

1976, 7 : 13-28

Archivum Linguisticum

SEMICULTISMO

ROGER WRIGHT

University of Liverpool



If we encounter in Spanish a Latin word which appears to have been in continuous spoken use without developing as did phonetically analogous words, we are not necessarily justified in inferring that its use was exclusive to the literate community. Some of these cases can be explained without such conjecture by two principles widely accepted in other contexts: that diachronic change normally implies a period of free variation, and that semantic change and lexical borrowing can often be explained in part with reference to a desire to resolve potential ambiguities. These two principles can be used to illuminate certain cases of 'semicultismo' in which a word has developed a variant but the original form has also survived. For example, *pensar* and *pesar* both develop from Latin *PENSARE*; *pensar* is often called 'culto', but has, in fact, always been the only one of the pair to dipht-ongize in the 'popular' way, and the answer to this apparent contradiction seems to be that both words have been in continual use throughout the community, and the variation that arose was exploited to clarify the pre-existing polysensy.

A. When a Castilian writer coins a neologism from the Latin, it is known as a 'cultismo'. Such words are often formally recognizable in themselves simply from their similarity to Latin, and when their first attestation is considerably later than the earliest Castilian texts it is normally safe to assume that such a coinage was made there, even in the absence of further evidence. Juan de Mena's use of *littig*, for example, in the fifteenth century, is the first attested, and was consciously based on Latin *LITTIGARE*: *Corominas*, in his etymological dictionary,¹ describes *littig* as descending 'por vía culta'. This assessment is only partly based on the formal similarity to the Latin: there is also a criterion of relative development involved, since *LITTIGARE* developed in the popular language into *lidiar*, by processes which are said to be regular in that analogous forms have given similar descendants.

The word 'cultismo', however, has also been applied to a quite distinct set of phenomena; words which satisfy the criterion of relative development, in that their form is more like the Latin form than is that of other Castilian words which derive from phonetically analogous Latin words, but which are attested from early times and cannot be regarded as individual coinages. In such cases, the notion of social context is usually brought into play: words which, for example, are commonly used in the Latin of the Mass may be inhibited from developing newer forms which they might otherwise have assumed. Such a word is *espiritú* < *SPIRITUM*; the -ITUM ending in most words becomes -ido, and the survival of popular 'esdrújulas' with a penultimate /h/ is uncommon, but none the less this is a word that has never fallen out of popular use: even if alternative forms have developed in some places at some times, the

NSKRIT STUDIES IN EUROPE

yi, founder of the principal school of

which Jumarandi, ('King Jamour'), an, Jaumara school of grammar, once

Saravartman and Kātyāyana, fl. 38th

system.

expected, many more than three other

lowing works stand out: the *Jainendra-*

1 cent. A.D.), the *Candra-vyakarana* of

bhidhasvopajña-sādanusāna of Hema-

quelques Missionnaires de la Compagnie de

& Bordelet, 1743.

rich, according to the Indians, is the

three times in Pāṇini's recital of verbal

ical Sanscrit it is usually an 8th class

tails of their formation, the following

(e).

der *Philippinen, Japans und Indochines.*

ter & Co., 1931, p. 107.

articular version or one of the others

id are absent in the second edition of

Lettres . . . Nouvelle Edition, vol. XIV,

, ed. W. Caland as vol. X of *Werken*

1915.

ation, *Le theatre de l'idolatrie, ou la porte*

ar le Sieur Abraham Roger, . . . Am-

nes of the *Idolatrous Nations*, London:

Religion and Manners of the Bramins

Iollander, . . . both names borrow'd

anguage of the *Literati*, as the Latin

(14). Another edition, reset, appeared

of the *Known World*, vol. III, London:

between pp. 345-405, the quote noted

H. Burnell, *Hobson-Jobson. A glossary*

L. W. Crooke (1903; reprint, London:

students at Purdue University, who

Latinate form has remained the standard. The Glosses of San Millán² gloss 'c pater et Spiritu Sancto' as *cono Pate, cono Spiritu Sancto*, and 'lignare' as *trame*; this seems to suggest that *Spiritu* should, and *lignare* should not, form part of the description of the Romance spoken at San Millán in the tenth century. It is thus reasonable to point to a small group of ecclesiastical words whose development was inhibited by regular spoken use in Latin. However, it has become tradition within philological studies to extend the argument in the following way: to assume that, if a word survives in a form which is less evolved than that of analogous popular words, therefore it must have been used mainly in the speech of those who know Latin rather than in the general language as a whole. It is doubtful whether this is a step which can plausibly be taken in more than a limited number of cases: it depends entirely on the criterion of relatively retarded evolution, while begging a number of other linguistic questions.

Ration, for example, is said by Corominas to develop from *RATIONEM*, 'por v culta,' being less developed than *razón*. It is difficult to see *ration* as a consoling borrowing, since its meaning is not that of *RATIONEM*: if it is to be regarded as 'culto,' it can only be in the second sense, that of belonging mainly to the register of Latinate speakers. The only basis for this is the assumption that educated speakers tend to preserve older forms, which is no more tenable as an a priori linguistic principle than the widely held reverse view, that remote dialects tend to be archaic compared with the literate standard.³

A further idea that has emerged is that of the 'semicultismo.' This term was originally applied to words that had developed regularly in some ways but held back in others, but the precise implications of labelling all such words as 'semicultismos' have never been entirely clear. Badia Margarit has recently argued that many such phenomena can be explained without invoking even a partial learned influence;⁴ but the critical cases, with which Badia has not yet dealt, concern the emergence in the vernacular of doublets. There are some pairs of words that derive from a single etymon (such as *piensa* and *pensa* from *PENSAT*) concerning which it is no longer tenable to take the traditional view that one of the pair was reintroduced from Latin some time after the original pronunciation had died out. Entwistle, for example, saw 'semicultismos' as essentially 'cultismos' in the first sense, as attempted coinages from Latin that were only partly accurate.⁵ This is inherently unlikely to apply to anything more than orthography: at best, the number of such nonce mishits that became standardized within the general lexicon of the speech community can only be small. A more initially plausible view is that such semi-learned words are in some sense part of the register of semi-learned people, although who these were is not often specified. There is a basic misconception here: that of supposing social registers to lie neatly on a descending scale of Latinity in the early Middle Ages. While it is undoubtedly true that different groups in a speech community have distinct linguistic habits for some purposes, there is not much evidence to suggest that any particular group of people at any time have exclusive use of a register that uses consistently more archaic spoken forms than that of other groups: yet the way the word 'semicultismo' tends to be used appears to take this for granted. *Siglo* > *Saeculum*, for example, is said to be 'semiculto' compared with *yo* > *Oculum* or *conyo* > *Cuniculum*, and has inadvertently become the standard example of

analogy with the written language, in which it is rational to regard many of the earlier documents, such as those in Menéndez Pidal's *Documentos Lingüísticos de*

approximate intermediate scale. However, many of the apparent attestations of 'semiculto' forms to be found here can be explained in the traditional manner. If we

particular result of a scribe's *ignorance* of Latin, when he probably pronounced the supposed 'semicultismo' is the

These documents as evidence of the contemporary spoken language, no deductions at all can be made concerning the prevalence of Latinate forms in the spoken language, even in that of the educated classes.

even among the literate. In contrast to the problems which beset this kind of social explanation for the

spoken language registers: it is based on the relativity within Castilian which we

each *chané* [ʃat], or *parts* [pa:]; the usual traditional classification rested

plants in Castilian (cp. *cava* > CAPSAM, *pagar* > PAGARE, etc, which are early popular).

is second principle underlies some semantic and lexical changes, and the phenomenon now unfortunately known as 'lexical diffusion'.

