

Chapter 31: Lexical Stability and Shared Lexicon

Steven N. Dworkin

31.1 General issues

The concept of stability in language change is fraught with difficulties. Certainly stability in this context cannot be equated with immutability. Change over time is one of the few absolute linguistic universals. Yet whereas change in form and, often, in function is the norm, grammatical or lexical categories and structures often display a high degree of relative stability. Nichols (2003:283f.) states that linguistic elements exhibit different kinds of stability, a trait that she defines as displaying more resistance to change, loss, or borrowing, and which does not lend itself to precise quantification.

The study of lexical stability in the Romance languages poses a number of methodological problems and the concept itself is open to various interpretations. The lexicon is that facet of a language's symbolic system that is open-ended, changes most easily, and is perceived as the least stable. In contrast to a language's phonological, morphological, and syntactic components, the lexicon is more prone to changes brought about by non-linguistic circumstances, such as population movements, and social, political, and cultural transformations. On a pan-Romance scale, lexical stability can refer to those orally-transmitted Latin lexical items that have come down into most (if not all) of the modern Romance languages. One might argue that the survival of any Latin lexical item in only some languages (or even in just one) represents an instance of individual lexical stability with regard to the language(s) whose lexicon still contains the word at issue (for examples and discussion, see §31.4. That is to say that the analyst can attempt to assess lexical stability at the level of the

Romance languages as a whole or at the level of individual languages.

With the exception of Latinisms, I shall not discuss systematically as examples of lexical stability and shared lexicon the continued survival of neologisms that entered the Romance languages as loanwords or through the various morphological processes of lexical creation, such as prefixal and suffixal derivation, infixation, compounding, sound symbolism, and lexical blends. The origin of a word is usually opaque to speakers and is in most instances irrelevant to its survival. This essay will deal mainly with the uninterrupted continuation through direct oral transmission of the vocabulary of spoken Latin, which, in quantitative terms today constitutes only a small part of the lexical stock of any Romance language. I will take as my starting point the writings of Arnulf Stefenelli (especially 1992, 1996, and 2011), the only Romanist of the last generation who has systematically investigated this topic. I shall discuss here both pan-and widespread-Romance lexical survivals (respectively ‘panromanisch’ and ‘interromanisch’ in Stefenelli’s terminology) as well as lexical survivals in only one or two languages (Stefenelli’s ‘teilromanisch’ category). A word will count as a lexical survival if documented in Romance, even if it later became obsolete or fell into disuse in individual languages.

I shall limit the scope of this study to the survival of the signifier and leave aside the slippery problem of semantic stability and semantic change over time (cf. §32). Change in the semantic range of a lexical item is the norm. It is often difficult to determine on the basis of extant written documentation the full semantic range in the spoken language of a word in the past. Are contemporary secondary and tertiary meanings recent developments in the semantic history of the lexical item at issue, or do they reflect the semantic range of the Latin starting point? Romance etymology has not traditionally paid adequate attention to the description and

analysis of the full semantic scope of the spoken Latin bases underlying the inherited lexicon. It starts from the meanings of the Latin base as preserved in written Latin. One of the innovations of the new *Dictionnaire Étymologique Roman* (hereafter *DÉRom*, discussed in greater detail below) is the effort to reconstruct, using the comparative method, the semantics of the proto-Romance (the glottonym consistently used in the *DÉRom*) starting point. It assumes that meanings that are widespread in the Romance reflexes were present in the relevant base and are not later, independent developments reflecting such cognitive cross-linguistic processes as metaphor and metonymy. As Rankin (2003:196) rightly claims, it is perfectly reasonable to reconstruct polysemy at the level of a proto-language. This type of semantic reconstruction has not received the attention it deserves from specialists in Romance diachronic lexicology; for a first step in this direction, based on the findings of the *DÉRom*, see Buchi (2012).

Most studies of the survival rate in Romance of inherited Latin lexicon start with documented written Latin as preserved, for example, in such compilations as the (still unfinished) *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, with its over 50,000 entries, and determine which lexical items have survived into Romance through oral transmission (as opposed to later integration as learned borrowings, usually from written Latin sources). However it is unlikely that the vast and rich lexicon of the various written registers of Latin truly reflects the narrower range of the lexicon of spoken Latin, the actual source of the Romance languages (cf. §1.2). Obviously spoken and written Latin are different language levels within the same diasystem. There are numerous recorded Latin words that have not survived in any Romance language. Does that mean that at some point in the linguistic history of the Roman empire they had fallen into disuse in the spoken language and were unknown and incomprehensible to illiterate

speakers, the overwhelming majority of the population? On the other hand, to quote Adams (2013:777) '[m]any Latin terms that were to survive in Romance languages are not attested at all in Latin texts, or alternatively hardly make an appearance'. One can attempt to reconstruct the lexicon of proto-Romance (a glottonym used by several eminent Romanists such as Robert de Dardel, Robert A. Hall, Jr, and by the *DÉRom*), by applying the comparative method to that portion of the Romance lexicon that entered (almost) all the Romance languages through oral transmission. In terms of lexical stability, the survival or stability of the reconstructed proto-Romance lexicon would be a misleading 100%. Reconstruction cannot necessarily capture the full dynamics of lexical rivalries that lead to lexical change and the regional and social variations that may have occurred in the spoken language of the Roman empire, nor can it recover those authentic (proto-)Romance lexical items that may have fallen into disuse before the appearance of the first texts.

Nevertheless, reconstruction can yield useful insights. This is the approach taken by the *DÉRom*, directed by Eva Buchi (Nancy) and Wolfgang Schweickard (Saarbrücken). Inspired by the methodological considerations in Chambon (2007), they applied the comparative method to a list of c. 500 pan-Romance survivals compiled by the Romanian linguist Iancu Fischer (1969) in order to determine the underlying proto-Romance lexical base, which they then correlated with the written Latin form as presented in *REW*₃. This use of comparative reconstruction in Romance etymology aroused the ire of Alberto Varvaro and led to a methodological debate between him and the directors of the *DÉRom* (see Varvaro 2011a,b and Buchi and Schweickard 2011a,b). The reconstructions undertaken so far (73 entries are currently [September 2013] available online at www.atilf.fr/DERom, with over 200 articles in progress), all presented in phonemic transcription rather than in the traditional orthography of

the written Latin equivalents, do capture some degree of regional variation within proto-Romance. I find the chronological limits of the term 'proto-Romance' as used in the currently available *DÉRom* entries vague and ambiguous, since the *DÉRom* tends to use it in two senses: (1) the once spoken ancestral language from which daughter languages descend; (2) the language reconstructed by the comparative method which represents the ancestral language from which the compared languages descend. Buchi (2013) has proposed a chronological nuancing of the label proto-Romance, dividing it into five periods. A word documented in only a few medieval or modern varieties of Romance (for examples, see below) may have enjoyed a far wider, but unrecorded, geographic distribution in an earlier period in other Romance languages, and, if not a local innovation, must have existed at the level of proto-Romance (understood as the spoken regional and social varieties of the Roman Empire prior to the splitting off of Sardinian in the second century AD).

A few words are necessary regarding the concept of 'pan-Romance lexical survival'. A word does not need to have left a reflex in every Romance variety to qualify as a pan-Romance survival. The absence of a word only from varieties of Romanian does not mean that the word did not form part of the original Romance varieties of the province of Dacia, but that it was replaced at some point in that long period before the attestation of the first Romanian texts in the sixteenth century. Contact between the spoken continuations of Balkan Latin and such diverse languages as Greek, Turkish, Hungarian, Albanian, and various south Slavonic languages could easily have led to numerous instances of lexical loss in the stratum of inherited Latin vocabulary and replacement in the form of borrowings. In separate enquiries Fischer (1964) and Sala (2005:33) claim that there are c. 200 inherited Latin words that exist in all Romance languages except Romanian. A study on the same topic by Gossen (1982) offers a

higher figure. Concrete examples will be presented and discussed below. A handful of such items are attested in Latin inscriptions from the Balkans and others entered Albanian as Romance loanwords (e.g., BESTIA ‘animal’ > Alb. *bishë*, MULUS ‘mule’ > Alb. *myll* OLIVA ‘olive tree’ > Alb. *ullí*, RAPUM ‘turnip’ > Alb. *rrepë*; cf. Gossen 1982:18f., and passim; Haarmann 1973:63-68, 200–71).

For the purposes of this study I have divided Romance Europe into the following geo-linguistic territories: Gallo-Romance, Ibero-Romance (which will here include Catalan as well as Galician, Portuguese, Spanish), Italo-Romance, Raeto-Romance (used here merely as a convenient cover term for Romansh, Ladin, and Friulian), and Daco-Romance. Although examples from Dalmatian/Vegliote will be offered, the absence of a Latin base from the attested lexicon of this sparsely documented language will not disqualify it from being considered as a pan-Romance lexical survival. If a given Latin word has left at least one orally transmitted reflex in any Romance variety found in each of these territories, it will be considered as a pan-Romance lexical survival. It will be assumed that the word may have earlier enjoyed in the spoken language a wider, but fortuitously undocumented, diffusion.

