Etymology and semantics. Theoretical considerations apropos of an analysis of the etymological problem of Spanish MAÑERO, MAÑERIA

The origin of the study of Diachronic Semantics in Spanish can be implicitly found in the pages of Orígenes del Español, where Menéndez Pidal (1956) takes up Lexicography and, particularly, Lexical Geography. In these pages, the neo-grammarians concern with isolated words which characterized the first part of the volume gives way to the discussion of related words. In § 82, which deals with Mozarabic “dictinaries”, quite a few interrelated lexical items are studied as well as some complete conceptual fields, such as the names of the horse in the Glossary at the Leyden Library (Seybold: 1900). In § 85, on derivatives of primum, nisi and cereola, not only do we find geographic interpretation, but also several semantic and lexicological nuances are identified by including, e.g., some derivatives. And later, § 84 bis not only explains the geographic distribution of names assigned to the mustela in Hispania and other Romanic areas (cf. Schott: 1935), but also studies the causes for changes in the denomination of this animal. Finally, § 85 is, from the start, a clear example of onomasiological semantics: “Topographical names which designate an isolated rise of land of less height than the mountain”.

In all of these cases, we are speaking of the onomasiological and etymological semantics of words. But, as has been indicated above, there are also interesting aspects for the study of derivational procedures or for the formation of locutions. This concept of Semantics has more to do with pragmatic implications — including literary considerations (Marcos—Marín: 1979) — than with those of either Morphology or Syntax. Therefore, it constitutes but one aspect of many existing possibilities. (For the diachronic interrelationship of Syntax, Semantics and Pragmatics, see Lapesa: 1970).
Given these preliminary observations and the inherent limitations involved, the time has come to present the following contribution. Here it is attempted to develop an etymological semantic study which is not only onomasiological, but also partially semasiological since the evolutionary data will indicate the appearance and development of certain characteristics of variation in the history of the terms.

We shall attempt to put some order into the scattered notes on the etymology of mañería and maño, deal with the chronological question and, after a critical review of the possibilities and rejection of the impossibilities, we shall suggest which of those possibilities still available to us seems to be the most reasonable.

Mañana and maño have come down to Modern Spanish as medieval judicial terms (García González: 1955; González Ollé: 1976, 9.65), referring to a legal tribute or obligation and to the person obligated by the tribute.

The tribute of mañana is the judicial form substituting the obligation of a colonist maño to restitute his lands to his lord at the maño’s death. The term maño is not only applied to a colonist subjected to the tribute of mañana which allowed those lands to be bequeathed to other heirs in the case there were no legitimate sons; it also refers to a person who, at his death, left no legitimate succession, and whose state reverted to the sovereign, that is, the king in the case of the nobility, or the lord in the case of the colonist peasants. We insist on the concepts of ‘legitimacy’ or ‘legitimate’ sons: the word maño, applied to persons, does not necessarily mean ‘sterile’ as it does when applied to animals, even though this meaning does seem to lie at the origin of its semantic evolution.

This semantic subtlety can be confirmed by the examination of the history of the word itself in Spanish. (The Latin and pre-Latin forms will be taken up later.)

The earliest Castilian example to be quoted corresponds to the form maño and is found in a document of a. 1030 of Clunia published by Menéndez Pidal (1956, p. 36):


A possible antecedent of mañana may be the form manaria as documented in the Fuero de Mendavia of 1274 (Lacarra: 1934):

Et que su merino nin su sayon, non les tome ninguna cosa contra su voluntad nin ayan sobressi ningun fuero malo de sayonía ni de nuda, nin de manaria ...

In Castilian, the first meaning of the lexeme which corresponds to these lexical items is that of ‘sterile’ or ‘sterility’. With the passage of time, this ‘sterility’ becomes relative and one may speak of ‘legal sterility’ or ‘judicial sterility’. Since, in ancient times it was believed that the woman was at fault when a couple did not have children, we should not be surprised that the feminine form, madera, is more frequent than the masculine maño. However, because of the greater influence of the man, the judicial term is the masculine for the individual.

In the Alphonsine works of the thirteenth century, the meaning of the word is ‘sterile’ and refers, for example, to animals (‘sterile female’) in the General Estoria (1930: 13,a,12; 569,a,9). Here it is also used to refer to land (80,a,9; 120,a,13) and to the water in areas in which nothing grows nor can be grown (133,b,49).

