A CLUSTER OF FOUR HOMOPHONES IN IBERO–ROMANCE

I. INTRODUCTION: IBERO–ROMANCE HOMONYMICS

The systematic study of clashes between homophones had its starting point in France and French Switzerland. While scholars from neighboring countries, without much delay, joined the initial team of explorers, there was no immediate change of primary

1 A balanced initiation into the problems of homonymy, from the vantage point of a Germanic scholar, is offered in the dense introductory chapter (pp. 1–44) of Edna R. Williams, *The Conflict of Homonyms in English* (New Haven, 1944), with a wealth of references to monographs ordinarily unfamiliar to the Romanistic. Gilliéron's radical theories, propounded with engaging élan half a century ago, should at present be reconsidered with special attention to the stringent qualifications of Elise Richter, "Über Homonymie," *Festschrift für Paul Kretschmer* (Berlin, Vienna etc., 1926), pp. 167–201. The author drew on her profound knowledge of prosodic (accentual) features such as stress, pitch, tempo, which aid in eliminating a high percentage of supposed homophones, in reality mere homographs; the essay broadens out into a study of misunderstanding, anecdote, pun, and folk-etymology. W. von Wartburg, putting to good use his exceptionally rich collection of French dialect records, gives a version substantially different from Gilliéron's of the process of lexical replacement (primarily, of its all-important initial phase) in his "Betrachtungen über die Gliederung des Wortschatzes und die Gestaltzierung des Wörterbuchs," *ZRPh.*, LVII (1937), 296–312, and "Sein und Werden in der Sprache," a chapter of his *Einführung in Problematik und Methodik der Sprachwissenschaft* (Halle a/S, 1943), pp. 125–143, also available in a French and in a Spanish translation. A liberal estimate of the power of associative interference is made in J. Orr's spirited debate, in dialogue form, "On Homonyms," in which the author, elaborating on Gilliéron, supplies corroborative shards of information from Old French texts; see *Studies . . . Presented to Mildred K. Pope* (Manchester, 1939), pp. 253–297. A rather unexpectedly friendly reaction to homonymy, in spite of its links to therapeutic and "thaumaturgical" theories (in terms of Gilliéron's colorful phraseology), came from a scholar known for his antiteleological bias, L. Bloomfield; see his statements in the review article "On Recent Work in General Linguistics, VII: The Pathology of Language," *MP*, XXV (1927–28), 227–229, and in the book *Language* (New York, 1933), pp. 396–399. L. Spitzer has several times changed his ideas on the subject; see "Aus der Werkstatt des Etymologen," *Jb.Ph.*, I (1925), 129–159, where he speaks of synonyms (p. 144) but, evidently, means homonyms; "Frz. voler: zur Frage der Homonymievermeidung," *ZFSL*, LI (1928), 460–469 (illustrating the impact, on the lexicon, of changes in material civilization, especially in modern technology); "Cas d'homonymie gênante en espagnol," *RFE*, XVI
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objectives in homonymic research. These objectives included, first, the complex and not easily predictable reactions of French dialect speakers to the inroads of Parisian linguistic habits and fashions on their native speech patterns; and second, barring the effects of diffusion, the multitudinous "collisions" (as a result of the crossovers of phonological drift leading, at some stage, to convergence) between Latin words firmly rooted in the traditions of the individual patois.

Gradually, the principles first formulated by Gilliéron (in too trenchant form, it would seem at this distance) began to be applied with varying success to other dialect groups both inside and outside the Romance domain. In Ibero-Romance, a few monosyllabic nuclei like cach- and pech- have, over the years, been isolated and shown to conceal a wealth of derivatives from heterogeneous sources.  

In some other exceptional cases, homonymic triads have (1929), 173–174; "Aunc prov. aib—anc. esp. aleve," MLN, LXI (1946), 423; RF, LXII (1950), 417. Attention is focused on the language of children in Marguerite Durand's analysis "De quelques éliminations d'homonymes chez un enfant," Journal de psychologie normale et pathologique, XLII (1949), 53–63, with a postscript on anas 'duck' vs. asinu 'donkey' in Old French, see the minutes of the discussion in BSLP, XLIV: 1 (1947–48), pp. xlv–xlvi, and M. Cohen's critique, ibid., XLV: 2 (1949), 9. Some effects of syntactic ambiguity or amphiboly (Quintilian's κακῶς μάθοντο inadvertent errors) are pointed out by H. Lausberg, RF, LXII (1950), 188–192. I do not here include the scores of studies in dialect geography which, preeminently in the Gallo-Romance domain, almost without exception incidentally touch upon homonymy. They can easily be identified and assessed with the aid of the following guides: I. Iordan and J. Orr, An Introduction to Romance Linguistics (London, 1937), pp. 144–278; A. Kuhn, "60 Jahre Sprachgeographie in der Romania," RJb., I (1947–48), 24–63, esp. 33–34, and S. Pop, La dialectologie; aperçu historique et méthodes d'enquêtes linguistiques, I (Louvain, 1950), passim, in addition to older magazine surveys by J. Huber, L. Spitzer, and U. Leo, and to the well-known books by Jaberg, Gamillscheg, Millardet, and Dauzat.

2 A noteworthy attempt, admittedly provisional, to disentangle the threads of the cach- knot was made by J. Corominas, "Indianoromanica," RFH, VI (1944), 33–34; contributions on a smaller scale are due to F. Lecoy, Rom., LXVIII (1944–45), 7, and to J. Hubenschmid, VR, X (1948–49), 310–311. On the pech-tangle, see my "Studies in Hispano-Latin Homonymics," LG, XXVIII (1952), 299–338. The normal preservation of the final vowel is one feature which accounts for the distinctly smaller number of homonymic collisions in Ibero-Romance than in Gallo-Romance. Whether the clash between urretés 'boar' and urremis 'worm' paved the way for (porcus) singulāris in Romanized Gaul—porcus originally meant 'sucking pig' (É. Benveniste)—as claimed by E. Gamillscheg, Französische Bedeutungslehre (Tübingen, 1951), p. 26, can hardly ever be defini-
been identified.³ Attention has repeatedly been drawn to homonymic doublets,⁴ whose protracted coexistence is apt to entail seriously “proved”; but it is a fact that no comparatable struggle could plausibly have had a fatal result for either partner on Iberian soil. On the other hand, the more energetic development, north of the Loire, of the vowel system in other positions allows the French to distinguish between royal and réel, whose Spanish and Portuguese equivalents sound alike. For a surprisingly early (to be sure, erroneous) statement on the effect of homonymy on the Spanish lexicon, see F. Diez, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der romanischen Sprachen* (Bonn, 1853), p. 521, s.v. pestillo.

