



## *Latin oboedio*: between phonological explanation and diastratic variation<sup>1</sup>

FRANCESCO GIURA

### ABSTRACT

If we accept the origin of *oboedio* as a compound of *ob* and *audio*, the result is completely clear from the semantic point of view but unexpected from the phonological one. In fact, the diphthong *oe* is not justified as a result of reduction (it should be *\*obūdīo*, like *inclūdo* and *preclūdo* from *claudo*, and *defrūdo* from *fraudo*, etc.) or of other changes. The phonological hypothesis is mostly founded on reconstruction of the ancient stages of *audio*, probably from *\*aūizdijō* (ób-aūizdijō > \*oboūizdijō > \*oboizdijō > oboedio). Instead, a second explanation considers *oboedio* a hypercorrected form of an original that has not survived: *\*obūdīo*.

This paper aims to analyse these reconstructions and selects the only one that would seem to yield effective results. Using evidence from a sociolinguistic perspective, it explains that *oboedio* contains a form of hypercorrection, probably invented by middle-class speakers, involving the archaizing and ennobling power of the diphthong *oe*, which the overall conservatism of Latinity, and in particular of some institutions and uses, (law and religion) may have kept alive.

KEYWORDS: Latin *oboedio* and *audio*, etymology, phonological reconstructions, diachronic sociolinguistics, typological and cognitive patterns.

### 1. *The purpose and the “embarrassant” problem of the diphthong oe*

The Latin verb *oboedio* is evidently a compound of *ob* plus *audio*. However, it should not contain the diphthong *oe* because it should be *\*obūdīo* as a result of reduction, in the manner of *claudo* > *inclūdo*, *preclūdo*, *exclūdo*, *occlūdo*, etc., *causo*, *causa* > *recūso*, *accūso*, etc., and *fraudo*<sup>2</sup> > *defrūdo*, *lavo* >

<sup>1</sup> Latin works are abbreviated with both the author's name and title in Latin (e.g. Hor. *sat.* 1.2.24) on the basis of Conte *et al.* 2010. Where Latin texts are quoted, the editor's name and year of publication follow the quotation (e.g. ed. Powell 2006). I would like to thank first of all the two anonymous reviewers for their very helpful comments, then Giovanna Marotta, Alberto Nocentini, Romano Lazzeroni, Maria Teresa Ademollo Gagliano, Christian Seidl and Clifford Ando for their precious advice. All the translations from Latin are mine, unless otherwise indicated.

<sup>2</sup> *Claudo* and *fraudo* have the same sequence as *audio* (-*aud-*). Even if the *a* in *fraus* – the denominative of which is *fraudo* – was probably not etymological but due to an obscure, and so far unexplainable, alternation between *au* and *ū*, *ō* as in *naugae* – *nūgae* (cf. EM *s.v.*), the reduction *fraudo* > *defrūdo* could have been partially helped by a hypothetical *\*frūdo*.

-*lūo*, -*lūvium*, *pavio* > *depūvio* (see Niedermann, 1906: 30-1; Palmer, 1954: 220; Godel, 1961: 57-8; Meiser 1998: § 53.4)<sup>3</sup>, or it should have kept the original diphthong *au*.

In fact, as we know, there are other compounds of *audio* like *exaudio*, *in(d)audio* and *subaudio*<sup>4</sup> where the reduction does not have any effect. It is reasonable to agree with Meier-Brügger that “Der Diphthong *au* des Hintergliedes unterliegt keiner Vokalschwächung und weist auf späte Entstehung bzw. junge Rekomposition dieser Komposita. Älteren Datums kann einzig oboedire sein” (1980: 288). If a recomposition was possible for the other compounds of *audio*, it may be argued that *oboedio* was an archaic verb, although it has existed since Plautus.

Two ways to solve this “embarrassant” (Vendryes, 1902: 284) issue have been proposed. The first one was a phonological explanation proposed by scholars like Schulze (1887: 251), Solmsen (1894: 150-1), Szemerényi (1960: 240-5) and Meier-Brügger (1980). Their results converged in influential handbooks and dictionaries such as WH, Sommer (1948), Leumann *et al.* (1977), Meiser (1998) and De Vaan (2008). The hypothesis is mostly founded on reconstruction of the ancient stages of *audio*, probably from \**auizdijō* (cf. Greek ἀἰῶ and ἀισθαίνομαι ‘perceive’) and the changes *ób-auizdijō* >

<sup>3</sup> Probably *au* > *eu* > *ou* > *ū* (Niedermann, 1906: 40-1). According to EM, *s.v. laus*, the compounds *adlaudo*, *conlaudo*, *dilaudo*, *elaudo*, from *laudo*, could have kept the radical *a* in order to avoid confusion with the *lūdo* group. Despite this, several verbs do not present any reduction from *au* to *u*.

<sup>4</sup> *Subaudio* appears for the first time in Seneca, but the majority of attestations are in the Vergilian comments by Servius, where it means ‘to imply (a word omitted)’, as if the meaning of the prefix *sub-* ‘secretly’ (see *subaudio* in Apul. *met.* 5.19 ed. Zimmerman 2012 *sed tantum nocturnis subaudiens uocibus...* and the verb *subausculto* ‘listen to secretly’) has shifted from the subject (‘hear secretly’) to the object (‘hear something hidden, that is not explicit’). In this case, attention should be drawn to the polysemic value of *subaudio*, because it stands between the hearing sphere and the cognitive one (*subaudio* as ‘to imply (a word omitted)’ is a synonym of *intellego*). See the frequent places where *subaudio* and *intellego* are close and interchangeable, e.g. Serv. *Aen.* 1.76.1 edd. Rand *et al.* 1946 *Subaudis ‘dixit’, quod ex posterioribus intellegitur, ut supra notavimus*.

Furthermore, there is *praeaudio* ‘hear in advance’, a late compound with a temporal-value prefix, in *Digest* (1.16.6 *pr.* 2 edd. Mommsen and Krüger 1868-70 *praeauditas custodias*) and in Cassiodorus (*hist.* 9.14 edd. Jacob and Hanslik 1952 *neque praeaudivimus omnino*).

Finally, *inaudio* is a very rare verb (16 records in PHI#5.3. See later). It is only attested in early, and probably strictly informal (all the four cases in Cicero are from *Epistulae*), Latin. Cf. García-Hernández, 1977: 132. *Inaudio* also has the form *indaudio* (9 records in PHI#5.3, 7 in Plautus). Cf. Lindsay (1894: 178) on the syncope due to the ancient protosyllabic stress: “The same shortening may have caused that confusion of the old preposition *indo* (*endo*) with the preposition *in* (*en*) (*ind(o)gredior* etc. becoming by syncope identical with *ingredior*) which led to the disuse of *indo* and the adoption of *in* in its place. Thus *indaudio* (Pl.) was completely ousted by *inaudio* by the time of Terence, and in the classical period compounds with *indo* are rare, only being found as archaisms in poetry, e.g. *induperator Juv*”.

