

Erratic Derivational or Compositional Designs as Clues to Word Origins

Author(s): Yakov Malkiel

Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (1989), pp. 379-390

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

ERRATIC DERIVATIONAL OR COMPOSITIONAL DESIGNS AS CLUES TO WORD ORIGINS

Yakov Malkiel

University of California, Berkeley

1. My purpose is to present to you three less than closely connected word-histories---better still, three diachronically skewed reports on Romance word-families and their ramifications. The common denominator is the fact that the words' vicissitudes can be explained only in part through appeal to straight phonology. These otherwise disparate lexical families cluster around certain key-words, which I herewith introduce to you in their respective pristine, i.e., Latin forms: first, uerēcundia 'bashfulness, restraint, modesty'; second, the group of personal pronouns, in the ablative case, with the particle cum, meaning 'with', standing in postposition to them, e.g., mēcum 'with me', tēcum 'with thee'; third and last, an unexplained derivational model, which involves Spanish nouns and adjectives in -ilón flanking verbs with infinitives in -er and -ir, e.g., com-ilón 'big eater', dorm-ilón 'sleepy-head' alongside com-er 'to eat' and dorm-ir 'to sleep'.¹

2. The connection between modern Sp. vergüenza 'shame' and its prototype in Antiquity uerēcundia has become somewhat hazy, through interplay of several circumstances. First, vergüenza, despite its relative length, is unanalyzable to the naïve speaker, in sharp contrast to most abstracts serving to describe human behavior, such as tern-ura 'tenderness', amistad 'friendship', atrevimiento 'boldness', brusquedad 'gruffness'; uerēcundia, in contra-distinction, was transparently tripartite, containing a verbal nucleus uerē-, which we dimly recognize in E. (to) re-vere; an adjectival, or adjectivizing, element -cund-,² plus the nominalizing suffix -ia, familiar from abstracts such as inert-ia 'idleness' or modest-ia 'moderateness, discretion'. One further complication stems from the fact that, cast for the role of the intermediate stage (if not exactly the mid-point) between ancient uerēcundia and modern-day vergüenza, one encounters in the Middle Ages, interchangeably, either vergüença or vergüēna (predominantly spelled -uenna).

2.1. Over a long period of continued productivity vergüenza has given rise to a number of suffixal derivatives, remaining firmly at the center of this newly-grown family; it is also conspicuously present in various widely-used idioms familiar to any native speaker from childhood. The present-day phraseological and derivational contour of the word under study can be thus illustrated: vergüenza 'shame, shyness, embarrassment' as the focus of the entire structure; the phrases tener vergüenza (de) 'to be ashamed (of)'; colloquial es una mala vergüenza 'it is a shame, it is too bad'; the exclamation ¡qué vergüenza! 'for shame!'; the affixal derivatives vergonzoso 'bashful, shy' (person), 'shameful' (actions), also applied, as a zoonym, to the armadillo, because that species rolls up in a ball when pursued; the rarer vergonzante, apt to qualify a beggar; the two high-frequency reflexive verbs avergonzarse (de) 'to be ashamed (of)' and desvergonzarse (con) 'to be impudent, insolent (to)', flanked by active avergonzar 'to put to shame' and by the past ptc. desvergonzado, used adjectivally or nominally: 'impudent, shameless (person)'; desvergüenza 'impudence', the polar opposite of vergüenza; plus a racier variant, namely sinvergüenza, adjectival or nominal, but under any circumstances focusing attention on the disparaged bearer of the lack of an esteemed quality, hence 'brazen, shameless' or 'scoundrel, rascal'; accompanied by an even more colloquial and distinctly modern-sounding sinvergüencería 'brazenness, impertinence'.³

2.2. The picture here sketched out is utterly at variance with the description one can offer of the place occupied by uerēcundia in its own lexical space, at the peak of Roman culture and power. That ancestral word belonged, hierarchically, to the very periphery of its far-flung family rather than occupying the latter's center. This subordinate status flows from its set of relations with the adj. uerēcundus 'restrained'; with the secondary verb uerēcundāri 'to show modesty'; and, above all, with the primary verb uerēri 'to display reverence or respect for' beside ruerēri 'to feel abashed before', a distinctly reverential verb indeed.

2.3. This entire edifice was doomed to collapse, perhaps on account of the fragility of deponential verbs past the summit of Latin (except for dispersed vestiges of gerundival uerend-u, -a in Italian dialects). As a result, OSp. vergüença became an isolate, an atypical situation for any word of that ilk, I repeat (observe the contrast to loc-ura 'craze'/loco 'crazy'). An additional two-edged reason for the isolation was the system-wide recession of the suffixes -ia and -cundu/-bundu.⁴

2.4. A certain unevenness of the phonological trajectory uerēcundia > vergüença makes itself felt as soon as one compares it to the near-parallel shift of the phytonym nastur-ciu, *-tiu 'kind of cress' to OSp. mastuerco. A /s/ after a sonorant, to be sure, was as admissible at the height of the flowering of Old Spanish as was its voiced counterpart /ʒ/, except that in the case of *nasturtiu the genesis of /s/ was expected, to the point of predictability, while it was not immediately foreseeable in the case of uerēcundia, given the presence of voiced d instead of voiceless t, in the critical segment. This anomaly made vergüença a prize exhibit in the celebrated controversy surrounding the "Old Spanish Sibilants".⁵

2.5. The discovery of the OSp. doublet vergüēña, which receded during the 15th century, caused embarrassment for the Neogrammarians in the absence of any differentiating evolutionary factor. Aside from going back to the same prototype, vergüença and vergüēña had an identical range of meaning and shared the patterns of most affixal offshoots, including the adj. vergoñ-oso, parallel to vergoñ-oso, and the verbs a-, en-vergoñ-ar--to the striking exclusion, however, of the negative members of the word-family: des-vergüēña, vergonçado, sin-vergüēña remained unvalued. Two possibilities of accounting for this lacuna come to mind: Either the items ushered in by des-, sin- sprang into existence at a fairly late date, when vergüēña had ceased to be truly procreative; or the -ña variant produced a welcome phonosymbolic effect alien to its counterpart in -ña.⁶

2.6. What about the state of affairs in neighboring Portuguese? There, vergonha, desvergonha; the verbs a-, en-, and des-a-vergonhar; the adj. vergonh-oso, in the company of the expected adverb; plus the phrase sem vergonha display strong resemblances to, and only moderate discrepancies from, their Spanish counterparts. Note one complication: Until the 16th century vergonça (i.e., the counterpart of OSp. vergüença), with its own set of offshoots, was also in use along the Atlantic Coast.⁷

2.7. An ensemble of three mutually independent circumstances foils any attempt to account for vergüença/vergonça in a single, simple manner. Could this be another instance of multiple causation?