It is now widely accepted that diachronic changes are not sudden, immediate or

ecclesiastical words whose development, however, it has become traditional

role. It is doubtful whether this is a limited number of cases; it depends

velop from RATIONEM, por via
icuit to see *raciō* as a conscious

tenable as an a priori linguistic
remote dialects tend to be archaic

eguaritly in some ways but held
 idelling all such words as semi-
 largarit has recently argued that

NSAT) concerning which it is no

... This is inherently unlikely to

pie, although who these were is here: that of supposing social

exclusive use of a register that
of other groups: yet the way

come the standard example of

smooth: it is not a case of the entire speech community going to bed one day saying one thing, and re-emerging the next saying another. Transformational grammarians may postulate a sudden rule-change within an individual,⁸ but they would normally wish to be taken to imply that every speaker's competence is affected precisely the same time. Within any linguistic community, the time that elapses after the first appearance of a particular evolved form until the final disappearance of the older form—if indeed the latter ever disappears—can vary greatly. The implication is that all events describable in retrospect as linguistic changes must have been describable during that event as cases of free variation.⁹

Thus in such a case some time elapses when both the old and the new use are 'acceptable': there may or may not be stylistic, regional or other differences between them, but each will have to be regarded as part of the language in a complete synchronic description. Some speakers of modern English may say 'economic' with an initial [ɪjk] and some with [ɛk]: many people may use both, with or without discernible reason for using one rather than the other, and everyone in the speech community will understand both. Free variation does not necessarily imply that each speaker makes a choice whenever he speaks, but that from the functional viewpoint either form will suffice.

Once this situation has arisen we have an evolution; it is only in practice called 'change' if eventually the chronologically earlier form is discarded and the new one becomes standard. But why should the original form disappear at all? Native speakers are not etymologists: Weinreich, Labov and Herzog¹⁰ suggest an opposition to think of in precisely those terms ('archaic' and 'innovating', which speakers are unlikely to think of in precisely those terms) unless the variation has arisen simply out of a desire for innovation in the first place): if they think of it at all, they see the situation as one in which there are two possible forms to fulfil the same function. So in practice this question is essentially the same as that to be asked in any such situation: when there are two forms available to fulfil one function, why should the collective sub-conscious of the speakers of that language decide to discard one of the two entirely? The usual answer to this is based on the principle of economy: it aids communication to standardize where there is variation to no functional purpose.

Often in the event the discarded form will be the older form, although not simply because of its age; whatever the original reasons were for developing the variant (whether functional or formal), they are likely to remain valid at the time of the decision to standardize. But it does not always happen that way: sometimes a widespread variant finds the decision going against it, for subconscious reasons which are stronger at the later date than they were at the time of the original development. Such is the case with *noch* in Old Castilian: *noch* and *noche* are both current at the time of the original composition of the surviving version of the *Poema de Mio Cid*:¹¹ *noch* appears thirty-seven times (including thirteen at the end of a line) and *noche* twelve. These are probably the earliest attestations of either word,¹² but it seems reasonable to assume, as in practice most investigators have, that *noche* is the earlier form. When the time came to choose one as standard, *noche* won. Questions of earlier appearance took no part in the processes involved in this decision. Yet had *noch* prevailed, subsequent scholars would have called it a 'change': as it is, the development tends to be regarded as an aberration. Such aberrations also tend to be

ascribed to social causes: Lapesa, and thence Anderson, for example,¹³ suggested that the /-e/ was lost owing to French influence on the upper classes. If there is anything in this, at least it argues against the view that the upper classes are automatically linguistically conservative.

The reasons underlying the origins of a change are often studied: those behind the decision to discard or retain an older form are rarely studied in such detail. But variation in language is universal: every synchronic state is transitional: not every variant either has been nor will be regarded as standard, for countless forms arise which do not obviously belong at one time more than any other during their currency;¹⁴ when such a choice arises and both forms survive, the relevant fact is that the language has decided that there is still a use for them both. For the ending of a state of free variation is a separate process from its inception, and in some cases there may emerge a reason strong enough to prevent the disappearance of either form.

G. There is a widely held view that it is possible to clarify the reasons for a semantic change by examining the deficiencies of the word replaced, rather than by seeking any particular virtue in the one that has extended its meaning. No such case can ever be proved, but the reasons for which—to take a well-known example—Latin *BUGCA*, 'check', has given derivatives in most modern Romance languages that mean 'mouth' (Sp. *boca*, It. *bocca*, Fr. *bouche*) are accepted to lie partly in the ambiguity or lack of distinctive clarity in Latin *OS*, *ORIS*.¹⁵ The postulation of a desire to clarify cannot be regarded as a sufficient cause, nor as in any sense predictive, of individual developments; but as an analytical approach it has recently been successfully extended by Hope to the study of lexical borrowing, and I shall argue in the next section that the survival of some 'semicisms' can be ascribed to the same desire.¹⁶ Most Castilian loanwords from other languages have been borrowed to refer to referents, or full functions, when Latin had originally an apparently good word for the same purpose. Contrary to the traditional view, that loanwords are normally introduced to refer to particular concepts of a more prestigious culture, a cursory glance at the list of words borrowed into Castilian from elsewhere is more than enough to reveal that many of the functions they perform were previously performed by something else.¹⁷ Sometimes this can be explained to some extent in social terms: a *mason*, for example, was originally a *mason* run by and operated for the Northerners on the 'camino francés', although the concept of an 'inn' can hardly have been unknown previously.¹⁸ But there are many cases in which this social explanation serves to confuse rather than enlighten; why, for example, when Latin had a perfectly good word in *BUFFO*, -*ONEM*, is *sapo* now the Spanish for 'toad'? Did Basque toads enjoy cultural prestige?

