'finger of the thumb', maintain the adjectival use of Lat. *pollicāris*, which most of the time appears in nominalized form, though (e.g., ORom. *pălicar* 'thumb', OOccit. *polgar*, Gasc. *pougà*, Sp. *pulgar*, Port. *polegar*). The primary adjectival function of the suffix declined but, in exchange, in the south-western area of the Romance domain, it gained new vitality in its secondary function as a nominalizer, especially for nouns designating places related to plants: OOccit. *milh* 'millet' → *milhar* 'millet field', Gasc. *geneste* 'broom' → *genestà* 'broom field', Cat. *canem* 'hemp' → *canemar* 'hemp field', Sp. *cañamo* → *cañamar*, OCat. *poma* 'apple' → *pomar* 'apple orchard', Sp. *pomo* 'seed fruit' → *pomar* 'orchard', Sp. *paloma* 'pigeon' → *palomar* 'dovecote'.

There are only a few derivatives with the variant *-īlis* ~ */-'il-e/* that have survived in Romance, such as Lat. *gentīlis* 'hereditary' that has possibly been continued by It. *gentile* 'gentle', Fr. Occit. Sp. *gentil*, despite the difference in meaning. Also quite rare are Late Latin formations like the adjective **axīlis*, which in nominalized form has regionally replaced Lat. *axis* 'axle' (cf. Romansh *ischel*, It. *assile*, Fr. *essieu*), or the derivative *focīlis* from *focus* 'fire', whence It. *fucile* 'flintstone; gunflint', OFr. *fuisil*, Port. *fuzil.* Its preferential use in Latin with bases designating human beings and animals has influenced its Romance coinages. After the model of *cīvīlis* (← *cīvis* 'citizen'), *juvenīlis* (← *juvenis* 'young'), *servīlis* (← *servus* 'slave') have been created adjectives like It. *signorile* 'seigniorial', Occit. *senhoril*, Sp. *señoril*, which add to loanwords such as It. *infantile* 'infantile', Fr. *infantile*, Sp. Port. *infantil*; It. *senile* 'senile', Fr. *sénile*, Sp. Port. *senil*. Latin denominations of shelters for animals or storage places for agricultural products have survived particularly well. These neutral nominalizations, after an ellipsis from Lat. *stabulum* 'barn', have been preserved as masculines: Lat. *cubīle* 'den, shelter for animals' > It. *covile* 'den', Sp. *cubil*, Port. *covil*; Lat. *fēnīle* 'hay barn' > It. *fienile*, Fr. Occit. *fenil*, Sp. *henil*. They have produced Romance formations in the same semantic fields: Lat. *canis* 'dog' → **canīle* 'kennel', from which It. *canile*, Fr. *chenil*, from Lat. *bōs, bovis* 'ox' → **bovīle*, from which It. *bovile* 'cowshed', Sp. *boil*, or specific to one language, Sp. *toro* 'bull' → *toril* 'grounds where the bull is locked up before the corrida', Fr. *four* 'bread oven' → *fournil* 'room where the oven is found', OOccit. *borda* 'rustic house' → *bordil* 'farmhouse'. From there, the suffix has extended its area of use: Sp. *carril* 'rut', Fr. *chartil* 'place where carts are stored'*,* OOccit. *mercadil* 'market place'.

Since the Latin period, the products of the suffix *-ārius*, *-a*, *-um* ~ */-'ari-u/*, */-'ari-a/* have been increasingly nominalized, to the point where the adjectival formations appear

regularly only with specific uses, for example in the domain of law or agriculture. The adjective *jugārius* 'related to the yoke', for example, is continued only by Rom. (*bou*) *jugar* 'coupling (ox)', *sōricārius* 'related to mice' by Béarnese *souriguè*. *Leviarius* 'light' has survived only in Fr. *léger* 'light', Occit. *leugier* and Cat. *lleuger* (which have been borrowed subsequently by other Romance languages). Other survivers are the result of the simplification of oppositions such as the one between Lat. *prīmus* 'first' and *prīmārius* 'principal, linked to the first', in favour of the latter, whence Fr. *premier* 'first', Cat. *primer*, Sp. *primero*, Port. *primeiro*, or between *tertius* 'third' and *tertiārius* 'containing a third', continued by Cat. *tercer* 'third', Sp. *tercero*, Port. *terceiro*. Although the adjectival function has been maintained (cf. also Fr. *ratier* '(dog, cat) that hunts mice, rats', Cat. *rater*, Sp. *ratero*, Port. *rateiro*, as well as Cat. *ratoner*), it was essentially the nominalizations that remained productive in the Romance languages, designating professions, places, instruments or fruit trees. The vitality of this type of formation can be seen in the fact that it appears in both popular and learnèd form (cf. Rom. *-ar*, *-ariu*, It. *-aio*, *-ario*, Fr. *-ier*, *-aire*, Sp. *-ero*, *-ario*, Port. *-eiro*, *-ario*), and that borrowing has introduced variants that have become autonomous, like *-iere/-iero*, in Italian, from French *-ier*. Among nouns designating professions can be found formations maintained since the Latin era, like *argentārius* m. 'silversmith' > Rom. *argintar*, It. *argentaio*, Fr. *argentier*, Cat. *argenter*, Sp. *argentero*; *ferrārius* 'smith' > Rom. *fierar*, It. *ferraio*, OFr. *ferrier*, Sp. *herrero*, Port. *ferreiro*. Most of these lexemes, however, are native formations: It. *cioccolataio* 'person who makes or sells chocolate', Fr. *chocolatier*, Sp. *chocolatero*, Port. *chocolateiro*. Neuter nominalizations in Latin designated places, out of which numerous examples have survived: Lat. *grānu* m. 'grain' → Lat. *grānārium* 'granary', continued by Rom. *grânar* n., It. *granaio* m., Fr. *grenier*, Cat. *graner*, Sp. *granero*. Romance formations have reinforced this model: from descendants of Lat. *formīca* 'ant' were derived Rom. *furnicar* n. 'anthill', It. *formicaio*, Occit. *formiguier*, Cat. *formiguer*, Sp. *hormiguero*, Port. *formigueiro*, while it is a feminine form that gave way to OFr. *formiere*. This is because, in parallel to the neuter noun, Latin developed feminine nominalizations, whose model has also been continued in the Romance languages, especially in the West, in order to designate places: OOccit. *feuziera* f. 'area where fens grow', Galician *filgueira*, and, by metonymic change, the plant itself: Fr. *fougère* 'fen', Occit. *falguiero*, Cat. *falguera,* Astur. *folguera*. The suffix has also been used in several Western Romance languages to designate fruit trees. In this case, the feminine and the masculine forms also alternate: Romansh *pirer* m. 'pear tree', Fr. *poirier*, Occit. *perier*, Cat. *perer* vs. Occit.

perièro f., Cat. *perera*, Port. *pereira*, competing, in this case, with the suffix *-ālis* ~ */-'al-e/ in Spanish, where the noun is *peral*.