³ On Sp. coto ‘enclosure of pasture grounds’ < cautu vs. cot-orra ‘magpie’ vs. cot- ‘elevation, protuberance’ (as in Ptg. cotovel ‘elbow,’ also in toponyms and dialect words), see R. Menéndez Pidal, “Cotto, cotta,” RPh., VI (1952–53), 1–4, and J. Hubeschmid’s elaboration, ibid., 190–198. Cf. macho < muacho ‘mule’ (transmitted through Galician-Portuguese) vs. macho ‘sledge hammer, square anvil’ < martul (beside martillo < martellu) vs. macho ‘male’ (Libro de miseria, 361) < masculu (beside OSp. maslu, also mascolu [RFE, XXI, 1934, 159]); see C. Michaëlis de Vasconcelos, “Studien zur hispanischen Wortdeutung,” *Miscelanea Caix-Canello* (Florence, 1886), No. 23, pp. 135–136.

⁴ On almarjo ‘glasswort’ (bot.) vs. almarjo ‘swampy ground,’ see J. Oliver Asín, “El árabe marj en el vocabulario romance,” *BRAE*, XXIV (1945), 161, who, inexplicably, neglects to cite E. K. Neuvonen, *Los arabismos del español en el siglo XIII* (Helsinki, 1941), pp. 248–252. Balza ‘lake, pool’ (cf. topon. Balza ‘Lusitanian city built in marshy terrain’) is contrasted with the better-known balza ‘raft’ by R. Lapesa, *Historia de la lengua española*, 2d ed. (Madrid, 1950), p. 34. Chisme ‘gossip’ < Gr.-Lat. schisma ‘dissension’ (Tertullian) is opposed to Nebrixa’s chisme ‘bedbug,’ a by-form of OSp. čisme (Don Juan Manuel; see C. Michaëlis de Vasconcelos, loc. cit., pp. 165–166), Sp. chinche < cimice, by R. Menéndez Pidal, “Etimologías españolas,” *Rom.*, XXIX (1900), 345. The same scholar distinguishes between collazo ‘foster-brother’ (cf. Amadís de Gaula, Bk. III, ch. ix) < colicateu ‘one who shares the (mother’s, wet nurse’s) milk’; and OSp. collazo ‘serf’ paying his master a certain tax’ (Juan Ruiz, *Cavallero Zifar*) < collātīō ‘contribution’ (ibid., pp. 343–344); the argument, incidentally, is not quite cogent: why not assume the equation ‘foster-brother’ = ‘son of a wet nurse, of a young female servant’ = ‘serf’? Ptg. grança, as a product of grandia, signifies ‘alimadura de cereis’ in rustic speech, cf. Sp. grança which recalls the development of vergiienza, OPt. vergonça; the same sound sequence corresponds to a variant form of garança < Germ. warantia (J. M. Piel, “Etimologías portuguesas,” *Bibl.*, XXI [1945], 489–499). Golfin ‘highwayman, disreputable person’ is usually interpreted as metathesized folguín (Menéndez Pidal, *Rom.*, XXIX, 353), which, in turn, either goes back to follicāre ‘to move up and down like a pair of bellows’ or is akin to Basque sorgin ‘witch’ (REW³, Suppl., No. 9712); golfin ‘dolphin’ seems related to delphinus, but the transmutation of the initial consonant remains an unsolved problem twice attacked, with different results, by G. Alessio, “Problemi di etimologia romanza, I: Delphinus, ballaena, vitulus marinus ‘lampa,’” *RLR*, XVII (1950), 28–37 [written ca. 1939], and “The Problem of balearare,” *Word*, VII (1951), 21–42. Huelga ‘hedged-in terrain immediately surrounding the house’ (cf. topon. Las Huelgas and Fr. ouche) is a reflex of Celt. olca; huelga
confusion or, at least, has led to the establishment of points of vital contact between the rivals. Now and then, cases have been pointed out of regional differentiation of actual or potential competitors. The occasional separation of single lexical units, fraught with meanings not easily compatible, into smaller independent entities which, at a more advanced stage, are bound to impinge on one another represents a phenomenon apart. In an effort to avoid embarrass-

‘fallow, ground lying at rest,’ fig. ‘strike,’ is cognate to holgar < folgar (Lapesa, op. cit., p. 33). Majuelo ‘estaca cortada de una rama con una cruz en su extremo’ < malleolus ‘small hammer, mallet’ is separated by Menéndez Pidal from majuelo ‘hawthorn bearing a red fruit’ < *majuelo < *mulleolus ‘reddish’ (Rom. XXIX, [1900], 348); mulleus alone is recorded. Mentiōne ‘mention’ vs. V.Lat. menti(t)ōne ‘lie’ (in preference to mendācium) are discussed, in detail, by J. Jud, “It. menzogna, fr. mensonge; esp. mentira,” VR, XI (1950), 101–124. For a tentative statement on Cat. pessol < *pediciolus as against peçol < pec-, petiolu, see J. Coromines, “El parlar de Cardós i Vell Ferrera,” BDC, XXIII (1935), 303a. The overlapping, though not interlocking, of the petere and the (obscene) pēdere families is analyzed at some length in my forthcoming monograph “The Coalescence of expediēre and petere in Ibero-Romance,” fn. 27; see also REV, 1195, 6538, 6539 for Meyer-Lübke’s explanation of the replacement of OFr. pestour ‘baker’ by boulanger. On the progenies of uērus and uarius in Old Spanish (difficult of distinction in groups like uvas veras, peñas veras), see my forthcoming article “Ancient Hispanic vera(s) and mentira(s),” RPk., VI: 2–3 (1952–53).

A measure of confusion between azar ‘hazard,’ azahar ‘orange blossom,’ dial. azarado ‘restless,’ and azorar ‘to terrify, to confound,’ also Gypsy-Sp. acharado ‘burned’ is conceded by C. Clavería, RFE, XXXIII (1949), 155–162. Vedijas ‘entangled locks’ and verijas ‘region of the genitals,’ the former an offshoot of uis, utis, the latter from uirità, have widely coalesced, in part, as a consequence of the common alternation [natural] ~ [r], see my article on vera(s) and mentira(s), fn. 34.

J. Jud, “S’éveiller dans les langues romanes,” RLIR, II (1926), 163–207, observes the impact of expergisci, experi(y)re ‘to wake up’ upon experiēre ‘to test, to experiment, to experience’ through the ambiguity of expertus, divided between the two families. P. Aebscher, starting from the dichotomy calx ‘limestone’ ~ calx ‘heel,’ goes on to reconstruct V.Lat. calcīāre ‘to shoe,’ *to tread upon, to trample,’ RFE, XXXV (1951), 23. Manada ‘handful, small quantity’ may have exercised its share of influence on dial. menar, minar ‘to drive (a herd),’ lit. ‘to goad, to threaten’ < minārī, Late Lat. mināre, producing manada ‘small herd’ and, through further repercussions, peada, piara ‘id.’ see BH, LI (1951), 41–80.