On the basis of his survey of the *REW* and the later (consequently more up-to-date) *FEW*, Stefenelli claims that slightly over 7,000 attested Latin words survive through oral transmission in the Romance languages. The raw number of survivals increases to c. 9,000 if the reconstructed asterisked forms posited in the *REW* and *FEW* are included. The *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* contains some 50,000 lexical items (Stefenelli 2011:568). Munteanu Colán (2008:21f.) claims that 1,300 Latin bases recorded in the *REW* survive in all the Romance languages, 4,000 live on in several Romance languages, and whereas some 1,500 have survived in only one Romance language The number of Latin words that live on in only a

subset of the Romance languages far exceeds those that have come down into all the Romance languages. The survival rate of the Latin lexicon is fairly low if the *REW* and *FEW* figures are used in comparison to the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* inventory, which is based on the enormous written Latin corpus. In order to study lexical stability and lexical change in the transition from Latin to the Romance languages, Stefenelli (1992; 1996; 2011) examined the fate of the thousand most frequent lexemes (limiting himself to nouns, adjectives, and verbs, while omitting function words), based on the Latin frequency dictionaries of Gardner (1971) and Delatte, Évrard, Goeverts, and Denooz (1981).

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, Matteo Bartoli (1925) argued that the peripheral or lateral areas of the Romània (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 (although perhaps to a lesser extent). The labels ‘conservative’ and ‘innovative’ with regard to a language’s lexicon have at best only a relative value and cannot be used as an absolute defining characteristic. At best the linguist can speak only of tendencies towards a higher or lower rate of retention of the inherited Latin lexicon, or of the replacement of this vocabulary through borrowings and internal lexical creations. Various specialists (Wagner 1997 [1951]:97–149, Blasco Ferrer 1984:32–41) have characterized the lexicon of Sardinian as ‘conservative’ or ‘archaic’. I shall

present below selected examples of inherited Latin vocabulary that has survived only in Sardinian or in Sardinian and a handful of other regions. However Koch (2004) has shown that the Sardinian lexicon offers a significant number of innovations both on the onomasiological and semasiological side. I would also advocate avoiding the label ‘archaic’ to characterize the lexicon of a Romance language that has preserved older lexical elements. Archaic implies a comparison with a norm that involves the loss of the items in question. For speakers of Spanish, who use such continuations of early layers of Latinity such as *tomar* ‘to take’ and *matar* ‘to kill’ (assuming derivation from AESTUMARE and MACTARE respectively), these high-frequency verbs are certainly not archaic elements of their active vocabulary.

Indeed, some innovations from the centre found their way into the peripheral areas. Bartoli quotes as an example of a conservative retention in the Iberian Peninsula the survival of the descendants of CLat. FABULARI ‘to speak, converse’, namely OSp. *fablar*, Pt. *falar* ‘to speak’ (in contrast to Cat. *parlar*; OSp *parlar* is a late medieval Gallicism). In Gallo-Romance and regions of Italo-Romance this verb was ousted by the descendants of the innovation PARABOLARE, namely Fr. *parler* and It. *parlare* (alongside which see It. *favolare* ‘to tell tales’). Yet the existence in Spanish and Portuguese of the nouns *palabra/palavra* ‘word’, descended from the noun PARABOLA indicate the presence of this family in the spoken Latin of the Iberian Peninsula. Although *tiesta* did not dislodge *cabeza* (< CAPITIA ‘opening for the head in a tunic’, a derivative of CAPUT) as the designation for ‘head’ in Spanish, its presence through the fifteenth century demonstrates that this innovative metaphoric use of Lat. TESTA ‘earthenware pot’, which struck root in Gallo-Romance and in parts of Italo-Romance (Fr. *tête*, It. *testa*) entered the spoken language of the Iberian Peninsula (for numerous additional examples from Spanish and Portuguese, see Dworkin 2012:54–58).

Several other broad questions merit consideration here. The study of lexical stability should include, for comparative purposes, the other side of the coin, namely lexical loss, both at the pan-Romance level (i.e., Latin words that have failed to survive in any Romance language), and inherited Latin vocabulary that fell into disuse after being documented at some earlier stage of a specific Romance language. Is there a correlation between lexical stability and loss? Do languages that show a high number of neologisms tend to lose inherited vocabulary at a higher rate, and consequently display a lower rate of lexical stability as defined for the purposes of this study? Are there semantic fields, either at the pan-Romance level or at the level of individual Romance languages, that show a high degree of lexical stability (e.g., numerals, basic colour terms, (visible) body parts, kinship terms, domestic animals)? Are there fields subject to much change by lexical replacement through neology and borrowing (cf. Haspelmath and Tadmor 2009)? To what extent is grammatical category a factor in lexical stability? I can treat only some of these questions in what follows. The reader interested in a broad overview (with abundant bibliography) of lexical loss can turn to Dworkin (2011:598-605).

31.2 Pan-Romance survivals and shared lexicon

I shall take as a starting point for the analysis of pan-Romance lexical stability the c. 500 pan-Romance etyma reconstructed by the *DÉRom* on the basis of the application of comparative reconstruction to the appropriate Romance cognates. As noted above, this list follows Fischer (1969) and is certainly not complete; Fischer based his compilation on those items marked in the third edition of Ernout's and Meillet's *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine* as 'pan-Romance'. It does not include bases that survived in all but one Romance language. As a

matter of convenience I am presenting here the classical Latin equivalents of the proto-Romance etyma reconstructed by the authors of the *DÉRom* entries. Inclusion of the classical Latin ‘corrélát écrit’ (‘written correlate’) is obligatory in all *DÉRom* entries. The glosses correspond to the primary meanings documented in written Latin. I have divided the material according to grammatical category (omitting function words). Articles completed by the end of 2013 are due to appear in print in 2015 in *Dictionnaire Étymologique Roman (DÉRom). Genèse, méthodes et résultats*, to be published by de Gruyter.

31.2.1 Nouns in *DÉRom* list

ACETUM ‘vinegar’, AER ‘air’, AGER ‘field’, ALLIUM ‘garlic’, ALTARE ‘that which was placed on the altar; altar’, AGNELLUS ‘lamb’, ANGELUS ‘angel’, ANIMA ‘wind, breath, soul’*, ANNUS ‘year’*, APRILIS ‘April’*, AQUA ‘water’, AQUILA ‘eagle’, ARANEA ‘spider’, ARATRUM ‘plough’, ARBOR ‘tree’, ARCUS ‘arc’, AREA ‘level or open space’, ARGENTUM ‘silver’, ARMA ‘weapons’, ASINUS ‘ass’, ATRIPLEX ‘orach (a kitchen vegetable)’, AUGUSTUS ‘August’, *BABA ‘slaver’, BALTEUS ‘girdle’, BARBA ‘beard’, BOS ‘ox’, BRACAE ‘breeches, trousers’, BRACHIUM ‘arm’, BRUMA ‘fog, mist’, BUCCA ‘cheek’ > ‘mouth’, CABALLA ‘mare’, CABALLUS ‘(pack) horse’, CAELUM ‘sky’, CAMISIA ‘shirt’, CAMPUS ‘field’, CANIS ‘dog’, CANNABIS ‘hemp’, CAPISTRUM ‘halter’, CAPRA ‘(she-)goat’, CAPUT ‘head’, CARBO ‘burning or burnt wood’, CARO(NIS) ‘flesh, meat’, CARPINUS ‘hornbeam’, CARRUM ‘cart, chariot’, CASA ‘cottage, rustic dwelling’ > house’, CASEUS ‘cheese’, CASTANEA ‘chestnut (tree)’, CATENA ‘chain’, CATTUS ‘cat’, CAUDA ‘tail’, CENA ‘evening meal’, CERA ‘wax’, CERUUS ‘deer, stag’, CHORDA ‘cat gut, string of a musical instrument’, CIPPUS ‘gravestone’, CIUITAS ‘city’, COHORS ‘cohort’, COMA ‘hair on the head’, CORNU ‘horn’, CORONA ‘crown’, CORRIGIA ‘shoelace; rein (horse)’, CORUUS ‘raven, crow’,