It seems to be clear in several passages of Castigos e documentos del rey don Sancho (1292–93, copy after 1351) that the word refers to sterility and not impotence.

Cap. LXXVI: Otrosi, si en el consentimiento hobiere tal condicion que procuremos mañeria e non hayamos fijos, ... allí non hay casamiento ninguno.

Cap. LXXVII: Esta manera pone Valerio Maximo en el segundo libro de los Reys e fechos maravillosos, do dize que des pues que fue fecha la cibdad de Roma fasta ciento e cincuenta años, nunca hobo y home que repoyase [repudiated] a su muger, e el primero que la repoyo por amor que era mañera [because she was ‘mañera’], fue Carbino Fornisino, el cual fue movido por razon de su esterilidad; empero fue mucho reprehendido por ello. (...) La segunda razon se toma de parte de los fijos; ca maguer a el casamiento sea maño, e non se deba departir por la mañana, segund dicho es, empero, si hobiere fijo o fijos [if there were sons], es bien comun del home e de la muger.

Cap. LXXIX: E si una muger fuese casada con muchos varones, todos estos bienes cuatro se embargarian. (...) Lo tercero, que se embargaría la generacion de los fijos; ca fazerse-y-an las mugeres
casadas mañeras, onde las malas mugeres que se dan a muchos homes por esta razon son mañeras, segund que dize el filosofo e lo probamos de fecho. Onde porque las mugeres casadas non pierdan la generacion de los fijos, nin sean mañeras, nunca deben ser ayuntadas en uno con muchos maridos.

It is therefore evident that the condition of ‘mañera’ may be acquired by a woman of her own will (contraception), and has nothing to do with ‘impotence’. At the very beginning of La estoria del rey Anemur e de Josaphat e de Barlaam, it is clearly shown that mañero or the derivative mañeriza / mañeresa refers to sterility and never to impotence.

Manuscripts P and G tell us of king Avenir (= Anemur) who was surrounded by great comforts and pleasures. He lacked only one thing for his happiness to be complete, “he was mañero, because he couldn’t have children” (Keller — Linker 1979: 5; we quote from P although there are some minor variants which are not relevant for our present purposes):

e aquella [that thing] atormentava la su anima de fiera guya de muchos pensamientos: e esto era porque era mañero, ca non podia aver ningund fijo. E por ende vyvia en muy grand cuydado [worry] e trabayavase mucho de comno podiese ser suelto de tal enlaizamiento, e fuese llamado padre de fijos, que es cosa de muchos codicicado.

In text S, somewhat briefer, the king is called Anemur and we can read (Keller — Linker 1979: 365):

E comno [although] visquisee en muchos deleytes, avia un mal de mañeriza, el qual menguava la su gloria e atormentava el su coraçon, ca non podia aver fijos.

Those who are familiar with the story know that king Avenir or Anemur will have a son somewhat later (P and G, on page 20, S on page 367), called Josafat, who will protagonize the subsequent story. There is no doubt that one cannot speak of sterility in this case, but rather of dilatoriness since the king’s paternity is unquestioned in the work.

Therefore, the condition of mañero can refer to temporary accident. Some nuances will be added to this concept later, in the Spanish world. Thus as concerns the second meaning, ‘judicial sterility’ I daresay, a mañero for the Sephardim is any man who dies without succession or with no direct heirs, even though he may have had children. At the beginning of the sixteenth century in the Farsa del Sacramento de Moselina, a mañera is a “woman who has had two children but who, because of her age, is no longer apt for generation”. (B. AA. EE. LVIII, 11b, cited in RFE, XXV, 247). Here it is obviously a matter of secondary sterility and not of sterility itself nor of impotence.

With these observations behind us, let us now examine the formal problems of the word’s evolution.

Both mañero and mañeria appear as derivatives, in -ero and -eria, respectively, of a radical which — if we recall the form mannaria registered above — may have been MANN — us. This form is quite well documented, with its derivative manulus as recorded in the Thesaurus:


i. q. equus parvulus (cf. Schuster, RE XIV 1228 sqq.): LVCR. 3, 1063 currit agens -os ad villam praepicitant. HOR. epod. 4, 14 Appiam -is tert. carm. 3, 27, 7 serpens terruit -os. epist. 1, 7, 77 impositus -is. PROP. 4, 8, 15 detonisio avexta est Cynthia -is (Beroald., ab annis codd.). OV. am. 2, 16, 49 rapientibus essedat -is. SEN. epist. 87, 11 v. vol. II 982. 70. SER. SAMM. 804 fimus -i. AVSON. 397, 7 vel celerem -um vel ruptum terga veraedum conscendens. HER. epist. 66, 8 ferventes -os. deriv.: manulus.