First, the parallel variants vergüēña/vergonha are readily understandable on the side of phonology, provided the posited starting point is not Class. ue-rē-cun-di-a, but post-Class. Folk Lat. /verekundja/: Consonantized i triggered a medial triconsonant cluster, /ndj/; next, a built-in tendency of Romance weakened the least resistant, namely second, member of that group, to the point of leading speakers to pronounce /nj/ and, eventually, /ñ/. Witness, in Italian (specifically, in Tuscan), vergogna and in French, obsolescent vergogne (overshadowed, it is true, by honte, a borrowing from Frankish, surrounded by hybrid hont-eux and the verb se honter, initially soi honter);⁸ also noteworthy is OPtg. rigonha 'wrath', a hapax legomenon, from irēcundia.⁹ Vergüēña/vergonha thus appear to represent the mainstream of events; but what, in that event, about vergüença/vergonça?

2.8. Second, one may want to take into account the significant intricacy of Rome's socio-educational structure. Among certain groups of speakers (e.g., magistrates and teachers), there could well have prevailed the tendency to use an alternative, retardatory style of pronouncing this key-word of exhortation. Since /ʒ/, as audible in late-medieval di-, de-zir 'to say' or fazer 'to do, make' (from parental dicere and facere, in this order), was not yet readily available in embryonic Hispano-Romance, as an alternative to the folk-speech skipping of the /d/ in -ndia, it is conceivable that the more privileged or pretentious nuclei of speakers experimented with the closest approximation within easy reach. It so happened that another affricate, namely /ʃ/, was at that juncture already in existence, being perceptible, e.g., in words shaped like (in-, ex-)tunc-ce 'then', cf. Sp. entonces beside OSp. (en-, es-)tonce(s) and Ptg. então alongside OPtg. entom. Arguably, a leap from "endangered" or "unstable" /ndj/ to /n's/ was executed instead of one, more logical, to */n'z/ by way of escape from the threat of an unprestigious course of events, namely the rise of the loose pronunciation /ndj/ > /nj/

> /ñ/. An alternative direction of escape, no doubt similarly motivated and conducive to the dyadic cluster -nd-, is visible in OProv. vergonda, for a while coexistent with vergonha (which later also manifests itself in Cat. vergonya). The alternative reappears in OFr. vergonde, which has left scattered traces in modern French: dévergonde 'brazen', plus the abstract dévergonnage.

2.9. Third, and once more independently, an advantage to the analyst accrues from viewing, as a subsidiary factor, the crystallization of suffixal gamuts (typically, but not exclusively, $\bar{A}\bar{I}\bar{U}$) in regional varieties of Folk Latin and early Romance.¹⁰ In aiming to find examples, one easily suffers from an embarrassment of wealth. Thus, to convey the idea of 'equipped, provided with', Romans had at their ready disposal the suffix -tus, var. -sus, outwardly resembling the past participle; the preceding long vowel was conditioned by the declension class of the respective noun, thus: alātu 'winged', from ala; crīnītu 'hairy, long-haired', from crīne; cornūtu 'horned', from cornū. Yet, in a daughter language such as Spanish, each of the three reflexes -ado, -ido, and -udo carries with it a unique semantic message and sometimes engages in a subtle interplay with an appropriate prefix. Thus, a-mulat-ado 'mulatto-like' signals resemblance; de-sabr-ido 'tasteless' connotes deprivation; while forz-udo 'robust, stout' suggests excess of physical prowess or power.¹¹ Then again, Latin authorized its speakers to oppose -ānu to -īnu, and both of these to -ūnu, as one gathers from urb-ānu 'relating to (the refinement of) the capital city', from urbs, urbe; mar-īnu 'referring to the sea', from mare; and apr-ūnu, capr-ūnu, ceru-ūnu 'reminding one of a male animal known for the odor it emits: the wild boar, the he-goat, the stag'; Spanish has preserved -ano, -ino, combining them even with Amerindian primitives (peru-ano, and-ino), yet, above all, has expanded the realm of -uno, extending it to all sorts of animal names and beyond (lacay-uno).¹² Given the steady accumulation of such preeminently triadic gamuts, does it not stand to reason that the uninterrupted growth of derivational models such as -antia and -entia (witness inf-antia 'babyhood', dol-entia 'sickness') might have stimulated some speakers to fool around with *uerēcuntia?¹³

2.10. For good measure one is tempted to throw in, by way of concluding possibility, the off-chance of some purely lexical pressure, which might, e.g., have spread from a certain substandard or taboo word not further identifiable at this instance. Such a blend or merger could easily have become operative in deflecting uerēcuntia from its straight course. In that eventuality, *uerēcuntia, launched as a tentative substitute for -cuntia, is likely to have involved some crude joke, or pun, or coarse sexual allusion easily associable with blushing. One expects to encounter such twists at every step in the speech---anything but polished---of legionaries stationed in camps. Conceivably, the joke, having run its course during the aftermath of the Punic Wars, had evaporated by the time the Roman armies seized Southern and, thereafter, Northern Gaul. Recall that, in a variety of languages, the same word or word-family, according to the context in which it lends services, can suggest something as harmless as 'restraint, discretion, modesty, bashfulness' and, at the same time, something as scandalous and shocking as 'shame', often with undeniable sexual overtones. For a typological parallel, cf., in Russian, стыд (a) 'feeling of shame', flanked by стыдлив 'bashful', yet (b) 'revolting action or attitude' (= грам, позор), accompanied by (po)стыднвй 'ignominious', 'contemptible', etc., which, to be sure, are less vituperative than overtly negative безстыдство 'brazenness', безстыдничат 'to engage in vulgar behavior', comparable in tone and content to Sp. sinvergüenza, Ptg. sem vergonha. One is also reminded of Lat. uerenda side by side with pudenda, the latter also used in English veiled discourse ('external genital organs, vulva'); of the practically parallel use of Sp. vergüenzas 'privates'; and of referentially germane lexical items, such as L. cunnius, E. cunt, which are, incidentally, not too far removed, along the phonic axis, from uerē*cuntia, *-cunnia, as here hypothesized. In case this argument has any merit, uerē*cuntia and *-cunnia would represent a pair of socially differentiated pre-Romance variants of Class. -cuntia, except that, unlike the situation described above, *-cuntia, far from corresponding to the upper socio-educational layer, might involve a downright vulgarism.