As soon as we begin to investigate Iberian words for 'toad', we at once submerge ourselves into a problem which is the same in essential respects as that of Vulgar Latin words for 'mouth'. The original Latin for 'toad' was *BUFFO*, but the Vulgar Latin for 'owl' was also *BUFFO*, a variant of the Classical *BUBO*; *BUFFO* and *BUBO* are variant dialectal forms of one word in origin.¹⁹ The result was that nothing in particular could be used unambiguously for 'toad'. The owl made use of the possibility of aspirating the intervocalic /-f-/ into a variant *buhō*: *buhō* first appears on paper in the works of Alfonso X, although both *buzo* and *guzo* appear in glosses of an earlier date.

ity going to bed one day saying
Transformational grammarians
individual,⁸ but they would not
lker's competence is affected at
unity, the time that elapses after
all the final disappearance of the
n vary greatly. The implication
istic changes must have been
on.⁹

h the old and the new use are
al or other differences between
the language in a complete syn-
ish may say 'economic' with-
ay use both, with or without a
er, and everyone in the speech
not necessarily imply that each
from the functional viewpoint

g, it is only in practice called a
n is discarded and the new one
orm disappear at all? Native
Herzog¹⁰ suggests an opposition
g, which speakers are unlikely
tion has arisen simply out of a
f it at all, they see the situation
ie same function. So in practice
ed in any such situation: when
why should the collective sub-
iscard one of the two entirely?
onomy: it aids communication
al purpose.

der form, although not simply
re for developing the variant
main valid at the time of the
ppen that way: sometimes a
it, for subconscious reasons
ne time of the original develop-
nd *noche* are both current at the
on of the *Poema de Mio Cid*.¹¹
the end of a line) and *noche*
of either word,¹² but it seems
have, that *noche* is the earlier
ard, *noche* won. Questions of
ved in this decision. Yet had
d it a 'change': as it is, the
ch aberrations also tend to be

Except in the far south of Italy, where *gusto* was the regular development for 'ov' the toad lost its own name.²⁰ Elsewhere *bufo* was not preserved in speech: with variants for an exceptionally long time, so that [bufo] would not necessarily be re-established as a separate word to which a distinct meaning could accrue until If [f] had not disappeared for so long, it might have been possible to preserve [but] as a recognizable separate form from *bufo*.

Gallo-Romance borrowed Germanic *KRAPPPO or *KRAPP (eg. O.F. *crappot*, Mod. Fr. *crapaud*): the origins of Italian *bolta* and *raspo* are unclear, and the rare *busone* is a fourteenth-century learned borrowing:²² the Rumanians call toads kind of frog, *broască rîioasă* (mangy frog) or *broască buboasă* (poxy frog: from BUBVA 'boil').²³ Wherever these words come from, the salient point seems to be that a vernacular felt a need to fill a gap.

If a word does disappear, but the concept and the referents do not, there are, in general, two main methods for filling the gap: Castilian tried them both, semantic change within Romance and lexical borrowing from outside. Cast. *escuerzo* is first found in the late thirteenth century, and *escuerzo* now means 'toad'. The Catalan *escorç*, 'viper', and the dialectal Italian *scorzona*, are said to derive from *EXCURTIC-ONEM, a variant of CURTIO: since toads were thought to be poisonous, it is possible that Castilian (in which 'viper' was usually *bivora*) adopted the expedient of dropping a distinguishing criterion and originally making the word more generic applicable to all small and unpleasant animals.²⁴ Thus we find Juan Ruiz once only using *escuerzo* to mean (probably) 'worm':

'Synon, desque es muerto, que lo coma el escuerzo' (LBA, 1544c).

And this may rather be an example of his stretching the vocabulary potential of Castilian to its limits for the ambitious needs of his rhymes.²⁵ There is an Aragonese form *escurzón*, now meaning 'scorpion': *escorçón* is also found in Castilian, meaning 'toad'.²⁶ Corominas adds that the Mozarabic for 'hedgehog' was *uxcurçhōn* or 'uskurçhūn, from the same etymon. So this word was of limited use for clearly signifying 'toad' until *escuerzo* had developed, in addition to its markers, a specific distinguishing confining it to use with toads:²⁷ it had done so by the time of Nebrija, who says: 'sapo o escuerzo: Bufo' in his Castilian-Latin dictionary (1494), but in the meanwhile the areas of the Castilian community that had most contact with Basque had found a more explicit alternative in *sapo*.

Exemplo XXI:

... que eran yernas todas las aldeas de aquel valle, et que fallava ella en las casas yernas muchas culnebras et lagartos et sapos et otras tales cosas que se crian en los lugares yernos . . .²⁸

In such a list a word that might still run the risk of being understood as generic could fail to convey the specific reference, so something more precise than *escuerzo* was chosen. The implication is that *sapo* is already well known to be intelligible, even if not yet standard and rarely used on paper. This story is almost certainly not set in the Basque country; toads are not a particularly Basque phenomenon, nor

did Basque toads have particular prestige. Michelena believed the word to be a Romance loan into Basque, but this is unlikely since we would then have to postulate some other source for this exclusively Iberian borrowing: Zahn has called it 'pre-romano': *'Sapo es sin duda ibérico (preromano), puesto que faltan cognados fuera de la península ibérica: this is a non-sequitur. Similarly, Hubschmid uses sapo as an example of 'elementos preindoeuropeos', but it is merely perverse to assign to prehistory a borrowing which all the evidence suggests is mediaeval.²⁹ (The Basque is not geminated, so if we wish to postulate that *sapo* had become a Castilian word before the intervocalic plosives had generally voiced, we might even be reduced to calling it 'culto'.) In the context of Mediaeval loanwards, the fact that Basque is not Indo-European but French and Catalan are, is of no significance: Basque is still available to borrow from now.*

Bufo, meaning 'toad' in Mediaeval Spanish texts can only be a 'cultismo' of the first variety, scribal nonce-imitation of the Latin. An interesting example occurs in the seventh is entitled *Exemplo del bufo con la liebre*, in which the *bufo* is almost certainly a toad: at the end of the story the lion says: 'Qui sapo ama luna le paresce, et si alguno ama la rana aquella le paresce reina,' corresponding to the Latin 'Si quis amat Kanam, putat esse Dianam' (i.e. here there is no BUFO in the Latin). Gayangos' in his edition, glossed *bufo* as 'acaso lo mismo que *bufalo*, a no ser que sea *buho*, cambiada la f en h.' The fifty-fourth *exemplo* runs entirely as follows:

'Un galapago pasava una vegada sobre el bufo. E vino otro e firióle en el espinazo. Estonce dixo el bufo: -¡Confonda Dios tantos señores!'

The Latin is BUFONEM: Keller suggests this is an owl: but in each case it seems to be clearly a toad, with the BUFO of the Latin being transferred whole to the Spanish.³⁰ This cannot be taken as evidence of the form's survival in any medieval register, whereas the use of *sapo* certainly can.

Toads are untypical among small animals in the lack of dialectal variation in the words used to refer to them. Bravo García found *sapo* (or cognates) over most of the peninsula;³¹ he also cited *escuerzo* and *ponzoño*, *ambo* borrowed from the gypsies in parts of Andalucía: and one *bufo* in Vallecas, on the South Eastern edge of Madrid. It is not obvious how to interpret the latter.