Only a few adjectival derivations on *-āticus* ~ */-'atik-u/ have survived in Romance, e.g., *silvāticus* ~ */sal'β-atik-u/ 'wild' (← *silva* 'forest'), continued by Rom. *sălbatec*, It. *salvatico*, Romansh *selvadi*, Fr. Occit. *sauvage*, Cat. *salvatge.* Most examples are old and rare, e.g., OFr. *marage* 'from the sea; situated on the sea shore' (← *mer* f. 'sea' < Lat. *mare*), *marage* 'that grows in marsh' (← *mare* f. 'pond' < ONorse *marr*), *ramage* 'bushy; that lives in the forest; wild' (← Fr. *raim* 'branch' < Lat. *ramus*). The suffix has developed into a nominalizer on the model of neuter nouns in Latin. As can be seen in the Latin example *granaticum* 'tax on granaries', the suffix served to form nouns designating royalties and charges: Medieval Latin *terraticum* n. (← Lat. *terra* 'land') > It. *terraggio* m. 'tax on lands and its products', Fr. *terrage*, Occit. Cat. *terratge*, Sp. *terrazgo*, Port. *terradego.* This type of formation has come to a second life in Romance languages through the imitation of French: Fr. *péage*, It. *pedaggio* 'toll', Cat. *peatge*, Sp. *peaje.* With bases designating persons, the suffix denotes state, condition, belonging to a group, as in Fr. *hommage*, It. *omaggio* 'acknowledgement of allegiance from a vassal to his lord', Occit. *omatge,* or, under the influence of Medieval Latin *hominaticum,* Fr. *homenage,* Occit. *omenatge*, Sp. *homenaje*. It is from this group that the collective value of the suffix has evolved (cf. Baldinger 1950: 152-174), as well as its use to form action nouns (cf. section 4.1.3; Fleischman 1977).

4.3. Verbal derivation

4.3.1. Denominal verbs

Prefixation. – The vigour of Romance denominal verbal derivation goes back to spoken Latin: "the greatest fertility is seen in the department of compound verbs, which form one of the marked characteristics of the *sermo plebeius*" (Cooper 1975: 246; see as well Moussy 2005). Involved prefixes are for instance *ad-* ~ */ad-/ 'toward', *con-* ~ */kon-/ 'with', *dē-* ~ */de-/ 'from', *dis-* ~ */dɪs-/ 'un-', *ex-* ~ */(ek)s-/ 'out of', or *in-* ~ */ɪn-/ 'in' (Anderson and Rochet 1979: 337−342). With respect to *dē-* ~ */de-/ and *dis-* ~ */dɪs-/, we are in the favorable (and uncommon) situation of being able to trace back the corresponding Romance suffixes not only to written Latin, but also to (spoken) Proto-Romance (Buchi 2009). With only three known derivatives lacking correlates from written Latin (*/de-'kad-e-/ 'to fall into an inferior state' < */'kad-e-/ 'to fall', */de-'pan-a-/ 'to unwind' < */'pan-a/ 'thread', and

*/de-'ren-a-/ 'to exhaust' < */'ren-e-/ 'loins'), Proto-Rom. */de-/ can be said to have been feebly productive. Chiefly denominative, */de-/ conveyed the meanings 'change of state' and 'deprivation', which contrasts with *dē-* in written Latin, which had a wider scope, since it also presented several other meanings. With the exception of French, where only */dıs-/ survived, Proto-Rom. */de-/ was inherited by almost all Romance languages (although it is very scarcely productive in Spanish and Portuguese), where its continuators mostly serve the purpose of creating denominal verbs presenting the sense of 'deprivation' (It. *bosco* 'forest' → *diboscare* 'to deforest').

Suffixation. − The most common mode of formation for verbs in Latin was conversion of nouns and adjectives, which also remained the most frequent pattern in the Romance languages. However, a few derivational models made significant developments in Late Latin and during the formative stage of the Romance languages. Leaving aside conversions derived from bases in *-ic-* (cf. *medicus* → *medicāre*, *jūdex, -icis* → *jūdicāre*), Latin also had a weakly productive suffix *-icāre* combining with verbal bases and adding an intensive value (*fodere* 'to dig' → *fodicāre*, *vellere* 'to tear; pull' → *vellicāre*), or with adjectival bases and adding an attenuative value (*albus* 'white' → *albicāre*, *niger* 'black' → *nigricāre*, *claudus* 'lame' → *claudicāre*). In Late Latin, this derivation spread to nominal bases: *follis* 'bellows' → *follicāre* 'to breathe like a bellows, pant'. This suffix became more productive in the formative stage of the Romance languages, attaching to new verbal bases (Lat. *fīgere* 'to fix' → *fīgicāre* ~ */fig-i'k-a-/ > It. *ficcare*, Fr. *ficher*, Occit. *ficar*, Gasc. *hicà*, Cat. Port. *ficar*) and to adjectival bases (Lat. *rasus* 'scraped; shaved' → *rasicāre* ~ */'ras-ik-a-/ 'to shave' > Sardinian *rasigare*, OFr. *racher*, Occit. Cat. Sp. Port. *rascar*). Derivatives from nominal bases which existed already in Latin have been continued (Lat. *follicāre* 'breathe like a bellows, pant' > Cat. *folgar* 'to rest', Sp. *holgar*, Port. *folgar*; for Rom. *înfuleca* 'to eat like a glutton', cf. Buchi 2008: 293−298), and a numerous progeny has been added: Lat. *caballus* 'horse' → *caballicāre* ~ */ka'βall-ik-a-/ 'to ride a horse' > It. *cavalcare*, Fr. *chevaucher*, Sp. *cabalgar*, Port. *cavalgar*; Lat. *carrus* 'cart' → *carricāre* ~ */'karr-ik-a-/ 'to carry' > It. *caricare*, Fr. *charger*, Sp. *cargar*, Port. *carregar*. The vitality of both formations is also confirmed by the following prefixations with *in-* ~ */ın-/ and *dis-* ~*/dıs-/, which are attested even in oriental Romania (cf. REW s.v. *cabăllĭcāre*, *carrĭcāre*, and *dĭscarrĭcāre*; Jactel and Buchi 2014 in DÉRom s.v. */ın-ka'βall-ik-a-/ and Hütsch and Buchi 2014 in DÉRom s.v. */dıs-ka'βall-ik-a-/). The early vitality of this derivation can be seen in several formations that are specific to certain geographic areas, such as Fr. *plonger* 'to

dive' (< *plumbicāre ~ */'plʊmb-ik-a-/ ← plumbum 'lead'), Sp. Port. salgar 'to salt' (< *salicāre ~ */'sal-ik-a-/ ← sāl 'salt'), OSp. saborgar 'to make tasty' (< *sapōricāre ~ */sa'por-ik-a-/ ← sapor 'flavour'). Nevertheless, this type of derivation did not remain productive in Romance languages.