2.11. The last point on my agenda for Section 2 is the casting-about for any cogent reason why, after centuries of wavering, Lusophones opted in favor of vergonha, rejecting its competitor vergonça, while the Castilians, conversely, generalized vergüenza, by the same token repudiating vergüeña. We have already toyed with the idea that in Spanish a slight phonosymbolic advantage of

vergüença over its rival (especially in exclamations such as: ¡Qué vergüença! ¡Eres un sinvergüença!) could have been operative. To grasp the Portuguese gambit in reverse direction, one may appeal to the recently-identified phenomenon of 'excessive self-assertion'.¹⁴ Between roughly 1400 and 1600, the Portuguese aristocracy and middle class came close to being bilingual, much as Catalonia has been over the last two centuries. In an exaggeratedly puristic effort to rid Portuguese of any words (or constructions) which, though actually native, gave the embarrassing impression of having been imported from Spanish and, in the process, superficially adjusted, the patriots tended to eliminate them. If so, vergonça became the victim of its suspiciously close resemblance to Sp. vergüença.¹⁵

3. The next issue on our program is the gradual decay of a morphosyntactic pattern that once flourished amid Class. Latin personal pronouns (to be specific, mē, tē, sē, nōbīs, uōbīs) combined with the postposition cum 'with'. Whether used as preposition (cum amīcō 'with, in the company of, a friend'), or intercalated between qualifier and noun (magnā cum laude 'with high praise'), or else postposed, as here, cum governed the ablative case in Antiquity. Less felicitous, even if sponsored, as late as the early 'thirties, by a Meyer-Lübke, was the tradition of treating mēcum and the other members of the set as so many autonomous lexical units.¹⁶

3.1. The opening gambit, projectable onto the temporal level of Folk Latin, was the replacement of nōbīscum 'with us' and uōbīscum 'with you' by nōscum, uōscum, vestigially attested.¹⁷ The process lends itself to several explanations, by no means mutually exclusive. One is free to surmise that the monosyllabicity of mē, tē, sē favored the reduction of bisyllabic nōbīs, uōbīs to nōs, uōs; or one can contend that the suitability of the subgroup mē, tē, sē for lending service as accusatives and ablatives alike, after the decay of certain better differentiated archaic forms of the paradigm,¹⁸ stimulated influential groups of speakers to endow the other subgroup, namely nōs and uōs, with a similar functional latitude; finally, the precipitate decline, in the "sermo plebeius", of dative and ablative forms, generally speaking, may have swept away nōbīs and uōbīs, even where seemingly congealed in idiomatic combinations with -cum. The strict exclusion from this tightly organized paradigm of the units matching 'him', 'her', 'it', and 'them' (as against 'him-, her-self', etc.) would cause small surprise to those aware of how sharply Latin, in general, tended to separate 3d-person pronouns of this category from the remainder of the set, unless reflexivity was involved.¹⁹

3.2. Direct Romance continuators of the meanwhile re-structured pentad mēcum(m), tēcum(m), sēcum(m), nōscu(m), uōscu(m) are spatio-temporally confined to (a) Hispano-Romance (including several successive phases of their growth); (b) Old Italian; and (c) several South Italian dialects of any period; i.e., on balance, to a mere minority of the better-known branches of written and spoken Romance, with the pervasive tendency to raise the inherited ē to i throughout the singular and, in parallel fashion if to a less sweeping extent, the ō to u in the plural. The mere appeal to the verb 'to raise' in this context alerts one to the likelihood that genuine metaphony or Umlaut (a label which precisely means 'vowel-raising') is here involved---a suspicion that might stand the chance of hardening into a certainty if the same vowel changes could be shown to have similarly hit other words closely akin in their phonological arrangement.

3.3. In contemporary Spanish, the singular subgroup migo, tigo, sigo, which snugly fits the description so far supplied, is still clearly recognizable as echoing parental mē, tē, sē except that the final segment -go, surely as a result of the voicing and subsequent spirantization of the intervocalic velar consonant, has been irreversibly separated from con, the normal representative of parental cum, and consequently denuded of all meaning, thus exemplifying the status of an "empty morph". Its original function has been taken over by con-, interpreted in its role of prefix (or opening component of a compound). In the plural, -co, the arrested counterpart of -go, as expected after g, has been resolutely cast off; as if by compensation, but actually serving a separate purpose, m. otros, f. otras 'other' have been added; cf. Fr. nous autres Anglais 'we Englishmen', without, it is true, any differentiation of gender so highly characteristic of contemporary Spanish. The close cohesion of nos and otros, etc. prompts Hispanophones to write them as a single word, separating them from less tightly conjoined con; conversely, conmigo, unaccompanied by otro, more easily lends itself to being

spelled as a single word.