In the east of the Iberian Peninsula one finds cama ‘leg,’ a congener of Fr. jambe, It. gamba; in the west, cama, from escamar < squamāre, signifies ‘chaff’ > ‘bed’ (this development has parallels in the dialects of southern Italy). See G. Alessio, “Problemi di etimologia romanza (II),” RLIR, XVII (1951), 61; H. Meier, VR, X (1948–49), 73–86, RF, LXIII (1951), 193.

On maña ‘deftness, (manual) skill’ > ‘cunning’ vs. dial. maña (for standard manojo) ‘bundle’ < V.Lat. manua, mania, see my forthcoming monograph on Sp. pihuela, tro(m)pezar, despejar, and maña. The oft-invoked power of “poly-
ing or simply misleading ambiguity, speakers may deem it advisable or necessary to introduce substitute words for the weaker (or more easily replaceable) of the two partners locked in a homonymic struggle or for both, depending on circumstances, a development


The substitution of cordero, of controversial ancestry (*RPh.*, IV [1950-51], 25, fn. 52), for agnu ‘lamb’ in Castilian alone has been ascribed to the conflict with annu ‘year’ (in Portuguese, anho and ano coexist peacefully); see A. Steiger, “Contribución al estudio del vocabulario del Corbacho,” *BRAE*, X (1923), 176-177; M. Durand, op. cit. (see fn. 1), mentions a late Old French pun on *a(γ)nel ‘lamb’ vs. a(n) *nel ‘little donkey’ (p. 62). Optg. asseitar ‘to stalk’ (cf. OSp. assechar, Sp. acechar ‘to lie in ambush for’) was superseded by espeitar soon after colliding with aceitar < acceptâr; see *HR*, XVII (1949), 183-232. As suggested by Gilliéron and Orr, propinquity to *amer ‘to love’ may have been a concomitant in the disappearance of OFr. asmer ‘to esteem, to think’ < aestimâr; partial merger is here assumed to have taken place. Sp. rienda, Ptg. rédea ‘rein’ < *retina (from retineó, -ère ‘to hold back, to bridle’) owe their coinage to the avoidance of habêna ‘thong, strap, rein’ endangered by auêna ‘oats, stalk, straw, reed-pipe,’ see J. Jud, “Probleme der altromanischen Wortgeographie,” *ZRPPh.*, XXXVIII (1914-17), 33-360. New-World “seseo” accounts for the local prevalence of cocinar over coger, and of costurar over coser; see A. Rosenblat, “Notas de morfología dialectal,” *BDHA*, II (Buenos Aires, 1946), 284-285, cf. M. L. Wagner, *Lingua e dialetti dell’America spagnola* (Florence, 1949), p. 44; K. Baldinger, *ZRPPh.*, LXVI (1950), 229; H. Meier, *RF*, LXIII (1951), 425. The crystallization of Late Lat. *dolus* ‘pain,’ from dolère, which underlies OSp. *duelo*, familiar from Berceo (Juan Ruiz’s *cudrío*, like Fr. *deuil* ‘mourning,’ calls to mind *dolium*) coincides with the extinction of classical *dolus* ‘wile’; there must have been a brief period of vacillation and confusion, see Ernout-Meillet, s.v., and F. Lecoy, “A propos de l’esp. alrededor: essai d’étymologie,” to appear in *RPPh.*, VII: 1 (August, 1953), S. Griswold Morley *Miscellaneous.* According to G. Sachs, OSp. de *thereo* (extracted from *non-de*, *non-de*) could not stand up against the homophonous preposition, *RFE*, XXI (1934), 159-160. The consequences of the collision, in late Old Spanish, of az <acie ‘sharp edge, line of battle,’ faz < *facie ‘shape, face, countenance,’ and faz(e) < fasce ‘fagot, burden,’ pl. ‘bundle’ as a result of the fall of *f-* and of the tendential apocope of *e* are presented in *RPPh.*, III (1949), 52-61; according to Piel, loc. cit., fasce intervened in the derivation of OPTg. *esfacho*, Braz. *fachear* from ex-faculâre. In Hispano-Latin, *foedus* ‘treaty’ yielded ground to *foedu*, a
which can be obviated by single or dual deviation from the evolu-
‘ugly’ > OSp. fe(d)o, hedo, OPtg. feo > feío. OSp. huebos me lo e ‘I need it’
(echoing opus est) was overlaid by me hace falta when, through the effacement
of the phonemic distinction between b and v, there arose the danger of inopportune
association of huebos with huevos ‘eggs,’ a situation awkwardly described by J.
Oliver Asín, Historia de la lengua española, 4th ed. (Madrid, 1940), p. 198. Ro-
dilla, originally ‘knee-cap’ < ‘little wheel,’ took the place of ynojo (hinojo)—the
congeneric of OPtg. güño, OFr. genoil, It. ginocchio < genuculum, -iculum favored as
late as the times of J. de Mena, A. de Palencia, and J. de Valdés—to eschew the
confusion with OSp. ynojo ‘fennel’ < fénuculo. The dialectal variants of the
botanical term: Moz. fónicho (V. García de Diego, RFE, XXXIV [1950], 123),
Ars. fenollo (occasionally cenolla), through “acoustic equivalence,” cf. J. Coro-
minas, RPH, V [1943], 6; on cenojil, see Steiger, BRAE, X [1923], 171-172)
do not jeopardize the status of the local designations of the ‘knee,’ in conse-
quence of the neat separation of ge- and fe-; cf. RPh., III, 59-60, and Jud, ZRPb., XXX-
VIII (1914-17), 65. The homonymous tension was keenly felt on the eve of the
extinction of hinojo ‘knee’ except in a few petrifact phrases, at a time when the
alternation fenollo ~ ynojo was playfully associated, by some imaginative con-
temporaries, with the initials of King Fernando of Aragon and Queen Ysabel of
Castile. One may here fittingly place the evicition of finiesta ‘window,’ at the
(h)iniestra stage, by hiniest < genesta, -ista ‘broom.’