Another suffix has been more successful. Latin borrowed the Greek suffix -ίζειν, and adapted it as -issāre, later on as -izzāre. But it is the adaptation to -idiāre that took roots in the Western Romance languages. The beginning of this process can be seen particularly well in Latin bases such as *auridiāre ~ */au'r-idi-a-/ 'to wind up, air' (← Lat. aura 'wind') > It. oreggiare, Occit. aurejar, Cat. orejar, Sp. orear, Galician ourejar, ourear (cf. Zamboni 1981). Numerous neologisms bear witness to the productivity of this suffix: Germanic werra 'war' > It. guerreggiare 'to make war', Fr. guerroyer, Sp. Port. guerrear; Germanic *bord 'id.' > It. bordeggiare 'to sail against the wind', Fr. bordeyer, Sp. bordear, Port. Bordejar; Lat. flamma 'flame' > It. fiammeggiare 'to blaze', Sp. llamear, Port. chamejar; Lat. flammula > Fr. flamboyer. This suffix was also added to adjectival bases: Lat. viridis 'green' > It. verdeggiare 'to turn green', Fr. verdoyer, Sp. verdear, Port. verdejar; Germanic *blank 'white' > It. biancheggiare 'to whiten', Fr. blanchoyer, Sp. blanquear, Port. branquejar. But it is the learnèd borrowing -izzāre which eventually took over: ecclesiastical Latin baptizāre > OIt. battizare, Fr. baptiser, Span. OPort. bautizar, competing with the popular type */bap't-idi-a-/ > It. batteggiare, battezzare, OFr. batoyer, Sp. Galician batear, Rom. boteza has survived. Many new formations have been built upon this learnèd model: Rom. automatiza 'to automatize', It. automatizzare, Fr. automatiser, Sp. Port. automatizar, etc.

4.3.2. Deadjectival verbs

The most common way of forming deadjectival verbs is conversion. Nevertheless, a suffixal model also spread during Late Latinity. Adjectives of the type brevis 'short' → breviare 'to shorten', isolated in classical Latin, became more common in Late Latin, as we can see from humilis 'humble' → humiliāre 'to humiliate', levis 'light' → alleviāre 'to make light'. Derivatives on the basis of comparatives may have furthered this evolution (prope adv. 'near' → propius 'nearer' → propiāre 'to come closer', appropiāre > 'to come closer'; amplus 'large' → amplius 'more' → ampliāre 'to increase'), as well as the alignment on the nominal derivation (angustus 'narrow' → angustāre, competing during later periods with angustiāre, from angustiae 'narrow passage; discomfort; critical situation'). As a consequence, a

deadjectival suffix -*i*- ~ */-i-/ developed which had great success in Romance (cf. Walsh 1984). A few Latin examples have been continued: *abbreviāre* 'to abbreviate' ~ */ab-'breβ-i-a-/ > Fr. *abréger*, Occit. Cat. *abreujar*; *alleviāre* 'to make lighter' ~ */al-le'β-i-a-/ > OIt. *allebiare*, Fr. *alléger*, Cat. *alleujar*, Sp. Port. *aliviar*; *angustiāre* 'to anguish' ~ */angus't-i-a-/ > It. *angosciare*, Fr. *angoisser*; *appropiāre* 'to approach' ~ */ap-'prop-i-a-/ > Rom. *apropia*, Sardinian *approbiare*, Fr. *approcher*, Cat. *apropiar-se*. The regular Latin derivation *mollis* 'soft' → *mollīre* 'to soften' suffered competition early on by *molliāre* ~ */mol'l-i-a-/, which has been continued by Rom. *muia*, Venetian *mogiar*, Fr. *mouiller*, Sp. *mojar*, Port. *molhar*. This model has also been extended to first class adjectives on a relatively large scale. The regular Latin verb *altāre* 'to raise' (← *altus* 'high') has left no trace in Romance, unlike **altiāre* ~ */al't-i-a-/, continued by It. *alzare*, Fr. *hausser*, Sp. *alzar*, Port. *alçar* and the Romanian prefixed verb *înălţa*. Antonymous Lat. *bassus* 'low' also adopted this derivation, as can be seen in **bassiāre* ~ */'bass-i-a-/ > South Italian *basciare*, Fr. *baisser*, Sp. *bajar*, Port. *baixar*. There exist approximately a hundred examples of continued derivatives of this type in Romance languages. Nevertheless, due to the unstressed character of the suffix, the model itself has not survived.

Late Latinity saw the development of factitive compounds in -*ficus*, from *facere* 'to make': *laetus* 'glad' → *laetificus* 'making glad'. After a conversion, this adjectival compound gave rise to the verb *laetificāre* 'to make glad, rejoice'. There were also parallel denominal formations: *ludus* 'game' → *ludificāre* 'to make a fool of'. After reanalysis, a direct connection of the verb to the base adjective was established. Late Latin literature gives testimony of verbs such as *dulcificāre*, *humilificāre*, *nūllificāre*, in which the -*ficus* adjectives, from which they should be derived, are missing. Thanks to the Christian literature, this derivation spread in the learnèd language. For example, corresponding to a derivative from *vīvus*, **advivificare* ~ */ad-βi'β-iɸik-a-/ 'to give life', is reflected in OIt. *abbeficare*, OFr. *aviger*, OCat. *aviugar* and OSp. *aviviguar*, while Rom. *vivifica*, It. *vivificare*, Fr. *vivifier*, Sp. Port. *vivificar* constitute modern borrowings from Lat. *vivificare* 'to vivify'. This derivational pattern became independent of Latin, to the point where medical Latin modified Lat. *lūbricāre* 'to make slippery', derived from *lūbricus* 'splippery', into *lubrificare*, which was then adapted as Rom. *lubrefia*, It. *lubrificare*, Fr. *lubrifier*, Sp. Port. *lubrificar*. Furthermore, modern languages have no need of a Latin model to create formations such as It. *plastificare* 'to plasticize', Fr. *plastifier*, Sp. Port. *plastificar*.