*\*oboizdijō* > *\*oboizdijō* > *oboedio* (except for Szemerényi, who considered a labial dissimilation from *-au-* > *-ou-* and then *-oi-* possible).

The other solution is based on a spelling and diastatic hypothesis (Havet, 1881: 410; Wackernagel, 1893: 55; Vendryes, 1902: 284; Burger, 1928: 40; Palmer, 1954: 270-1). As will be demonstrated, the phonological approach does not seem to have yielded effective results so far. The goal here is to analyse and discuss every reconstruction from every perspective that it is possible to adopt: those from lexicology in cognitive semantics, etymological good praxis and hypothetical sociolinguistic reconstruction. At the end, I will try to add new evidence to explain *oboedio* from a sociolinguistic point of view.

In fact, the approach used in this research is a synthesis of lexicological data from historical linguistics, in particular of the contribution of etymology (dictionaries and specific studies) and of epigraphy, cognitive interpretations of semantic patterns (see the link between hearing perception and the semantic field of obedience), typological structures (see Greek ὑπακούω ‘listen to’, ‘obey’ from ἀκούω ‘hear’, and German *gehörchen* ‘obey’ from *hören* ‘hear’), and diachronic sociolinguistics, which is the explanatory key to solving the *oboedio* question.

The paper is organised as follows. First I outline the formal (section 2.1) and semantic features (section 2.2) of Latin *oboedio* in order to define the identity of this verb. Then, I review the phonological (section 3) and sociolinguistic (section 4) explanations, and from there I draw some conclusions (section 5).

## 2. *Oboedio* – ID card

### 2.1. *Formal features*: *oboedio*, ob + audio

Over the years, the only scholar not to accept the origin from *audio* has been Pisani (1948: 17 and 1968: 68-9). In his opinion, the diphthong *oe* is clear if we consider another initial root word, i.e. *oboedio* as *\*ob-boedio*, where *\*boed-* comes from *\*bheidh-* and is comparable with Latin *fido*, *fides*, *foedus*, Greek περίθρομαι, ‘to obey’, Russian *ubedit*, ‘to persuade’, Slave *běda*, ‘necessity’, Albanian *bē*, ‘oath’ (cf. *besë* ‘faith, promise, pact’). However, this solution presents many difficulties both at the formal and the semantic levels.

From a formal point of view, it is useful to note the late form *obaudio* as a proof of a link between *oboedio* and *audio*, at least in terms of speaker perception (see also Aug. *serm.* 111 ed. Carrozzi 1983 *multi auditis et pauci*

*oboeditis* and Isid. *or.* 10.196 ed. Lindsay 1911 *oboediens ab aure, eo quod audiat imperantem*. See below). *Obaudio* is attested in Apuleius (*met.* 3.15 ed. Zimmerman 2012), Tertullian (*Marc.* 2.2.7 ed. Moreschini 1972) and in the Vulgata (ed. 1979), and Festus wrote: *oboedire obaudire* (ed. Lindsay 1913). Regarding Christian and late texts, it is possible to consider the direct influence of Greek ὑπακούω ‘obey’ (from ἀκούω ‘hear’),<sup>5</sup> as can be seen in a passage from Augustine, who quotes the *Itala* version and where the Hippo bishop deprecates the over-frequent use in Latin of Greek syntactic structures such as the genitive object of a perception verb (*Graeca magis locutio est*): *et non obaudierunt vocis meae*, which corresponds to οὐχ ὑπήκουσαν τῆς φωνῆς μου (*locut. hept.* 7.9. edd. Zycha and Tempisky 1894, cf. Coleman, 1975: 142 and Löfstedt, 1959: 90).<sup>6</sup> Although in that period the influence of Greek was deep and evident in Latin, and the form *obaudio* cannot be considered proof of the certain origin of *oboedio* from *audio* (we could also judge this form to be folk etymology), in my opinion, *obaudio* is an etymological and analogical form with respect to the other compounds of *audio* (*exaudio, in(d)audio, subaudio, etc.*).

## 2.2. Semantic features: oboedio as ‘auditory obedience’

The connection between *audio* and *oboedio*, which, as said, was transparent for late Latin speakers, can be found throughout literary Latinity:

- (1) a. Pl. (*mil.* 805-6 ed. Lindsay 1904-5) *Pa: nunc tu auscultata mi, Pleusicles / Pl: tibi sum oboediens* “Pa.: Now, you listen to me, Pleusicles! / Pl.: I obey you!”
- b. Cic. (*Caec.* 52 ed. Clark 1905-11) *ut ad uerba nobis oboediant* “to obey our words”
- c. Aug. (*serm.* 111 ed. Carrozzi 1983) *multi auditis et pauci oboeditis* “many people hear and few obey”
- d. Isid. (*or.* 10.196 ed. Lindsay 1911) *oboediens ab aure, eo quod audiat imperantem* “*oboediens* comes from ‘ear’ (*aure*), because you listen to who orders”

<sup>5</sup> The correspondence between Latin *oboedio* and Greek ὑπακούω is essentially typological, not a literal translation, nor due to a common etymological origin. Such a typological resemblance can sufficiently reinforce a reciprocal link between two words coming from two different languages, in particular in a bilingual environment like Late Antiquity.

<sup>6</sup> The genitive *vocis meae* was eliminated in the *Vulgata* text.

If we expand our point of view to a perspective capable of joining typological and historical data with a concrete cognitive interpretation, we can find the bonds that tie the two semantic areas in question: hearing and obedience. In Sweetser (1990: 41-3), the listener perspective is indicated by two semantic features: [attention] and [receptivity]. An internal reception often yields understanding, i.e. from a perception dimension to a cognitive one through a well-known metaphorical and metonymic shift. In many perception verbs in various (in time, space and phylogenesis) languages, receptivity is in contact with obedience, as we can see from Table 1 by Viberg, by way of example, referring to English (1983: 157-8):

Perception	Cognition	Social
Hear	'know', 'understand'	'meet', 'obey'

Table 1. Extended meanings of verbs of hearing perception.

How can we explain these passages? What Viberg calls “social meaning” (in a hearing perception verb such as ‘meet’ or ‘obey’) is a communicative dimension where verbal relationships between human speakers occur. The characteristic feature of receptivity in hearing perception is an active will to pay attention. This will can also be conceived as a disposition to obedience because when we give an order or a prescription with words and speech the listener’s attention grows. In this sense, as Ibarretxe-Antuñano notices (1999: 65), phylogenetically different languages present similar extended meanings. Some examples of hearing verbs that mean ‘obey’ are:

- (2) a. Italian *Ti ho detto che devi ascoltare tua madre*  
 b. English *I told you to listen to your mother*  
 c. Spanish *Te he dicho que escuches a tu madre*  
 d. Basque *Seme batak ez eukan entzunik* “One of the sons was not obedient”

In all these cases, the hearing perception verb expresses what Viberg names “activity”, i.e. the intentional will to perceive (see Id. 1983 and 2001). In Danish *lystre* ‘to obey’ has lost its original meaning linked to hearing: cf. English *listen*, German *lauschen*, Swedish *lyssna*. In Sanskrit śruṣṭi- ‘obedience’ comes from śru- ‘hear’ (see also Clackson, 2007: 52).