COSTA 'rib', COXA 'hip', CRISTA 'crest (animal, bird)', CUBITUS 'elbow', CULUS 'arse'*,
CUNEUS 'wedge', CUPPA 'cup, goblet', DECEM 'ten', DENS 'tooth', DEUS 'god', DIES 'day',
DIGITUS 'finger', DOLOR 'pain, sorrow', DOLUS 'trick', DOMINUS 'master', DORSUM 'back', DUO
'two', ERICIUS hedgehog', FABA 'bean', FALX 'scythe', FAMES 'hunger', FARINA 'flour', FASCIA
'band, bandage', FEBRIS 'fever', FEBRUARIUS 'February', FEL 'bile', FENESTRA 'window',
FAENUM 'hay', FERRUM 'iron', FERUS 'wild animal', FILIUS 'son', FILUM 'thread', FLAMMA
'flame', FLOCCUS 'flock of wool', FLOS 'flower', FOCUS 'fire', FOLIUM 'leaf', FOLLIS 'bellows',
FONTANA 'fountain', FORMICA 'ant', FRATER 'brother', FRAXINUS 'ash tree', FRONS 'forehead',
FRUCTUS 'fruit', FUMUS 'smoke', FURCA 'pitchfork', FURTUM 'theft', FUSTIS 'stick, staff, club',
FUSUS 'spindle', GENER 'son-in-law', GENUCULUM 'knee', GINGIUA 'gum', GLANS 'acorn',
GRANUM 'grain, seed', GULA 'throat', GUSTUS, 'taste', GUTTA 'drop', HEDERA 'ivy', HERBA
'grass', HIBERNUS 'winter', HOMO 'man, person', HOSPES 'host', IOCUS 'game', IUDEX 'judge',
IUGUM 'yoke', IUNIPERUS 'juniper tree', LA(M)BRUSCA 'wild vine', LAC 'milk', LACRIMA
'tear', LACUS 'lake', LANA 'wool', LAR(I)DUM 'lard', LAURUS 'laurel', LENS 'lentil', LEPUS
'hare', LEX 'law', LICIUM 'leash', LIGNUM 'piece of wood', LINGUA 'tongue', LINUM 'flax,
linen', LOCUS 'place', LUMEN 'light', LUNA 'moon', LUPUS 'wolf', MAGISTER 'teacher', MAIUS
'May', MALLEUS 'hammer, mallet', MANICA 'long sleeve of the tunic', MANUS 'hand', MARE
'sea', MARMOR 'marble', MARTIUS 'March', MEDULLA 'marrow', MEL 'honey, MENS 'mind',
MENSA 'table', MENTA 'mint, MERULA 'blackbird', MILIUM 'millet', MILLE 'one thousand',
MOLA 'millstone', MONS 'mountain', MORUM 'mulberry, blackberry', MUCCUS 'snot', MULIER
'woman', MUNDUS 'world', MURUS 'wall', MUSCA 'fly', MUSTUM 'must', NAPUS 'turnip', NARIS
'nostril', NASUS 'nose', NIX 'snow', NODUS 'knot', NOMEN 'name', NOUEM 'nine', NOX 'night',
NUX 'nut', OCTO 'eight', OCULUS 'eye', OLLA 'jar, pot', OSSUM 'bone', OUUM 'egg', PAGANUS

‘country dweller’, PALEA ‘chaff’, PALMA ‘palm’, PALUS ‘stick’, PANIS ‘bread’, PARENS ‘parent’,
PARIES ‘wall’, PARS ‘part’, PASCHA ‘Passover; Easter’, PASSER ‘sparrow; small bird’, PASSUS
‘step, pace’, PASTOR ‘shepherd’, PAUO ‘peacock’, PAX ‘peace’, PECCATUM ‘hobble; sin’,
PECTEN ‘comb’, PECTUS ‘chest’, PEDUCULUS ‘louse’, PELLIS ‘skin’, PE(N)SUM ‘weight’, PERSICA
‘peach’, PETRA ‘stone’, PILUS ‘skin hair’, PINNA ‘feather’, PINUS ‘pine’, PIRUM ‘pear’, PISCIS
‘fish’, PLANTAGO ‘plantain’, POMUM ‘any kind of fruit’, PONS ‘bridge’, POPULUS ‘people’,
PORCUS ‘pig’, PORRUM ‘leek’, PORTA ‘gate’, PRETIUM ‘price; reward’, PUGNUS ‘fist’, PULEX
‘flea’, PULPA ‘flesh’, PULUIS ‘dust, powder’, PUTEUS ‘well’, QUADRAGESIMA ‘forty day period’,
QUATTUOR ‘four’, QUINQUE ‘five’, RADIUS ‘ray, spoke’, RAMUS ‘branch’, RAPUM ‘turnip’, REN
‘kidney’, RIPA ‘bank, shore’, RIUUS ‘river’, ROTA ‘wheel’, SABBATUM ‘Saturday’, SACCUS
‘sack, pouch’, SAGITTA ‘arrow’, SAL ‘salt’, SALIX ‘willow’, SALUIA ‘sage (herb)’, SA(M)BUCUS
‘elder (tree)’, SANGUIS ‘blood’, SEBUM ‘suet, grease’, SEPTEM ‘seven’, SERPENS ‘serpent’,
SERUUS ‘servant’, SEX ‘six’, SIGNUM ‘sign’, SINUS ‘breast’, SITIS ‘thirst’, SOCER ‘father-in-law’,
SOMNIUM ‘dream’, SOMNUS ‘sleep, slumber’, SOROR ‘sister’, SORS ‘fate, chance’, SPATHA
‘spatula’, SPICUM/SPICA ‘ear of grain’, SPINA ‘thorn’, STELLA ‘star’, STUPPA ‘tow’, TAURUS
‘bull’, TEMPUS ‘time’, TERRA ‘earth, land’, TESTA ‘earthenware pot’ > ‘head’, TILIA ‘linden
tree’, TITIO ‘firebrand, torch’, TRES ‘three’, TURDUS ‘thrush’, TURTUR ‘turtledove’, TUSSIS
‘cough’, ULMUS ‘elm’, UMBILICUS ‘navel’, UNCTUM ‘ointment, oil’, UNDA ‘wave’, UNGULA
‘fingernail’, UNUS ‘one’, URSUS ‘bear’, URTICA ‘nettle’, UTER ‘wineskin’, UACCA ‘cow’,
UADUM ‘ford’*, UALLIS ‘valley’, UAS/UASUM, ‘vessel, dish’, UENA, ‘vein’, UENTUS, ‘wind’,
UERMIS ‘worm’, UERRES ‘boar, swine’, UESPA ‘wasp’, UESSICA ‘bladder’, UESTIMENTUM,
‘clothing’ UICES/UICIS ‘change, alternation’, UICINUS ‘neighbour’, UIDUA ‘widow’, UIDUUS
‘widower’, UIGINTI, ‘twenty’, UILLA ‘country-estate, farm’, UINEA ‘vine’, UINUM ‘wine’, UIRGA

‘green twig’, UITA ‘life’.

31.2.2 Adjectives in *DéRom* list

ACER/*ACRUS ‘sharp, cutting’, ALBUS ‘white’, ALTER ‘other (of two)’, ASPER ‘rough’, BONUS ‘good’, CALDUS ‘warm, hot’, CRASSUS/GRASSUS ‘fatty, greasy’, CRUDUS ‘raw’, CURTUS ‘short’, DIRECTUS ‘straight’, DULCIS ‘sweet’, FORTIS ‘strong’, GRAUIS ‘heavy’, GROSSUS, ‘fat, thick’ INTEGER ‘whole, complete’, IUUENIS ‘young’, LARGUS ‘ample’, LATUS ‘wide’, LONGUS ‘long’, MACER ‘thin’, MASCULUS ‘male’, MATURUS ‘ripe’, METIPSE ‘same’, MINUTUS ‘small’, MOLLIS ‘soft’, MUTUS ‘inarticulate, dumb’, NIGER ‘black’, NOUUS ‘new’, PLENUS ‘full’, PRIMARIUS ‘first’, PRIMUS ‘first’, RANCIDUS ‘stinking, rancid’, RECENS ‘new, fresh, young’, ROTUNDUS ‘round’*, SANUS ‘healthy’, SICCUS ‘dry’, SURDUS ‘deaf’, TARDIUS ‘tardy’, TENER ‘tender’, TRISTIS ‘sad’, UERUS ‘true, genuine’, UETULUS/UECLUS ‘old’, UIRIDIS ‘green’, UIUUS ‘alive, lively’, UINACEUS ‘pertaining to wine or grapes’.