It should be added here that Nebrija (1492) records mannus, -i as a ‘dwarf horse’ as well as mannus -i which the grammarian explains with ‘por aquello mismo’ (for that very reason), i.e., because of the smallness.

Above, we promised to come back to the term mannus as documented in the Fuero de Mendavia (1274) in our etymological arguments. In fact, one finds this passage in a Lusitanian inscription from Mertola, dated March 17 of era 532 (Hispanic), i.e., the year 494 AD. This tombstone is reproduced by Hübner (1891, rep. 1975). It may be useful to us later to caution that María Lourdes Albertos (1966) does not document Mannaria as a proper noun because she
only deals with Tarraconensis and Baetica. Because it is Latin and of a rather late period, the term also cannot appear in Palomar Lapesa (1957), although this fact might as well indicate that, if the word is to be considered an anthroponym, it would not be pre-Latin. Let us see the text:

309 (...) Mannaria famula Chr[ist]i vixit annos novem menses quattuor, requievit in pace d[ie] XVI Kal[endas] Apriles era DXXXII.

First, one might ask whether this Mannaria is an adjective or a proper noun. Were it a proper noun, it would be the only example known. This fact, of course, would support those who consider it an adjective. However, this is not an unsurmountable obstacle, given the scarcity and dispersion of anthroponymic remains. Syntactically, as an adjective, mannaria is placed before the noun it modifies, according to the order in Classical Latin, where the adjective normally precedes the noun unless: the adjective is a monosyllabic noun modifier; it is derived from a proper noun, or; it forms part of a set expression. On the other hand, it is common knowledge that both the Satiricon and the Peregrinatio offer many cases of the noun-adjective order which are not explained by significant or expressive intensification. Thus, the above arguments are weakened by the end of the fifth century. We cannot even refer to the conservative nature of funerary inscriptions because Mannaria famula appears only once in an inscription and it is precisely here. Since it does not seem likely, considering the material characteristics of this tablet, that another anthroponym could come first, the fact that the inscription is headed by the deceased person’s name would seem to corroborate the hypothesis of mannaria as a proper noun. Nothing conclusive can be obtained from either possibility.

There can be no doubt that there is an example of the word-form mannaria in the fifth century and that the radical m-an- is by no means unknown to us. This fact invalidates those hypotheses which would propose a later etymon such as that of an Arabic loan word, rejected elsewhere (Marcos—Marin, 1982).

The words mañero, mañeria and other cited above not only appear in the world of Romance lexic, but are also evidence of a primitive lexeme of wide-spread use: Portuguese maninha ‘sterile woman’, Galician maninha ‘a cow which is not sterile but does not always conceive’, Castillian mañera (to follow some sort of geographical ‘order), Gascon mano ‘sterile cow’ and mane ‘sterile woman’, Be-
from Rumanian mînзare. But Albanian and Greek are not alone among the Indo-European languages, as we shall see.

Nevertheless, first we must fulfill our promise to present our chronological discussion for which we need only agree on a few initial, but incomplete, conclusions:

1. The widespread incidence of the lexeme within all the Romance languages would clearly indicate that the antecedent form of mañero and mañeria, that is, the basic form MANN-, already existed in Latin.

2. However, due to the late date of documentation, one might think it to be a regional or rustic form or that it came into Latin from another language.

3. In spite of this manifestation in Latin, the lexical base is documented in all the Indo-European languages which were slowly implanted in the Northern Mediterranean basin towards the tenth century BC.

4. The form mand- in Basque would suggest that this language did not receive the term from the source documented in Latin. The word came into Basque through or from another language.

5. Some important semantic contrasts have been noted: on the one hand, there is the meaning ‘teat’, ‘mamma’ and, on the other, ‘young animal’ and ‘sterile or sterilized animal’.

This would lead us to think that there already existed in the Indo-European languages a lexical base (or radical, if one prefers) MA(N)D-, a thousand years before our era.