In terms of word formation, we have already observed that Greek ὑπακούω, ‘to listen to, to obey’, comes from ἀκούω, ‘to hear’, and German *gehörchen*, ‘to obey’, and *Gehorsam* ‘obedience’ comes from *hörchen*, ‘to listen to’.

This semantic pattern also occurs in Latin, as Nonius reminds us: *auscultare est obsequi* (370.9 L) “listen means obey”. Auditory obedience in Latin<sup>7</sup> is expressed by specific structures that involve hearing perception verbs:

(3) *ausculto* + dative ‘to heed’, ‘to obey’:

e.g. Cato (*agr.* 5.3.2 ed. Mazzarino 1982) *cui iussus siet, auscultet* “He must pay heed to anyone to whom he has been bidden to listen” (trans. Hooper)

Pl. (*mil.* 805-6 ed. Lindsay 1904-5) *Pal. Nunc tu auscultam mi, Pleusicles. / Ple. Tibi sum oboediens* (see above).

(4) *dicto audiens sum*, ‘to obey’ (until 1<sup>st</sup> century A.D.)<sup>8</sup>:

e.g. Cato (*agr.* 142.1.5 ed. Mazzarino 1982) *dominoque dicto audiens sit* “and obey the master”

Pl. (*Amph.* 989 ed. Lindsay 1904-5) *Ego sum Iovi dicto audiens, eius iussu nunc huc me adfero* “I obey Jupiter, I’m here now on his orders”

The semantic field of Latin obedience has been researched by García-Hernández (2001). From a structuralist point of view the semantic field is organized as follows:

(5) archilexeme: *pareo*

lexemes: *pareo, obtempero, obsequor, oboedio, obsecundo*.

classeme: dative

<sup>7</sup> See Anscombe and Pierrot (1985) for the probable performative value of such phrases.

<sup>8</sup> Such a periphrastic construction comes to be used quite seldom. In PHI Latin corpus (see next footnote), we find 52 occurrences of *dicto audiens sum* (Cato 1, Pl. 6, *B. Afr.* 2, Caes. 4, Cic. 12, Nep. 4, Varro 2, Liv. 9, Quint. 2, Apul. 1, Hyg. 1, Porph. 1, Iust. 5, Symm. 3), and only 6 of *dicto oboediens sum* (Pl. 2, Acc. 1, Liv. 1, Gell. 1, Vulg. 1), with a more meaningful distribution in early and classical Latin. From the functional point of view, as already Marouzeau 1910: 3-4 noticed, the periphrasis shows a nominal value, comparable to *cupiens sum* + genitive (see Piras 1989/1990: 73 ff, for a detailed discussion on the criteria to distinguish between nominal and verbal value in classical and late periphrastic constructions. See the relevant references on this topic in Amenta 2003 and Bentain 2010).

Archilexeme	Communication dimension	Obedience modalities
<i>pareo</i>	non-immediate: <i>(dicto) oboedio</i> immediate: <i>tibi ausculto, te audio</i> durative: <i>dicto audiens sum</i>	moderation: <i>obtempero</i> pleasure: <i>obsequor</i> favour: <i>obsecundo</i>

Table 2. The semantic field of Latin obedience in García-Hernández (2001: 752).

Besides the internal classification (non-immediate, immediate, durative) which concerns aspectuality and the Aktionsart categorization, what is important to note is the consistency of the communication dimension and the crucial role played by the hearing perception lexemes *audio* and *ausculto*.

If we calculate the distribution of obedience verbs in a Latin language corpus such as PHI#5.3<sup>9</sup>, we find that the communication dimension represented by *oboedio*, *ausculto* + dative and *dicto audiens sum* amounts to about 7% of the whole verb-obedience area.

Lexemes	absolute frequency	fq. % in obedience field	fq. % in total PHI Latin
<i>pareo</i>	3080	79%	0.0422%
<i>obsequor</i>	401	10%	0.0055%
<i>oboedio</i>	204	5%	0.0028%
<i>obtempero</i>	160	4%	0.0022%
<i>obsecundo, ausculto</i> + <i>dat., dicto audiens sum</i>	102	2%	0.0014%
Total	3947	100%	0.0540%

Table 3. The semantic field of Latin obedience verbs: distribution in PHI#5.3 Latin corpus.

<sup>9</sup> PHI#5.3, or PHI Latin, is a Latin language corpus compiled by Packard Humanities Institute of Los Altos, California. Created for CD-ROM but available online at <http://latin.packhum.org/> since September 2011, this corpus was collected between 1987 and 1991. It contains almost all the Latin literary texts up to 200 A.D. plus some late authors like Servius, Porfirius, Zeno, Justinian and the *Vulgata*. The whole corpus boasts 7.3 million words and contains an excellent choice of the best critical editions.

### 2.3. Formal and semantic features. Conclusions

*Oboedio* turns out to be closely related to the auditory dimension both formally and semantically: formally, for its indisputable derivation from *audio* ‘to hear’, ‘to listen to’; semantically, because of the relationship between hearing attention and receptivity to auditory obedience, as happens in many languages.

The verbal-communication dimension also recurs in a particular sphere of the Latin language, the legal and sacred one. If there is a special obedience in Latin strictly connected to hearing perception (*oboedio, dicto audiens sum, ausculto* + dative), namely a communicative act but linked to an order and duty situation, then it is possible to recall a verb like *interdico*, ‘to forbid, prohibit, interdict’. *Interdico* is also etymologically linked to the verbal-communication dimension. It comes from *dico* ‘to say’ (cf. the same formation of *antarə-mruye*, ‘I interdict’, in the Gathas’ language of the Avesta) and, in addition to the question of the polysemy of communication verbs (*verba dicendi*, hearing *verba sentiendi*, etc.), evokes another important element, the performative value of words.

In general, *oboedio* is a low-frequency verb in Latin texts (fq. 0,0028% in Corpus PHI#5.3). Half of all its occurrences are in the *Vulgata* (about 70) due to the evident influence of the frequent Greek biblical verb ὑπακούω, ‘to obey’. This may be the most important source for its recovery in the Romance languages during the Middle Ages<sup>10</sup>.

In particular, the *Septuaginta* influence causes an increase in *perfectum* forms in Latin *oboedio*, because before Jerome’s version *oboedio* was mostly *infectum*, but Greek ἀκούω did not present this constraint.