31.2.3 Verbs in *DéRom* list

ADIUTARE ‘help’, ARARE ‘plough’, AUDIRE, ‘hear’* AUSCULTARE ‘listen’, BATTUERE ‘beat’, BIBERE ‘drink’, BLASPHEMARE/BLASTIMARE ‘curse, insult’, CABALLICARE ‘ride’, CACARE ‘shit’, CADERE ‘fall’, CANTARE ‘sing, chant’, CERNERE ‘separate, sift’, CINGERE ‘gird’, CIRCARE ‘go about, wander through’, CLAMARE ‘shout’, CLAUDERE ‘close’, COGNOSCERE ‘know’, COLLIGERE ‘bind, tie together’, COMPARARE ‘provide, furnish, get ready’, COMPREHENDERE ‘grasp, seize’, CONSUERE ‘sew together’, COQUERE/COCERE ‘cook, bake, boil’, CREDERE ‘believe’, CRESCERE ‘grow’, CURRERE ‘run’, DARE ‘give’, DICERE ‘say, tell’, DISCARRICARE ‘dismount’, DOLERE ‘be in pain’, DORMIRE ‘sleep’, DUCERE ‘lead’, ESSE/*essere ‘be’, EXIRE ‘go

out', FACERE 'make, do', FRANGERE 'break, smash', FRICARE 'rub', FRIGERE 'roast, fry',
 FUGERE/FUGIRE 'flee', FUTUERE 'fuck', GEMERE 'groan', HABERE 'have', INUITARE 'invite,
 entertain', IACERE, 'lie down', IEIUNARE 'abstain from', IOCARE 'play', LAUDARE 'praise',
 LAUARE 'wash', LAXARE 'loosen', LEUARE 'raise', LIGARE 'bind', LUCERE/LUCIRE 'shine, be
 bright', LUCTARE 'struggle, strive', MASTICARE 'chew', ME(N)SURARE 'measure',
 MINUERE/*MINUARE 'make smaller', MIRARE 'stare with wonder', MOLLIARE 'soften',
 MO(N)STRARE, *MORERE / *MORIRE (CLat. MORI) 'die', MULGERE 'milk', MUTARE 'change',
 NASCERE 'be born', NOMINARE 'name', NUTRIRE 'feed', OBLITARE 'forget', ORARE 'pray',
 ORDIRE 'begin commence', PARERE 'appear', PLACERE 'please', PLUERE/PLOUERE 'rain',
 PONERE 'place, put', POSSE/POTERE 'be able', PRAEHENDERE 'grasp, seize', QUAERERE 'seek',
 RADERE 'scratch, scrape', RESPONDERE 'answer', RODERE 'gnaw', RUGIRE 'roar', RUMIGARE
 'ruminate', RUMPERE 'break', SALIRE 'go up', SALUTARE 'greet', SCRIBERE 'write', SEDERE 'be
 seated', SENTIRE 'feel', SIBILARE 'whistle', SONARE 'sound', SPARGERE 'scatter', STARE 'stand',
 SUDARE 'sweat', SUFFLARE 'blow', TALIARE 'split, cut', TENDERE 'stretch', TENERE 'hold',
 TEXERE 'weave', TONARE 'thunder', TORNARE 'turn', TORQUERE 'twist', TREMULARE 'tremble,
 shake', TUSSIRE 'cough', UNGERE 'anoint', UADERE 'go', UENDERE 'sell', UENIRE 'come',
 UIDERE 'see', UINDICARE 'lay a legal claim', UOLARE 'fly'.

31.3 Lexical stability, shared lexicon, and semantic fields

In what follows, I shall illustrate from selected semantic fields instances of widespread lexical stability and shared lexicon in the Romance languages. Emphasis here will be on the survival of the Latin base; individual details of formal development will be ignored. In some varieties of Romance, the local reflex of the Latin word in question, although extant, is losing ground to

other forms. Exemplification is not intended to present every attested Romance reflex of the relevant Latin base. For those bases for which I have offered no Romance descendants, the reader may consult the appropriate entries in the *REW*₃, *FEW*, *LEI*, and the *DÉRom*. Romance forms will be presented in their respective standard orthographies insofar as possible. Friulian forms follow the headwords in Pirona (1992). Romansh spellings follow Decurtins (2012) and Sardinian spellings follow Pittau (2000–03).

31.3.1 Numerals

The numbers ‘one’ to ‘ten’ have remained stable. Orally-transmitted reflexes of UNUS, DUO, TRES, QUATTUOR, QUINQUE, SEX, SEPTEM, OCTO, NOUEM, DECEM live on in all Romance languages. The numerals ‘eleven’ to ‘sixteen’, UNDECIM, DUODECIM, TREDECIM, QUATTORDECIM, QUINDECIM, SEDECIM, have also survived in various guises. Whereas the Italian, Sardinian, and Romansh reflexes, respectively, *undici, dodici, tredici, quattordici, quindici, sedici; undiki, doiki, treiki, battordiki, bindiki, seiki; endisch, dudisch, tredisch, quitordisch, quendisich, sedisch* are morphologically transparent, the French, Spanish, and Portuguese cognates are synchronically opaque and unsegmentable, respectively: *onze, douze, treize, quatorze, quinze, seize; once, doce, trece, catorce, quince; onze, doze, treze, quatorze, quinze*. OSp. *seze* and OPt. *seze* were replaced by *diez y seis* lit. ‘ten and six’ and *dezasseis* lit. ‘ten and six’ respectively. This same opaqueness is seen in Catalan and several Italo-Romance varieties (Price 1992:454–57). The Latin SEPTEMDECIM ‘seventeen’, DUO DE UIGINTI ‘eighteen’, UNUS DE UIGINTI ‘nineteen’ (lit. ‘two from twenty’, ‘one from twenty’) gave way to various forms involving the addition of ten + seven, ten + eight, ten + nine. Romanian uses the raw materials provided by spoken Latin, but has created its own unique structure possibly based on

surrounding Slavonic models: e.g., *unsprezece* ‘eleven’ lit. ‘one over ten’ where *spre* is from SUPER (but in everyday speech these are less transparent: *unșpe, doișpe, treișpe, paișpe, cinșpe, șaișpe, șapteșpe, optșpe, nouășpe*). The Latin decads from twenty to ninety, UIGINTI, TRIGINTA, QUADRAGINTA, QUINQUAGINTA, SEXAGINTA, SEPTUAGINTA, OCTOGINTA (replaced by OCTAGINTA), NONAGINTA underlie (with various formal and analogical adjustments) the corresponding Romance numerals: Fr. *vingt, trente, quarante, cinquante, soixante*, OFr. *septante, huitante/octante, nonante* (the French of Belgium and Switzerland has preserved *septante* and *nonante*, whereas *huitante/octante* is rare; cf. Bauer 2004:26f), Sp. *veinte, treinta, cuarenta, cincuenta, sesenta, setenta, ochenta, noventa*, Pt. *vinte, trinta, quarenta, cinqüenta, sessenta, setenta, oitenta, noventa*, It. *venti, trenta, quaranta, cinquanta, sessanta, settanta, ottanta, novanta* (paradigms from Catalan, Sardinian, and Surselvan available in Price 1992:461). In some varieties (French, Occitan, southern Italian dialects e.g., Sicily, Abruzzo, Apulia; cf. Bauer 2004:29), such items as QUADRAGINTA, SEXAGINTA, OCTOGINTA, were replaced (at least in part) by a vigesimal system; cf. Fr. *soixante-dix* ‘seventy’ (lit. ‘sixty-ten’), *quatre-vingts* ‘eighty’ (lit. ‘four twenties’), *quatre-vingt-dix* ‘ninety’ (lit. ‘four twenties ten’). This pattern was more widespread in the numeral system in old French, and also found vestigially in other Romance speaking regions; see Price 1992:463–69 and Bauer 2004:26–31. For these same numbers, Romanian uses a system involving multiples of inherited *zece* ‘ten’ (plural *zeci*), e.g., *douăzeci*, ‘twenty’ (lit. ‘two tens’), *treizeci* ‘thirty’ *patruzeci* ‘forty’, etc.. Latin CENTUM ‘one hundred’ survived in all Romance languages except Romanian where ‘100’ (and its multiples) is expressed by the Slavonic borrowing *sută*, plural *sute*. Nevertheless, reflexes of CENTUM may have formed part of the number system of early spoken Daco-Romance prior to the introduction of the Slavonicism, and it does survive in Aromanian. In

short, although the Romance languages have greatly innovated with regard to the internal syntactic structure of their numerals, they continue the raw lexical material inherited from spoken Latin.

31.3.2 Kinship terminology

Basic kinship terminology also shows a high degree of lexical stability and shared lexicon.

With the exception of Romanian, all the Romance languages continue to use orally-transmitted reflexes of MATER ‘mother’ and PATER ‘father’: Fr. *mere/paire*, Occ. *maire/paire*, Sp., It.

madre/padre, Pt. *mãe/pai* (also OPt. *madre/padre*), Cat. *mare/pare*, while Romanian, Vegliote,

and many southern Italian dialects turn to Lat. TATA ‘father’ and MAMMA ‘mother’, the

documented products of child language (e.g., Vgl. *tuota*, Ro. *tată, mamă*). Reflexes of FILIUS,

FILIA and their diminutives have survived in all Romance languages as the designations for

‘son’ and ‘daughter’: Fr. *fi/s/fille*, Sp. *hijo/hija*, Cat. *fill/filla*, Pt. *filho/filha*, Ro. *fiu/fiică* (the latter is a diminutive, FILIA survives directly in, for example, *fiu-ma/ta/sa* ‘my, etc. daughter’).

The labels for ‘brother’ and ‘sister’ pose some analytical problems. Lat. FRATER ‘brother’ and

SOROR ‘sister’ have survived respectively as Fr. as *frère*, Occ. *fraire*, Vgl. *frutro*, Slit., Ro.

frate, and Fr *sœur*, Occ *sòrre*, OSp. *seror(a)* (> Basque *serora* ‘spinster who looks after the

church’), OIt. *suora* (but still used in modern Italian with the meaning ‘nun’), Rms. *sour*, Frl.

sur, Srd. *sòrre*, Vgl. *saur*, Ro. *soră*. Italian has had recourse to forms based on a diminutive of

FRATER/SOROR, namely *fratello* and *sorella*. Spanish *hermano/hermana*, Pt. *irmão/irmã*, Cat.

germá(n)/germana reflect lexical reduction of Lat. FRATER GERMANUS/SOROR GERMANA

‘brother/sister born of the same parents’ Consequently, these forms provide evidence of the

survival in the spoken Latin of the Iberian Peninsula of FRATER and SOROR (OSp. *fray* and *sor*,

as religious titles, are medieval Gallicisms).