Látus ‘broad’ survived into Old Spanish and into Old French, only to retreat
before ancho in the former, and before large in the latter; the competition with
latu(s) ‘side’ may bear its share of responsibility for this withdrawal; see G.
Sachs’s glossary to El libro de los caballos: tratado de albeiteria del siglo XIII
(Madrid, 1936), p. 134b. Rapidu gave rise to rabio (in toponymy), less successful
than the alternate product rabdu, raudo as a result of the unrelenting pressure of
rabia, rabiar, and satellites; see Menéndez Pidal, “Modo de obrar el substrato
lingüístico,” RFE, XXXIV (1950), 5. OSp. traer < trádere ‘to deliver up, to
betray’ failed to stand its ground before traer (OArag. trayr: Fernández de Here-
dia; OPtg. traer stands apart) < trahere ‘to draw, to drag’; semantic bridges,
however frail, were not lacking in this instance—one can visualize a person
betrayed by his friends and dragged before the judge—; see Spitzer, RFE, XVI
(1929), 173-174, with a reference to E. Pasquier (line 8 of Spitzer’s note is mean-
ingless, unless one corrects the text: “Il ne semble attesté qu’en espagnol ancien”);
also Menéndez Pidal, Leyenda de los Infantes de Lara, 2d ed. (Madrid, 1934), pp.
228, 410, 446b. Traer ‘to betray’ was eliminated, except for the unexposed deriva-
tive traidor ‘traitor’; the substitute formation, traicionar, oddly enough, has a
counterpart in Portuguese, atraiçar, although the west has not suffered acutely
from any homonymous tension; the role played by such peculiar forms as OPtg.
treiçom (H. R. Lang, Miscelânea Leite [Coimbra, 1934], p. 33) and trei, treides
(Piel, Bibli., XXI [1945], 192, 197) requires special study. When the functional
distinction between –ç- and –z- was discarded (A. Martinet, “The Unvoicing of
Old Spanish Sibilants,” RPh., V: 2-3 [1951-52], 133-156), there was no room for
further undisturbed coexistence of dezir ‘to say’ < dicere and dežir ‘to ascend’
(used as late as the Cancionero de Baena, Pero Guillén de Segovia’s rhyme dic-
tionary, and the 1499 ed. of Calisio y Metíbea), differently interpreted by J.
tionary norm once known as "sound-laws." As in Gallo-Romance territory, diffusion (for instance, the penetration of a Galician-Portuguese word into Castilian or vice versa, as a sequel to a given cultural shift, such as the spread of music and poetry) has been recognized as a major contributing factor in the disturbance and subsequent restoration of the lexical balance. The morphological system (including inflection and derivation, though hardly ever composition) may, in exceptional cases, be notably affected by the tendency of speakers at all costs to eschew homonymy. The ac-

Cornu, O. J. Tallgren [-Tuulio], Meyer-Lübke (REW¹, Rew²), V. García de Diego (Contribución . . . ), and Menéndez Pidal (1908, 1946); see the latter's revised Cantar de Mio Cid ed., pp. 617–618, 1222–1223.

¹ Meyer-Lübke, "Miscelânea etimológica," Bibl., III (1927), 2–3, speaks of "homonymophobia" apropos of fodicāre 'to dig' > *folgar, contaminated with fossa (> Ptg. fusgar) so as to obviate the clash with folgar 'to rest' < follicāre. M. Sanchis Guarner, "Noticia del habla de Aguaviva de Aragón," RFE, XXXIII (1949), 27, observes Ag. [nau] 'nine' < noue beside [noú] 'new' < nouu (both words coincide in Standard Cat. [noú]), in violation of normal sound correspondences: "Se deshace la homonimia en Aguaviva." When OSp. fizo < fízu 'fastened' and fijo < fíliu 'son' ceased to be distinguished by the presence or absence of voice in the central spirant, the alternative to retain or to drop initial j- provided a welcome means of secondary differentiation. A similar course of events is observable in Sp. hiel < OSp. fiel < fel 'gall' vs. Sp. fiel < OSp. fiel < fidēle 'faithful,' where ancient differences of syllabic structure threatened to become effaced; see Steiger, BRAE, X (1923), 171. One might here recall Ptg. trazer < trahere, an analogical formation patterned on fazer, dizier.

¹¹ Amusing errors may occur in translations. Thus, a Spanish cleric laboring on the adaptation of a Portuguese model text confused OPortg. beesta 'bow' < bal(l)ista with besta 'animal' < bèstia (the latter had a more easily recognizable cognate in Spanish) and erroneously equated Ptg. falar 'to talk' < fábulāri with Sp. fallar 'to find' < f + aflāre, see Piel, Bibl., XXI (1945), 178, 183. OSp. desfecha as a term of late medieval versification (cancioneros) presumably echoes Ptg. fechar, of disputed background (fístulāre? pessulāre?), but smoothly lent itself to reinterpretation as a derivative from desfazer, see my "Studies in Hispano-Latin Homonymics," fn. 92.

¹² The classic inflectional example is the replacement of Lat. es 'thou art' by eris (> Sp. eres) in Proto-Castilian, so as to preclude confusion with est 'he is' (> Sp. es); Portuguese exhibits a different pattern of distribution (Menéndez Pidal, Manual de gramática histórica española, 7th ed. [Madrid, 1944], p. 204, §73). The convergence of cantāte and cantātu in Gallo-Romance territory (Catalan included) led to the replacement of the imperative by the present indicative, see H. Kuen, "Die sprachlichen Verhältnisse auf der Pyrenäenhalbinsel," ZRPk., LXVI (1950), 109, fn. 2. Spanish and Portuguese have suffered less than French from the collision of suffixes (-imen, -īnu, -īgine; -tāte, -tātu; -ōticu, -ōgine) which had a singularly strong effect on the gender. Piel is unjustified in labeling
ceptance or rejection of tentatively proposed “cultismo” has also, in a measure, been dependent on homonymic tensions within the vernacular stratum of the vocabulary, as could have been foreseen from similar discoveries made by Gilliéron. Invariably, the alternative to this escape from confusion through the withdrawal of the “ailing” partner is the complete merger of two words of (regionally) similar form and near-identical or, at least, mutually reconcilable meaning (whatever, in the historical perspective, the disparity of their backgrounds). Just how semantic compatibility

Lat. -ía and Gr. -áx as homophonous (“A formação dos substantivos abstractos em português,” Bibli., XVI [1940], 218): he seems to confuse acoustic with visual identity. The homonymic “blocking” of suffixes (e.g., the inability of the French to apply bonbonnière to the ‘candy-maker,’ because its function has been preempted by ‘candy-box,’ or to use médecine for ‘doctoresse’ so long as it is spontaneously associated with ‘medical science’ or ‘medicament’) is studied in W. Stehli’s meritorious Zurich dissertation Die Femininbildung von Personenbezeichnungen im neuesten Französisch (Berne, 1949), cf. L. Remacle, RBPhH, XXIX (1951), 548; J. de La Harpe, RPPh., III (1949–50), 189. Applied to Spanish, this principle shows the futility of any effort to replace (perro) ladrador by (perro) ladrón, although -ador and -ón, as characterizers, are near-identical in function, hence frequently interchangeable. For the latest structuralist statement, in criticism of E. A. Nida, on the analysis of homophonous morphemes, with special regard to English, see D. L. Bolinger, “Complementation should complement,” SiL, VIII (1950), 29–39.