### 3. Phonological perspective

All the phonological explanations begin with the difficult etymology of *audio*. Two starting points are possible. The first is:

<sup>10</sup> According to this hypothesis, Italian literary texts, already in the 13<sup>th</sup> century (Ugucione da Lodi, Andrea da Grosseto, Giacomo da Lentini and Albertano. Cf. data in TLIO) recover the Latin verb in the following forms: *obedire, obbedire, ubidire, ubbidire* and *obbidire*. The first cases show a more conservative form, i.e. closer to the Latin model, while those with *-i-* in the second syllable have probably been subjected to a metaphonetic process.



- 1) from  $a\text{□}izdii\text{□}\bar{o}$ , so that *audio* <  $*a\text{□}is + *d^b\text{-ie/o-}$  ‘to render manifest to hearing’; see Schulze (1888: 251); Solmsen (1894: 150-1); Meier-Brügger (1980).

$*a\text{□}is\text{-}$  cf. Gk. ἀἶω and ἀισθάνομαι ‘to perceive’ (ἀισ-, cf. Skt. *āvih* <  $*h_2eu\text{-is-}$  ‘clearly’),  $*au\text{-s-i-}$  derivative suffix in *-s-* and dual *-i-* > *auris* ‘ear’

$*d^b\text{-}$  ‘to render’ (*facio*, τήθημι) or  $*d\text{-}$  ‘to give’ (*do*, δίδωμι) or resultativity. Cf. Gk. suffix *-θη-*, Lat. *condo*, *abdo*, *perdo?*, *reddo?* etc.

As Meier-Brügger notes, “Die Bedeutungsverengung von ‘wahrnehmen’ zu ‘hören’ wäre speziell lat.” (1980: 288), as happens in German *hell*, ‘bright’, but *hallen*, ‘to resound’.

The second starting point is:

- 2) from *ausdii□ō*, so that *audio* <  $*aus + *d^b/d\text{-ie/o-}$  ‘to give/put ear’; see Bréal (1878: 408-12); Szemerényi (1960); Pisani (1968: 68-9).

$*aus\text{-}$  root ‘ear’ > *auris* ‘ear’

$*d^b\text{-}$  ‘to render’ (*facio*, τήθημι) or  $*d\text{-}$  ‘to give’ (*do*, δίδωμι) or resultativity. Cf. Gk. suffix *-θη-*, Lat. *condo*, *abdo*, *perdo?*, *reddo?* etc.

From a third conjugation verb, *\*ausdo*, *-ēre* dropping the sibilant before the dental consonant (cf. *idem* <  $*is\text{-dem}$ ) would become *audio* with the addition of the *-i-* suffix (< *-ye/yo*), a typical formation process for a 4<sup>th</sup> conjugation verb (see Palmer 1954: 267-8 and Ernout 1953 § 227 B), as *vincio* comes from *vinco*, *condio* from *condo*, and *dormio* from *dormo*. It is possible that in this process *audio* could have been conditioned by a special influence of *sentio*. From a typological and comparative point of view, see Persian *goš dad* ‘to give ear, listen to’.

Starting from  $*auizdij\bar{o}$  (solution 1) implies explaining *oboedio* in these steps:

$*ób\text{-}a\text{□}izdii\text{□}\bar{o} > *obo\text{□}izdii\text{□}\bar{o} > *oboizdii\text{□}\bar{o} > oboedio$ ,

where “the reduced  $*a\text{-}$  in the second syllable was rounded and the following  $*w$  was lost before  $*a\text{-}$  could develop into /u/. The resulting diphthong /oi/ was protected by the following  $*z$  from monophthongization to  $\bar{u}$  or  $\bar{e}$ ” (De Vaan, 2008 *s.v.* *audio*. Cf. Leumann *et al.*, 1977 for the same sequence).

The most significant problem in this hypothesis is the elision of the semivowel  $y$ . According to phonological handbooks and studies, it is possible to illustrate all the cases where a semivowel  $y$  is elided in Latin (for a concise review, see Meiser, 1998: §67):

$y > 0/_[o, \bar{o}, u, \bar{u}]$  probably 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C.

e.g. *suodales* > *sodales*, *Gnaivod* > *Gnaeo*, \**sue-yorsos* > *seorsus*, \**suosor/suesor* > *soror*, \**olaj-yom* > *oleum*<sup>11</sup>, etc.

$y > 0/V_1-V_1$  probably 4<sup>th</sup> century B.C.

e.g. \**pro-yorso-* > *prorsus*, \**lauyatrina* > *latrina*, \**obli-yutis* > *oblitus*, \**ui-yita* > *vita*, \**di-yitis* > *ditis* but *auarus*, *seuerus*, *diuinus*, *lauatio*, *obli-yiscor*, *di-yitia*, and *ouum*, *nouus*, *sequor* by analogy (gen. *oui*, *noui*, 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. *sequitur*).

Moreover, there are two changes which are attributed to different periods (see Vendryes, 1902: 284; Rix 1966: 157): a change during the prehistoric period: *-oyi-*, *-oye-*, *-oyo-* > *-oyu-* > *-ou-* > *-u-* (e.g. \**reyorsos* > *rursus*, \**noyendinai* (\**ney-*) > *nūundunae* and *nōndinae*, \**spoye-ma* > *spūma*, *proyidens* > *prūdens*, *iouestod* > *iustō* – not a syncope change but an assimilation; and one during the historic period: *-oyi-*, *-oye-* > *-oyo-* > *-oo-* > *-ō-*, e.g. \**mooye-t-o* > *motus*, *co-yentio* > *contio*.

Only the second change ( $y > 0/V_1-V_1$ ) produces a real loss of  $y$ , but only under a strict condition, i.e. between two identical vowels. Furthermore, numerous exceptions like *auarus*, *seuerus*, *diuinus*, etc. should be highlighted (cf. also Monteil, 1973: 68-70)<sup>12</sup>. The other cases are probably events of assimilation (moreover, for some words the reconstruction is very uncertain). Therefore, *oboedio* presents a different situation<sup>13</sup>.

<sup>11</sup> For *oleum*, Safarewicz (1969: § 49 and 1974: 172, 182) considered a simpler shortening, according to the rule *vocalis ante vocalem corripitur*, from *ei* in *ē* (\**oleiuom* > \**olōm* > *oleum*. Cf. also *dēus* from *deiuos*), instead of a semivowel loss.

<sup>12</sup> Again, throughout the Latin period the semivowel tends to disappear (through elision or assimilation) in intervocalic position, especially before back vowels. In addition to the examples mentioned, the *Appendix Probi* shows some such changes in use: *avus non aus*, *flavus non flaus*, *rivus non rius*, *pavor non paor* (*App. Pr.* 29, 62, 174 and 176 ed. Asperti and Passalacqua 2014). On the other hand, no semivowel disappearances happen after *i*, as would be needed for *oboedio*, and more generally neither in the first hypothesis for *audio*. In fact, *novus* does not evolve into \**nous* as a regulating force in the paradigm (see *novi*, *novā*, etc.). Cf. Väänänen (1981; It. trans. 1982: § 90).