The history of the designations for ‘uncle’ and ‘aunt’ is more complex. Lat. AUUNCULUS ‘mother’s brother’ lived on as Fr. *oncle* (whence Eng. *uncle* and Ger. *Onkel*), OProv. *a(v)oncle*, OCat. *avoncle/avonclo*, ModCat. *oncle.*, Ro. *unchi*,(*LEI* 31, 2673). The Hellenisms THIUS, THIA underlie It. *zio/zia*, Sp. *tío/tía*, Pt. *tio/tia*, Srd. *tiu, tia*. Since the medieval period Catalan has opposed *oncle* to *tia* (a similar split is seen in Occitan and Gascon); modern *tio* is a Hispanism. In Dworkin (2012:62) I raised the possibility that the Greek base directly and independently entered the spoken Latin of the Italian and the Iberian Peninsulas. A semantic evolution of Lat. BARBA ‘beard’ > ‘uncle’ (due to the association of the beard with the male authority of the father’s brother in some kinship systems) underlies the designation of ‘uncle’ in varieties of northern Italo-Romance, Ladin, Friulian, and Vegliote (see *DÉRom*, s.v. *barba*, and *LEI* 43, 1171-77). Latin AMITA ‘father’s sister’ underlies OFr. *amte* (the source of Eng. *aunt*), numerous forms found in northern Italian varieties such as Pie. *magna* (*LEI* 13, 815-23) and Frl. *agne*, Rms. *onda*.

Latin AUUS/AUA ‘grandfather/grandmother’ (AUUNCULUS is a derivative of AUUS) underlies Italian *avo/ava* (today limited to the written and juridical language (but there with the meaning ‘forefather, ancestor’), OSrd. *a(u)u/abu*, as well as various reflexes in northern Italian varieties, Ladin and ARo. *aus* (*LEI* 31, 2674–2678). Derivatives of AUUS have survived elsewhere in the Romance languages. The diminutives ?AUULUS/AUULA (the latter documented in African Latinity) underlie OIt. *àvolo* (also in northern dialects and old Tuscan, including Florentine; *LEI* 31, 2668–73). Opinions are divided as to whether ?AUULUS/AUULA or AUIOLUS/AUIOLA are the starting point for Sp. *abuelo/abuela*, OPt. *avoo/avoa* (modern *avô/avó*) ‘grandfather/grandmother’, and OFr. *aïel/aïeule*, modern *aïeul* ‘grandfather’ (though less

common in this sense than *grand-père*) ‘ancestor’ (see Malkiel 1981–83). Latin *AUIUS/AUIA (the latter in Plautus) have been invoked to account for OFr. *aive*, OPrv. Cat. *avi/avia*, as well as scattered northern Italian forms, Srd. *avu/ava* (*DES*, I, s.v. *avu*, *LEI* 31, 2655–56). Does Sp. *ayo* ‘tutor’ also continue this base (*DCECH*, s.v. *ayo*, Malkiel 1981–83) or is it of Gothic origin, as argued by Gamillscheg (1934)?

Latin NEPOS lives on in most languages, but with a meaning split that is found in other kinship systems: Sp. *nieto/nieta*, Pt. *neto/neta*, Cat. *net/neta* ‘grandson/granddaughter’ versus Fr. *neveu/niece*, Cat. *nebot/neboda* ‘nephew/niece’. Ro. *nepot/nepoată* and Italian ambigeneric *nipote* have both meanings. Sp. *sobrino/sobrina*, Pt. *sobrinho/sobrinha* ‘nephew/niece’ continue Lat. (CON)SOBRINUS/(CON)SOBRINA ‘maternal cousin.M/F’. Lat. SOCER/SOCRA ‘father-/mother-in-law’, GENER ‘son-in-law’, NURUS, whose form was altered under the influence of SOC[E]RA ‘daughter-in-law’, live on widely in Romance: OFr. *suevre*, Occ., Cat. *sogre*, Sp. *suegro*, Pt. *sogro*, It. *suocero*, Ro. *socru*; the corresponding feminine forms designate the ‘mother-in law’ Fr., Occ., Cat. *gendre*, Sp. *verno*, Pt. *genro*, It. *genero*, Srd. *benneru*, Frl. *dzinar*, Ro. *ginere* denote ‘son-in-law’, while OFr. *nuere*, Occ., Cat., Pt. *nora*, Sp. *nuera*, It. *nuora*, Srd. *nora*, Ro. *noră* name the ‘daughter-in-law’. In French, *suevre* and *nuere* have completely disappeared in the face of competition from *belle-mère* ‘mother-in-law’ also ‘stepmother’ and *bru* alongside *belle-fille* ‘daughter-in-law’; also ‘stepdaughter’. Latin COGNATUS ‘blood relation’ took on the meaning ‘brother-in-law’ in all areas outside Gallo-Romance: Occ. *cunhat*, Cat. *cunyat*, Pt. *cunhado*, Sp. *cuñado*, It. *cognato*, Srd. *konnadu*, Rms. *quinau*, Frl. *cognat*, Vgl. *komnut*, Ro. *cumnat*. Tappolet (1895) remains a valuable source of pertinent data.

31.3.3 Colour terms

The bulk of the Latin colour vocabulary did not continue into Romance. Only three Latin primary chromonyms, NIGER ‘black’, UIRIDIS ‘green’, ALBUS ‘white’, have survived widely: Fr. *noir*, Sp./Pt. *negro*, Cat. *negre*, Rms. *ner*, It. *nero*, Frl. *neri*, Ro. *negru* (Srd. *ni(g)eddu* continues Lat. NIGELLUS, *DES*, 2, 166b); Fr., Occ., Cat., Frl. *vert*, Sp., Pt., It., Ro. *verde*. In contrast to the first two terms, the semantic history of ALBUS is more complex. It is documented as a chromonym in Ro. *alb*, Vgl. *jualb*, Rms. *alv*, OSp., OPt. *alvo*, OSrd. *albu/alvu*, and indirectly in such Spanish and Italian toponyms as *Peralba*, *Vialba*, *Pietralba*, *Montalvo* (*LEI* 9, 16). As a colour term ALBUS was replaced by the Germanic *blank, the source of Fr. *blanc*, Sp. *blanco*, Pt. *branco*, It. *bianco*, Lad./Frl. /blank/. Given the presence with the meaning ‘white’ and the relative vitality of vernacular descendants of ALBUS in the Iberian Peninsula and in Italian toponyms, one cannot rule out the possibility that the aforementioned Spanish, Portuguese, and Italian cognates of *blanc* are early Gallicisms rather than the local vernacular descendants of an early Germanic loan in spoken Latin (Dworkin 2012:69f; also *LEI-Germanismi* fasc. 6, 1053–55); Srd. *biancu* is an Italianism (*DES*). Substantivised ALBUS and ALBA have survived widely with various meanings referring to (originally white-coloured) clothing, trees, animals, birds (numerous examples in *LEI*, *FEW*, and *DES*). Feminine ALBA has survived with the meaning ‘dawn’ in all Romance languages except Romanian. Most other Latin colour terms have survived only in scattered Romance languages (e.g., COCCINUS ‘scarlet red’ in Rms. *tgietschen* and ARo. *coatin*, MELLINUS ‘yellow’ in Rms. *mellen* and Srd. *mé(li)nu* (specifically with reference to a horse’s coat), RUSSEUS ‘reddish’ in Sp. *rojo* ‘red’, RUBEUS ‘red’ as Fr. *rouge* ‘red’, Sp. *rubio* ‘blond’, Pt. *ruivo* ‘strawberry blond’), or have fallen into disuse. This semantic field has been receptive to borrowings (cf. Fr. *bleu*, of Germanic

background, Sp./Pt. *azul*, It. *azzurro* ‘blue’ all Arabisms) and to internal creations (e.g., Sp. *amarillo*, Pt. *amarelo* ‘yellow’ < AMARELLUS, diminutive of AMARUS ‘bitter’, Pt. *vermelho*, OSp. *bermejo* ‘(bright) red’ < UERMICULUS ‘small worm that gives a red dye’). Kristol (1978) is an excellent source for data and analysis of Romance colour terms.