Let us mention now the Indo-European people who invaded the Northern Mediterranean basin at the beginning of the last millennium BC, and dispersed over the whole area: the Celts. This Indo-European people poses many problems; we have very little knowledge of the Hispanic Celtic languages or of Gallic, although we do know more about several other Celtic languages, specially the insular ones such as Welsh, Gaelic, Irish and Breton (insular Celt of late emigration to the continent). However, there are several scholars, such as Pokorny, Tovar, and of course, Menéndez Pidal (1943), who accept the existence of pre-Celts or para-Celts called Illyrians, Ligurians, Illyrian-Ligurians, Ambrons or Ambroillyrians.

Menéndez Pidal (1943, 1968: 174–5) synthesizes one of the most apparently obvious aspects of these peoples: the Ambrons, who gave the name to the island of Amrun in Southeast Denmark, were amber merchants in the North Sea. ‘Amber’, in Greek, was called precisely λτγόρτον i.e., ‘ligurian’. (Pauly—Wissowa 3. 300. Here-

after we quote from the second edition of Adolfo Schulten’s, 1955, see also Krahe, 1955, I: 103). Tovar (1977) points out that the reference to amber seems to indicate an etymology a posteriori and he comes to the conclusion that it is an interpolation. Nevertheless, he does not attack “en su conjunto la construcción levantada por Schulten sobre ideas de G. Schoning y K. Mullenhoff”.

The Celts gradually pushed this group to the South towards Liguria, according to Rufus Festus Avienus (end of the fourth century AD.), a later author in whose Massaliot periplus from ca. 520 BC, in book I of his Ora Maritima we can find in lines 129–136 the following:

... siquis dehinc
ab insulis Oestrynicis lembum audeat
urgere in undas, axe qua Lycaonis
rigescit aethra, caespitem Ligur[gl]um subit
cassum incolarum, namque Cetlarum manu
crebrisque dudum proelis vacua arva sunt
Liguresque pulsí, ut saepe foris aliquos agit,
uenerē in ista ...

Schulten (1955: 97) confirms that the Ligurian formerly lived on the coast of Frisia. He based this theory on several factors: the fable of the Frisian king Cicio; the name of amber, as we have just mentioned, and the common origin of the Ligurians and Ambrons according to Plutarch (Life of Marius, 19). Marius took Ligurians from Italy in his army which fought against Teutons (Germanic), Cimbrians (Celts) and “Ambrons” in the battle of Aquae Sextiae. Marius’ Ligurians were surprised to learn that the Ambrons shout “Ambrons!” to identify themselves in battle, just as the Ligurians did themselves because, as Menéndez Pidal translates, “The Ligurians call themselves and their race Ambrons”.

Of course, it is not intended here to review D’Arbois de Jubainville’s hypothesis of a cohesive Ligurian civilization, nor do I intend to pass judgement on pre-Celtic problems. For the purposes of this paper it is to be understood that, according to those who have traditionally postulated two invasions, the Celts push, and carry with them, these people even less known than themselves, and it is precisely these groups which have been related to our etymology of mañero and mañeria. Ligurians and Illyrians would have occupied the Alpine area now contained in Switzerland, Austria and Italy and probably spread throughout the Northern Mediterranean basin.
before or at the same time as the Celts. Therefore they should not be ignored in our analysis. On quoting the *Thesaurus* above, it was noticed that its writers assign an Illyric etymology to Latin *mannus*. This thesis is supported both by Alpine forms and Rumanian as much as by the cult of Jupiter Menzana, to whom “the Messapians made offerings of a horse” in Southern Italy. (REW; Tovar, 1949: 157–8, remembers that this cult is known through a text of Paulus Festus.)

The Celtic hypothesis is supported by the testimony of the grammarians Consentius (fifth century AD.) partially reproduced by Tovar, who based his hypothesis on it (Grammat. Lat., V, ed. H. Keil, Leipzig: 364; Tovar, 1949: 157):

Omne peregrinum nomen, siquidem id iam receptum est, ut Gallorum manni, Medorum acinacis vel gaza, Poenorum tubur, dirigi ad eius latini sermonis similitudinem debet, cui proximus est.