<sup>13</sup> Two specific examples are usually mentioned relative to *oboedio*: *amoenus* 'lovely' from \**amoyeno-* < \**ama-yen-o-* (see Meiser, 1998: 71) and *proelium* 'battle' from \**prōyelio-m* < \**pro-g<sup>h</sup>el-yo-* (see Blümel 1972 and Klingenschmitt 1980). These words represent the only real comparison capable of explaining the

This explanation has been rejected by some scholars who do not accept *oboedio* from \**ob* + *auizdiĵō* (solution 1). As Fay wrote, “Of course the elaborately fanciful primate *awisdio* has been invented to turn a special phonetic trick for *oboedio*” (1920: 124) and, furthermore, to justify a relationship with Greek *αἰσθάνομαι* ‘to perceive’ (from *ἄισ-* < \**h<sub>2</sub>eu-is-* ‘clearly’). This is Pisani’s consideration, which leads us to the second phonological solution: “Scomparso così l’obbligo di ficcare a forza un *i* in *audio* per ricavare *oboedio*, ritornerà in onore la vecchia ed evidente etimologia di *audio*: composto di \**aus-* ‘orecchio’ (latino *auris*) con una formazione di \**dhē-* ‘porre’: così come noi diciamo ‘porgere orecchio’. Morfologicamente sembrerebbe trattarsi del denominativo da un \**aus-dh-io-* ‘colui che porge orecchio’ o di un femminile astratto \**aus-dh-ā* ‘il porgere orecchio’” (1968: 69).

The second phonological hypothesis was mostly supported by Szemerényi (1960) (see also Bréal 1875) and consists in a labial dissimilation from *ou* to *oi* due to the labial feature in *ob-*:

**\**ob-au(s)dio* > \**ob-ou(s)dio* > \**oboi(s)dio* > *oboedio*.**

The only comparable example is the conjectured sequence for *liber* ‘free’: \**leudheros* > \**louberos* > *loiberos* > *liber*. Against this opinion we should acknowledge that, first of all, according to *liber*, it should be \**obīdio*. Second, the labial dissimilation seems to be limited to pre-labial position and possibly after *l* (cf. Palmer 1954: 268). Third, there are a consistent number of counter-examples, such as *Pūnicus*, *commūnis*, *pūnio*, *mūnio*, etc., where labial dissimilation is absent (cf. Godel, 1961: 58 n. 12). Finally, there is the fact that *b* and *u* form a sequence fully marked by the feature [+grave]. Natural languages generally show consistency in co-articulation of the feature [+labial]<sup>14</sup>.

In conclusion, it should be considered that exploration of reconstructions of *oboedio* from a phonological perspective produces more problems than answers.

diphthong in *oboedio*. It is a pity that their reconstructions are so uncertain that all the best etymological Latin dictionaries are doubtful about them (see WH, EM and De Vaan *ss.vv.*). Klingenschmitt (1980) insists on mentioning personal names like *Cloelius* from (?) \**kloielios*, but cf. Volscian *Cloil* and Latin *Clylius*, *Coelius* from (?) \**koŋielios*, *Boelius* from (?) \**boŋielios*. It is more logical to presuppose \**oi* and not \**oue* in these roots. In fact, the relationship with Proto-Indo-European \**kl(ē)u-* is not clear.

<sup>14</sup> Moreover, only from the 1<sup>st</sup> century B.C. does it happen that *b* and *u* tend to merge in a unique medial sound β (bilabial constrictive. Cf. contemporary Spanish and Catalan intervocalic *b*). See spellings like Νέρβας for *Nerva*, *baliat* for *valeat* at Pompei, *plebes non plevis* (*App.Pr.* 9 ed. Asperti and Passalacqua 2014). See Väänänen (1981; It. trans. 1982: § 88-89).

#### 4. *A sociolinguistic perspective*

Towards the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, studies in historical and comparative linguistics took a different direction to solve the problem of Latin *oboedio*. We are talking about scholars like Havet (1881: 410), Wackernagel (1895: 55), Vendryes (1902: 284), Burger (1928) and Palmer (1954: 220). What they focused on was that a Latin *ū*, in addition to in many cases being the result of reduction of *au* in a second syllable, can also originate from the diphthong *oi*. This happened from Indo-European *oi̯* to Old Latin *oi̯* / *oe* and from there to Classical Latin *ū*. The last step (the reduction of *oe* to *ū*) has variously been dated between the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C and the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C.<sup>15</sup>

As is known, the whole of Latinity experienced a general archaizing tendency in spelling, literature and pronunciation (see Clackson and Horrocks, 2011: 90 ff.). A *ū* might be expressed in two other forms, marked by archaizing conservatism: *oe* and *oi* (cf. Marouzeau, 1911: 270-3, Leumann *et al.*, 1977 § 73, Adams, 2007: 44-5).<sup>16</sup> Some words present all three realizations, some others just two, but they all generally settle into just one form, as shown in Table 3.

<i>oi</i>	<i>Oe</i>	<i>ū</i>	<i>loci</i>
<i>plourume</i>	<i>Ploera</i>	<i>plūra</i>	<i>plourume</i> occurs in The Scipioni tomb (CIL I <sup>2</sup> 9); <i>ploera</i> in Cic. <i>leg.</i> 3.6.10 ed. Powell 2006.
<i>moiros</i>	<i>Moerus</i>	<i>mūrus</i>	<i>moiros</i> occurs in CIL I <sup>2</sup> 1722; <i>moerus</i> in En. <i>An.</i> 16.418 ed. Skutsch 1985, <i>Acc.tr.</i> 348 ed. Ribbeck 1897, <i>Lucret.</i> 4.220 and 6.926 ed. Müller 1975, <i>Varro Lat.</i> 5.50 ( <i>Sacra Argeorum</i> ) 5.141, 5.142, 6.87 (Tab. Censoriae) ed. Collart 1954, <i>Verg. Aen.</i> 10.24 ed. Conte 2009, <i>Plin. NH</i> 15.73.3 (quot. Cato) ed. André 1960, <i>Quint.</i> 8.3.24-6 (about Verg.) ed. Winterbottom 1970, <i>Serv. in Aen.</i> 10.24.3 edd. Rand <i>et al.</i> 1946.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Safarewicz (1969: § 50) at the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C.; Lindsay (1894: 240-1), at the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C.; Sommer (1902: 88), 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C.; Benedetti and Marotta (2014: 27 ff.), 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C.; Anderson (1909), from 204 to 154 B.C. Probably the earliest epigraphic evidence for the change is found in *utier* (CIL I 33); (Meiser, 1998: § 47) before the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C. In *Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus* (CIL I<sup>2</sup> 581, 186 B.C.) both the spellings *oi* and *ou* are archaisms standing for an actual pronunciation *ū* (e.g. *plous*).