31.3.4 Body parts

Many Latin designations for body parts and major organs have come down into most Romance languages (see now Adams 2013:777–91). This is a semantic field in which, cross-linguistically, borrowing is rare (e.g., It. *guancia* ‘cheek’ of Germanic origin, Ro. *obraz*, a Slavonic loan; for additional examples, see Krefeld 1999:263f.). The following Latin bases have left widespread descendants in the Romance languages:

AURICULA ‘ear’, BARBA ‘beard; chin’, BRAC(C)HIUM ‘(fore)arm’, BUCCA ‘cheek’ > ‘mouth’, CAPUT ‘head’, CARO ‘flesh’, COR ‘heart’, CORPUS ‘body’, COXA ‘thigh’, CILIUM ‘eyebrow’, CUBITUS ‘elbow’, CULUS ‘arse’, DENS ‘tooth’, DIGITUS ‘finger’, GENUNCULUM ‘knee’, GINGIUA ‘gum’, GULA ‘throat’, LINGUA ‘tongue’, MANUS ‘hand’, NARES ‘nostrils’, NASUS ‘nose’, OCULUS ‘eye’, OS ‘bone’, PELLIS ‘skin’, PES ‘foot’, PUGNUS ‘wrist’, SINUS ‘breast’, UNGULA ‘fingernail’, UENTER ‘belly’.

Most of these items have retained their original spoken Latin meaning. Although Ro. *bucă* can still mean ‘cheek’ Slavonic *obraz* is the preferred term; today *bucă* is mainly ‘buttock’. Given that Fr. *bouche*, Occ., Cat., Vgl. *buka*, Srd., Rms. *bucca*, Frl. *buke*, Sp., Pt. *boca*, It. *bocca* all mean ‘mouth’, it seems reasonable to claim that the semantic shift occurred in the spoken Latin of the Empire; indeed, BUCCA is already found with the meaning of ‘mouth’ in Petronius (cf. §1.5). In Romanian the reflex of GULA, namely *gură*, acquired the

meaning ‘mouth’; cf. coll. Fr *gueule*, documented with the meaning ‘mouth’ in the twelfth century; elsewhere the progeny of GULA retained its original meaning. The descendants of COR preserved the meaning ‘heart’, while in Romanian *inimă* < ANIMA ‘soul, spirit’ took on this meaning (note also Srd *anima* ‘stomach’ [DES I, 90; see also *LEI* 15:1319 for other anatomical uses in Italo-Romance of reflexes of ANIMA). Romanian also stands apart in its choice of *picior* both ‘foot’ and ‘leg’ < PETIOLUS, a diminutive of PES. The metaphoric use of TESTA ‘earthenware pot’ (a meaning preserved in Neapolitan where *testa* only means ‘pot, vase’ alongside *capo* (F) ‘head’ with the meaning ‘head’ is widespread: Fr. *tête*, OSp. *tiesta*, It. *testa*, Vgl. *tiasta*. Zauner (1894) is a useful source of relevant data on Romance names for parts of the body.

31.3.5 Calendar terms

The Latin names of the days of the week have survived on a pan-Romance scale, although the syntactic relationship between the elements (the name of the relevant pagan god and the noun DIES ‘day’) shows considerable variation which goes back to spoken Latin, e.g., Fr. *lundi*, It. *lunedì* versus Cat. *dilluns* versus Sp. *lunes*, Ro. *luni*. Portuguese chose to retain the Christian system (proposed in the writings of Saint Augustine and Cesarius of Arles) for the names of the weekdays: *segunda feira* ‘Monday’, *terça feira* ‘Tuesday’, *quarta feira* ‘Wednesday’, *quinta feira* ‘Thursday’, *sexta feira* ‘Friday’ (lit. ‘second, etc. feast(day)’). The Hebraism (transmitted through Greek into Latin) SABBATUM/SAMBATUM and the Christian DOMINICUS have survived widely (albeit with different genders, e.g. It. *domenica*, Ro. *duminică* (F) vs Fr. *dimanche*, Pt./Sp. *domingo* (M); It. *sabato*, Pt./ Sp. *sábado*, Fr. *samedi* (M) vs Ro. *sâmbătă* (F)) as the designations for ‘Saturday’ and ‘Sunday’ respectively, rivalling, since the time of

Tertullian (AD 160–225), the pagan SATURNI DIES and SOLIS DIES (for details, see Wartburg 1949). Unique to Sardinian is the term *kenápura* ‘Friday’ < CAENA PURA ‘meal requiring abstinence from certain foods’ (lit. ‘pure dinner’) introduced as a calque of a Greek phrase by Jews from Africa (*DES*, I, 328, Wagner 1951:72). Some varieties of Romansh employ *mesjamna* ‘Wednesday’, lit. ‘middle of the week’ (a calque on German *Mittwoch*?; see Decurtins 2012: s.v. *mesjamna*), as does Vgl. *missédma* ‘Wednesday’ and various northern Italian dialects (see *REW*₃ 4090). In the Vegliote and Italian dialect examples the second element continues the Hellenism HEBDOMAS/HEBDOMADA (see below).

In like fashion, the Latin names of the months – IANUARIUS, FEBRUARIUS, MARTIUS, APRILIS, MAIUS, IUNIUS, IULIUS, AUGUSTUS, SEPTEMBER, OCTOBER, NOUEMBER, DECEMBER – display pan-Romance stability. A handful of Romance varieties have opted for local innovations, e.g., Rms. *zerkladur* ‘June’ (cf. *zerklar* ‘to weed, hoe’; Decurtins 2012: s.v. *zerkladur*) and *fenadur* ‘July’ (cf. *fenar* ‘to stack hay’; Decurtins 2012: s.v. *fenadur*); also Srd. *ladáminis* ‘October’ < LETAMEN ‘manure’, *lampada* ‘June’ (*DES* II, 7), *tréulas* ‘July’ (see *DES* II, 515), and *cabidanni* ‘September’, literally ‘beginning of the year’.

The names for the seasons in spoken Latin have fared well in Romance. While HIEMS ‘winter’ fell into disuse, adjectival HIBERNUS ‘pertaining to winter’, acquired substantival function through reduction of the syntagm (TEMPUS) HIBERNUM and survived on a pan-Romance scale (see *REW*₃, 4126.). The label for ‘summer’ AESTAS/AESTATIS, lives on in most Romance languages except Romanian, Spanish, and Portuguese, in which members of the family of Lat. UER ‘spring’, namely *vară*, *verano*, *verão* have triumphed (*LEI*, 6, 1139–48; *FEW* 24). In medieval Spanish *verano* meant ‘spring’, a meaning retained by Srd. *veranu* (*DES*, II, 571). Sp., Pt. *estío*, OPrv., Cat. *estiu* ‘summer’ bespeak the presence of (TEMPUS)

AESTIUUM in the spoken Latin of the Iberian Peninsula and southern Gaul. To designate the transitional season known as ‘spring’, Lat. UER combined widely with the adjective PRIMA: Ro. *primăvară*, It., Sp., Cat., Pt. *primavera*, OFr. *primevoir*. The Latin simplex also came into Romance with its original meaning: OFr., OPrv. *ver*, Vlc. *ver*, ONap., ORmg. *vera* (FEW 14, s.v. VER). Latin AUTUMNUS ‘autumn’ has also thrived: Fr. *automne*, Occ. *auton*, Pt. *outono*, Sp. *otoño*, OCat. *autumne* (ousted in the modern language by the neologism *tardor/tardó*), Srd. *attungiu/attunzu*, It. *autunno*, Ro. *toamnă* (FEW 24, s.v. AUTUMNUS, LEI 31, 2593-2594, Colón 1976:223-39).

The designation for various periods of time display a high degree of stability. Descendants of Lat. ANNUS ‘year’ are found in all Romance languages. Almost all languages continue to use the progeny of MENS to designate ‘month’; Romanian uses *lună*, the word for ‘moon’, to label this time period. Reflexes of SEPTIMANA entered all the Romance languages. In Sardinian, *settumana* week’ has been displaced by *chida*, of disputed origin (DES II, 348); orally-transmitted reflexes of the Hellenism HEBDOMADA (attested since the time of Varro) turn up in Vgl. *jedma* ‘week’, OIt. *edima*, Rms. *jamna* ‘week’, OIt. *domada* ‘weekly lesson’, OFr. *domée* ‘Sunday Mass’, OGl. *domaa* ‘week’, Cat. *doma* ‘type of ecclesiastical office held on a weekly basis’ (REW₃, 4090, FEW 4, s.v. HEBDOMAS). Both DIES ‘day’ (or substantivized DIURNUS, originally ‘daily’) and NOX ‘night’ have survived in all the Romance languages (although in French and Italian *di* is restricted to day names, e.g., *lundi*, *lunedì* and lexicalized Fr. *midi* ‘midday’, It., *mezzodi* ‘midday’, *oggi* ‘nowadays’, *buondi* ‘good day’), as have the Latin terms for ‘today’ and ‘yesterday’, HODIE and HERI respectively (although OPt. *eire* was replaced by *ontem* in the medieval language). Latin CRAS ‘tomorrow’ lived on as OSp., OPt. *cras* (ousted by *mañana* and *amanhã* respectively < *manjana), Srd. *cras(a)/cras(i)*, SI. (some

parts of Campania) *krai*; elsewhere prefixed derivatives of MANE ‘morning’ (Fr. *demain*, It. *domani*), acquired this meaning.

31.3.6 Domestic and wild animals

The Latin signifiers for many domestic and domesticated animals have remained stable.