Accepting, after Tovar, the authenticity of this testimony, some aspects should be differentiated. Scholars do not necessarily agree on the genuineness of the paragraph quoted. It seems convenient to say that Tovar was primarily interested in the etymology of the name of the famous illergetean chieftain *Mandonio* (from Ilerda, Cast. Lérida, Cat. Lleida, N. E. of Spain). The form *Mando-* can be seen as the root of that noun, joined to a well-known Celtic suffix, -oniós, which Illyric also attests. This suffix is to be related to the Urmefelder culture, the first wave of the Celts, ca. 900 BC., which soon merged with the Iberians. It is an acceptable etymology, believed to be “totally demonstrated” by Maria Lourdes Albertos (1966: 146). Nevertheless, it occupies a marginal place in this discussion, which will not enter into its specific difficulties. It is fair to recognise, however, the basic help provided by Tovar’s studies in the development of this part of the present paper.

Thus, I must dispense with the doubtful forms some authors seem to reduce mainly to *mendo*, such as Mid. Ir. *menn*, Welsh *myn*, Cornish *min*, Bret. *men* ‘kid goat’. On the other hand, Maria Lourdes Albertos cites many anthroponyms and toponyms with the base *mendo-,* such as:

*Mandalonius* (CIL XIII 4130) in Belgium; *Mandatus* in the Illyric region, Gaul and Germany; *Mandelana* and *Mandilo* (CIL V 6803, 5001) in Cisalpine; *Mando* (from which *Mandonius* is directly derived), a type of pottery in Gaul; *Mendorinus* (CIL IX 1404) in Italy, etc. In composition, see in Hispania *Melmandi* and its variants and *Lica-manda*. (…) However, *Mandia* (CIL XIII 7893) in Low Germania seems to come from the base *mandio*. In toponyms, see Illyric *mándëriovon, Manduria; Gallic *Epomanduo-durum,* etc.

Evans (1967: 197–199; 222–3) has discussed the etymology of the compound name *Epomanduo-durum.* Referring to the second element, *mandu-,* he writes: “Names in mand(u)- ... are doubtless of multiple origin. A number of them are probably to be related to the form *mannus* ‘a pony’ or ‘a little draught horse’ first attested in Latin by Lucretius 3. 1063 (dimin. *mannulus* Plin. ep. 4.2.3) and claimed as Celtic by Consentius”.

He continues (1967: 223): “However, d’Arbois de Jubainville *(NG 127f.*) claimed that Gaulish *mandu-* (in names such as *Mandubracius, Mandubilus,* and *Manduesdum*) should be related to the root *mendh-* seen in Gk. ἑκάτον *φροντίς,* ἐκάτον *I learn,* etc. (see *W.—P.* 2. 270f., *IEW* 730), and that the form pointed to an ‘adjectival’ pre-Celtic *mndh-i-s* ‘qui réfléchit à’, ‘qui se préoccupe de’, en gallois *mandu-s*”.

Besides, it would seem correct to suppose that the anthroponym *Mandulius* or *Mandulus* of Barcelona (CIL II 6147 = 4516), for which there are variants *Mandulus* in Aquitaine *(DAG 322)* and *Manduilllos, Manduilla* in Cisalpine, has the same radical and is involved in this very discussion. Maria Lourdes Albertos proposes, following Schmidt (1957: 236), the radical *mandu-,* D’Arbois de Jubainville, however, and Holder later have related it to *mendh-* ‘to think’, as we have just remembered, quoting Evans. But their etymological proposal for *Manduesdum* is worth discussion: Maria Lourdes Albertos maintains that it can be related to *mendo-,* although Tovar accepts it with reticence.

*Manduesdum* was a Roman garrison in Britainia, today Mancetter, in Warwick County, England (21 kilometers north of Coventry). It appears in the form of *Manduesedo* *(IA 470, 3).*

Holder, s. v., records the interpretations offered by Pictet, Πολυάριμος, and D’Arbois de Jubainville: *Mandu-essedo-s* ‘celui qui veille sur les chars de guerre’ or ‘qui s’occupe des chars de guerre’ and refers to *Tarv-essedum.* However, earlier (col. 404), in a discussion of the radical *mandu-,* according to d’Arbois de Jubainville, Holder relates the term to pre-Celtic *mndh-i-s* ‘qui réfléchit à’ ‘qui se préoccupe de’, which is related to the Greek radical *mendh,* as we saw. On the contrary, Tovar wisely points out (p. 155) that if the parallel form is *taruesdum,* meaning ‘ox-cart’, there is no reason why *manduesdum* cannot be analyzed as *mandu-essedum.*
and “mean simply ‘mule cart’ or some such thing”. Here, he relies on Dottin (La langue gauloise: 358) and, although he does not explicitly say so, takes it into consideration the meaning of *mannus* in Latin, “small draught horse”.