13 Doze ‘twelve’ < duodecim and doce, doz ‘sweet’ < dulce were near-homophones in Old Spanish (as they continue to be in Portuguese); the preference, at long last, accorded to learned dulce over doz in Castilian, explicable in different contexts, may secondarily have aided to widen the distance between the two words. Sp. hueso < os(su) ‘bone’ and Sp.oso < ursu ‘bear’ do not stand in each other’s way, as their counterparts would do in Portuguese, a language lacking in ascending diphthongs, if the “cultismo” urso had not expediately been introduced. One advantage of erudite falso ‘deceitful’ over vernacular *foso, *(h)oso < falsu is that it is neatly distinguishable from foso ‘ditch, moat’ < fossu, whose erratic f-; in turn, is a barrier to any confusion with oso; see Steiger, BRAE, X, 171.

14 Fijar and fisgar ‘to pierce (with a glance),’ locally pronounced [fi̞xár], may have become amalgamated in Murc. fijón ‘descorado, mirón’ (Lemus y Rubio, García Soriano). The influence of póllice ‘flea’ on póllice ‘thumb’ (hence Sp. pulgar in preference to *polgar) is an oft-quoted example, corroborated by mata-piojos ‘thumb’ < ‘lousekiller.’ The frequently assumed merger of ibi ‘there’ (which lives on undefiled in Arag. bi, vi) and híc ‘here’ in OSp. y, hi is confirmed by A. Badía Margarit, “Sobre ibi e inde en las lenguas de la Península Ibérica,” RFE, XXXV (1951), 62–65, where he takes up the threads of his thesis (1947) and of D. Gazdaru’s review of it, Fil., II (1950), 29–44. The possibility of secondary association of Ptg. pop. seu José ‘senhor José’ (< seniêr) and seu tolo (< suu, cf. vulg. Sp. so mentiroso) is granted by H. Meier, RF, LXII (1951), 168–169. OPtg.
can be rigorously defined, scholars are not yet prepared to say, and they are loath to admit that essentially the same situation, no doubt on account of seemingly minor but, in fact, decisive factors rarely identifiable in exploring past stages of language growth, is quite likely to yield diverse results.¹⁶

In the diagnoses of some linguists, the role played by this homonymic “ailment” has, without question, been exaggerated.¹⁶ Fu-

चार (< Germ. gainb ‘to open one’s mouth avidly’) and q(u)anhar (< Germ. waidanjan ‘to chase, to graze’ > ‘to gain’) blended into the single verb ganhar, see Meyer-Lübke, Miscelânea Leite (Coimbra, 1934), p. 334. For a different interpretation of pulgar, see P. Fouche, RH, LXXVII (1929), 137–138, 152.

¹⁶ H. Meier, “Port. laje, Gal. laxe,” RF, LXIII (1951), 7: “Wo Fortsetzungen von lâma [‘Platte’] und von lâma ‘Sumpf, Schlamm’ homonym wurden, konnte diese Homonymie zum Zurücktreten des einen oder anderen der beiden Wörter führen oder beitragen. Gelegentlich berühren sich die beiden Bedeutungs-

kreise und ist die etymologische Zuordnung schwierig.”

¹⁴ How could OSp. coxo ‘lame’ < cozu (in glosses) and *cojo ‘testicle’ < côleu have hindered each other in early Spanish (as insinuated by G. Sachs, El libro de los caballos, p. 123b), if French (couillon) and other congener show the abandonment of côleu at an early date and for obviously different reasons, in favor of a derivative? Excess of enthusiasm led the same author quite unnecessarly to speak of a conflation of fasciâre and facere (p. 131a), two heterophonous verbs. H. Meier goes too far in reconstructing any degree of homonymic tension between Ptg. criar and crer, curtir and cortar, comer and coimar, morrer and morar, polir and pular, quebrar and cubrar, see his Ensaios de filologia românica (Lisbon, 1948), pp. 31–54. Also, his assumption of rivalry between gêna ‘knee’ and genus ‘kind’ in Vulgar Latin, necessitating the coinage of *genilus ‘kind,’ immune to ambiguity (RF, LXII [1950], 235), is dubious, not to say gratuitous, since the forms actually in use were geniculou, -uculu and generu (cf. Fr. genre), hardly detrimental to each other. Whatever tension may have existed in this area involved genus, -eris and gener, -erî ‘son-in-law,’ cf. the abnormal ending of the Spanish erudite género (alongside strictly scientific congêneres). The separation, by Meier, of melindre into a product of meliligne ‘honey substance’ and one of molligne ‘softness,’ according as it means ‘fitters’ or ‘affectation,’ is most unfortunate (RF, LXIII [1951], 329–330), above all, semantically unwarranted. One finds it difficult to follow V. Garca de Diego, “El castellano como complejo dialectal y sus dialectos internos,” RFE, XXXIV (1950), 112, in his projection, into Hispano-Latin, of a “roce acústico y mental” between rigêscre and re + ezër.

I wish here briefly to revert to two problems which, in recent years, have been much in the focus of interest. OSp. yegüerta ‘mess’ (transmitted through the Biblia medieval romanceada), probably from Late Latin iecúria (gloss) ‘giblets,’ may have fallen into disuse in consequence of its friction with yegua ‘mare’ < equa, surrounded by satellites like yegüeriza (E. Asensio, RFE, XXXIV [1950], 303). In contrast, the status of its western equivalent iguaria ‘choice food, tidbit’ was strengthened by the neighborhood of iguar ‘to prepare, to deal out food’ < æquâre. This, probably, is the fairest conclusion that can be drawn from a pro-
ture research, in Spanish no less than in contiguous fields, will have to concern itself not only with stray additions, always gratifying, but also with substantial, in part sweeping deductions, from the original claims, admittedly a less stimulating task. For those shrinking back from the notion that linguistics can thrive only in a hermetically closed space, the intimate relationship between homonymy and puns opens up interesting avenues of joint approach to literature and language.17

To illustrate this general state of affairs, attention, in this article, is directed to the dissyllabic nucleus pe(g)oll-, pegull- which, upon closer inspection, turns out to be correlated to as many as four different Hispano-Latin word families.