3.4. Winding our way back from the splash of this big leap to the less exciting step-by-step realizations of evolutionary trends, we are now in a position to aver that the relative autonomy of as many as four processes involved, namely: (a) vowel-raising; (b) preservation or abandonment of the semantically fading word-final segments -co, -go traceable to the ancestral postposition; (c) transfer of the key-message 'with' to word-initial position (co-, con-); plus, so far as the plural is concerned, (d) addition or omission of the word-final ingredients otr-os, -as, marked as to gender and number, has been the chief cause of a proliferation of competing (or overlapping) possibilities. One can distinguish among the following principal varieties:

- (A) Basic type, in every respect most conservative: mego, tego...nosco, vosco, peculiar to past stages (abstention from vowel-raising, preservation of -co, -go and their continued endowment with meaning, failure of con- to be prefixed, absence of -otr-os, -otras);
- (B) Transposition of the carrier of the 'with' message: comigo...connosco ~ coñusco (hesitant vowel-raising, observable in the singular rather than the plural; downgrading of -co, -go to a pair of empty morphs; continued resistance to intrusion of -otr-os, -as);
- (C) Abandonment of older Sp. comigo, coñusco, two items marked by weakly-contoured word boundaries, in favor of more easily segmentable conmigo, con nosotros (a string of lexico-morphemic losses depletes the ranks of items characterized by a raised vowel o > u, while sparing e > i; or by the segment -co, while sparing -go; or by -ñ- caught in alternation with -n-; invasion of the turf by gradually more and more mandatory -otr-os, -as);
- (D) Superior conservatism of Portuguese vis-à-vis Spanish shows in these idiosyncrasies: -otr-os, -as, although freely available, fall short of full standardization; convosco is kept in the West of the peninsula, while in the Center it yields ground, at first, to convusco (the partner of coñusco), and is subsequently altogether dropped there.

3.5. All in all, one can tentatively set off the following stages for Spanish, allowing for overlaps and for certain regional distinctions: (α) mego and (β) migo; (γ) co(n)mego beside (δ) co(n)migo; (ε) coñusco giving way to con nosotr-os, -as, similarly con vusco; and eventually, (ζ) the innovation usted(es) 'you' (heralded, where appropriate, by con), for polite address, entering the arena.²⁰

3.6. Given this foreknowledge, we can now revert, with better prospects of success, to the key questions already hinted at: Can the changes (mecum >) mego > migo, (uoscum in lieu of uobiscum) > vosco > vusco, etc. be ascribed to the agency of metaphony? The safest reaction to this query is to answer it in the negative, and to fall back instead on lexical contamination or inflectional analogy. For the object cases of the stressed personal pronouns the individual Romance vernaculars, based on the provincial varieties of colloquial Latin, selected as their model either the accusatives/ablatives or the datives of the parent tongue, i.e., either me, te, se... or mihi, tibi, sibi. Hence the familiar contrast between Fr. moj, toj, soj... (from older mej, tej, sej...) and Sp. mi, ti, si... We can now assert that the shift mego > migo (and its counterparts) illustrates mihi > mi's impact on mecum, etc.

While a shift like se(go) > si(go) was being executed, it was liable to have secondary repercussions outside the narrowly pronominal domain. In Portuguese, ancestral se(n)su 'perception, feeling, sensation', advancing past the phase seso(s) 'brain(s)', was ultimately pushed in the direction of siso; Spanish, in contrast, has kept sesu(s) unaltered.²¹

3.7. There occurred yet other vowel shifts in Peninsular pronouns seemingly isomorphic, but in reality motivated by not at all identical causes, differently oriented, and anything but synchronous. Thus, post-medieval separation of masculines from neuters among demonstrative and indefinite pronouns for which, under a set of circumstances not yet fully explained,²² there suddenly arose a demand amid late-medieval speakers of Portuguese (though not their Spanish contemporaries), rapidly led to the coinage of isto, isso, aquilo, tudo in lieu of preceding esto < istu(d), esso < ipsu(m), aquelo < accu + illu(d), todo < totu(m), as against unaltered (m.) este /e/ ~ (f.) esta /ɛ/; (m.) esse ~ (f.) essa; (m.) aquele ~ (f.) aquela; (m.) todo ~ (f.) toda. This peculiar development occurred at such a late date as to have become amenable to direct observation. Spanish, I repeat, had no share in it,

continuing to tolerate, past the watershed of 1500, triads on the order of (m.) este ~ (f.) esta ~ (n.) esto, or resorting to tricks such as lo veo todo, which in its impact matches Ptg. vejo tudo.²³

4. The concluding problem of concern to us centers about a handful of Spanish deverbals in -ilón, flanking -er and -ir infinitives; e.g., com-ilón 'big eater', dorm-ilón 'sleepy-head', mord-ilón 'sharp-toothed', romp-ilón 'having a habit of breaking', beside com-er, dorm-ir, mord-er, and romp-er. Regionally (e.g., in Peru) one also runs into a few items ending in -alón, hugging -ar verbs, among them convers-alón 'chatty', peg-alón 'given to beating', tropez-alón 'stumbling easily', while in Mexico and sections of Central America counterparts in -elón, bracketed with -er infinitives, are reported to have surfaced: com-elón 'big eater', mord-elón as a facetious designation of 'a (bribe-taking) traffic cop'---two additional witnesses to the vogue of suffixal vowel gamuts.²⁴

4.1. At the outset, Latin formations in -ō/-ōne were, typically, denominal: ped-ō/-ōne 'foot soldier', later 'road-builder', from pēs, pēde 'foot' (cf. Sp. peón). Subsequently, vernacular derivatives from verbs, with (m.) -ōn respond-ōn, -ona 'ever-ready to reply', extracted from respond-er; grit-ōn, -ona 'vociferous', elicited from gritar, a phonosymbolically orchestrated verb, rather than from the corresponding noun grito, including the adverbial phrase a gritos; mand-ōn, -ona 'accustomed to giving orders', from mand-ar. All derivatives geared to the composite (or, better still, expanded) suffixes -ilón, plus the rarer -alón and -elón, turn out to be deverbal.