It would seem preferable to mention in passing another of the etymologies which has been pondered and which came to be quite accepted. In ZRPh, XI: 256, corresponding to “Miscellanea Etymologica” and under the heading “Spanisch mañana”, W. Meyer – Lübke writes:

For Sp. mañana ‘sterile woman’, Galician mañana ‘barren female’, mañiero: ‘sterile’, Port., Gall. maninho ‘sterile’ for animals, mañero ‘he who dies leaving no legitimate heirs’, one finds in Gascon only one simple word, mane. The information available would suggest a relation between the Portuguese and Gascon forms and a basic form *manna*, and not *manyga*. The meaning immediately brings to mind Italian *meno* dealt with in Caix Studi 46 and Schuchardt Litteraturblatt 1885, in particular: 114. However, the sounds are against it. Whatever the etymon of *meno* is, an é in Italian cannot correspond to an å in the Iberian Peninsula. Since *manna* does not appear in Latin and there is no corresponding form in Arabic, only Basque and Germanic are left. The former has against it that the word also appears in Portuguese, and in the latter we have *manna* ‘the man’ whose feminine *manna*, with the meaning given above, would behave similarly to Latin taurus, Port. tura ‘sterile cow’ as related to Lat. taurus, Port. tauro ‘bull’.

Although the information we possess today allows us to reject this etymology (as did the DECH earlier), it should be mentioned here, if only for the sake of exhaustiveness since it is accepted in the review in Romania, XVII: 149–150 (— ‘breaigne’ < Ger. mann) and by Américo Castro in RFE, XVI: 413. It was corrected in Brüch (1919), where the relation to *mansion* was established, the Germanic form *Menz* documented and where Basque *mundo* was incorrectly thought to be a Romanic loan according to Baist, ZRPh, XIV: 183.

Five provisional conclusions were proposed above which allowed us to postulate a radical *MAN(N)D*-. Now it seems that something can be added to them:

6. Three types of radicals have been encountered: *MANN*, which seems to be basic, *MANN-* by assimilation of the dental sound to the preceding nasal, and *MANN- yodh* (palatal glide) which would result in the palatalization and assimilation of the dental sound. According to our information, the basic Indo-European type could be *mänd-* and *mánd-. (See Tovar, 1949: 158. For a critique of J. Loewenthal’s statement, also mentioned in the DECH, see Wörter und Sachen, IX, 1924/26: 188 ff., and ibidem: 158, 159, and note 1 on this last page.)

7. I totally agree with Tovar (1949: 159): “Semantically, this data can only be reduced to a unity when one starts with the idea of ‘udder’”. From that point, one progresses to the concept of ‘weakness’, then to ‘an animal too young yet to reproduce’ and, finally, to the concept of ‘sterile’. The intermediate step is well documented for animals and people by the Rumanian *mânz* meaning ‘colt’ or ‘boy’. One could add another observation a propos of ‘young animal’: this meaning, applied to people, would correspond to ‘boy’, ‘girl’. Perhaps it would be plausible to agree with J. Corominas’
and J. A. Pascual's opinion in the *DECH* (although taking into account the reservations they point out there) and look there for the etymology of Sp. *maño* (cf. s. v.) and *maña*, maybe from *mannus*, a word with an initial meaning of 'young', 'one who has not yet had children' also in Valencian zones where Catalan is spoken. This does not exclude the simultaneous development in Spanish of a hapaenthological form of *germanus*, with the parallel *hermano / mano* in Mexico and other Central American areas. An Arabic etymology has also been ventured, in this case, but does not offer the necessary methodological rigor nor consistency (a critique in Marcos—Marín, 1982).

8. From 'sterile animal' stems, naturally, on the one hand, *steer*, *mule* and, on the other, *mahería* and *mañero*, semantically in that order.

9. Basque *mando* means 'mule' according to the *Diccionario vasco-español-francés* by R. María de Azkue. But it also corresponds to 'sterile' for female animals and, pejoratively, for women. Other meanings are 'large, bulky' as opposed to *zorr* 'small' (originally 'louse' which may indicate the metaphorical origin of the semantic change: large as a mule, small as a louse). The affective form, with palatalization of the *d*, is used for 'male mule', 'ass', 'small sterile woman' and 'a bird hybridized of two species'.