This is only one example in which the incentive for borrowing may have originated in part in potential ambiguities within the Romance. This can also be seen in many instances where the traditional view of cultural contact as the trigger for borrowing might seem to be most plausible, when the word is borrowed with the referent. There will have been a period before the definitive borrowing of *tomate* from Nahuatl when tomatoes were normally referred to by some kind of periphrasis in Castilian (such as the Kumanian toad), or by extending the meaning of some pre-existing Castilian word, as pineapples were and still are called *piñas* (originally meaning only 'pine-cones'). An illuminating example is the jaguar, which was called *tigre* when first met, since that was the compartment into which it most obviously fell; the Portuguese decided to borrow the Tupi *yaguarda* (whence French and English *jaguar*), which was only adopted by Spanish in the last century,³² at a time of increased biological sophistication when the possible confusion came to appear worth avoiding. In the River Plate area it is still called *tigre*. Here the problem has been solved by both expedients in turn; it is the same phenomenon in each case, and we need not postulate

as the regular development for 'owl' [h] would have been considered for 'owl' [bufo] would not necessarily be intact meaning could accrue until approximately the twelfth century: have been possible to preserve [bufo] PPO or *KRAPPA (eg. O.F. *botia* and *rospo* are unclear, and the wing:²² the Rumanians call toads a *bubosa* (poxy frog: from RUBUM. : salient point seems to be that all

the referents do not, there are, in Castilian tried them both, semantic from outside. Cast. *escuerzo* is first now means 'toad'. The Catalan said to derive from *EXCURTIO: ere thought to be poisonous, it is by *bivora*) adopted the expedient of making the word more generic. Thus we find Juan Ruiz once only

rgo' (LBA, 1544c).

hing the vocabulary potential of rhymes.²⁵ There is an Aragonese also found in Castilian, meaning or 'hedghog' was *uxurción* or limited use for clearly signifying markers, a specific distinguisher by the time of Nebrija, who says: ary (1494), but in the meanwhile : contact with Basque had found

Juan Manuel: *El Conde Lucanor*,

e, et que fallava ella en las casas

of being understood as generic thing more precise than *escuerzo* enough known to be intelligible, its story is almost certainly not arly Basque phenomenon, nor

a high cultural value in Tupi or Portuguese felines any more than in Basque or phibians.

- D. I hope to have established that the following principles are at least plausible:
1. Diachronic change implies synchronic free variation. Free variation can! theory last indefinitely, but when there are two forms available for one function the tendency is for one to be discarded.
 2. The phenomena of semantic change and lexical borrowing can sometimes be illuminated if we see them as available means for alleviating already existing ambiguities.

A joint application of these principles can explain the popular use of some 'semi-cultismos' (and 'cultismos' in the second sense): I suggest that a homonymic or polysemic form might, during the period of phonetic free variation that normally occurs in the course of a sound change, have the homonymy or polysemy resolved by keeping both forms with separate meanings.³² Many words have more than one function, but a language often tolerates such a state if the means of clarifying it are not at hand. If any such word undergoes, for any reason, some kind of phonetic development, the immediate result is a state of free variation: in other words, a form with more than one function has become two alternative forms, each with more than one function. Rather than dropping the old form, this situation can be resolved by allotting one of the variant forms to part of the functions undertaken jointly by both, and the other variant to the rest.

Latin *MUNDUM* was homonymic: it could mean either 'clean' or 'world'.³³ The originally distinct phonemes /u/ and /o/ lost their distinctiveness: the sounds probably came to be allophonic or in free variation in spoken Latin. It is likely that within the community as a whole, there were for a while at least two variants available, each with either meaning: perhaps the advantages of simplification were clear enough for both forms to survive, with separate functions, and with distinctiveness preserved in an acceptable way under the superseding phonological system (since the /u/ of *mundo*, its apparently 'culto' feature, is in itself unremarkable within Old Spanish, in a way that an /f/ in **bufo* would not have been). *Mundo* is found in the Glosses of San Millán and of Silos: although it has never been particularly common, and was ignored by Nebrija, it has always meant in Castilian 'clean'. (The adverb *munda miente* and the peculiar antonym *sine munda* also occur in the glosses of Silos: these are probably best seen as separate lexical items, for in these cases there is no problem of ambiguity). Corominas mentions *mundo* as meaning 'world' in the *Auto de los Reyes Magos*, but Deyermond is surely right in assigning this work to Gascon provenance:³⁴ Modern French has chosen *monde* for world, and lost the meaning 'clean', but Old French was probably trying to specialize *monde* as 'clean' and 'mont' as 'world', until the plurality of *monts* led eventually to the modern system. (Cp. Fr. *immonde*, 'unclean'.)³⁵ *Mundo*, 'world', is first found in Spanish in the Poem of the Cid, and is common from then on: so far as I know, it never meant 'clean'. Yet Corominas says that *mundo* derives 'por vía semiculta' which is misleading if it is meant to imply that the word was only or mainly used in semi-learned registers, of whose existence we are justified in being provisionally sceptical, rather than being

a simple formal observation on the similarity to Latin when compared with *mundo*. This is not to deny the existence of register (or 'vertical dialect'); merely to deny the relevance of registers to the development of *MUNDUM*. Any postulated correspondence between archaizing spoken habits and the language of educated groups is not self-evident enough to be taken for granted: nor does the linguistic and historical evidence suggest that early Mediaeval Castilian administrative and ecclesiastical classes were as a group particularly expert in Classical Latin. Contamination with Latin almost certainly affected the pronunciation of Mediaeval Latin rather than Castilian, as indeed the pronunciation of Modern Castilian affects the Spanish pronunciation of Latin today.³⁷

Cases of polysomy seem to be able to react in the same way as homonymy, although the precise basis for distinguishing between the meanings is less immediately clear, and thus the period of free variation—of both forms having the same uses—is normally longer. An extended example of this phenomenon is the development of Latin *OPERA*. *OPUS* (> *huebos*) disappeared in Old Castilian in all contexts where it could be confused with *huegos*, the Romance plural of *huevo* (> *OVUM*), only remaining in such unambiguous idioms as 'Huebos vos es que lliedes a guisa de varones' (Poem of the Cid, l. 3563).³⁸ It has since fallen into disuse. The neuter plural (and feminine singular) *OPERA* had no such problem, and gave a number of variant forms, the two of which that survived into Old Castilian being *huebra* and *obra*, for some time in free variation. *Huebra* occurs in a document of Burgos dated 1207, with a wide generic meaning:

'e quanta renda selevantare dista heredat, dolo pormia anima halahuebra desancta Maria de Villa mediana.'³⁹

It occurs twice in the Poem of the Cid:

'e acostarse los tendales, con huebras eran tantas' (l. 2401):
'sobrelas unos gapatos que a grant huebra son' (l. 3086):

and here it means 'handiwork', referring to finely worked tent-posts and shoe-leather. Thus the first part of the thirteenth century seems to be a time when both forms had at least both these uses: some of the earliest occurrences of *obra*, such as that referring to the 'casulla de San Ildefonso' in Berceo (*Milagros* 60c) imply the results of good craftsmanship in the same way as *huebra* in the Poem of the Cid, while others are quite generic, such as the following from Berceo's *Vida de Santo Domingo de Silos*, 631a:

'Metieronlo en obra lo que avien asmadeo.'