4.3.3. Deverbal verbs

Prefixation. – A traditional view (see, for instance, Meyer-Lübke 1895: § 595) holds that the Romance languages lost the Latin prefixes *ob-* 'against' (Lat. *obesse* 'to hinder' < *esse* 'to be', Ernoult and Meillet 1959 s.v. *ob*, *obs*) and *retro-* 'back' (Lat. *retrocedere* 'to move back' < *cedere* 'to go', Ernoult and Meillet 1959 s.v. *re-*, *red-*). However this is inaccurate, as there is no evidence whatsoever that these prefixes existed in Proto-Romance. Indeed, there are no inherited verbs in Romance (REW, FEW) containing the prefix *retro-*, and those etyma with *ob-* classically quoted are impossible to sustain: the cognates given by REW s.v. *ŏbstāre* rather call for */'ost-a-/ and */'dost-a-/, those from REW s.v. *obtūrāre/*attūrāre* unanimously call for */at'tur-a-/, and Italian *ovviare* (REW s.v. *ŏbviāre*) is not inherited, but internally created (DELI). Thus, the loss of these prefixes is strictly a matter of internal Latin diachrony (Cooper 1975: 281 typically characterizes *ob-* as archaic).

The Romance languages inherited a small number of deverbal verb-forming prefixes from Proto-Romance, amongst which *dis-* ~ */dɪs-/ and *re-* ~ */re-/ are the most productive. In comparison with */de-/, Proto-Rom. */dɪs-/ was quite productive, more so than written Latin testimony suggests; as Cooper (1975: 275) puts it: "verbs compounded with *dis-* […] belong almost exclusively to the *sermo plebeius*". In the proto-language, both verbs (*/'dɪgn-a-/ 'to consider worthy' > */dɪs-'dɪgn-a-/ 'to consider unworthy') and nouns (*/'ram-a/ 'branch' > */dɪs-'ram-a-/ 'to prune') were used as bases (Buchi 2009), whereas the heirs of the prefix in the Romance languages only utilized its deverbal function. The meanings conveyed by the prefix in Proto-Romance were 'separation', 'change of state' (the latter probably passed on from */de-/, to which */dɪs-/ was close phonologically and semantically), and 'reversion', this last sense being the only one transmitted to the Romance languages: Fr. *capsule* 'bottle cap' → *décapsuler* 'to uncap', Spanish *cabello* 'hair' → *descabellar* 'to ruffle'. As for the Proto-Romance prefix */re-/, it conveyed the meanings 'return', 'repetition', and 'intensity' (REW s.v. **rĕjĕctāre* 'to throw back [repeatedly]' ← Lat. *jactāre* 'to throw', REW s.v. **rĕnĕgāre* 'to renounce' ← Lat. *negāre* 'to deny'). It has been inherited by all Romance languages except Romanian: It. *ricominciare* 'to begin again' ← *ri-* + *cominciare*, Fr. *retirer* 'to remove' ← *re-* + *tirer* 'to pull', Sp. *recargar* 'to load again' ← *re-* + *cargar* 'to load'. These prefixes have a functional match with Romanian *re-* (*recădea* 'to fall again' < *re-* + *cădea* 'to fall'), which however is not inherited, but borrowed from Latin (Bulgăr in SMFC 2: 67−78). Other quite productive inherited prefixes are *ad-* ~ */ad-/ (Sp. *abarrancar* 'to make cracks [in]' < *a-* + *barranco* 'cliff'), *e(x)-* ~ */(ek)s-/ (It. *sferrare* 'to

unshoe, launch' < *s-* + *ferro* 'iron; tool'), and *in-* ~ */ɪn-/ (Romanian *a încheia* 'to finish' < *în-* + *cheie* 'key'), whose meanings are, however, often distinct in Romance from their Latin counterparts (Lüdtke 2007: 148−156).

Suffixation. – Latin had a suffix *-sc-* ~ */-sk-/ (see Meul 2013) which formed verbs presenting a lexically bound inchoative aspect. Most formations were deverbal (*flōrēre* 'to flower' → *flōrescere* 'to begin to flower'), even in Late Latin (*apparēre* 'to appear' → *apparescere* 'to appear suddenly', ca 400, TLL), but some were also denominal (*ignis* 'fire' → *ignescere* 'to ignite') or deadjectival (*gravis* 'heavy' → *gravescere* 'to become heavy'). Rudes (1980) delineates the destiny of this suffix in Romance: the heirs of */-sk-/ lost the aspectual meaning and mutated from a derivative suffix to an inflectional suffix, a stem-extension (e.g., It. *finire* 'to finish': *finisco* '[I] finish').

4.4. Adverbial derivation

In Latin, adverbial derivation was characterized by a great deal of polymorphy (Leumann 1963: § 212−215; Löfstedt 1967; Krefeld 1999: 113): adverbs could be coined by adding *-ē* or *-ō* to the stem of adjectives in *-us* (*rectus* 'right' → *rectē* 'rightly'; *certus* 'certain' → *certō* 'certainly'), *-ter* to the stem of adjectives mostly in *-is* (*brevis* 'brief' → *breviter* adv. 'briefly') and to prepositions (*circā* 'near' → *circiter* 'nearly'), *-um* to selected adjective stems (*multus* 'many' → *multum* 'much'), *-tim* to noun stems (*pars* 'part' → *partim* 'partly'), rarely also *-tus* (*dīvīnus* 'divine' > *dīvīnitus* 'divinely'). Etymologically, most of these derivative suffixes go back, by way of grammaticalization (or more precisely morphologization), to inflectional suffixes: *-ē* and *-ō* initially marked the ablative case, *-tim* and *-um* the accusative case (although the latter could be a nominative if it represents a neuter). None of these derivational patterns live on in Romance. Instead, most Romance languages (with Romanian and Ladin being the exception) present the adverbial suffix *-mente* (see article 106 on the Romance adverbs in *-mente*), which was morphologized from Proto-Rom. */ˈmɛnt-e/ f. 'manner' (see Groß 2011–2014 in DÉRom s.v. */ˈmɛnt-e/ III.). Whereas forrunners of */-ˈmɛnt-e/ as a suffix appear already in classical Latin – Cicero has *sānā mente* 'with a healthy mind', which lead to the future interpretation 'in a healthy manner' –, the noun is grammaticalized in Proto-Romance, where even the Latin adverb *quōmodo* 'how' (< *quō modō* 'in what way') was reanalyzed in */koˈmɛnt-e/ (> Sardinian *comenti*, Northern It. ˈcomenteˈ, Fr. *comment*, REW s.v. *quōmŏdo*).