II. The Hispanic Progeny of peculiúm


17 Quite typical is the pun on yerro and hierro which pervades the Siglo de oro literature, starting with the Auto de los hierros de Adén, included in Vol. II of L. Rouanet’s collection.
environment,\textsuperscript{18} at the two extremes of Romania: in Macedo-
Rumanian, south of the Danube, where [pikúlu] signifies ‘savings
(for old age),’ and in Alentejano, the Portuguese dialect spoken
south of the lower reaches of the Tagus: pegulho ‘sheep or hog given
to the head shepherd as his wages or in partial compensation for his
service.’\textsuperscript{19} Of the two disconnected areas, the last may be sizably
enlarged by including Gal. pegullo, in the northwest of the Penin-
sula,\textsuperscript{20} and (West-) And. pegullo (de cabras) ‘hatajo o pequena
porción de ganado,’\textsuperscript{21} in all likelihood, a word imported from
Spanish Extremadura, where Portuguese words are found in abun-
dance, or directly from Alentejo.\textsuperscript{22} Of the corresponding Old Spanish
form pecuyo only vestigial evidence has so far been produced.\textsuperscript{23}
Learned Sp. peculio (occasionally disguised as pecullo) is of no im-
mediate concern to us in this context,\textsuperscript{24} nor are its derivative peculiar,

\textsuperscript{18} The dominant meanings of pecúlium (and pecúnia) in Late Latin were
‘share of the fortune given to a son or a serf,’ ‘property, money.’ Alent. pegulho
possibly echoes a still older usage (Ernout-Meillet, Dict. étym.: pecúlium ‘petite
part du troupeau laissée en propre à l’esclave qui le gardait,’ cf. pecúliāris ovis),
which squares with our knowledge of the archaic strain in the Luso-Latin lexicon.

\textsuperscript{19} These bits of information have presumably been copied from S. Pușcaru,
“Rumänische Etymologien, II,’” ZRPk., XXVIII (1904), 685; id., Etymologisches
Wörterbuch der rumänischen Sprache (Heidelberg, 1905), §1294; and A.D.R.
Gonçalvez Viana, Apostilas aos dicionários portugueses (Lisbon, 1906), II, 255.
Pușcaru lists the Mac.-Rum. variants [pekúλu], [pikúλu], emphasizes the surviv-
alf in the same dialect, of [pekúμa] < pecunia, and identifies a trace of pecúlium
in Albanian.

\textsuperscript{20} V. García de Diego, Elementos de gramática histórica gallega (Burgos, ca.
1909), p. 168; cf. BH, LIII (1951), 44.

\textsuperscript{21} A. Alcalá Venceslada, Vocabulario andaluz (Andújar, 1933–34), p. 298:
“Empezó con un pegullo de cabras y hoy tiene una piara grande.”

\textsuperscript{22} The influx of western forms into Andalusian deserves separate study; note
fechillo (Seville), fecha and fechadura (Huelva), the southeastern outposts of the
unmistakably Galician-Portuguese verb fechar ‘to lock, to shut,’ with counter-
parts in the Canary Islands and in Louisiana’s St. Bernard parish.

\textsuperscript{23} V. Fernández Llera, Gramática y vocabulario del Fuero Juzgo (Madrid, 1929),
pp. 236b, 237a, quotes the crucial passage from M. 163, i, 18: “... que el peguyo
o pegujar todo es una cosa.” One can here observe a primitive in the process of
giving way to a derivative with which, by dint of usage, it has become synonymous,
cf. OSp. cuer ~ corazón ‘heart,’ OFr. pis ~ peitrine (≥ OArag. petrina)
‘breast.’

\textsuperscript{24} Peculio is documented in the D.Aut., V (1737), 179b, with excerpts from
Martín de Azpilcueta (el Navarro’s) Manual de confesores y penitentes and from
Madre María de Jesús de Agreda’s Mística ciudad de Dios; add J. M. de Pereda,
Pedro Sánchez (Madrid, 1883), ch. xxx, p. 415: “Como el crédito estaba consumido
used figuratively, and its cognate pecunia, which has strayed far from its original meaning,24 of any greater interest. The underlying pattern of distribution: the perseverance of the lexical patrimony in vernacular garb all over the west and in learned shape around the center of the Peninsula, has been observed on numerous occasions;26 note, in particular, semi-learned OSp. pécoras, reminiscent of animalia(s), later alimañas, beside Gal. (em)prega ‘head of cattle,’ and the various western expressions for ‘shepherd’: pegoreiro, preguero, priguero < pecoráriu.27

A few derivatives from pecúlium have entrenched themselves more tenaciously than the primitive in sections of the vast territory hasta su último maravedí, tuve yo que pagarlas de mi peculio." De mi (tu, su) propio peculio is a fixed phrase at present. The spurious spelling peculo is favored by J. Borao, Diccionario de voces aragonesas, 2d ed. (Zaragoza, 1908), p. 283.

25 The contrast, in form and meaning, between scholarly peculiar and rustic pegujal has served Menéndez Pidal as a stock example of dual transmission of a Latin word in Spanish ever since the original edition of his historical grammar (Madrid, 1904), p. 76. Pecunia was accepted as an unassimilated Latinism by Berceo, known for his hospitality to “cultismos”: Milagro XXIII (La deuda pagada), 630b, 653d; Vida de Santo Domingo, 175a. Ast. pecunia, in traditional garb but endowed with a new and astonishing meaning (‘molestia grande’), is recorded by M. J. Canellada [de Zamora Vicente], El bable de Cabranaes (Madrid, 1944), p. 290.

26 This is true of approximately a score of formations in -entia (Ptg. -ença vs. Sp. -encia instead of preliterary -iencia; see UCPL, I: 4 [1945], 64–72), of certain compound verbs (Ptg. interromper vs. Sp. interrumpir: both borrowed at a late date, but differently integrated); cf. also abstracts like Ptg. segredo vs. Sp. secreto, Ptg. enveja vs. Sp. envidia, OPtg. cobiça vs. OSp. cobiçia (in the last case the suffixes alone exhibit different degrees of “learnedness”).

27 The sentence “Abigeus es ladrón que furtá yeguas o pécoras” is quoted from A. de Palencia’s Universal vocabulario (1490), not directly accessible to me, by F. Lázaro Carreter, RFE, XXXIII (1949), 185. Covarrubias, Tesoro, s.v. carta, defines carta pécora thus: ‘el pergamino, por ser de la piel de la pécora’; see also D.Aut., V, 179a.