4.2. While searching for some suitable attachment, and having made sure that pan-Hispanic dorm-ilón could plausibly have acted as the leader word (and thus tendentially have imposed its characteristic penultimate vowel even on derivatives from com-er, mord-er, and romp-er), we stumble over It. dorm-igliare 'to dose', to which dorm-iglione, -a 'lazy riser' and dorm-iglioso, -a 'sleepy' seem to be subordinated. By experimentally reversing this hierarchy, we propose dorm-iglione as the leader of the contingent of Italian cognates; this move gives us the obvious benefit of the word's ready comparability with Sp. dorm-il-ōn. Could fairly isolated Sp. dormilón then have been a borrowing from better-integrated It. dormiglione? For all its instantaneous seductiveness, this hypothesis, on second thought, loses much of its plausibility. We happen to know a good deal about Italianisms in Spanish, absorbed, as a rule, between 1400 and 1700; they relate to such facets of culture and material civilization as: titles, forms of address, interjections, names of games, plays, and pastimes, features of travel and of rural living, the home and its interior design, garments, jewelry and adornments, cuisine, intimate life, moral qualities, contagious diseases, not to mention terms of fine arts, all sorts of performances, and literary crafts, armed forces and lay-out of fortifications, fleet and merchant marine, etc.²⁵ With all these domains dorm-il-ōn, obviously, has nothing at all in common.

4.3. Could dormilón, alternatively, involve *dormirón (from the infin. dormir), with dissimilation of the second r to l, as in carcel 'jail, prison' (from carcere) and in mármol 'marble' (from marmore), also in corcel 'steed' from borrowed OFr. corsier (=mod. coursier) < cursāriu, akin to currere 'to run'? While the rule (or mere tendency) thus invoked is tenable,²⁶ its application to the case at hand would be unrealistic, since no derivatives are known to have split off from integral infinitive forms in Spanish, except where habitually substantivated infinitives were involved, as with pesar-oso 'sorrowful, uneasy' and poder-oso 'powerful'.

4.4. Having staggered through two blind alleys, we may now forgivably turn our attention to an, at first glance, entirely different set of circumstances. The Latin inventory of zoonyms included uesper-t-iliō 'bat', from uesper 'evening'---the name of an animal notoriously active by night, yet shockingly sleepy by daylight; for the roots of intercalated -t- observe the adj. uesper-t-inus 'belonging to evening' (cf. G. 'abendlich', R. 'večernij'), while the segment -iliō reminds one of pap-iliō 'moth, butterfly' familiar from Fr. papillon. The preservation of uespertiliō in two Romance-speaking peninsulas, the Apennine (OIt. vipistrello, mod. pipistrello) and the Iberian (Ast. esperteyu, Gal. espartello, either one extracted from the parental nominative picked in exceptional preference to the oblique case) allows one to visualize Sp. *dormilar (which could have given rise to dormilón) and It. dormigliare (which defensibly underlies dormiglione) as having been independently transmitted from a common source in Folk Latin---a jocose elaboration on dormire suggestive of the erratic behavior of that animal (which not a few folks in those distant centuries held to be a bird)---namely,

the bat. This impression is reinforced by the existence of dormiller in French and of dormilhar in Old Provençal, which jointly form a territorial bridge between the two aforementioned peninsulas, and thus encourage us to push back into Antiquity the putative date for the mintage of the common ancestor.

5. To compress our stray impressions so far gathered and to cast into bolder relief the intended message: In all three cases here scrutinized, phonological arguments applied in isolation failed to lead us as far as one might, in an optimistic mood, have initially hoped for. Appeals to phonology alone sufficed to account for OSp. verguēña and Ptg. vergonha, but to justify more successful verguēña and less lucky vergonça, attention had to be riveted also to entirely different alliances of forces active in language growth, including the possible crystallization of an ephemeral suffixal vowel gamut -antia/-entia/*-untia. The change of mēcum to meço and thence to migo or, via analogy (or symmetry, or plain parallelism) the shift of nosco to nusco, etc., or else the transmutation of sē(r)u to eso and from there, in Portuguese alone, to iso, cannot serve as valid bits of evidence for the agency of metaphony, at least not under the given set of conditions: archaic meço became migo under heavy pressure from mí 'me', but the unraveling of that knot also required careful study of compositional models involving con, as post- and pre-position, and also otro. Finally, dormilón as the leader of a small group of Spanish colloquialisms ending either in -ilón or, less commonly, in -alón, -elón requires meticulous study of an unprecedented suffix, the starting point of whose zigzagging itinerary is best placed in the name of a strangely behaving animal, namely Lat. uespertilio 'bat'. Should the solutions here cautiously advocated in the end turn out to be correct, then nobody should rejoice more in this than the true phonologist, whose path, as a result of the cleaning process here undertaken, may well have become less cluttered.

Endnotes

¹ In picking illustrations of modern-day usage, I have checked my memory against the information provided by standard dictionaries, mono- and bi-lingual, including those compiled by Figueiredo (1925), Reynolds (1962), Ušakov (1935-40), and Williams (1955). My principal sources for Latin were: Ernout & Meillet (1959-60) and Glare (19[68]-82).

² -Bund- and -cund- were the twin adjectival suffixes not transmitted into Romance, except as weakly characterized ingredients of individual words, chiefly Latinisms (cf. Fr. moribond, Sp. moribundo). Latin examples of the two series were plentiful: fā-cundus 'eloquent', fe-cundus 'fertile, abundant', irā-cundus 'hot-, quick-tempered, resentful', iū-cundus 'delightful'; gaudi-bundus 'rejoicing', mīrā-bundus 'amazed', pudi-bundus 'bashful', uagā-bundus 'strolling around'.

³ Corominas (1957:713), additionally, lists the 19th-century Latinisms (in)verecundo and verecundia and several vernacular items of marginal importance, including sinvergonzón and poca verguēña, the latter flanked by Cat. pocavergonya. He further documents medieval desvergonç-ar(se) and -amiento as well as isolated occurrences of vergonçar, envergonç-ar and -amiento. The syntax of a- and des-vergonçar was previously studied with microscopic precision by Rufino José Cuervo (1886: 806-7; 1893: 1190-91).