As Krefeld (1999) shows very convincingly, the preeminent feature of this kind of morphologization lies in its original relationship with a human agent: semantically, the sequence was '(human) mind' > 'manner' > '(adverb marking suffix)', so much so that the first *–mente* adverbs had to determine verbs – moreover verbs with a personal noun as external argument, like Fr. *il écoutait calmement* 'he listened calmly' – rather than adjectives, as they may do in modern Romance languages (e.g., Fr. *c'est vraiment bête* 'this is really stupid').

Formally, *-mente* combines in most cases with the feminine form of the adjective stem, showing thereby its nominal origin: It. *chiaramente* 'clearly' (← *chiaro* 'clear'), Sardinian *distintamente* 'distinctly' (← *distintu* 'distinct'), Fr. *particulièrement* 'particularly' (← *particulier* 'particular'), Cat. *meravellosament* 'marvellously' (← *meravellós* 'marvellous'), Sp. *solamente* 'only' (← *solo* 'alone'), Port. *cruamente* 'crudely' (← *cru* 'crude'). As Rainer (2002: 111) points out, the grammaticalization process is however more complete in some languages than others: whilst Spanish still maintains a secondary accent in these adverbs and allows elision of the first suffix in coordination (*lisa y llanamente* 'in plain language'), French forms some of the adverbs in this series from the masculine stem of the adjective (*violent* 'violent' → *violemment* 'violently'). Maximum grammaticalization is obtained when even a borrowing from Latin like the Italian adverb *quasi* 'almost' receives the adverbial suffix: documented from the 13th century, It. *quasimente* 'almost' is now of dialectal use, whereas Fr. *quasiment*, documented since the 16th century, seems to represent a borrowing from Italian (DEI's etymology; TLF opts for an internal creation).

Apart from that, Italian and French share a more peripheral adverbial suffix *-oni* which takes its origin in the denominal suffix *-ōne* ~ */'-one/* and conveys the meaning 'peculiar form of appearance': It. *(a) tastoni*, Fr. *à tâtons* 'gropingly' (← It. *tastare*/Fr. *tâter* 'to touch'; see Krefeld 1999: 119−122, 126−127, providing a list of 21 Italian coinages, as well as Corona 2012). Subsequently, these adverbs went through categorial reanalysis: they may (in Italian) or must (in French) be introduced by the preposition *a* and therefore function like nouns. Romanian *-iş*, (e.g., *brăţiş* adv. 'embracing' ← *braţ* 'arm'), whose origin also seems to lie in a nominal suffix (introduced through borrowings from Slavic languages, see Pascu 1916: 358), presents some functional and semantic parallelisms to *-oni* (Krefeld 1999: 122−123, 127, providing a list of 22 Romanian coinages). Finally, Romanian adverbs from adjectives in *-esc* (< *-iscu* ~ */-'isk-u/*) present the suffix *-e* (*frăţesc* 'brotherly' → *frăţeşte* 'in a brotherly way').

5. Conversion

Conversion is very popular, both in Latin and in Romance, with nominalization representing the most common type. The bases for nominal conversion are mostly adjectives (Rom. *bun* 'good' → 'estate; virtue', It. *caldo* 'hot' → 'heat', Fr. *ridicule* 'ridiculous' → 'ridiculous feature', Sp. *rojo* 'red' → 'colour red; communist') or verbs (It. *valicare* 'to cross' → *valico* 'passage', Fr. *marcher* 'to walk' > *marche* 'walk', Sp. *contar* 'to count' → *cuenta* 'account'), but virtually all parts of speech are represented: Rom. *eu* pers. pron. 'I' → *eu* noun 'self', It. *perché?* adv. 'why?' → *perché* noun 'reason', Port. *onze* numeral 'eleven' → *onze* noun 'football team'.

Adjectival conversion is particularly frequent with Romance colour terms, the adjective being in general invariable: It. *arancia* 'orange' → *arancio* 'of orange colour', Fr. *orange* noun → *orange* adj., Sp. *naranja* noun → *naranja* adj., Port. *laranja* noun → *laranja* adj.

Latin made extensive use of denominal and deadjectival verbal conversion (see section 4.3.1), whose results were integrated into the *-a-* ~ */-'a-/ or the *-i-* ~ */-'i-/ declension: *mātūrus* 'mature' → *mātūrāre* 'to mature', *vestis* 'dress' → *vestīre* 'to dress'. The Romance languages inherited this double feature, most of them giving a preference to the inflectional class descended from */-'a-/ for denominal creations (Rom. *telefon* 'phone' → *telefona* 'to phone', It. *telefono* → *telefonare*, Fr. *téléphone* → *téléphoner*, Sp. *teléfono* → *telefonear*, Port. *telefone* → *telefonar*) and to the inflectional class inherited from */-'i/ for deadjectival creations (Rom. *alb* 'white' → *a albi* 'to whiten', It. *bianco* → *bianchire*, Fr. *blanc* → *blanchir*).

Adverbial conversion was productive in Latin, particularly in the colloquial language (Löfstedt 1967: 101−109). Three types coexisted: type 1a (neuter singular in *-um* ~ */u/ from *o*-stem adjectives: *multus* 'many' → *multum* 'greatly', *primus* 'first' → *primum* 'in the first place'), 1b (neuter singular in *-e* ~ */-e/ from *o*-stem adjectives: *difficilis* 'difficult' → *difficile* 'with difficulty', *fidelis* 'faithful' → *fidele* 'faithfully'), and type 2 (ablative masculine singular in *-o* ~ */-o/: *multo* 'a great deal', *raro* 'rarely'). The Romance languages inherited this threefold structure in a slightly adapted form (Dardel 1995). Indeed, as Romance adjectives are devoid of neuter forms, converted forms correspond to the unmarked

(masculine singular) form: Rom. *a cînta frumos* 'to sing beautifully', Fr. *chanter faux* 'to sing out of tune', Sp. *trabajar duro* 'to work hard'. Adverbial conversion, which is clearly inherited from Proto-Romance (Hummel 2013), is monopolistic in Romanian, whereas it pertains, save some lexicalized exceptions, to the informal variants of Western Romance.