One may group with OProv. pegora (E. Levy, Supplement-Wörterbuch, VI [Leipzig, 1910], 176b) the western forms assembled by V. García de Diego, RFE, VIII (1921), 411, and by myself, UCPL, IV: 3 (1951), 150. Note further West.-Ast. pegoreiro, preguero ‘shepherd lad’ < pecoráriu, which Meyer-Lübke, REW2, 6326, starred without justification; OPtg. piqueiro ‘id.’ (A.D. 1175; see N. P. Sacks, The Latinity of Dated Documents in the Portuguese Territory [Philadelphia, 1941], p. 168b); Braz. pegoreiro ‘shepherd’s dog’ (C. Teschauer, Novo dicionário nacional, 2d ed. [Porto Alegre, 1928], p. 694); Berc. priquero ‘pastor or persona encargada de llevar la vecera al monte y cuidar de su guarda’ (V. García Rey, Vocabulario del Bierzo [Madrid, 1934], p. 130, with a valuable excerpt from an ancient local ordinance).
between Portugal and Rumania. Prov. *pegulhada, a visibly late innovation based on pecūlium and involving a suffix productive in Romance rather than in Latin, entitles nobody to project *pecūliāta into Common Vulgar Latin, but does add Southern France to the previously circumscribed zone stubbornly held by pecūlium long after its general retreat. The adjectival derivative pecūliāre marginally attested in the ancestral language (REW3, 6336) has struck deep roots in a major part of the Iberian Peninsula and again in Southern France,28 calling to mind the traditionally close connection between these two adjoining territories, a link which presumably reached its greatest strength under the early Visigothic rulers. The Romance progeny shows pervasive alternation of -al and -ar, a state of wavering with numerous parallels,29 hence one which does not necessarily presuppose the merger of pecūliāre with its distant kin pecudīāle ‘concerning the herds or the cattle,’ from pecus, -udīs ‘head of cattle,’ as distinct from pecus, -oris ‘herd.’30 A hypothesis carrying less conviction would be to start out from the dissimilation of r’s in pegujarero > pegujalero (cf. verdura ‘vegetable’ beside verdulero ‘fruit vendor’) and to assume some kind of recoiling action on pegujar > -al, much as acechar, for OSp. assechar, echoes assechança transformed, through assimilation, into açechança.

Meyer-Lübke was satisfied with mentioning Ptg. pegulhal ‘small herd’31 and Sp. pegual ‘small farm,’32 beside Prov. pegulhiera ‘dowry,’ which of course should have been listed separately, s.v. pecūliāria.33 He also referred to OLog. pecuiare ‘private property’

28 Inexplicably, Meyer-Lübke starred pecūliāris, an adjective of notable currency in Latin on various levels of speech and at different periods (the record includes Plautus, Cicero, Suetonius). The rival derivatives pecūliāsus and pecūliātus have, to my knowledge, left no descendants.


30 Pecudīālis and pecūliāris, all differences of derivational hierarchy notwithstanding, may have sounded almost alike in late substandard Latin through the effect of [j] on the preceding consonants, d and l; cf. meliōrāre > medrar. There is no independent evidence of the persistence of pecudīālis in any corner of Ro-

31 Note the important entry in Joaquim de Santa Rosa de Viterbo’s Eluci-
dário, 2d ed. (Lisbon, 1865), II, 141b–142a.

32 Meyer-Lübke’s (possibly, earliest) statement on pegujal in the Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien, 1891, p. 773, is known to me only through G. Körting’s Lateinisch-romanisches Wörterbuch, 3d ed. (Paderborn, 1907), §6966.

33 Employed by Ulpianus and recorded in inscriptions; cf. fn. 38. Meyer-Lübke’s spelling pegulheira is inaccurate; see E. Levy, Suppl.-Wtb., VI, 177.
in northcentral Sardinia. Strictly speaking, one may distinguish, in Old Spanish, between *pegujar,* with its satellite *pegujarero,* and *pegujal,* the form eventually standardized and consistently favored by Renaissance dictionaries, accompanied by *pegujalerio.*

*Pegujar* occurs in a document from San Salvador dated 1074 ("pectet . . . medietatem de suo peguvar," quoted by V. R. B. Oelschläger, *A Medieval Spanish Word-List* [Madison, 1940], a source to which I owe yet other bibliographic hints); in the *Fuero de Teruel,* near the southern tip of the Old Aragonese domain (a rival MS favors *peguyar*; see M. Gorosch's ed. [Stockholm, 1950], §448); in the *Fuero de Palenzuela* (". . . pectet ad palatinum medietate de suo peguvar"); see J. Cejador y Frauca, *Vocabulario medieval castellano* [Madrid, 1929], p. 301b); in Berceo's *Estoria de Sant Millán,* ed. Janer, quatr. 240d: "... si peguvar [read *peguyar*] toviesse, non gelo escondría"; Juan Ruiz, MS S, 170d: "Quien en el arenal siembra, non trilla peguajares*" (expressly adduced as a refrán); in one late-fourteenth-century glossary, see A. Castro, *Glosarios latino-españoles de la Edad Media* (Madrid, 1936), p. 262a, s.v. *pecul[i]um* (T 1298)—note the ed.'s reference to the Alfonsin *Partida* V; in Pero López de Ayala's *Rimado de palacio,* N, 574cd: "Redima sus pecados e faga peguajares/allá en paraño ..."; at a later date, in Martín de Azpilcueta's *Manual,* see *D.Aut.,* V, 179b, s.v. *peculio* (ch. xvii, §141: "Quatro maneras de bienes o peculios o *peguajares* pueden tener los hijos en vida de sus padres"; the form is declared obsolete by the Academicians, s.v. *peguyal*), and in the *Don Quixote,* Part II, ch. ii (Bonilla-Schevill's ed., III, 52–53: "... id a governar vuestra casa y a labrar vuestras *peguajares*"). Peculiarly archaic forms, with clumsy Latinizing spelling, were identified at San Juan de la Peña, a.d. 1063; see E. Ibarra y Rodríguez's collection of documents (Zaragoza, 1913), No. 1: *peculiare,* and at Calatayud, a.d. 1159 ("... tres pexas de terra: una est illo *peculiar*"), cf. Oelschläger, loc. cit. The spellings *pecular,* *peguyar,* *peguyar,* *pigual,* documented by Fernández Llera, *Gramática y vocabulario del Fuero Juzgo,* pp. 236b-237a, must be assessed in the light of Menéndez Pidal's statement on pre-Alfonsin orthography.

Found in the Escorial Biblical MS I-j-8, see R. Oroz's vocabulary, *BIF,* IV (1944–46), 412. An awkward attempt at Latinizing the suffix alone is discernible in a text from Madrid, a.d. 1198, cited by Oelschläger: "Bestias vel oves, vel xxxta mechales, habeatur pro *peguyerario.*"

Including Nebríxa, Alcalá, Casas, Molina, Córdova, Percival-Minsheu, Oudin. The *D.Aut.* defines the word thus: 'se llama la corta porción de siembra, ganado o caudal' and illustrates its use with a passage from Francisco López de Gómara, *Historia de las Indias y conquista de México* (Zaragoza, 1552), ch. cxxvii: "Cada esclavo podía tener muger y *peguyal,* del qual muchas veces se redimían." Oddly enough, Covarrubias, *Tesoro,* s.v. *pegual,* gives a cross-reference to *peculio* where, amid otiose quotations from Isidore of Seville, one stumbles upon the following picturesque definition: "... *peguyal,* que el padre permite tener a su hijo, o el señor al siervo, como si entre los hatos de su ganado tuviessen éstos algún hatillo permitido en la forma sobredicha."