It may be that this situation caused as much confusion as the polysomy of one form would have: in any case, in the increasing linguistic awareness of the late thirteenth century, this seems to have been resolved, although not in the most foreseeable way: the use of *huebra* narrowed greatly. Juan Ruiz did not use it, using *obra* in the sense of 'handiwork' in his *Libro de Buen Amor* (1330):

'La obra de la tienda vos querria contar' (LBA 1266a).

lines any more than in Basque and

principles are at least plausible: Free variation can in no forms available for one function. exical borrowing can sometimes be uns for alleviating already existing

tain the popular use of some 'semi-: I suggest that a homonymic or metic free variation that normally homonymy or polysomy resolved by Many words have more than one ite if the means of clarifying it are free variation: in other words, a plural (and feminine singular) *OPERA* of variant forms, the two of which that survived into Old Castilian being *huebra* and *obra*, for some time in free variation. *Huebra* occurs in a document of Burgos dated 1207, with a wide generic meaning:

mean either 'clean' or 'world': their distinctiveness: the sounds in spoken Latin. It is likely that, while at least two variants available, ices of simplification were clear functions, and with distinctiveness ing phonological system (since the itself unremarkable within Old have been). *Mundo* is found in the never been particularly common, in Castilian 'clean'. (The adverb also occur in the glosses of Silos: ms, for in these cases there is no as meaning 'world' in the *Auto de* assigning this work to Gascon or world, and lost the meaning specialize *mundo* as 'clean' and eventually to the modern system: it found in Spanish in the Poem now, it never meant 'clean'. Yet 'ta' which is misleading if it is used in semi-learned registers, ally sceptical, rather than being

Huebra instead specialized in a separate meaning: Nebrija's main meaning for the word is 'uebra, obra de un día, with a subsidiary 'uebra de dos bues', which is the only meaning the modern language has. In sum, the two forms were both used for a long time for most of the available meanings inherited from OPERA, and both have survived into the modern tongue by splitting the function. The precise reasons for choosing the modern division and diminishing the range of thirteenth-century *huebra* are not clear, although guesses are easy: for example, possible confusion with *hebra* (<FIBRAM), for then the aspiration was becoming more liable to disappear. So far as I know, no one has called *obra* a 'semicultismo', probably in view of the loss of the post-tonic vowel, whose retention is often a stimulus for the use of the term.⁴⁰

A word which seems to exemplify with exceptional clarity this desire to resolve polysemy by preserving otherwise doomed forms is Latin PENSARE. Spanish *pensar* and *pesar* both come from PENSARE, and are both first attested in the Poem of the Cid. All Romance languages other than Provençal have chosen in the same way between the [-ns-] and [-s-] variants, and Provençal has been able to make the distinction with *pezar* ('weigh') and *pesar* ('think'). In the Poem of the Cid, differentiation of form and function have standardized to a large extent. *Pensar* appears in fifty separate uses in a variety of morphological forms, all meaning approximately 'think'.⁴¹ *Pesar* as a finite verb is only used in the (Romance) sense 'grieve'; *pesar* as a noun means 'sorrow': the noun *peso* only means 'weight' and *pesado* only means 'heavy' (not appearing as a part of *pesar*). In short the writer has used many of the available variations in order to standardize and simplify the correspondence between form and meaning as far as possible.⁴² Nothing can be meant by saying *pensar* arrives 'por via semiculta' (as Corominas does), or calling it a literary or learned term (as Anderson does)⁴³ beyond the trivial fact of its formal similarity to the Latin. For a further point is that *pensar* regularly diphthongizes and *pesar* regularly does not: this has probably always been so, for in the Poem of the Cid *pensar* never fails to diphthongize when it would be expected. On the five occasions where the scribe of the extant MS omitted the glide, they are all diphthongized forms in which the distinctiveness of the nasal is not essential, since *pesar* has no such forms: Menéndez Pidal and Smith are right to correct this automatically to a form of *pensar* rather than *pesar* (ll. 324, 389, 391, 1680, 2501), although only Menéndez Pidal indicates the scribal omission. This is exactly the opposite of what one would expect were this simply a case of learned versus popular registers, for the popular form would then be the one to undergo diphthongization.

There is, in addition, the distinction of *pienso*, 'a weighed portion of animal food, from *peso*, and the use of *pensar* which derives from this to mean 'feed an animal, in syntactic contexts where it cannot mean 'think' and the distinction from *pesar* is important.⁴⁴ *Pienso* and this *pensar* seem intrinsically less likely to belong to learned registers than do *peso* and *pesar*, so the social implications of 'cultismo' or 'semicultismo' are not even initially attractive in this case.

E > ie is an irregular change, even if popular: the vowel in Old Latin [-ens] was normally long, even if cognates were short (eg. DENS, DENTIS, DENTIO), so that if I am right in postulating a retention of the nasal consonant in PENSARE when it meant 'think' and its abandonment for a nasalized vowel when meaning 'weigh', the

aning: Nebrija's main meaning for the heavy 'nebra de dos bues', which is the form, the two forms were both used for the function. The precise reasons for the range of thirteenth-century borrowings into Romance in almost every area from early Mediaeval Latin) is further undermined by evidence that the written -n- in -ns- may not have been pronounced in reading or reciting post-imperial Latin prior to the Carolingian reforms (whose influence in Castille before the eleventh century was slight): a silent n. For example, -ns- is sometimes written in words that never had a nasal at all, as a possible graph for /s/ (or /z/):⁴⁵ so the /n/ in *pensar* is peculiar even if it is a borrowing, for it must be an early one to undergo the diphthongization. *Ración* is another standard example of 'semicultismo'. *Razon* and *ración* both come from RATIONEM, and are both attested from the twelfth century. Yet despite the fact that the meaning of *ración* is closer to that of the original Latin, Corominas merely says that *ración* comes 'por via culta'. (Blaise's dictionary of Mediaeval Christian Latin lists fifteen senses for RATIO, but none of them is that of *ración*). This could be another case in which different meanings were around at a time when the word could acceptably either keep the yod and remain unvoiced, or do without it and voice, and this division of labour is a rational result. The four uses of *ración* in the Poem of the Cid have a recognizably distinct meaning: 'part', or 'share'. It looks as if the retention of the yod was the distinctive feature of this meaning, for it appears consistently in writing. If this is the meaning intended, whether the written language is supposed to be Latin or not. As well as *ración*, Oelschläger mentions the spellings *racion* (in Menéndez Pidal's *Documentos* no. 262, of 1194): *razion* (in Berceo's *Milagros*, 132a): *tracion*, (in *Documentos* no. 13, of c. 1174): *racione* (in a document of 1075 from San Juan de la Peña): and *razon*, which appears closely following five uses of *ración* in *Documentos* no. 16, dated 1187. All seem to have recognizably the meaning of 'explanation', and most of the twenty-nine occasions on which *razon* occurs also refer to various phenomena of 'connected words'. This generic meaning has not survived: it was in the process of becoming even more generic (as in PMC 1.279, or *Libro de Apolono*, 428d), and Lanchetas was right to observe that in Berceo 'esta palabra tiene una significación muy vaga'.⁴⁷ It has been suggested that semi-learned terms tend to be more abstract in meaning than popular ones, but *ración* and *razon* are strong counter-examples.⁴⁸

This phenomenon of keeping a pair of variants with separate functions is not even confined to words of Latin origin: Vulgar Latin words of Germanic origin can equally well go through the same process, although the word 'semicultismo' has rarely if ever been applied to them. It is, for example, probable that *robar* and *roba* come from the same Germanic root, which may well have been borrowed at a time when the course followed (out of several available) was to keep both forms and share out the verbal and nominal functions one each.⁴⁹ The verb meant originally simply 'pillage' (as in Berceo's *La Iglesia Robada*, in which the church is not stolen, nor, in the event, even robbed, but simply vandalized: or in the phrase *robar el campo*, which occurs three times in the Poem of the Cid) and the noun originally specifically 'a weighed portion of animal food', and the distinction from *pesar* is likely to belong to learned applications of 'cultismo' or 'semicultismo'. The vowel in Old Latin [-ens] was NS, DENTIS, DENTIO), so that, consonant in PENSARE when it vowel when meaning 'weigh', the

meant the booty gained in such activity, so it is likely that it was one lexeme borrowed rather than two. The following sole use in the Poem of the Cid may be used to refer to clothes, but in context it just means 'goods captured in war':

"Tanto traen las grandes ganancias
muchos ganados de ovejas e de vacas

e de ropas e de otras riquizas largas" (ll. 480-481b).