10. It was stated too that Albanian and Greek are not alone among the Indo-European languages. Also in the Germanic languages, in Old High German, *manzon* 'ubera' is documented by Trautmann and quoted by Tovar (1949: 158, referring to ZuS, XLV, 1913: 252). Rudolf Schützzeichel (1974) records it as *manzo* meaning 'breast' ('breast' or 'eats'), a weak masculine noun documented in Tatinus, Cod. 56: 25–342 of the St. Gallen conventual library.

11. Those languages which have lost the primary meaning of 'udder', such as Celtic, Basque, Latin and the Romance languages, present the form without palatal glide.

12. Those languages which have retained the primary meaning 'udder' (Germanic, Albanian, Southern Italian dialects) tend to use the form with palatal glide for the meanings 'young animal' or 'sterile woman'. This, of course, may be a morphological indication of this form's secondary lexical-grammatical nature. These fragmentary conclusions, although not all of the same validity, may be considered sufficient to venture a synthesis.

*Mañero* - *a* and *mañería* are derived from an Indo-European base *MANN*- the result of *MAND*- by assimilation of the group -nd-, and present in the Celtic-Latin lexical form *mannus*. Semantically, our two words represent the last step in the evolutionary process, that is the reference to sterility, which occurred at a relatively modern period since the meaning 'young animal' is still frequent in the Romance languages. By logic and from a semantical point of view, the first term must be *mañera*, 'sterile woman' from which *mañeria* would be formed, at first for a vital situation, and later for judicial reference. Finally, *mañero* would be formed fundamentally as a judicial term. This contrast in the meaning of the derivatives in -ero, -a, depending on the gender, is not rare in Spanish, although it is usually ordered in relation to the primitive gender. Thus, masc. *bombón*, fem. *bombonera*, fem. *gallina*, masc. *gallinero* (Garcia: 1970).

These observations would be sufficient for a Romanist (and should also be sufficient for the author) since they have reached the limit of etymological speculation. For the Indo-Europeanism, there is still one more path to follow, a path somewhat more removed chronologically: the possible Illyrian origin of the radical and its pre-Celtic nature. This aspect may also be of interest to Hispanists as one more datum on the contacts sustained between Basques and Iberians in what was not yet called Hispania, nor Iberia, but perhaps was beginning to be known as Oestrymnia or Osusa.

Notes

1. I greatly appreciate having been allowed to consult the files of the Seminario de Lexicografía de la Real Academia Española since the *Diccionario Histórico* is still quite distant from *M*. It is a pleasure to acknowledge how much I am indebted to Prof. Dr. K. Dietz for his comments on an earlier redaction of this paper. Prof. Dr. H. Lüdtke also jotted down some valuable remarks. I fear, however, they may not recognize their generous help in the results.

2. I quote from the edition in the Biblioteca de Autores Españoles (BAAE) since the variants which may exist due to the lack of editorial rigor, are not relevant to the purpose of this paper. See the modern edition by Agapito Rey, Indiana University, 1952. However, the punctuation is slightly corrected and the accentuation is suppressed.

3. The text of chapter LXXXIX is partially quoted by Julio Cejador, 1929. Almost the exact same text appears in Juan García de Castrojeriz's *Regimento de los principes*, a translation of the Latin work by Frier Gil de Roma, Gil de Colmena or Egidius Romanus, ca. 1345, published in Sevilla, 1494, by Ungut and Polono, fol. LXXXV: "Lo terzera se embargaria la generacion de los Ejos. Ca fazer se yan las mugeres [sic] casadas por esta razon mañeras". A *Regimento de principes* was also written by Gómez Manrique (XXV c.).


6. Although the coincidence is probably due to popular etymology and a cross I won’t go into now, it might be mentioned here that *manner* is the name of the ‘argemone’ in the anonymous Hispanic-Musllman botanist of ca. 1100. (M. Asin Palacios, 1943, 324: 166). This plant is from the papaveraceae family and is considered an antidote or counterpoison. It would be interesting to know whether it is also an abortive.

7. Also recorded there is: *MANNULUS, -I, m. a mannaus demin. GLOSS*. Corp. M 57:-us caballus, buricus. MART. 12, 24, 8 nusquam est mulio: sic tacentb. PLIN. epist. 4, 2, 3 habetab puer -os multos et iunctos et solutos.