Selected examples include: AGNUS/AGNELLUS > Fr. *agneau*, Occ. *agnel*, Gal. *anho*, Cat. *anyell* (rivalled today by *be* and *xai*; see *DECat*, I, 338), It. *agnello*, Frl. *agnel*, Ro. *miel*; BOS > Fr. *boeuf*, OPrv. *bou*, Pt. *boi*, Sp. *buey*, It. *bue*, Ro. *bou*; CABALLUS > Fr. *cheval*, Occ. *caval*, Cat. *cavall*, Sp. *caballo*, Pt. *cavalo*, It. *cavallo*, Ro. *cal*; CANIS > Fr. *chien*, Occ., OSp. *can* (ousted in Spanish by *perro*; see Dworkin 2012:38f.), OCat. *ca(n)* (alongside *gos*), Pt. *cão*, It. *cane*, Frl. *can*, Ro. *câine*; CAPRA > Fr. *chèvre*, Occ., Cat., Sp., Pt. *cabra*, It. *capra*, Frl. *ciavre*, Ro. *capră*; CATTUS > Fr. *chat*, Occ., Cat. *gat*, Sp., Pt. *gato*, It. *gatto*, Frl. *giat*, Ro. *cătușă* (which today, as plural *cătușe*, means ‘handcuffs’; the common word for ‘cat’ is *pisică*); PORCUS > Fr., Occ., Cat., Ro. *porc*, Pt., It. *porco* (although today *maiale* is the common word for the animal), Sp. *puerco*, Vgl. *puark*, Rms. *piertg*; TAURUS > OFr. *tor*, Occ., OCat. *taur*, Pt. *touro*, It., Sp. *toro*, Ro. *taur*; UACCA > Fr. *vache*, Occ., Cat., Pt. Sp. *vaca*, It. *vacca* (although *mucca* is the preferred term in the modern language), Ro. *vacă*. In the Latin of the Iberian Peninsula the phrase AGNUS CORDUS ‘lamb born late in the year’ was replaced by *kordarju, the source of Sp. *cordero*, Pt. *cordeiro* (Cat. *corder* may be a Hispanism). The spoken Latin designations for certain wild animals have survived on a pan-Romance scale, e.g., LUPUS ‘wolf’ > Fr. *loup*, Occ. *lop*, Cat. *llop*, Sp., Pt. *lobo*, It. *lupo*, Rms. *luf*, Frl. *lof*, Ro. *lup*; UULPES (or its diminutive UULPICULA) ‘fox’ > OFr. *goupil* (replaced by *renard* of Germanic origin), Occ. *voulpilh*, OCat. *volpell*, OSp. *gulpeja/vulpeja* (ousted by etymologically obscure *zorro*), It. *volpe*, Rms. *uolp*,

Frl. *bolp*, Ro. *vulpe*; URSUS > Fr. *ours*, Occ. *ors*, Cat. *os*, Sp. *oso*, OPt. *osso* (replaced by Latinate *urso*), It. *orso*, Rms. *uors*, Ro. *urs*. The Latin names for some common insects have also fared well; witness FORMICA ‘ant’ > Fr. *fourmi*, Occ., Cat., Pt., Srd. *formiga*, Sp. *hormiga*, It. *formica*, Rms. *furmicla*, Vgl. *formaika*, Ro. *furnică*; PEDUCULUS ‘louse’ > Fr. *pou*, Occ. *pezolh*, Cat. *poll*, Sp. *piojo*, Pt. *pioho*, It. *pidocchio*, Srd. *preducu*, Frl. *pedoli*, Rms. *plugl*, Ro. *păduche*; PULEX ‘flea’ > Fr. *puce*, Occ. *piuze*, Cat. *pussa*, Sp., Pt. *pulga*, It. *pulce*, Srd. *puliche/pulighe*, Rms. *pilesch*, Frl. *puls*, Ro. *purece*. APIS ‘bee’ (especially its diminutive APICULA), and MUSCA also fared well: e.g., OFr. *eis*, It. *ape*, Vgl. *uv*, Frl. *ave*: Sp. *abeja*, OOcc. *abeilla* (> Fr. *abeille*) Tsc. *pecchia*; Occ., Cat., Sp., Pt. *mosca*, Fr. *mouche* Ro. *muşcă*.

31. 4 Relic words

Words that have survived in only one or two languages (Stefenelli’s ‘teilromanisch’ category) represent the other side of lexical stability. One might reasonably expect that such items are found more often in isolated regions of the Romània, e.g., Sardinia, Romania, the Alpine regions of Switzerland and northern Italy, or in areas colonized in the earliest days of Roman expansion, such as Sardinia and the Iberian Peninsula, territories that have preserved vocabulary from earlier chronological layers of Latin. Many of the relevant orally transmitted lexical items listed here entered other Romance languages as late medieval or early modern Latinisms. Blasco Ferrer (1984:34–39) lists 59 Latin bases that have survived either only in Sardinian or, more often, in Sardinian and other isolated or lateral areas of the former empire. In many instances the word has retained its original meaning in Sardinian, whereas it has acquired new meanings elsewhere in the Romània. I offer here selected examples of items limited to Sardinian or southern Italian varieties: ACINA > *ácina* ‘grape’, CONIUGARE >

cojubare ‘to get married’ (flanked by *coyubiu* ‘marriage, wedding’, DOMUS > *domu* ‘house’, EXCITARE > *ischitare* ‘awaken’ (*DES*, I, 658), *EXTUTARE > *istut(t)are* ‘extinguish a fire’ (*DES*, II, 537), FERRE > *ferrere* ‘carry, lead’, FRATUELIS > *fratile* ‘cousin’ (*DES*, I, 543), FURFUR > *furfure* ‘chaff, bran’, IUBILARE > *jubilare* ‘shout’, NARRARE > *narrere* ‘say, tell’ (detailed discussion in *DES*, II, 156f), POLLEN > *póddine* ‘bran, chaff’. Some words survive only in varieties of Sardinian and Romanian, two territories that split off early from the Roman Empire, e.g., HAEDUS > Srd. *edu*, Ro. *ied* ‘kid’ (reflexes of the diminutive HAEDIOLUS appear in various northern Italian and Ræto-Romance varieties, *REW*₃, 3973), NEMO > *nemos* ‘nobody’, Ro. *nime*, *nimeni*

Sala (2005:32) claims that Romanian has preserved in its inherited lexicon approximately 100 Latin words that have not survived in any other Romance language. Haarmann (1978:93-105) offers 141 such items, and also adduces numerous Romanian words of Latin origin that have orally transmitted cognates in only one or two other Romance languages. I offer here selected examples from the data in Sala (2005) and in Haarmann (1978): ADIUTORIUM > *ajutor* ‘help’ (but cf. OFr *aitoire/aitour*), CANTICUM > *cîntec* ‘song’, DISMERDARE > *dezmierda* ‘caress’, HERRERE > *urî* ‘hate, loathe’, LIBERTARE > *ierta* ‘forgive’, LANGUIDUS > *lînced* ‘weak, feeble’, LINGULA > *lingură* ‘spoon’, MAS/MARIS ‘male’ > *mare* ‘big, great’, OUIS > *oaie* ‘sheep’, PUTRIDUS > *putred* ‘rotten’, TRAIECTA > *treaptă* ‘step, stair’.

Stefenelli (1979), Diekmann (1987), and Liver (2012:72–86) list a number of Romansh lexical items that they claim are exclusive to that linguistic domain or that are found only in scattered other Romance languages. Their examples include the survival of Lat. ALGERE > (*a*)*ulscher* ‘freeze’, ARATIO > *araziun* ‘ploughing’ (also Francoprovençal, see *FEW* 135, s.v. ARATIO), CONSUESCERE > *cudescher* ‘become accustomed’, CODEX > *cudisch* ‘book’, DIU >

ditg ‘long’, INCIPERE > *entscheiver* ‘begin’ (also Ro. *incepe*), LINERE > *lenar* ‘bedaub’ (also OFr. *liner*; see *FEW*, 5, s.v. LINERE), NATURA > *nadira* ‘vagina’ (also Francoprovençal), NIMIA > *memia* ‘too much’, QUIESCERE > *quescher* ‘be silent’, UIX ‘scarcely, hardly’ > *vess* ‘difficult, hard’, SARIRE ‘weed’ (Friulian, northern Italian, Francoprovençal), TRANSFUNDERE ‘baste’ (Romansh, Ladin), and INTELLEGERE ‘understand’ (both in Romansh and Romanian), CANTICUM ‘song’ (Ladin, Friulian, and Romanian).