Berceo probably coined *ropella* (eg. *Malagros* 6c, 874b) for 'clothes': he used *roba* for 'stolen goods' (*VSD* 466c). The stage of free semantic variation was long: Corominas quotes Lope de Vega's generic *roba de bagaje* (from *El Guero Loco*): and once *roba* acquired the normal meaning of 'clothes' it was already a separate word, for *robar* has never been tied down in this way.

The preservation of the intervocalic /p/ within Castilian was possible in itself since words with an original geminate developed regularly into such forms within Old Castilian (eg. CUPPAM > *copa*), so the survival of *roba* commits no offence against the phonology. The Germanic can hardly have had a geminate in view of the development of the verb (and of Italian *roba*). The explanation proposed here is tentative, but the alternatives are not obviously better. Is *roba* a 'cultismo' in the sense of being the exclusive property of an esoteric intellectual area? The military connection suggests not. Is *roba*, like *sapo*, a very much later borrowing? This is improbable. Is it a borrowing from Aragonese (some areas of which lack intervocalic voicing)? The Leonese is the same and the first attestations are in León. It is just conceivable that the nominal use was not borrowed from the Visigoths until after the Romance voicing, but whether this would count as 'cultismo' or lexical borrowing is such a difficult question to clarify that it adds weight to this view that the two are related.

Tuscan liked to preserve intervocalic voiceless plosives, but despite this the Italian is *roba*: another method of distinguishing them was devised on the basis of the [u]-[o] variation: for *roba* is now the noun (with very generic meaning) and *rubare* the Italian verb. The French chose *robe* as the noun and formed a compound with a Romance affix, *devorer*, for the verb. All sensible ways of differentiating: none of them is normally called 'semicultismo', despite the parallel between *roba* and *mundo*, *pensar* or *racón*.

The same principle can also be invoked within orthography: *bardn* and *wardn* both come from Latin BARONEM, which was originally Germanic. In Classical Latin it meant 'idiot': St Isidore used it to mean 'mercenary':⁵⁰ later Goths lost any pejorative implication, so that, if *bardn* is in any sense a 'cultismo', it is one with almost the opposite meaning from that of Classical Latin BARO. Once the spelling settles, it is clear that the orthographic choice of 'b' or 'v' (to represent the same modern phoneme) has been sorted out—perhaps even consciously—on semantic grounds in the same way as the preceding examples. In the Middle Ages the word tended to mean both 'noble' and 'male' at once (however spelt), but twice in the Poem of the Cid it was used in specific opposition to *mugier*,⁵¹ and I know of no occasion when it was used to refer to women. *Varona*, 'female', first appears in the

'La Gloriosa diz: dadmelo, varona' (172).

Libre dels tres reys d'Orient:

keyly that it was one lexeme borrowed from the Cid may be used to refer to the war?

481b).
 874b) for 'clothes': he used *roba* a de *bagaje* (from *El Cuerdo Loco*): 'clothes' it was already a separate way.
 in Castilian was possible in itself.
 regularly into such forms within
 rival of *roba* commits no offence
 have had a geminate in view of
 The explanation proposed here is
 better. Is *roba* a 'cultismo' in the
 intellectual area? The military
 much later borrowing? This is
 some areas of which lack inter-
 the first attestations are in León.
 not borrowed from the Vizigoths
 it would count as 'cultismo' or
 larify that it adds weight to this
 sives, but despite this the Italian
 was devised on the basis of the
 very generic meaning) and *rubra*
 and formed a compound with a
 ways of differentiating: none of
 parallel between *roba* and *mundo*,
 thography: *barba* and *varon* both
 y Germanic. In Classical Latin
 cenary? later Goths lost any
 use a 'cultismo', it is one with
 Latin *BARO*. Once the spelling
 or 'v' (to represent the same
 ven consciously—on semantic
 In the Middle Ages the word
 to *mugier*,⁵¹ and I know of no
 female, first appears in the

A similar use appears in the Libro de Buen Amor:

Dizes: *Quomodo dilexi vuestra fabla, varona?* (382a).

Aguado⁵² points out that all the early uses are vocative, and this may be the context of the original semantic evolution into the specifically sex-marking sense (as *Sir Madam*, used in addressing people of any rank). Margarita Morreale⁵³ believes *varona* was only originally used to gloss or translate Biblical Latin *VIR*, *VIRAGO*, and if this is true the spellings *varon* and *varona* may count as partly 'culto': in which case the 'cultismo' is the variant least like the original etymon, so it hardly supports the traditional view.

E. Conclusion

When more than one form of a word has survived, it seems to be insignificant which of the variants is closer to the etymon: and that is all that the word 'semicultismo' can imply in such cases. It should not be taken to imply its exclusive use by a hypothetical group with a partly 'culto' register, and probably not even be taken to imply any particular connection between the 'semiculto' form and the Latin in the native speaker's mind. There are also cases of 'semicultismo' which have not normally been allied with a popular counterpart: such a case is Latin *SAECULUM* > *siglo*. The consonant cluster is less evolved than that of comparable words, but the vowel is more: not only has *AE* become /e/ and then diphthongized, but the normal thirteenth-century form *siglo* has become the modern *siglo*. This cannot be seen as even partly 'culto'.⁵⁴ Butwistle saw *siglo* > *siglo* as connected with the contemporary change *castello* > *castillo*, which could be right.⁵⁵ Elcock adopted a moral tone, saying it 'ought' to have palatalized.⁵⁶ But the choice between the competing derivatives of *SAECULUM* cannot be seen as a question of Latinizing registers. It might be profitable to investigate it in parallel with words from which it needed distinction—particularly, perhaps, *SIGILLUM*, which developed along regular lines to the thirteenth-century *sigillo*; a postulated desire to avoid a clash may simultaneously explain why *SAECULUM* avoided earlier palatalizing into a similar form, and the way in which *siglo* became *siglo* and *siglo* became *siglo* (not **sillo*, as would be expected) at the same time, Juan Ruiz, who almost exclusively wrote *siglo*, almost exclusively wrote *sello* too; the salient distinction in the confusion came eventually, on this view, to concentrate at about the start of the fourteenth century on a simple closed vowel for one meaning (*siglo*) and open vowel for the other (*sello*). It may thus be that the theory sketched here to explain doublets could be extended to cover some cases of unexpected lack of evolution where there is no popular counterpart from the same etymon. In any case, the doublets must count as the central issue here, and I hope to have shown that the decision to retain an older form after the evolution of a newer is sometimes more understandable if we see it as comparable to semantic or lexical change, and arising from the apparently natural desire to have ambiguities clarified. Whether or not this turns out to be helpful in more than a few cases, it should be agreed by now that even if 'semicultismo' was once definable, it is no longer, and cannot be taken to imply any particular connection with learned or semi-