<sup>16</sup> Marouzeau writes: “Cette conservation des diphongues a pu être favorisée par diverses causes: dans l’écriture, par une manie persistante d’archaïsme, encouragée peut-être par l’exemple du grec, et, dans la prononciation, par la diffusion du parler de Rome” (1911: 270).

coiravit	Coerari	cūravit	<i>coiravit</i> occurs in Alatri inscription, Gracchi period (CIL I 1166); <i>coerari</i> in Cic. <i>Leg.</i> 3.10.8 ed. Powell 2006.
oino	Oenus	ūnus	<i>oino</i> occurs in The Scipioni tomb (CIL I <sup>2</sup> 9); <i>oenus</i> in Pl. <i>Truc.</i> 102 ed. Lindsay 1904-5
loidos		lūdus	<i>loidos</i> occurs in CIL I <sup>2</sup> 364
comoinem		commūnis	<i>comoinem</i> occurs in <i>Sen. C. de Bacch.</i> (CIL I <sup>2</sup> 581; E 126)
	Oesus	ūsus	<i>oesus</i> occurs in Cic. <i>leg.</i> 3.10.8 and 3.10.14 ed. Powell 2006.

Table 4. Graphic variation in terms with *oi*, *oe* and *ū*.

This tendency occurs both in epigraphic and literary texts. The archaic *facies* of CIL I<sup>2</sup>, 9 *honc oino ploirume cosentiont R[omane] / duonoro optumo fuise uiro* is quoted in Cicero in Classical Latin as follows: *hunc unum plurimae consentiunt gentes populi primarium fuisse uirum* (*de sen.* 17.61 ed. Powell 2006), but when the subject of the text (e.g. a legal one) needs a higher and more solemn tone, the same author uses a conservative style. Cf. phrases in Cic. (*Leg.* ed. Powell 2006): *loedis publicis* (2.22), *ploera* (3.6), *coerari oesus sit* (3.10). See also Lucretius 1.29, 1.32 and 5.1308 (ed. Müller 1975) *moenera* (from \**moi-*) for *munera*, and Cato *or.* 167.6 (ed. Malcovati 1953) *impoene* for *impūne* (see Palmer, 1954: 121-2)<sup>17</sup>.

In addition to this, archaic forms with *oe* or *oi*-marks are frequent in the ironic tone, especially in Plautus (see *moenitum*, *Bacch.* 926 ed. Lindsay 1904-5), and language with a teasing or a heroic and lofty spirit (see also *Cist.* 540, *Pers.* 554, 559; *Pseud.* 384, 585a ed. Lindsay 1904-5).

This is a pan-Latin tendency to archaism that is particularly found in epigraphic and legal texts. Moreover, as Adams writes, “the various examples cited here from republican legal documents are to be treated as archaizing forms suited to the language of law, with no relevance to regional variation” (2007: 45). This is why I talk of a pan-Latin – i.e. in time and space – tendency<sup>18</sup>.

According to these considerations, as has previously been affirmed, it is possible to establish two different levels of the Latin language: a conservative

<sup>17</sup> For archaism as an ingredient of Latin poetry generally, see Palmer 1954: 98.

<sup>18</sup> Again, during the Augustan period we can read the archaizing spelling *faciundum coiraverunt* (CIL I 1252).

one and a usual one. Words that come from a root in *oi* may present a double form: the first is characterized by the archaic mark *oe*, and the second one by *ū*<sup>19</sup>.

<i>oe</i>	<i>ū</i>
moenia, moerus, moiros	murus
<i>poena</i> Gk. ποινά	pūnio
<i>Poenus</i> Gk. Φοίνικες	Pūnicus
foedus	* <i>fūdus</i> (conjectured by Wackernagel, 1895: 55)
<i>oboedio</i> ?	* <i>obūdio</i>

Table 5. The double series *oe* / *ū* (both from *oi*).

I have also inserted *oboedio* on the basis of Burger (1928: 40): “*oboedire* n’est pas, au début, un mot du vocabulaire courant; il semble qu’on ait affaire à un forme technique de la langue du droit; quand il est entré, assez tardivement, dans la langue commune et a tendu à remplacer *parēre*, l’orthographe a pu influencer la prononciation”. Similar views can be found in Havet (1881: 410), Wackernagel (1895: 55), Vendryes (1902: 284), and Palmer (1954: 220), who considered *oboedio* a hypercorrection (or *notation renversée*, or *umgekehrte Schreibung*) of a popular and usual form \**obūdio*<sup>20</sup>. Since *ū* was the result both of archaic Latin *oi* (e.g. *plōira*, *plūra*, etc.) and of *au* > *ū* reduction (e.g. *claudō*, *occlūdō*; see above), the conjectured hypercorrection in *oboedio* means that this verb should be assigned to a specific level of Latin, which we have defined as conservative language (in particular, law and religion).

The question now is: is *oboedio* “une forme technique de la langue du droit” (Burger, 1928: 40)? The answer is uncertain. Legal texts (e.g. *Institutiones* by Gaius, *Codex Theodosianus*, *Codex Iustinianus*, *Digestus*) show a limited number of cases of *oboedio*, but not as significant a number as to be able to draw any conclusion. In the *Corpus civilis*, verbs like *obsequor* and *obseruo* are much more frequent than *oboedio*. As Szemerényi wrote, “we have no right to assume that it was only in the language of the law that *oboedio* was pro-

<sup>19</sup> Against this hypothesis, Meiser writes: “Hinter wortanlautendem *p*, *f* bleibt *oi* als *oe* erhalten außer vor *i* der Folgesilbe, vgl. *poena* (<= griech. ποινά) vs. *pūnio*, *Poenus* vs. *pūnicus*, *foedus* (zu *fides*)” (1998: §63.4). See the same opinion in Parodi (1893: 437) and Safarewicz (1969: § 50.3).

<sup>20</sup> Very common hypercorrections are *au* / *o*: *ausculum*, *austium*, *plaudō* (specifically a hyperurbanism); *eili*: *ueiuam* (CIL I<sup>2</sup> 1837) instead of *uiuā*, *inceideretis* in place of *incideretis*, etc. (see Thurneysen 1887 and Vendryes 1902: 284).

nounced since the evidence shows, if proof were needed, that the verb was used in the most diverse phrases and contexts” (1960: 241). In fact, *oboedio* occurs in Plautus, Accius, Afranius, Cicero, Nepos, Livy, Sallust, Curtius, Pliny, Seneca, Valerius Maximus, Apuleius, Gellius, Suetonius, Tacitus, Servius, *Vulgata* and Justinian, but it is absent from classical poetry (data from PHI#5.3. See also Eichenseer 1964).