There seem to be fewer inherited lexical items that have survived only in Gallo-Romance, an area open to lexical innovations in the form of neologisms. Among the examples found in Stefenelli (1981:103f.) are SUSPICARI > OFr. *soschier* ‘suspect’, DOCERE > OFr. *duire* ‘teach’ (which coincided with OFr. *duire* ‘lead’ < DUCERE), DIMIDIUS > *demi* ‘half’, IUXTA > OFr. *joste* ‘beside, next to’, PARUUS > OFr. *pare* ‘little’, RES ‘thing’ *rien* ‘nothing’ (borrowed into Catalan and old Spanish as *ren*, and also found in Piedmontese dialects (*ren*) as a simple marker of sentential negation like mod. Fr. *pas*), UIRIDARIUM > OFr. *vergier*, OOcc. *vergel* ‘garden, orchard’ (whence Sp. *vergel*, Pt. *vergeu*), TAMDIU ‘so long’ > Fr. *tandis* (with addition of adverbial *-s*), SOLLICITARE > *soucier* ‘worry’, FARCIRE > *farcir* ‘stuff’, INFANTIA > *enfance*, CLAMOR > *clameur* ‘shout, noise’, REDEMPTIO > *rançon* ‘ransom’.

The following Spanish and Portuguese words either have no orally transmitted cognates outside the Iberian Peninsula, or have congeners only in Sardinian, Sicilian, and/or central and southern Italo-Romance, all territories where Latin was introduced several decades before the arrival of the Romans in the Iberian Peninsula in 218 BC. Many of these items in all likelihood go back to Latin bases brought into the Iberian Peninsula by the first waves of Roman occupiers, while the others represent retentions of words eventually replaced by neologisms elsewhere in the Romania: Sp. *acechar* (OSp. *assechar*), Pt. *asseitar* ‘lie in wait for, ambush’ <

CL. ASSECTARI, Sp. *ajeno*, Pt. *alheio* ‘of another’ < ALIENUS, Sp. *asar*, Pt. *assar* ‘roast’ < ASSARE, Sp. *atar* ‘bind’ < APTARE ‘to fit, accommodate, adjust’, Sp. *ave*, Pt. *ave* ‘bird’ (also OCat. *au*, Srd. *ae* ‘bird; eagle’) < AUIS ‘bird’, Sp. *barrer* ‘sweep’ < UERRERE, *cabeza*, Pt. *cabeça* ‘head’ < CAPITIA ‘hole in a tunic through which the head passes’ Sp. *centeno*, Pt. *centeio* ‘rye’ < CENTENUM ‘a kind of grain’, Sp. *cieno* ‘mud, slime’ < CAENUM ‘dirt, filth, mud’, *comer* ‘eat’ < COMEDERE ‘eat up entirely’, Sp. *cojo*, Pt. *coxo* ‘lame’ < COXUS ‘id.’, Sp. *hablar* ‘speak’, Pt. *falar* < FABULARI (cf. also the hapax legomena OOcc. *faular* and OBol. *fablança* (see FEW, III, 345–46)), Sp. *feo*, Pt. *feo* ‘ugly’, < FOEDUS ‘repugnant’, Sp. *heder*, Pt. *feder* ‘stink’ < F(O)ETERE, Sp. *lamer*, Pt. *lamber* ‘lick (cf. Srd. *làmbere*) < LAMBERE ‘id.’, Sp. *lejos* ‘far’ < LAXUS, OSp. *madurgar* (modern *madrugar*), Pt. *madrugar* ‘get up early’ < *maturikare (MATURUS ‘early’), Sp. *medir* ‘to measure’ < CLat. METIRI, Sp. *preguntar*, Pt. *perguntar* ‘ask, question’ < PERCUNTARI, OSp. *pescudar* ‘investigate’ < PERSCRUTARI, Sp. *pierna*, Pt. *perna* ‘leg’ < PERNA ‘ham’, Sp. *porfia* ‘stubbornness; dispute, challenge’ < PERFIDIA ‘betrayal’, Sp. *recudir* ‘respond, recount’ < RECUTERE, Sp. *rostro*, Pt. *rosto* ‘face’ < ROSTRUM, *trigo* ‘wheat’ < TRITICUM ‘id.’, Sp. *vacío*, Pt. *vazio* ‘empty’ < UACIUUS; for additional examples and further discussion, see Dworkin (2012:46–49). 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.

Colón (1976:144f.) lists several Latin bases that, in his view, left orally-transmitted reflexes only in Catalan: CATARRHUS > *cadarn* ‘head cold’ (also widespread throughout southern Italy, LEI 110:1418-27), CONFIGERE > *confegir* ‘join together’, CONGEMINARE > *conjuminar* ‘arrange, adjust’, DELIRIUM > *deler* ‘strong desire’, IGNORARE > *enyorar* ‘miss, feel nostalgia for’ (borrowed into modern Spanish as *añorar*), INDAGARE > *enagar* ‘incite’, ODIARE > *ujar*

‘tire’, PACIFICARE > *apaivagar* ‘pacify’, REPUDIARE > *rebutjar* ‘reject’, *tardatjone > *tardaó* ‘autumn’ (alongside more common *tardor/tardó*; see *DECat*, 8: 309f).

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., Pt. *eido* < ADITUS, OPt. *fornigar* ‘fornicate’ < FORNICARE (also OSrd. *forricare*, *DES*, I, s.v. *forricare*), OPt. *fornço* < FORNICIUM (ALSO OSD. *forrihiu*), Pt. *colmo*, Ast. *cuelmo* ‘stem’ < CULMUS ‘stalk, stem’, Glc. *domear* ‘tame’ < DOMINARE (cf. Sp. *domar* ‘tame’ < DOMARE), Pt., Glc. *adro* ‘patio, churchyard’ < ATRIUM ‘entrance room’ (see also *FEW* 25: 689-91), Glc. *asomade/asemade* ‘suddenly, finally’ < SUMMATIM ‘slightly, summarily’, Glc. *con* ‘large rock’ < CONUS ‘cone’.

31.5 Latinisms

The entry into those Romance languages with a strong literary tradition during the late medieval and early modern periods of hundreds of borrowings from written Latin changed permanently the lexical makeup of French, Spanish, Catalan, Italian, and Portuguese. Indeed, the number of Latinisms far exceeds the number of words inherited directly from spoken Latin. The majority of these neologisms first entered the written language as part of the lengthy process of linguistic elaboration, from where, with the spread of literacy, they entered various strata of the spoken language. Some Latinisms may have entered through the spoken language of the liturgy and the oral use of Latin in university and some (medical, legal) professional circles. Once integrated into the host language, Latinisms show a high degree of lexical stability or retention, and many have filtered down into the active vocabulary of speakers. Others are restricted in oral and written use to specific technical registers or to poetic and other

specific literary registers. The overwhelming majority of the Latinisms recorded in Reinheimer Rîpeanu et al. (2004) appear in all the Romance languages surveyed for her compilation – Portuguese, Spanish, Catalan, French, Italian, and Romanian – thus forming part of the modern shared lexicon. It is difficult to determine in many cases whether a specific Latinism was borrowed from written Latin independently in each of the host languages, or whether it was first introduced into one language, say French, a major scholarly vernacular in the sixteenth through eighteenth centuries and then transmitted as Gallicisms into other Romance and non-Romance European languages. This situation is particularly true for Romanian, in which many apparent Latinisms are, in reality, borrowings from French and Italian (see §7:REF).

There are instances in which a Latinism is found in only one Romance language or territory. Reflexes of PRETIUM ‘price, reward’ came into most Romance languages through oral transmission: Fr. *prix*, Pt. *preço*, Cat. *preu*, It. *prezzo*, Ro. *preț*. However in Spanish the sole reflex of PRETIUM is learned *precio*, a noun abundantly documented in medieval Spanish (*prez* is a Gallicism; see Malkiel 1957). On the surface Sp. *dulce* ‘sweet’ has the appearance of a Latinism, in contrast to Fr. *doux*, OOcc. *dulz*, Pt. *doce*, OSp. (rare) *duz*, Cat. *dolç*, It. *dolce*, Ro. *dulce*; for differing analyses of the Spanish adjective, see Bustos Tovar (1974:423), Malkiel (1975), and Hartman (1980). Latinate Pt. *urso* ‘bear’ (first documented only in the nineteenth century) ousted OPt. *usso* and the less frequent *osso*, the orally-transmitted descendants of URSUS. Fr. *pâle* (OFr. *palle/palde*), Occ. *palle* ‘pale’ reflect oral transmission of PALLIDUS, whereas Pt., Sp. *pálido*, Cat. *pallid*, It. *pallido*, Ro. *palid* are Latinisms. Latin FORNICARE and FORNICIUM came through oral transmission into old Sardinian as *forricare* and *forrithu* (Pittau 2000-03, s.vv.).

Often the introduction of a Latinism into the written language is an individual act,

repeated independently by numerous writers who sought to elaborate the Romance languages as languages fit for scholarly and literary use on a par with Latin. Most Latinisms are the result of a deliberate action. Not all such experiments struck root. The following items found in the Latinate poetry of the Spaniard Juan de Mena (1411–56), though documented sporadically in other late medieval and early modern writers, did not survive: *pigro, ficto, vaniloco, fruir, corusco, superno, belígero, bello, nubífero, clarífico, longevo, murices, vulto, circuncingir*; or further examples and discussion of failed Latinisms in Spanish, see Dworkin (2012:176–78).

LSA User 10/8/2016 11:49 AM

Deleted: f

LSA User 10/8/2016 11:48 AM

Deleted: .

... [1]