⁴ The recession of -ia, however, was carried out less energetically than is usually assumed. There was sufficient time, Meyer-Lübke argued in both editions of his influential dictionary, for *spiss-ia 'thickness, tightness' and *strictia 'narrowness, contraction' to have sprung into existence in Gallo-Latin (1911-20, 1930-35: §§ 8159, 8302, 8305), while OSp. premia, which underlies mod. premio 'tight, close, troublesome, strict, rigid, slow, heavy, dull' and the corresponding abstract in -idad, was independently traced back to Hispano-Latin usage. For circumstantial discussion of this point, with full use of the phrases a premia, por premia, sin premia, salir de premia, etc., see Malkiel, 1953-55: 108-11).

⁵ The chief protagonists of that controversy---after a short play-off in Paris---were A. Horning (1883), R. J. Cuervo (on two occasions), J. D. M. Ford, J. Saroïhandy, and O. J. Tallgren-Tuulio; but A. Mussafia, G. Baist, W. Meyer-Lübke, R. Menéndez Pidal, J. Subak, and yet other investigators each also played a role in the dispute. For a partial summary of the results (and of the issues left unsolved) see two earlier papers of my own (1971: 1-52; 1982: 586-600).

⁶ It is helpful to remind oneself of the long-prevalent pronunciation of the *ç* as /s/; cf. G. zischen, a verb applying to reproachful or reprobative interjections uttered by spectators, or to R. cykat ['sýkat'] 'to shout in threatening manner'. Conversely, the /ñ/ is widely associated with tenderness; cf. Sp. niño 'little child', ñoño 'delicate, plaintive', 'decrepit, impaired by age' < *noño.

⁷ In Galician, vergoña and its word-family (adjectives in -oso and -ento; -ar verbs ushered in by a-, des- or en-, etc.) prevail by a wide margin over vergonça and its system of satellites. Nevertheless, traces of vergonça have been discovered at Redondela; avergonzarse is characteristic of Pontevedra; conversely, in Lugo and Orense vergoña and its prongs clearly prevail. Speakers left undecided have at their disposal numerous synonyms of, e.g., avergonzar(se). For details see Carré Alvarellos (1933) and Crespo Pozo (1963), s.vv.

⁸ Dévergondage was preceded by dévergondement, and dévergondé for a while stood in competition with desvergogné, not to elaborate on its rivalry with éhonté, from honte. The leading French dictionaries, starting with Hatzfeld, Darmesteter, Thomas' (1890-1900), supply excellent information on the early use of the individual variants, but stop short of accurately defining the relation between vergogne and vergonde.

⁹ The etymology, which goes back to Cornu (1882: 95), is the more dependable as rigonha occurs in the translation of a passage of a Church Latin text, in which irācundia actually was used. The disappearance of the "dangling" (i.e., word-initial) front vowel can be explained away through application of the Lex Ascoli; the -rā- > ri- step (to say the least, unusual) may, in turn, lose some of its strangeness through appeal to the elimination of (ī)rācundu.

¹⁰ Romance linguists have demonstrably been operating with the concept of vocalic gamuts, in regard to suffixal derivation, for over a century. For details see two articles of mine awaiting publication (Forthcoming a and b).

¹¹ There exists a whole congeries of fairly recent writings, most of them middle-sized notes or short articles, on words entering into these three series. The latest approximation to a synthesis is Dworkin's monograph (1985), of which I prepared a lengthy critical appraisal (1986: 282-301).

¹² Over the years, I have devoted several consecutive inquiries to the three series here alluded to (1950: 17-45; 1959: 241-90; 1988: 409-34). The analysis developed there can be advantageously contrasted with the methods put to use by Hanssen (1913: §§ 270, 292); Alemany Bolufer (1920: §§ 21, 27, 107, 110, 170); and Alvar & Pottier (1983: § 309).

¹³ Galician-Portuguese shows the parallel development of -ança and -ença at its most effective. In Castilian, the diphthongization of ĕ in -ĕntia > -iença (cf. OSp. semiença 'seed') may have crippled that parallelism, but this thwarting process has little to do with the late-antique crystallization of *uerĕcuntia. The Latin -ientia variant, as in sapientia 'wisdom', had little bearing on the evolution here surveyed, except among words transmitted through learned channels. Some segments of my (1945: 41-186) monograph bear re-formulation.

¹⁴ See forthcoming c and the epitome published in 1989: 44, under No. 117d.

¹⁵ I discuss similar chains of events in certain forthcoming publications; the reasons adduced are summarized in (1989: 42-43, under Nos. 114 and 115). The analysis of uerēcundia here offered differs in several respects from the approach I had recourse to on a preceding occasion (1944: 501-20). For a critical reaction to those early stirrings of my curiosity see Piel (1949: 283-85).

¹⁶ Even though, in his comparative phonology, the Vienna Romanist correctly interpreted co(n)migo as influenced by mí, and conusco as patterned on comigo (1890:§§ 120, 147), he proceeded somewhat capriciously in his dictionary, by arranging for separate entries for mēcum, tēcum, sēcum (1930[-35]:§§ 5450, 8610a, 7771a), yet neglecting to accord a similar quota of attention to nōbiscum, uōbiscum. The course taken by French, radically at difference with whatever is observable in the two peninsulas, cannot be separated from the rise in Romanized Gaul of the adv. avuec < ab (or ad) hoc, comparable to G. dazu, Fr. davantage, which eventually was called upon to function as a preposition (avec) and thus to act as an heir to con.

¹⁷ E.g., in the Appendix Probi (§§ 220-21). Baehrens (1922: 124-25), in discussing at some length the relevant passage, not only mentions [O]It. nosco, vosco beside Sp. conmigo, contigo, but also adduces arch. quīcu(m) 'with whom' and its occasional elaboration conquīcu in epigraphic context. He further documents instances of confusion of accusative and ablative (with the former usually emerging as the winner) after other prepositions, e.g., with prae echoing propter; the ambiguity of se proved contagious in the widespread inscriptional formula pro se et suos 'for himself and his kinsfolk'.