8. The move from *sterile* to ‘impotent’ is apparently possible in one case: Landes dialect manne “stérile, impuissant (en parlant du bétail)” (Métivier, Agric. des Landes, 732), cited in the DECH, s.v. *mañero*. One should keep in mind, however, that in modern Italian, manso is a ‘castrated bovine animal’. M. Alniem (1980: 19–20) has proposed an etymon *mannis* in agreement with Diz’s proposal, without considering the great extension of the lexical family we are studying and its presence in non-Latin Indo-European languages. In view of our data, one may suppose that the influence of *manso* on *manzo* could be explained by a popular etymology.

9. The *FEW* gives us new forms under the pre-Roman headings *mand- and *mand', which it explains after the Indo-European radical *MEND*. It agrees with Tovar on the semantic development, and discusses its relation to MANNUS (p. 147): “Nach Stolz – Leumann 169 ist es zweifelhaft, ob lit. MANNSUS zu den vereinzelten Wörtern gehört, die -nd- zu -nm werden lassen (wie etwa abt. *grandio > grannio; dispemnite, zu pandere, neben distendile; tennitur*). Es erhebt sich deshalb die Frage, ob dieser Lautwandel bei MANNUS nicht schon sehr alt ist, zwar nicht im L., aber im Gallischen, wovon die heute aufs Gask. beschrankte Lauterscheinung nur noch ein Relikt wäre; ... Darauf könnten auch apr. hyperkorrekten Bildungen wie corona für corona, colonna, ferext endir < HINNIRE, endilhar neben enilhar < HINNITULARE (...) deuten, sowie die Tatsache, daß die mit Belege für MANNUS aus Gallien und Spanien stammen”.

I don’t believe so obvious the connection with the noun *manno* and the verb *manner* or *manner* discussed by Georg Sachs in the Miscelanea of RFE, 23, 1936 (183–4). The proposed etymology, “Iberian *manna* ‘sterile’ (REW, 530)” is, of course, wrong. The noun *manna* appears in 1283, in the Alphonsine *Libro de Anejez* (fol. 10b) in the phrase *juego meta*, Sp. *tales’, chee game drawn by reason of inability of either player to checkmate*. The verb *manner* appears in fol. 133b. A verbal adjective *mannada* which refers to a verb *manner* is recorded in the *Fuero de Cuenca* (Ureña ed., Madrid, 1935: 533). The meaning ‘to equal’ can only be remotely related to the concept of ‘sterility’, although such a remote connection cannot be denied.

References


AHDE Anuario de Historia del Derecho Español, Madrid.
Hübner, Ernst Willibald Emil

Hubschmid, Johannes
1954 *Pyrenäenwörter vorromanischen Ursprungs und das vorromanische Substrat der Alpen* (Salamanca: Universidad).

I. E. W.
see Pokorny: 1959.

I. H. C.
see Hübner: 1871.

Keller, John Esten, and Linker, Robert W. (ed.)

Krahe, Hans

Lacarra, José María (ed.)
1934 "Fuero dado a Mendavia por Sancho el Sabio y confirmado por el Infante don Fernando de Castilla el 19 de Noviembre de 1274", *AHDE* 11: 1157/492.

Lapesa, Rafael

Maltiel, Yakov
1956 "Studies on Spanish and Portuguese animal names (Conclusion). IV. Verbs derived from animal names", *HR* 26: 207-231.

Marcos-Marín, Francisco
1977 "Notas de literatura medieval (Alejandro, Mainete, Marco Polo ...) desde la investigación léxica de 'brahmán' y sus variantes", *Vox Rom.* 36: 121-161.

1982 "Eunvas no es 'eunmas'. (Notas léxicas sobre los textos del privilegio de Valderazo)", *DICENDA, Cuadernos de Filología Hispánica, Universidad Complutense*, 1: 169-175.

Menéndez Pidal, Ramón

Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm
see *REW*

Nebrija, Elio Antonio de

NG see Arbois de Jubainville, H. d’

Palomar Lapesa, Manuel
1957 *La onomástica personal pre-latina de la antigua Lusitania* (Salamanca: C. S. I. C. and Colegio Trilingüe de la Universidad).

Pauly—Wissowa

Pokorny, Julius