NOTES

1. J. Corominas, *Diccionario Crítico Etimológico de la Lengua Castellana* (Madrid, 1954-57); there some revisions in his *Breve Diccionario Etimológico de la Lengua Castellana* (Madrid, 1961).
2. Reprinted in full in R. Menéndez Pidal, *Orígenes del Español* (4th edition, Madrid, 1956); p. of the greater archaism of its dialects.
3. No one, so far as I know, has argued that mediaeval Sardinia was unusually literate, on the
4. A. M. Badia Margarit, 'Por una Revisión del Concepto de "Cultismo" en Fonética Histórica *Studia Hispanica in Honorem R. Lapesa* (Madrid, 1972), vol. I, pp. 137-52.
5. W. J. Entwistle, *The Spanish Language* (2nd edition, London, 1962), p. 48.
6. R. Menéndez Pidal, *Documentos Lingüísticos de España* (new edition, Madrid, 1966).
7. For a similar view, see the review by R. Harris of D'Arco Silvio Avalle, *Latino, circa romano e 'rustica romana lingua', Medium Aevum XXXVI* (1967), pp. 52-4.
8. e.g. R. D. King, *Historical Linguistics and Generative Grammar* (New Jersey, 1969).
9. See J. Lyons, *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics* (Cambridge, 1968), pp. 49-50; M. L. Samu
10. *Empirical Foundations for a Theory of Language Change*, in *Directions for Historical Linguist* edited by W. P. Lehmann and Y. Malkiel (London, 1968), pp. 95-188; W. Labov, 'The Inter
11. Evolution of Linguistic Rules', in *Linguistic Change and Generative Theory*, edited by R. P. Stockw
12. *Op. cit.*, pp. 156, 184.
13. Quotations are from the edition by C. C. Smith (Oxford, 1972): statistics are critically based
14. those in F. M. Walman, *Concordance to the 'Poema de Mio Cid'* (London, 1972).
15. Authority for dates is usually based on Corominas.
16. R. Lapesa, 'La apócope de la vocal en el castellano antiguo', in *Estudios dedicados a R. Menéndez*
17. *Pidal*, vol. II (Madrid, 1951), pp. 185-226; J. M. Anderson, *Structural Aspects of Language Chang*
18. (London, 1973), pp. 175-8. The argument here presented is over-simplified: it is likely, fo
19. rather than disappearing (as in Modern Portuguese).
20. K. Baldinger and J. L. Rivarola, 'Linguística Tradicional y Fonología Diacrónica', *Anuario d*
21. *Letras IX* (1971), pp. 5-49, disagree: 'el hecho de que, en un estado de lengua, pueden coexisti
22. sistemas que corresponden a distintos estados diacrónicos' (p. 42).
23. See S. Ullmann, 'Historical Semantics and the Structure of the Vocabulary', in *Miscelánea*
24. *Homenaje a A. Marín*, vol. I (La Laguna, 1957), pp. 289-303 (p. 294); W. D. Elcock, *The Romance*
25. *Languages* (London, 1960), p. 157. The same principle can then illuminate MAXILLAM 'jaw
26. >mejilla 'check'.
27. T. E. Hope, *Lexical Borrowing in the Romance Languages*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1971); particularly pp.
28. 701-10, where he talks of an 'ecology of vocabulary' (p. 709).
29. D. J. Gifford makes the same observation, concerning Arabisms, in 'Spain and the Spanish
30. Language', in *Spain: A Companion to Spanish Studies* edited by P. E. Russell (London, 1973), pp.
31. 1-40 (p. 14). J. J. Katz, *Semantic Theory* (New York, 1972), Chapter 2, argues forcefully that any
32. language is capable of expressing anything expressible in any other language.
33. 18. *La maison*, 1173: *la maison*, 1181: *el meson*, 1349. Entwistle (*op. cit.*, p. 66) reverses the order of events:
34. 'Fr. *maison*, when borrowed, took the sense of "inn", Sp. *mesón*.'
35. A. Ernout and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Latine* (Paris, 1951) say (Art.
36. BUFO): 'Mot dialectal, comme le montre la préservation de -f-leave intervocalique. Le mot
37. a dû désigner deux animaux différents.'
38. 20. But see below (p. 9).
39. 21. See R. W. Penny, 'The Re-emergence of /f/ as a phoneme of Castilian', *ZRPh LXXIII* (1973),
40. pp. 463-82. The precise nature of the pronunciations involved remains unclear.