6. Minor processes

6.1. Reduplication

In Latin, reduplication – inherited from Proto-Indo-European, originally with intensive meaning – pertains mostly to inflection: *dō* '(I) give' → *dedī* '(I) gave', *currō* '(I) run' → *cucurrī* '(I) ran' (Leumann 1963: § 222, 240). Reduplication is only scarsely used in Latin word-formation (the index of André 1978 contains more than 400 items, but most of them are not Latin coinages). Its function is then either iterative or intensive, mostly based on onomatopoeias (e.g., *murmur* 'murmur', Leumann 1963: § 177) and nursery words (Groß and Schweickard 2009-2014 *in* DÉRom s.v. */'baβ-a/ f. 'drool'), sometimes also on lexical bases (*furfurāculum* 'gimlet' < **bher-* 'drill', André 1978: 41), and there is no lexical opposition between reduplicated and not reduplicated items.

Word-formation based on reduplication has almost no role to play in most of the Romance languages, with the exception of French, where it is quite widespread (Mayerthaler 1977: 81−92 lists 222 lexemes, some of which are however inherited or borrowed and therefore not of French coinage). In this language, (mostly partial) reduplication is used for creating not only onomatopoeias, but also hypocorisms, mainly from nouns ([*un*] *ours* '[a] bear' → *nounours* 'teddy bear') and adjectives (*bête* 'stupid' → *bêbête* 'silly'). The reduplicative base is either a monosyllable (*fille* 'girl' → *fifille* 'little girl') or one syllable of a polysyllable (*nourrice* 'childminder' → *nounou* 'nanny') and presents the phonological structure CV. This phenomenon originated in child language – probably in the 17th century –, from where it migrated first to childminder language, then to colloquial language (Rainer 1998).

In a similar way, Brazilian Portuguese uses reduplication for hypocoristic kin terms (*pai* 'father' → *papai* 'daddy', *avó* 'grandmother' → *vovó* 'granny'), with secondary stress falling on the first syllable (Comrie 1989), as well as for some other coinages (*bibichinho* 'animal [pet name]' ← *bicho* 'animal', Kröll 1991: 37). In the other Romance languages, the

role of reduplication is minor (see for instance Cabré Monné 2008: 910−920 for Catalan coinages like *pica-pica* 'appetizer' ← *picar* 'to snack' or Lloyd 1966 and Pharies 1986 for Spanish creations like *bullebulle* 'busybody' ← *bullir* 'to bustle').

There are considerable theoretical implications which follow from these findings, such as the three identified by Hurch and Mattes (2005): (1) reduplication is not a form of affixation, (2) partial reduplication does not always originate in total reduplication, and (3) reduplication does not necessarily implicate grammaticalization.

6.2. Blending

Blending was already used occasionally in former centuries (e.g., Rabelais' *sorbonnagres* 'students/professors of the Sorbonne' ← *Sorbonne* x *onagre* 'donkey'), but has only become more popular in recent times (e.g., Fr. *information* 'information' x *automatique* 'automatic' → *informatique* 'computer science').

6.3. Clipping

Whereas clipping was scarcely productive as a word-formation pattern in Latin (Biville 1989), it has developed in a spectacular way in colloquial Romance during the 20th century, quite independently from Proto-Romance. Romance clippings present a strong preference for disyllabicity: French *manifestation* 'demonstration → *manif*, Catalan *ginecologia* 'gynaecology' → *gine*, Spanish *profesor* 'professor' → *profe*. They often convey hypocoristic and/or colloquial connotations. Many clipped words are certainly due to borrowing; cf. the parallelism between Fr. *télévision* → *télé*, Cat. *televisió* → *tele*, Sp. *televisión* → *tele*.

7. References

Adams, Edwards L.   1913   *Word-Formation in Provençal*. New York: MacMillan.

Anderson, James M. and Bernard Rochet   1979   *Historical Romance Morphology*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.

André, Jacques   1978   *Les mots à redoublement en latin*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Badia i Margarit, Antoni M. (ed.)   1991   *Dictionnaire historique des noms de famille romans. Actes del III Col·loqui (Barcelona, 19-21 juny 1989)*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Badia i Margarit, Antoni M.   1994 [1981]   *Gramàtica històrica catalana*. 3rd ed. Valencia: Tres i Quatre.

Baldinger, Kurt   1950   *Kollektivsuffixe und Kollektivbegriff. Ein Beitrag zur Bedeutungslehre im Französischen mit Berücksichtigung der Mundarten*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Bauer, Brigitte L. M.   2011   Word formation. In: Martin Maiden, John Charles Smith and Adam Ledgeway (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages*. Vol. 1, 532−563. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biville, Frédérique   1989   Un processus dérivationnel méconnu du latin: La dérivation par troncation. *L'information grammaticale* 42: 15−22.

Bork, Hans Dieter   1990   *Die lateinisch-romanischen Zusammensetzungen Nomen + Verb und der Ursprung der romanischen Verb-Ergänzung-Komposita*. Bonn: Romanistischer Verlag.

Bosque, Ignacio and Violeta Demonte (eds.) 1999   *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española.* Vol. 3: *Entre la oración y el discurso. Morfología*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.

Bruguera, Jordi   2006   *Diccionari de la formació de mots*. Barcelona: Enciclopèdia Catalana.

Buchi, Éva   2008   Joan Coromines et l'étymologie lexicale romane: L'exemple roumain. In: Antoni M. Badia i Margarit and Joan Solà (eds.), *Joan Coromines, vida y obra,* 282−332. Madrid: Gredos.

Buchi, Éva   2009 La dérivation en */de-/ et en */dɪs-/ en protoroman: Contribution à la morphologie constructionnelle de l'ancêtre commun des langues romanes. *Recherches linguistiques de Vincennes* 38: 139−159.

Buchi, Éva   2010   Where Caesar's Latin does not belong: A comparative grammar based approach to Romance etymology. In: Charlotte Brewer (ed.), *Selected Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Historical Lexicography and Lexicology held at St Anne's College, Oxford, 16-18 June 2010*. Oxford: Oxford University Research Archive. http://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid%3A237856e6-a327-448b-898c-cb1860766e59.

Burdy, Philipp   2013 *Die mittels* -aison *und Varianten gebildeten Nomina des Französischen von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. Eine Studie zur diachronen Wortbildung*. Frankfurt/M.: Klostermann.