Moreover, with regard to the spelling *oe* in Latin there is another issue which we can call Greek-loan interference. If we browse the incomparable repertory that is *Der Vokalismus des Vulgärlatein* by Schuchardt, we discover that in many cases of Greek loanwords the diphthong *oe* appears in place of an original Greek upsilon (1867: II, 278 ff.). Well-known examples, already from the time of Plautus, are: *lagoena* from the Greek λάγυνος ‘flask, bottle’ (Pl., Varr., Hor., Pers., Petr., Plin., Apul., etc.). Other forms are: *laguncula* (cf. Burger 1928: 40), *lagona* (from Cato), late forms *lagyna*, *lagaena* (from which λαγήνα); *Antamoenides* (Pl. *Poen.* 1322) from the Greek first name Ἀνταμυνίδης, *Antamoenides*; *goerus* (Non., Auson. ?), *gyrus* (Catul.), from the Greek γῦρος ‘circle’.

A much discussed question is that of how Greek *y* was pronounced and spelt in the Plautus period: *u*, *oe* or *ü*? If we consider examples like Pl. *Ps.* 703 *turanne* from τύραννος (Pl. *Ps.* 1197, 1200) *sucophanta* from συκοφάντης, the wordplay in Pl. (*Bacch.* 129 ed. Lindsay 1904-5), *Non omnis aetas, Lyde, ludo convenit*, and 362 *Crucisalum me ex Chrysalo*, 687 *in cruciatum Chrysalum*, 1183 *Chrysalus . . . excruciem*, we can affirm that the spelling of Greek *y* was probably varied (mainly with *u* and *y*) but it was pronounced [u]. This seems to confirm the authenticity of the forms *lagoena* and *Antamoenides* with regard to a *u* hypercorrected by the diphthong *oe*. Otherwise, we should return to the evergreen idea of an intermediate phase between *oi*, *oe*, *ü* and *u*, where the spellings of Greek loanwords fit.

Can the diphthong *oe* in *oboedio* be considered similar to such Greek loanwords? And then, was *oboedio* an artificial spelling or the effective pronunciation? Before we try to answer these questions I would like to add a significant element. Varro, in *Lat.* 5.50 (ed. Collart 1954) quotes from *Sacra Argeorum* a place in Esquilino that is called *Lucus Poetelius*, probably linked to the *gens Poetelia* that appear in Livy, like a family of high rank during the 5<sup>th</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> centuries B.C. (see, for example, the *Lex Poetelia de ambitu* dated 358 B.C.). The Esquilino area was a particular zone in the city of Rome. It was traditionally connected to the underworld, death and water. On the hill was the Mephitis Temple, an archaic sanctuary dedicated to Mephitis,

goddess of waters and of sulphurous waters, wells, underground cavities and the afterlife. On one side of the hill there was an area called *Puticuli* (see Varro *Lat.* 5.24 ff.), which was a cemetery – simple natural holes and wells in the ground – where poor people and slaves were buried. On the basis of these few elements we can perceive a folk-etymological interference between *puteus* ‘well’ and *puteo* ‘to stink’ (cf. *putidus*, *putresco*). In fact, Varro in the same passage (*Lat.* 5.26) describes the smell from the rotting corpses in the *puticuli*. The name of the city of Puteoli in Campania, although probably derived from *puteus* ‘well, water zone’, has always been connected to sulphurous smells from the Solfatara volcano, and so from *puteo* ‘to stink’. In *Lucus Poetelius* and in the gentilial name *Poetelia*, we can suspect an attempt to ennoble the family name by hiding the allusion to the stink through the use of an archaizing element, i.e. the diphthong *oe*, which occurs in words like *Poenis*, *poena*, *moenia* – words probably connected to legal and sacred original meanings (a conservative and high area of the Latin language) – or in archaizing forms like *moerus* or *coeravit* (see above).

In conclusion, we can affirm that, once we acknowledge the failure of the phonological approach, the only possible solution is that *oboedio* contains a form of hypercorrection with the archaizing and ennobling power of the diphthong *oe*. It does not seem that *oboedio* was a verb limited to a specific area (law and religion) of the language, but the conservatism of the whole of Latinity, and in particular of some institutions and uses, can have kept the form with *oe* alive. Even if we do not have precise comparisons, a small number of Greek loanwords where *oe* renders *y* can help us to better understand the unexpected form *oboedio*. Moreover, the particular case of *Lucus Poetelius* on Esquilino can represent an interesting comparison, especially regarding the socio-semantic causes of the presence of the diphthong *oe*. Finally, there is no reason to assume that *oboedio* was not pronounced with a real diphthong, unless we accept that *poena* or *moenia* also sounded like *\*pūna* and *\*mūnia*.

### *Conclusions*

To solve what is only apparently the simple issue of *oboedio*, a sort of exploration in different areas of linguistics has been necessary. Comparative data, credited with a great tradition in historical linguistics (from Schulze 1887 to Meier-Brügger 1980), have been combined with more recent typo-



logical patterns (Viberg 1983 and 2001) enriched by a cognitive-linguistic categorization framework (Sweetser 1990 and Ibarretxe-Antuñano 1999). To sum up, *oboedio* is definitely a compound of *ob* and *audio*. The phonological explanations have not yielded effective results. The solution proposed here is a form of hypercorrection with the archaizing and ennobling power of the diphthong *oe*. After the valuable and essential contribution of diachronic and comparative linguistics, typological linguistics and cognitive categorization, it is, then, sociolinguistics that casts light on a possible solution.

Who was the inventor of such a hypercorrect form? Probably, *oboedio* was invented by middle-class speakers who made an incorrect imitation of the archaizing styles of the professional community connected to the legal-sacred sphere.

### References

- ADAMS, J. (2007), *The Regional Diversification of Latin 200 BC-AD 600*, CUP, Cambridge.
- AMENTA, L. (2003), *Perifrasi asettuali in greco e in latino, Origini e grammaticalizzazioni*, Franco Angeli, Milano.
- ANDERSON, A. R. (1909), *The Use of the oe-Diphthong in Plautus*, in "Classical Philology", 4, pp. 291-300.
- ANSCOMBRE, J.C. and PIERROT, A. (1985), *Noms d'action et performativité en latin*, in "Latomus", 44, pp. 351-369.
- BENEDETTI, M. and MAROTTA, G. (2014), *Monottongazione e geminazione in latino: nuovi elementi a favore dell'isocronismo sillabico*, in *Latin Vulgaire – Latin Tardif. Actes du Xe colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif* - Bergamo, 5-9 September 2012 - Edited by Piera Molinelli, Pierluigi Cuzzolin and Chiara Fedriani, Vol. 1, pp. 25-44.
- BENTAIN, K. (2010), *Review Article: Luisa Amenta, Perifrasi asettuali in greco e in latino, Origini e grammaticalizzazioni*. Milano: Franco Angeli, 2003 (Materiali Linguistici. Università di Pavia 38), 170 pages, in "Journal of Greek Linguistics", 10, pp. 127-141.
- BLÜMEL, W. (1972), *Untersuchungen zu Lautsystem und Morphologie der vorklassischen Lateins*, Kitzinger, München.
- BRÉAL, M. (1875), *Variétés*, in "MSL", 3, pp. 408-12.