¹⁸ For details see Sommer (1914:§§ 261-62), Kent (1946:§§ 308-10), and Ernout (1953:§§ 148-53). Even though reduplicative mēmē and mēd (its -d due to transfer from id 'it', illud 'that there', quid 'what') for a while were used interchangeably in accusative and ablative, their differentiation, had it been wanted, might easily have been achieved. Mihī, at the start, was at a certain disadvantage as a result of its lack of structural affinity with tibi and sibi; but the loss of -h- and -b- abolished the differentiating feature, making mī, tī, sī eligible for a new role in nascent Luso-Hispano-Romance.

¹⁹ By the same token, the---increasingly prominent---non reflexive 3d-person pronouns in Romance can be bracketed with demonstratives: The progenies of ille, iste, and ipse clearly belong together, and the first two groups, moreover, share a certain susceptibility to adoption of either ecce- or accu- as a prefixed deictic element. In addition to aque medieval and classical Spanish boasted aqueste, etc. Old French can here serve as a helpful foil to Spanish (Meyer-Lübke, 1913:§§ 264-65).

²⁰ Only a modicum of sources can here be briefly identified. Williams (1962, 1968:§ 140.3) provides an overview of old and modern Portuguese variants and discusses the rivalry between co- and com- before migo, but remains inexplicit about the relation of e- to i- forms. Examples of OPtg. comego ~ cōmeço, comigo, migo, nosco, sigo, tigo, vosco can be culled from Rodrigues Lapa (1970: 24, 25, 62, 67, 97, 103, 110). Earlier, an equally valuable network of textual references for OPtg. comego, comigo, con migo, con nosco, consigo, contigo, convosco, convusco, meço, migo, nosco, sigo, vosco ~ vosqu', and vusco was established by Michaëlis de Vasconcelos (1905-20: 20, 21, 22, 53, 56, 60, 86, and 94). After 1500, the margin of wavering among Hispanophones dwindled to co- ~ con- before -migo, according to Keniston (1937: 56). Lloyd's flawless bird's-eye view presentation of the entire problem (1987: 278) derives its extra strength from mention of Leon. nosco, vosco; whatever his source on that score, it was not the celebrated monograph by Staaff (1907: 271) who, while meritoriously documenting from charters OLeon. conusco and convosco, -vusco, slipped in espousing J. Cornu's untenable conjecture (1884: 291).

²¹ See Malkiel (1988b: 44-55). A cross-connection with esso > isso, esto > isto may have been operative (see the following); however, it was Spanish rather than Portuguese that, in the end,

advanced mesmo to mismo 'same'.

²² See Malkiel (1981: 91-107). One suspects that the differentiation of the stress vowels in (m.) êste /e/ and (f.) esta /ɛ/, etc. could have acted as the prime stimulus for the transmutation of (n.) esto into isto, but this motivation does not hold for todo > tudo, which must consequently be categorized as an instance of analogically caused repercussion.

²³ Considerations of space prevent me from examining in depth the Italian evidence. In the Southern dialect zone, forms with and without con- (its nasal subject to assimilation to the following consonant) are seen to alternate. In the Abruzzi, Rohlfs observed the use of /meko/, /nosko/; in Southern Lazio he recorded comméco, cottéco; to justify metaphonic miecu, tiecu in Northern Calabria and Lucania, he saw himself forced to operate with [*]mĕcu, [*]tĕcu (1949: 61-62). Schuchardt's magisterial note on It. a teco meco 'you or I' (uttered in a defiant tone) follows the semantic decay of this phrase, after it percolated into Southern German (Techtel-mechtel 'secret understanding' > 'confusion, chaos') and, from there, even into Czech: tlachy-machy 'rumor mongering'. Equally fascinating is Schuchardt's allusion to Basque teke-meke 'provocation', except that he stops short of reconstructing convincingly its all-important itinerary (1907: 30-31).

²⁴ I owe knowledge of several items, chiefly those ending in -elón, to John F. Levy (pers. comm.), who, as a child, overheard them in Mexico City, but recently derived pleasure from re-acquainting himself with a few through a thoroughly updated dictionary (Smith et al., 1971). Levy correctly remarks that Mex. vacil-ón 'merrymaker, reveller' can be only indirectly invoked in the context of -ilón. The most successful collector of relevant colloquialisms has been, over the years, Beinhauer, roughly from 1930 until 1968 (passim).

²⁵ While details of Terlingen's Utrecht dissertation, devoted to this topic (1943), were subjected to criticism by J. E. Gillet and, in a more severe vein, by J. Corominas and other reviewers, the cultural ambit of the flow of borrowings he circumscribed turned out to be reliable.

²⁶ For exemplification see Posner (1961: 105-24); and for criticism, Togeby (1964: 642-67, esp. 665-66). The relation between Gallo-Rom. -el, -(i)er and Sp. -el was studied in searching detail by A. K. Levy (1967: 296-320).

References

- Alemaný Bolufer, José. 1920. Tratado de la formación de palabras en la lengua castellana: la derivación y la composición... Madrid: Victoriano Suárez.
- Alvar, Manuel, & Bernard Pottier. 1983. Morfología histórica del español. Biblioteca Románica Hispánica 3:57. Madrid: Gredos.
- Baehrens, W. A. 1927. Sprachlicher Kommentar zur vulgärlateinischen Appendix Probi. Halle: Niemeyer.
- Beinhauer, Werner. 1930, 1957. Spanische Umgangssprache. Berlin & Bonn: F. Dümmler.
- . El español coloquial, tr. Fernando Huarte Morton. Madrid: Gredos.
- Carré Alvarellos, Leandro. 1933. Diccionario galego-castelán e vocabulario castelán-galego. La Coruña: Zincke Hermanos.
- Cornu, Jules. 1882. "Études de grammaire portugaise; étymologies". Romania 11: 81-96.
- . 1884. "Mélanges espagnols; remarques sur les voyelles toniques". Romania 13: 285-97.
- Corominas, Joan. [1957]. Diccionario crítico etimológico de la lengua castellana, 4. Bern: Francke, & Madrid: Gredos.