Cabré Monné, Teresa 2008 [2002]   Altres sistemes de formació de mots. In: Joan Solà, Maria-Rosa Lloret, Joan Mascaró and Manuel Pérez Saldanya (eds.), *Gramàtica del català contemporani*. Vol. 1: *Introducció, fonètica i fonologia, morfologia*, 889−932. 4th ed. Barcelona: Empúries.

Comrie, Bernard   1989   The phonology of Brazilian Portuguese hypocoristic kin terms. In: Ursula Klenk (ed.), *Variatio linguarum. Beiträge zu Sprachvergleich und Sprachentwicklung. Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Gustav Ineichen*, 63−66. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Cooper, Frederic Taber   1975 [1895]   *Word Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeius*. Reprint. Hildesheim/New York: Olms.

Corona, Luisa 2012   Il suffisso italiano *-oni*. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 97: 34−77.

Dardel, Robert de   1995   Le protoroman comme héritier de l'indo-européen (à propos de la construction *clamare altvm*). In: Louis Callebat (ed.), *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif IV. Actes du 4e colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif. Caen, 2-5 septembre 1994*, 21-28. Hildesheim: Olms.

Dardel, Robert de   1999   Composés rectionnels nominaux nom + nom en protoroman. *Probus* 11: 177-208.

Dębowiak, Przemysław   2014   *La formation diminutive dans les langues romanes*. Frankfurt/M.: Lang.

DEI = Carlo Battisti and Giovanni Alessio   1950–1957   *Dizionario etimologico italiano.* Firenze: Barbèra.

DELI = Manlio Cortelazzo and Paolo Zolli   1999 [1979–1988]   *Dizionario etimologico della lingua italiana*. 2nd ed. Bologna: Zanichelli.

DÉRom = Éva Buchi and Wolfgang Schweickard (eds.)   2008– *Dictionnaire Étymologique Roman (DÉRom)*. Nancy: ATILF. http://www.atilf.fr/DERom.

DRG = Robert von Planta   1938– *Dicziunari Rumantsch Grischun*. Chur: Bischofberger.

Ernout, Alfred and Antoine Meillet   1959 [1932]   *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots*. 4th ed. Paris: Klincksieck.

FEW = Walther von Wartburg et al.   1922–2002   *Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Eine darstellung des galloromanischen sprachschatzes.* Bonn/Heidelberg/Leipzig-Berlin/Basel: Klopp/Winter/Teubner/Zbinden.

Fleischman, Suzanne 1977   *Cultural and Linguistic Factors in Word Formation. An Integrated Approach to the Development of the Suffix* -age. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Publications.

Giurescu, Anca 1975 *Les mots composés dans les langues romanes*. La Haye/Paris: Mouton.

Grossmann, Maria and Franz Rainer 2004 *La formazione delle parole in italiano.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Hakamies, Reino   1951   *Étude sur l'origine et l'évolution du diminutif latin et sa survie dans les langues romanes*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Kirjapainon.

Hall, Robert A., Jr.   1983   *Proto-Romance   Morphology*.   Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Hasselrot, Bengt   1957   *Études sur la formation diminutive dans les langues romanes*. Uppsala: Lundequist.

Heidemeier, Ulrike   2014   Reconstruction dérivationnelle. In: Éva Buchi and Wolfgang Schweickard (eds.), *Dictionnaire Étymologique Roman (DÉRom). Genèse, méthodes et résultats*, 211−246. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Hummel, Martin   2013   Attribution in Romance: Reconstructing the oral and written tradition. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 34: 1−42.

Hurch, Bernhard and Veronika Mattes   2005 Über die Entstehung von partieller Reduplikation. In: Gertraud Fenk-Oczlonand and Christian Winkler (eds.), *Sprache und NatürlichkeIt. Gedenkband für Willi Mayerthaler*, 137−156. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto.

Jochems, Helmut   1959 Beiträge zu einer vergleichenden Wortbildungslehre des heutigen Bündnerromanischen. PhD dissertation, University of Cologne.

Kircher-Durand, Chantal (ed.)   2002   *Grammaire fondamentale du latin. Tome IX: Création lexicale: La formation des noms par dérivation suffixale*. Louvain/Paris/Dudley: Peeters.

Koch, Peter and Wulf Oesterreicher 2008   Comparaison historique de l'architecture des langues romanes. In: Gerhard Ernst, Martin-Dietrich Gleßgen, Christian Schmitt and Wolfgang Schweickard (eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen*. Vol. 3, 2575−2610. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Krefeld, Thomas   1999 Agens mit Leib und Seele. Zur Grammatikalisierung romanischer Abverbbildungen. In: Jürgen Lang and Ingrid Neumann-Holzschuh (eds.), *Reanalyse und Grammatikalisierung in den romanischen Sprachen*, 111−127. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Kröll, Heinz   1990-91   Beitrag zu den Reduplikationen im Portugiesischen. *Lusorama* 11: 31−39; 15: 25−44.

Lausberg, Heinrich   1976 [1971]   *Linguistica romanza*. 2nd ed. Milano: Feltrinelli.

Leumann, Manu   1963   *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. München: Beck.

Lindner, Thomas   1996 *Lateinische Komposita. Ein Glossar vornehmlich zum Wortschatz der Dichtersprache*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Lloyd, Paul M. 1966 Some reduplicative words in colloquial Spanish. *Hispanic Review* 34: 135−142.

Löfstedt, Bengt 1967 Bemerkungen zum Adverb im Lateinischen. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 72: 79−109.

López del Castillo, Lluís 2002 *Diccionari de formació de paraules*. Barcelona: Edicions 62.

Lüdtke, Jens 1995 Grundzüge der Entwicklung der Relationsadjektive vom Latein zum Romanischen. In: Wolfgang Dahmen, Günter Holtus, Johannes Kramer, Michael Metzeltin, Wolfgang Schweickard and Otto Winkelmann (eds.), *Konvergenz und Divergenz in den romanischen Sprachen. Romanistisches Kolloquium VIII*, 138−150. Tübingen: Narr.

Lüdtke, Jens 1996 Gemeinromanische Tendenzen IV. Wortbildungslehre. In: Günter Holtus, Michael Metzeltin and Christian Schmitt (eds.), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik (LRL)*. Vol. II,1: *Latein und Romanisch. Historisch-vergleichende Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen*, 235-272. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Lüdtke, Jens 2007 *Romanische Wortbildung. Inhaltich – diachronisch – synchronisch*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Malkiel, Yakov and Karl D. Uitti 1968 L'ancien français *gab-ois*, *ir-ois*, *jargon-ois* et leurs contreparties dans l'anglais d'Amérique. *Revue de Linguistique romane* 32: 126−174.