- BURGER, A. (1928), *Études de phonétique et de morphologie latines*, Recueil de travaux publiés par la Faculté des lettres - 13<sup>e</sup> fasc., Neuchâtel.
- CLACKSON, J. (2007), *Indo-European Linguistics. An introduction*, CUP, Cambridge.
- CLACKSON, J. and HORROCKS, G. (2011), *The Blackwell History of the Latin Language*, Wiley-Blackweel, Malden (Mass.).
- COLEMAN, R. (1975), *Greek Influences of Latin Syntax*, in "TPhS", 74, pp. 101-56.
- CONTE, G. B., PIANEZZOLA, E. and RANUCCI, G. (2010), *Il Latino. Vocabolario della lingua latina*. Terza edizione, Le Monnier, Milano.
- DE VAAN, M. (2008), *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and other Italic Languages*, Brill, Leiden-Boston.
- GARCÍA-HERNÁNDEZ, B. (2001), *Las estructuras de campo y clase. El campo semántico de parere*, in MOUSSY, C. (2001, ed.), *De lingua latina nouae quaestiones. Actes du Xe Colloque International de Linguistique Latine*, Peeters, Louven-Paris, pp. 735-753.
- GODEL, R. (1961), *Sur l'évolution des voyelles brèves latines en syllabe intérieure*, in "CFS", 18, pp. 53-69.
- EM = ERNOUT, A. and MEILLET, A. (1985 [1951<sup>1</sup>]), *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latin. Histoire des mots*, 4a ed. rev. par J. André, Klincksieck, Paris.
- ERNOUT, A. (1953), *Morphologie historique du latin*, 3. ed. revue et corr., Klincksieck, Paris.
- FAY, E.W. (1920), *Indo-iranica*, in "Journal of the American Oriental Society", 40, pp. 121-125.
- HAVET, L. (1881), Os, aus; - cautes; - oboedire; - adulari, in "MSL", 4, p. 410.
- IBARRETXE-ANTUÑANO, I. (1999), *Polysemy and Metaphor in Perception Verbs: A Cross-Linguistic Study*, PhD Thesis, University of Edinburgh.
- LEUMANN, M., HOFMANN, J. B. and SZANTYR, A. (1963-1977), *Lateinische Grammatik*, 5 voll., Beck, München.
- LINDSAY, W. M. (1894), *The Latin Language*, The Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- LÖFSTEDT, E. (1959), *Late Latin*, Aschehoug, Oslo, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, London, Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.

- KLINGENSCHMITT, G. (1980), *Zur Etymologie des Lateinischen in Lautgeschichte und Etymologie: Akten der VI. Fachtagung der indogermanischen Gesellschaft*, Dr. Ludwig Reichert, Wiesbaden, pp. 208-222.
- MAROUZEAU, J. (1910), *L'Emploi du participe présent latin à l'époque républicaine*, H. Champion, Paris.
- MAROUZEAU, J. (1911-2), *Notes sur la fixation du latin classique*, in "MSL", 17, pp. 266-280.
- MEIER-BRÜGGER, M. (1980), *Lateinisch audire/oboedire: Etymologie und Lautgeschichte*, in MAYRHOFER, M., PETERS, M. and PFEIFFER, O.E., *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie: Akten der VI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*, Dr. Ludwig Reichert, Wiesbaden, pp. 287-292.
- MEISER, G. (1998), *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt.
- MONTEIL, P. (1973), *Éléments de phonétique et de morphologie du latin*, F. Nathan, Paris.
- NIEDERMANN, M. (1953 [1906<sup>1</sup>]), *Phonétique historique du latin*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., Klincksieck, Paris.
- PALMER, L. R. (1954), *The Latin Language*, Faber and Faber, London.
- PARODI, E. G. (1893), *Noterelle di fonologia latina*, in "SIFC", pp. 385-441.
- PHI#5.3 = Latin: Latin texts corpus by Packard Humanities Institute, Los Altos, California.
- PIRAS, A. (1989-1990), *Criteri e limiti di accertabilità della perifrasi con sum e il participio presente: dalle origini a Lucifero di Cagliari*, in "Sandalion", 12-13, pp. 63-97.
- PISANI, V. (1948), *Etyma latina*, in "REIE", 3, pp. 51-62.
- PISANI, V. (1968), *Storie di parole*, in "AGI", 53, pp. 59-71.
- RIX, H. (1966), *Die lateinische Synkope als historisches und phonologisches Problem*, in "Kratylos", 11, pp. 156-165.
- SAFAREWICZ, J. (1969), *Historische lateinische Grammatik*, Niemeyer, Halle.
- SAFAREWICZ, J. (1974), *Linguistic Studies*, Mouton, Warszawa.
- SCHUCHARD, H. (1867), *Der Vokalismus des Vulgärlatein*, 3 voll., Teubner, Leipzig.
- SCHULZE, W. (1887), *Zwei verkannte Aoriste*, in "KZ", 29, p. 230-255.

- SOLMSEN, F. (1894), *Studien zur lateinischen Lautgeschichte*, K. J. Trübner, Strassburg.
- SOMMER, F. (1948), *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre. Eine Einführung in das sprachwissenschaftliche Studium des Lateins*, Winter, Heidelberg.
- SWEETSER, E. (1990), *From Etymology to Pragmatics. Metaphorical and cultural aspects of language*, CUP, Cambridge.
- SZEMERÉNYI, O. (1960), *Etyma Latina I. (1-6)*, in "Glotta", 38, pp. 216-251.
- THURNEYSEN, R. (1887) *Lateinische Lautwandel*, in "KZ" 28, pp. 154-162.
- TLIO = *Tesoro della Lingua Italiana delle Origini* (a cura di OVI, Opera del Vocabolario Italiano del CNR): <http://www.ovi.cnr.it>.
- VÄÄNÄNEN, V. (1981 [1963<sup>1</sup>]), *Introduction au latin vulgaire*, 3. ed. revue et argumente, Klincksieck, Paris (It. trans. *Introduzione al latino volgare*, Terza edizione italiana a cura di A. Limentani, traduzione di A. Grandesso Silvestri, Patron, Bologna).
- VENDRYES, J. (1902), *Recherches sur l'histoire et les effets de l'intensité initiale en latin*, Klincksieck, Paris.
- VIBERG, Å. (1983), *The verbs of perception: a typological study*, in "Linguistics", 21, 1 [263] pp. 123-162, Berlin-New York-Amsterdam.
- VIBERG, Å. (2001), *Verbs of perception* in HASPELMATH, M., KÖNIG, E., OESTERREICHER, W. <sup>and</sup>and RAIBLE, W. (edd.), *Language Typology and Language Universals. An International Handbook. Vol. 2.2* [Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 20/2], Berlin-New York, pp. 1294-1309.
- WACKERNAGEL, J. (1893), *Miszellen zur griechischen Grammatik*, in "KZ", 33, pp. 1-62.
- WH = WALDE, A. and HOFMANN, J. B. (1938-1954), *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2 voll., Winter, Heidelberg.

MANCA INDIRIZZO