nationum, Graecos dico. Si ex his rebus passim latentibus colligere licet, vix dubitari potest, quin inventor sive auctor nominis Germaniae in sinistra ripa Rheni habitaverit[55]). Ii enim populi, qui dextram ripam incolebant, nullum habebant vocabulum, quo universi se ipsi complectebantur[56]).

Mytacism in Latin Phonology

By Martti Nyman, Helsinki (Finland)

§.1: Introduction

The term *mytacismus* (*moetacismus*, *myotacismus*, *motacismus*) is used by Roman grammarians for the purpose of characterizing a specific type of barbarism or phonetic incorrectness met with in unlearned or foreign people trying to pronounce the Latin final *-m*.

In spite of the fact that the Latin final *-m* has been the object of several studies attempting to clarify its phonetic quality (e.g. Seelmann 1885: 356–357; Gröber 1891; Safarewicz 1933) and, in addition, to determine its phonological status (Safarewicz 1960; Allen 1965), mytacism has not been considered in this connection. Nor is it mentioned in the standard handbooks of Latin historical phonology (Sommer 1914; Leumann 1977). The reason for this curious omission may lie in a bias to consider it as belonging to the domain of rhetoric; e.g. Georges' Handwörterbuch gives the following definition, which pertains only to rhetoric: "der häufige Gebrauch, die häufige Einanderfolge des Buchstaben M (μῦ)" (II: 1079). The majority of grammarians, however, use this term in a different sense, as implied by Bickel (1937), Niedermann (1948), and Hofmann (ThesLL 8. 1332. 29–75). Bickel even attempted to relate mytacism to the phonetic history of Latin.

The general failure to relate mytacism to the discussion of the final *-m* is an indication and consequence of the fact that its nature is poorly understood. Mytacism involves at least three problems, and at least two of them still lack a credible answer.

---

[55]) Cfr. F. Schlette: Werden und Wesen frühgeschichtlicher Stammesverbände, Zeitschrift für Archäologie, 5, 1971, 19–38.

[56]) Si vis scire, quid fuerit apud antiquos Romanos notio illa Germanorum, cura ut videas R. Hachmann – G. Kossack – H. Kuhn: Völker zwischen Germanen und Kelten, Neumünster 1962; facilius accessu atque intellectu est R. Hachmann: The Germanic Peoples, London 1971, quod opus vulgo scriptum est.

112   Martti Nyman

a) **Orthography.** Is there only one correct way of spelling this word, or should variation in orthography be admitted? While Bickel (1937) reconstructs *moetacismus* as the sole admissible form, Niedermann (1948) pleads for variance.

b) **Origin.** Has the term been borrowed from Greek, although *μυτακισμός is nowhere attested, or is it a Roman coinage on a Greek model? The problem whether mytacism was one of the *vitia oris et linguae* listed by Quintilian (inst. 1.5.32) also pertains here.

c) **Meaning.** The picture obtained on the basis of grammarians' use of the term mytacism is not entirely clear at first sight (compare, e.g., Sacerdos 6. 454. 22–28 K[eil] to Pompeius 5. 287. 7–11 K.). This is reflected in the fact that the definition given by Bickel (1937: 75–76) is entirely different from that given by Niedermann (1948: 9 n. 2). It is also clear that there is no *a priori* reason why the grammarians' use of mytacism should have been strictly uniform. The variability observable in the spelling of this word may very well indicate variability in meaning, as is frequently the case in morphological matters (cf. Anttila 1975).

In the present paper I will have nothing to say about orthography. My primary concern is to clarify the problem of defining mytacism. It will be shown that the definitions given by Bickel, Niedermann, and Hofmann (who reflects Bickel) are incompatible with what emerges from a careful linguistic interpretation of the grammarians' statements. They also entertain unreal sociolinguistic implications. It is argued that the definition of mytacism resulting from our discussion satisfies the purpose of sociolinguistic reality, which is (becoming) a necessary ingredient in any study on linguistic change.

§. 2: What we learn from Sacerdos

Two lexicographical definitions are given by Hofmann in his ThesLL article *moetacismus*:

(1) a. "in re *gramm.* de obscuratione *m* litterae terminantis inter vocales" (line 45)[1],

b. "in *rhet.* ... de nimia assonantia *m* litterae" (71).

---

[1] The dependency on Bickel is quite obvious: "moetacismus ... terminantis ... *m* obscurationem in commissura verborum ante vocabula a vocali incipientia spectat" (1937: 75).