Mayerthaler, Willi   1977   *Studien zur theoretischen und zur französischen Morphologie. Reduplikation, Echowörter, morphologische Natürlichkeit, Haplologie, Produktivität, Regeltelescoping, paradigmatischer Ausgleich*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Meul, Claire 2013 *The Romance reflexes of the Latin infixes* -I/ESC- *and* -IDI̯-. *Restructuring and remodeling processes*. Hamburg: Buske.

Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm   1895   *Grammaire des langues romanes.* Vol. 2: *Morphologie*. Paris: Welter.

Moussy, Claude (ed.) 2005   *La composition et la préverbation en latin*. Paris: Presses de l'Université Paris-Sorbonne.

Nyrop, Krystoffer   1908 *Grammaire historique de la langue française.* Vol. 3: *Formation des mots*. Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandel.

Olcott, George N.   1898   *Studies in the Word Formation in the Latin Inscriptions. Substantives and Adjectives with Special Reference to the Latin Sermo Vulgaris*. Rome: Sallustian Typography.

Pascu, Giorge 1916   *Sufixele   românești*.   București/Leipzig/Wien: Socec/Harrassowitz/Gerold.

Pharies, David A.   1986   *Structure and Analogy in the Playful Lexicon of Spanish*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Pharies, David   2002   *Diccionario etimológico de los sufijos españoles y de otros elementos finales*. Madrid: Gredos.

Rainer, Franz 1993   *Spanische Wortbildungslehre*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Rainer, Franz 1998   La réduplication française du type *fifille* d'un point de vue diachronique. In: Giovanni Ruffino (ed.), *Atti del XXI Congresso Internazionale di Linguistica e Filologia Romanza. Centro di studi filologici et linguistici siciliani, Università di Palermo 18-24 settembre 1995*. Vol. 1, 279−289. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Rainer, Franz 2002   Convergencia y divergencia en la formación de palabras de las lenguas románicas. In: Joaquín García-Medall (ed.), *Aspectos de morfología derivativa del español*, 103−133. Lugo: Tris Tram.

Rainer, Franz 2003   L'intégration des composés latins du type *aurifer* en français. In: Bernard Fradin, Georgette Dal, Nabil Hathout, Françoise Kerleroux, Marc Plénat and Michel Roché (eds.), *Les unités morphologiques. Forum de morphologie (3èmes rencontres). Actes du colloque de Villeneuve d'Ascq (19-21 septembre 2002)*, 151−168. Villeneuve d'Ascq: SILEX.

Rainer, Franz 2004   From Latin to French. In: Geert Booij, Christian Lehmann, Joachim Mugdan and Stavros Skopeteas (eds), *Morphology. An International Handbook on Inflection and Word-Formation*. Vol. 2, 1698−1712. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Rainer, Franz 2005a Semantic change in word formation. *Linguistics* 43(2): 415−441.

Rainer, Franz 2005b Noms d'instruments/de lieux en *-tor* dans la Galloromania. *Vox*

romanica 64: 121−140.

Rainer, Franz 2008 Konvergenz- und Divergenzphänomene in der Romania: Wortbildung. In: Gerhard Ernst, Martin-Dietrich Gleßgen, Christian Schmitt and Wolfgang Schweickard (eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen*. Vol. 3, 3293−3307. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Rainer, Franz 2011 The agent-instrument-place "polysemy" of the suffix -TOR in Romance. *Language Typology and Universals* 64: 8−32.

REW = Wilhelm Meyer-Lübke 1930–1935 [1911–1920] *Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 3rd ed. Heidelberg: Winter.

Rohlfs, Gerhard 1931 Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Pyrenäenmundarten. *Revue de linguistique romane* 7: 119−169.

Rohlfs, Gerhard 1954 *Historische Grammatik der italienischen Sprache und ihrer Mundarten.* Vol. 3: *Syntax und Wortbildung*. Bern: Francke.

Ronjat, Jules 1980 [1937] *Grammaire istorique des parlers provençaux modernes.* Vol. 3: *Morphologie et formation des mots, notes de syntaxe*. Reprint. Geneva: Slatkine.

Rudes, Blair A. 1980 The functional development of the verbal suffix +*esc*+ in Romance. In: Jacek Fisiak (ed.), *Historical Morphology,* 327−348. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.

Sandmann, Antônio José   1986   *Wortbildung im heutigen brasilianischen Portugiesisch.* Bonn: Romanistischer Verlag.

Schmitt, Christian   2000   À propos de l'européisation des langues romanes. In: Annick Englebert, Michel Pierrard, Laurence Rosier and Dan Van Raemdonck (eds.), *Actes du XXIIe Congrès International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes (Bruxelles, 23-29 juillet 1998).* Vol. 6, 457−465. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Siller-Runggaldier, Heidi   1989   *Grödnerische Wortbildung.* Innsbruck: Institut für Romanistik.

SMFC =   1959–1972   *Studii şi materiale privitoare la formarea cuvintelor în limba română.* Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Romîne.

Tekavčić, Pavao   1974 [1967]   *Grammatica storica dell'italiano.* Vol. 3: *Lessico.* 2nd ed. Bologna: Il Mulino.

TLF = Paul Imbs and Bernard Quemada (eds.)   1971–1994   *Trésor de la langue française. Dictionnaire de la langue du XIXe et du XXe siècle (1789–1960).* Paris: Éditions du CNRS/Gallimard.

TLL = 1900– *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, Leipzig/Stuttgart/Berlin/New York: Teubner/Saur/De Gruyter.

Viaro, Mário Eduardo (ed.)   2014   *Morfologia histórica.* São Paulo: Cortez.

Villoing, Florence   1999   La querelle, au XIXe siècle, autour des mots composés du type [VN]$_N$: Quels enjeux pour la grammaire? *Linx* 40: 159−185.

Walsh, Thomas James   1984   *The Verbal Suffix* -iāre*. Latin Origin and Development.* Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.

Weiss, Michael   2011 [2009]   *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*. 2nd ed. Ann Arbor/New York: Beech Stave Press.

Williams, Edwin Bucher   1962 [1938]   *From Latin to Portuguese. Historical Phonology and Morphology of the Portuguese Language*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Zamboni, Alberto   1981   Un problema di morfologia romanza: L'ampliamento verbale in *-idio*, *-izo*. *Quaderni patavini di linguistica* 2: 171−181.

Éva Buchi and Jean-Paul Chauveau, Nancy (France)