- Crespo Pozo, José S. 1963. Contribución a un vocabulario castellano-gallego, con indicación de fuentes. Madrid: Revista "Estudios".
- Cuervo, Rufino José. 1886, 1893. Diccionario de construcción y régimen de la lengua castellana. 2 vols. (A-D). Paris: A. Roger & F. Chernoviz. Reprinted Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo, 1953-54.
- Dworkin, Steven N. 1985. Etymology and derivational morphology: The genesis of Old Spanish denominal adjectives in -ido. Supplement 206 to Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Ernout, A[lfred]. 1953. Morphologie historique du latin. Rev. 3d edn. Paris: C. Klincksieck.
- , and A[ntoine] Meillet. 1959-60. Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots. Rev. 4th edn. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Figueiredo, Cândido de. 1925. Novo Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa. Rev. 4th edn. 2 vols. Lisboa: A. Brandão.
- Glare, P.G.W., ed. 19[68-]82. Oxford Latin dictionary. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press.
- Hanssen, Federico. 1913. Gramática histórica de la lengua castellana. Halle: Niemeyer.
- Hatzfeld, Adolphe, Arsène Darmesteter, Antoine Thomas. [1890-1900.] Dictionnaire général de la langue française. 2 vols. Paris: Librairie Ch. Delagrave.
- Kent, Roland G. 1946. The forms of Latin: A descriptive and historical morphology. Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America.
- Keniston, Hayward. 1937. The syntax of Castilian prose: The sixteenth century. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Levy, Anita Katz. 1967. "Contrastive developments in Hispano-Romance of borrowed Gallo-Romance suffixes," 2. Romance Philology 20.3: 296-320.
- Lloyd, Paul M. 1987. From Latin to Spanish, 1: Historical phonology and morphology of the Spanish language. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
- Malkiel, Yakov. 1944. "The development of uerēcundia in Ibero-Romance". Studies in philology 41.501-20.
- , 1945. The development of the Latin suffixes -antia and -entia in the Romance languages... University of California publications in linguistics... 1.4: 41-186.
- , 1950. "The Latin background of the Spanish suffix -uno: Studies in the genesis of a Romance formative". Romance Philology 4.1: 17-45.
- , 1953-55. "Apretar, pr(i)eto, perto: historia de un cruce hispanolatino". Thesaurus: Boletín del Instituto Caro y Cuervo 9.5-139.
- , 1959. "Nuevas aportaciones para el estudio del sufijo -uno". Nueva revista de filología hispánica 13.241-90.
- , 1971. "Derivational transparency as an occasional co-determinant of sound change: A new causal ingredient in the distribution of -ç- and -z- in Ancient Hispano-Romance", Romance Philology 25.1: 1-52.
- , 1981. "Hypercharacterization of pronominal gender in Romance". Language, meaning and style: Essays in memory of Stephen Ullmann 91-107, ed. T.E. Hope. Leeds: University Press.
- , 1982. "A hidden morphological factor behind instances of erratic distribution of ç and z in Old Spanish?" Romance Philology 35.4: 586-600.
- , 1986. Review of S.N. Dworkin (1985). General Linguistics 26:4.282-301.
- , 1988a. "Apocope: straight; through contact of languages; via suffixal polarization. The Spanish derivational morphemes and word-final segments -in and -ino". Hispanic Review 55: 409-

- , 1988b. "Why Spanish seso, but Portuguese siso, from ancestral sē(n)su?" Neophilologus 72.44-55.
- , 1989. Tentative autobiography..., with an Introduction by Henry Kahane. Romance Philology, Special issue.
- , Forthcoming a. "French suffixal derivation: Its aloofness from vocalic gamuts". To appear in a British testimonial volume.
- , Forthcoming b. "Vowel gamuts in Romance derivational suffixation". To appear in the transactions of a Leningrad-U.S.A. linguistics conference (1988).
- , Forthcoming c. "New problems in excessive self-assertion vs. hypercorrection". To appear in Papers from the Eighth international conference on historical linguistics: Lille, Aug.-Sept. 1987.
- Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm. 1890. Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen, 1: Lautlehre. Leipzig: Fues & Reisland.
- , 1911 [-20]. Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Heidelberg: C. Winter. Rev. 3d edn., 19[30-]35.
- , 1913. Historische Grammatik der französischen Sprache, 1: Laut- und Flexionslehre. 2d & 3d edns. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Michaëlis de Vasconcelos, Carolina. 19[05-]20. "Glossário do 'Cancioneiro da Ajuda'". Revista lusitana 23: v-xii, 1-95.
- Piel, Joseph M. 1949. Review of Malkiel (1944). Revista portuguesa de filologia 2.283-85.
- Posner, Rebecca R. 1961. Consonantal dissimilation in the Romance languages. Publ. of the Philological Society, 19. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Reynolds, Barbara, gen. ed. 1962. The Cambridge Italian dictionary, 1: Italian-English. Cambridge: at the University Press.
- Rodrigues Lapa, M[anu]el. 1970. Vocabulário galego-português extraído da edição crítica das "Cantigas d'escarnho e de mal dizer". No pl.: Editorial Galaxia.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1949. Historische Grammatik der italienischen Sprache und ihrer Mundarten, 1: Lautlehre. Bern: A. Francke.
- Schuchardt, Hugo. 1907. "Zur romanischen Wortgeschichte". Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 31.1-35.
- Smith, Colin, et al. 1971. Spanish-English, English-Spanish dictionary. London-Glasgow: Collins.
- Sommer, Ferdinand. 1914. Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre. 2d and 3d edns. Heidelberg: C. Winter.
- Staaff, Erik. 1907. Étude sur l'ancien dialecte léonais d'après des chartes du XIII^e siècle. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Terlingen, J. H. 1943. Los italianismos en español, desde la formación del idioma hasta principios del siglo XVII. Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij.
- Togeb, Knud. 1964. "Qu'est-ce que la dissimilation?" Romance Philology 17.3: 642-67.
- Ušakov, D. N. 1935-40. Tolkovj slovar' russkogo jazyka. 4 vols. Moskva: OGIZ.
- Williams, Edwin B. 1955. Spanish and English dictionary / Diccionario inglés y español. New York: Henry Holt.
- , 1962, 1968. From Latin to Portuguese: Historical phonology and morphology of the Portuguese language. Rev. 2d edn. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.