22. See B. Migliorini and A. Duro, *Prontuario Etimológico della Lingua Italiana* (Third edition, Turin, 1958) and C. Battisti and G. Alessio, *Dizionario Etimologico Italiano*, 5 vols. (Florence, 1968). The change of BU- to GU- is paralleled in Southern Calabria (e.g. *guru* < BURRUM), but standard Italian has developed no other word like this; see G. Rohlf, *Grammatica Storica della Lingua Italiana e dei suoi Dialecti, Fonetica* (Italian translation, Turin, 1966), p. 196; on p. 303 he suggests that BURBO > gufo may be a case of dissimilation.
23. This kind of circumlocution is always available but not normally lexicalized; see Samuels, *op. cit.*, p. 65, note 2. Similarly, the fifteenth-century Castilian humanist Palencia explains BURFO in Latin as 'rana terrestris maxima', translated into Spanish as 'gran rana terrestre'.
24. Cf. the dialectal form *ponzono* mentioned by Bravo García (see note 31).
25. See K. W. J. Adams, 'Juan Ruiz's Manipulation of Rhythm', in *Libro de Buen Amor Studies*, edited by G. B. Gybbon-Monypenny (London, 1970), pp. 1-28, especially pp. 13-15. J. Aguado, *Glosario sobre Juan Ruiz* (Madrid, 1929), p. 368, suggests *escuerto* < EXCORTEBUM, 'descortezada', i.e. in context 'la descarnada', death. H. B. Richardson, *An Etymological Vocabulary to the Libro de Buen Amor of Juan Ruiz* (Yale, 1930) follows Meyer-Lubke in suggesting *escuerto* < SCORTEBUM, 'made of leather', meaning in 1544c 'toad'; this is possible, given the parodic context (the mock planctus for Urraca); Juan Ruiz did not use *sapo*. If this etymology is correct, my argument (mutatis mutandis) still holds.
26. Such wide regional differences need cause no surprise; see the useful warning against postulating any kind of wide standard in W. Rothwell, 'Medieval French and Modern Semantics', *MLR* LVII (1962), pp. 25-30. I do not wish to imply that in any particular area the same word came to mean both 'toad' and 'vipera'.
27. This is a parallel to the English restriction of *deer*, which formerly meant 'animal', on the arrival of the potential confusion between *heart* and *hart*: Samuels, *op. cit.*, pp. 73-4 describes this as 'functional pull'. Eventually it will probably be possible and convenient to describe such developments in transformational terminology of distinguishers and markers (see Katz, *op. cit.*, Chapter 3) but only once we are sure of what happened.
28. *El Conde Lucanor*, edited by J. M. Blecua (Madrid, 1969), p. 129, last line; edited by H. Knust (Leipzig, 1900), p. 84, l. 18.
29. L. Michelena, *Fonética Histórica Vasca* (San Sebastián, 1961) p. 225; L. J. Zahn, the 'Vocabulario Etimológico' to *Libro de los Exemplos por A.B.C.*, edited by J. E. Keller (Madrid, 1961), p. 430; J. Hubschmid, 'Lenguas prerromanas no Indo-europeas: Testimonios Romanicos' in *Enciclopedia Lingüística Hispánica*, vol. I (Madrid, 1959), pp. 27-66.
30. *Escritores en Prosa anteriores al Siglo XV*, edited by Don Pascual de Gayangos (Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, vol. LI, Madrid, 1884), pp. 543-60 (the comment on *bufo* appears in the glossary at the end of the volume); *Libro de los Calos*, edited by J. E. Keller (Madrid, 1958), p. 130. I am grateful to Dr. G. B. Gybbon-Monypenny for drawing these exempla to my attention.
31. J. Bravo García, 'Carta del Sapo', *Revista de Dialectología y Tradiciones Populares* IV (1948), pp. 482-3. See also R. W. Penny, *El Habla Pastaga* (London, 1969), p. 213.
32. Corominas dates *yaguar* at 1879 and *jaguar* at 1899. See C. E. Kany, *American-Spanish Semantics* (California, 1960), particularly p. 2.
33. See the valuable general remarks on this phenomenon within English in R. A. Waldron, *Sense and Sense Development* (London, 1967), chapter 3.
34. R. Vilches Acuña, *Semántica Española* (Buenos Aires, 1954), states that MUNNUS 'world' was originally coined off MUNNUS 'clean'; if this were true—Ernout and Meillet are sceptical—it would still be unlikely for the word to be considered polysemic in the fifth century AD.
35. A. D. Deyermann, *The Middle Ages*, in the series *A Literary History of Spain* (London, 1971), pp. 208-9.
36. See F. Godefroy, *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française* (Paris, 1888), vol. V.
- Juliano" en *Fonética Histórica*, p. 137-52.
- 962), p. 48.
- tion, Madrid, 1966).
4. Ilvito Avallé, *Latino, circa romany*.
- ew Jersey, 1969).
- 1968), pp. 49-50. M. L. Samuels, *Directions for Historical Linguistics*, p. 188; W. Labov, 'The Internal Theory', edited by R. P. Stockwell.
- : statistics are critically based on London, 1972).
- n *Estudios dedicados a R. Menéndez* *Structural Aspects of Language Change* is likely, for over-simplified: it is likely, for ty, with the final [e] unvoicing
- onología Diacrónica, *Anuario de* *ado de lengua, pueden coexistir* *the Vocabulary*, in *Miscelánea* (1947); W. D. Biecock, *The Romance* *illuminare MAXILLAM* 'jaw'
- Cxford, 1971); particularly pp.
- is, in Spain and the Spanish 3. Russell (London, 1973), pp. 2, argues forcefully that any r language.
- 36) reverses the order of events: *Latine* (Paris, 1951) say (Art. leave intervocalique. Le mot
- ilian; *ZRP* LXXIII (1973), uns unclear.

37. See Menéndez Pidal, *Documentos*: P. Lindehan, *The Spanish Church and the Papacy in the 17th Century* (Cambridge, 1971); H. Lüdtke, *Chapter 5*.
38. Compare *It. uopo*, O. Fr. *ues*, O. Cat. *ops*, and O. Fr. *eslovoit* < EST OPUS, 'to be needed' in *Grammatica Historica Española* (6th edition, Madrid, 1940), §77.2.
39. Menéndez Pidal, *Documentos*, no. 158. He also suggested a Latin OPERA (> *obra*) in *Mo* since clarity of final syllables was the main effect of the Carolingian reforms of the pronoun of Latin. See also Badia Margarit, *op. cit.*, pp. 140-5.
40. H. Corbató, 'Sinonimia y Unidad del Cid', *HR IX* (1941), pp. 327-47 (pp. 335 ff.) distinguishing four uses of *pensar* in the Poema: as synonym of *curiar* (four times); of *curdar* (seven times); of *de* and *pensar* as inceptive, and a further four uses with *de* that need classifying in some way. These are all uses which suggest that the lexical meaning is 'think' and further point to acquired in context.
41. Writers tend to be consistent with themselves if not with each other, although rarer form probably remoted on each occasion: e.g. *pesante* in Berceo, meaning 'heavy' in *Milagros 3* and 'sad' in *VSD 209d*.
42. *Op. cit.*, p. 185.
43. F. Huerta y Tejadas, 'Vocabulario de las Obras de Don Juan Manuel', *BRAE XXXV* (19 p. 99, suggests this derives from PINSARE 'crush' (cp. PINSARE > *pisar*, 'read'). This is probable.
44. See V. Väänänen, *Introduction au Latin Vulgaire* (Paris, 1967), p. 66 and such spellings as *occasion* (although Rice argues, from *penser* and *pensar* alone, that the 'n' here was probably pronounced the Latin). See also Lüdtke, *op. cit.*, chapter 5.
45. Poem of the Cid, lines 2329, 2467, 2773, 3388: V. R. B. Oelschläger, *A Medieval Spanish Word List* (Wisconsin, 1940).
46. R. Lanchetas, *Grammatica y Vocabulario de las Obras de Gonzalo de Berceo* (Madrid, 1900), art. *razo* history of *razo* is probably connected with the increasing generality of CAUSA > *cosa*, which was used to fill the hole caused by RES > *res* specializing as 'head of cattle'; *cosa* is now ver generic, and *razo* had standardized as the word for 'reason' by the late fifteenth century.
47. The lack of voicing in the noun was the distinctive feature: Menéndez Pidal quotes *raupha* (922) *raupha* (929), *ropha* (1080), *ropha* (1090). (*Orígenes*, §19.2.).
50. See Blaise, *Dictionnaire Latin-Français des Auteurs Chrétiens* (Strasbourg, 1954), art. BARO.
51. I. I. 2709, 3347.
52. *Op. cit.*, p. 620. In fact, in *Castigos e Documentos del Rey Don Sancho*, Chapter XIX, Adam says to Eve: 'Tu serás llamada varona porque saliste de la costilla del varón.' (Included in Gayangos, *op. cit.*, pp. 85-232 [p. 133].)
53. Margarita Morreale, 'Libro de Buen Amor, Comentario Literario', *BRAE XLIII* (1963), pp. 249-371 (p. 278).
54. *Siculus glosses SECUA* in the Glosses of San Millán: *siglo*, *sigro* and *sego* occur in MSS of the Fuero Juzgo: *siglo* is standard in Juan Ruiz.
55. *Op. cit.*, p. 48.
56. *Op. cit.*, p. 200.