*Peguyalerio* enjoyed a considerable vogue. To the well-known passage from the *Nueva recopilación,* VII, i, 13 ("... una de las cosas que más ha acabado el ganado a los *peguyaleros* y ganaderos pobres es el rigor con que se ejecutan las
There existed further, in keen rivalry with *pegujarero, -aler*, the
less complexly structured *pegujero*, either directly traceable to Late
Lat. *peculiarius*, already mentioned anent Prov. *pegulhiera*, or
newly developed from the short-lived *peguo*.\(^{38}\) OLeón. *peguyar*
‘small farm’ seems to call for no comment.\(^{39}\)

Through the fairly recent tendential elimination of medial
spirantized -g- \(\gamma\)\), there arose in many corners of the country dis-
syllabic forms involving the secondary diphthong -eu- which, on
account of its outlandishness,\(^{40}\) was reduced to the tertiary sequences
-iu-, -io-. Consider *pecujal* (which, unfortunately, I cannot, at
present, localize with any degree of precision),\(^{41}\) Sal. *piojar* and
*piojar(r)ero* (used in rivalry with *pelguero*, probably identical with
*perguero*, that is, metathesized *pegrero* < *pecorāriu*),\(^{42}\) And. *piojar*,
*piojarero,\(^{43}\) Seg. *piojar, piojar*, and Murc. *piojar, pivjar, piojarero, piu-

--penas de ordenanzas")\), add the record of *peguialero* (León, A.D. 1097), with the
digraph *ii* serving to represent a single phoneme; see Menéndez Pidal, *Orígenes del

---

\(^{38}\) Recorded in the *Cortes de los antiguos reinos de León y Castilla*, II (Madrid,
1863), p. 68 ("Cortes de Valladolid de 1351," ch. xxxviii): "A lo que me pidieron
por merçet ssobre rrazón que los perlados e omes fijos dalgo e otros omes poderosos
que las cibidades e villas e lugares de Gallizia que traen ganados e bueyes e vacas
e bestias e mulas e cabras e ovellas e otros ganados, e que non traen con ellos
*pegujeros* nin pastores que ge los guarden." Note the reference to Galicia in this
Castilian text and, coincidentally, the restriction of *pegujero* to pastoral activities,
apparently to the exclusion of tillage.

---

\(^{39}\) See the *Fuero de Ledesma*, §36 (included in *Fueros leoneses*, ed. A. Castro and
F. de Onís [Madrid, 1916]).

---

\(^{40}\) Cf. Eulàlia > pop. Olàlia, *Eufemio* > *Ufemio*, Eleuterio > Luterio, Leo-
cadia > Liocaria, Locaría etc.; see Espinosa, Alonso, and Rosenblat, *BDHA*, I
(1930), 107, 113.

---

\(^{41}\) C. Michaëlis [de Vasconcelos], *Studien zur romanischen Wortschöpfung*
(Leipzig, 1876), p. 295a.

---

568, 579. *Piojarero* was recorded at Vitigudino (\(-r- > -rr- through the intrusion
of the suffix -arro), *pelguero* at Cantalapiëdra. The latter may be due to the
neutralization of the contrast between implosive (syllable-final) \(r\) and \(l\), studied on
two occasions by A. Alonso and R. Lida (BDHA, VI [1940], 295–297; *RFH*, VII
[1945], 315–345) and also to the widespread confusion of the prefix *pre- and per-
(RPh. III [1949–50], 61–67).

---

\(^{43}\) Alcalá Venceslada, op. cit., p. 311: "Sembró el año pasado un *piojar* de
trigo y cogió muy bien"; "los *piojareros* no me han pagado todavía."

---

\(^{44}\) G. M. Vergara Martín, *Vocabulario de palabras usadas en Segovía y su tierra*
(Madrid, 1921), p. 65: ‘corta porción de terreno que se cede al guarda de una
finca rústica para que la cultive por su cuenta.’
jareo, with the noteworthy substitute word *pedacero*, of transparent derivation, in northeastern Murcia, conceivably brought in to avoid embarrassing associations.

*To be continued*

Yakov Malkiel
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**List of Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGI</td>
<td>Archivio glottologico italiano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AILC</td>
<td>Anales del Instituto de Lingüística de Cuyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLG</td>
<td>Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie und Grammatik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASNSL</td>
<td>Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBMP</td>
<td>Boletín de la Biblioteca de Menéndez Pelayo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDC</td>
<td>Buttlelío de dialectologia catalana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHDA</td>
<td>Biblioteca de dialectología hispanoamericana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEP</td>
<td>Bulletin des études portugaises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF</td>
<td>Boletín de Filologia (Lisbon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH</td>
<td>Bulletin hispanique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibl.</td>
<td>Biblos (Coimbra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIF</td>
<td>Boletín del Instituto de Filología (Santiago de Chile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAE</td>
<td>Boletín de la R. Academia Española</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSLP</td>
<td>Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Aut.</td>
<td>Diccionario de Autoridades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEW</td>
<td>W. von Wartburg, Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fil.</td>
<td>Filologia (Buenos Aires)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>Le Français moderne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Hispanic Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jb.Ph.</td>
<td>Jahrbuch für Philologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lg.</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLJ</td>
<td>Modern Language Journal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLN</td>
<td>Modern Language Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Modern Philology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJKA</td>
<td>Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRFH</td>
<td>Nueva revista de filología hispánica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBPhH</td>
<td>Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REW³</td>
<td>W. Meyer-Lübke, Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (3d ed.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>Romanische Forschungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFE</td>
<td>Revista de filología española</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFH</td>
<td>Revista de filología hispánica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJb.</td>
<td>Romanistisches Jahrbuch (Hamburg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL</td>
<td>Revista Lusitana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLaR</td>
<td>Revue des langues romanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLiR</td>
<td>Revue de linguistique romane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom.</td>
<td>Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPF</td>
<td>Revista portuguesa de filologia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPh.</td>
<td>Romance Philology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiL</td>
<td>Studies in Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCPL</td>
<td>University of California Publications in Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VKR</td>
<td>Volkstum und Kultur der Romanen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td>Vox Romanica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Wörter und Sachen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZFSL</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZRPh.</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>