The first thing that catches the eye in these definitions is the
"lucus a non lucendo" relation between the grammatical and
rhetorical definitions of this term. In other words, the relation
between (1 a) and (1 b) seems to hinge on only one thin bond of
semantic association, viz. that mytacism has something to do
with *m*. A circumstance of this kind almost makes one wonder
whether (1 a) and (1 b) are held together rather by homonymy than
polysemy, although the latter would be more expectable. This
question will be touched upon below. Let us now concentrate on
the first definition.

Definition (1 a) has been entertained by two eminent scholars.
We are therefore entitled to expect that it be directly or indirectly
recoverable from what has been stated by Roman grammarians.
However, a moment's inspection of the relevant passages[2]) makes
one suspect, and on further reflection it becomes evident that (1 a)
contradicts every single statement made by grammarians. This
being the case, it is imperative to take a fresh look at what the
grammarians are implying by their statements.

The earliest definition of mytacism is to be found in Sacerdos
who wrote towards the end of the third century:

"Myotacismus fit, cum finita pars orationis in *m* et excepta ⟨a vocali⟩
foedam faciat dictionem, ut

> *poeta cum primum animum ad scribendum appulit.*

huic vitio similes sunt †nattacismi, rottacismi et omnino, cum in consonan-
tem finiatur pars orationis et excipiatur a vocali. hoc namque volunt techno-
graphi, ut pars orationis finiatur in vocalem et excipiatur a consonanti"
(6. 454. 22–28 K.).

According to Sacerdos the circumstance that a word ends in -*m*
and the following one begins with a vowel results in an offensive
juncture. He then cites a line from Terence (Andr. 1) as an example.
The first thing which draws one's attention is the fact that syste-
matically or morphophonemically there are three instances where
the -*um* sequence occurs in prevocalic position. According to the
well-known prosodic rule, a juncture of this type is eliminated by
the elision of the preceding -*Vm* (i.e. vowel + *m*) sequence:

> . . . *prim*(*um*) *anim*(*um*) *ad scribend*(*um*) *appulit.*

---

[2]) Sacerdos 6. 454. 22–28 K.; Servius 4. 445. 14–19 K.; Pompeius 5. 287.
7–20 and 298. 19–30 K.; Diomedes 1. 453. 9–19 K.; Consentius 5. 394. 5–11
K.; Isid. orig. 1. 32. 6.

114   Martti Nyman

The elision took place, because the extremely weak articulation of the final -*m* in prevocalic position made it possible to treat the -*Vm* sequence as a vowel or diphthong in Latin versification (cf. Soubiran 1966: 47–48). From this it might be inferred that in Sacerdos' usage mytacism refers to this very weakening of the final -*m*; hence Hofmann's definition (1a) in ThesLL.

This conclusion is, however, too hasty. To show this, let us quote Sacerdos' preceding discussion of *hiulcatio*:

"Hiulcatio est, si finiatur in vocalem oratio et excipiatur a vocali, quod facit hiare dictionem, ut *insulae Ionio in magno*" (19–21).

Sacerdos states that contiguous words beginning with and ending in a vowel effect a gaping diction (*hiulca dictio*). At face value, this seems to imply a general recommendation for poets to avoid hiatus.

However, this interpretation seems somewhat suspect. Even the best poets use hiatus quite freely, because these can be eliminated by the application of elision, which is a device to get rid of a *morphophonemic* hiatus. The main source of phonetic hiatus is of course the non-application of elision, but sometimes it happens, however, that there remains a hiatic juncture despite the application of elision. The Virgilian line (Aen. 3.211) quoted by Sacerdos proves, indeed, that it is exactly the phonetic hiatus that the term *hiulcatio* refers to. The line in question has to be scanned as follows:

$$\acute{i}ns\breve{u}l\breve{a}e \ \acute{I}\breve{o}ni(o) \ \acute{i}n \ m\bar{a}gn\acute{o}.$$

In the first hiatus, one has to do with a "weak" hiatus after the Greek style (cf. Crusius & Rubenbauer 1961: 19). In the second case, the prosodic effect of the -*o* in *Ionio* is eliminated by elision, but there still remains the hiatic -*i*#*i*- sequence (# = word boundary) to which elision cannot be applied any more.

In short, Sacerdos is not talking about hiatic junctures of the morphophonemic level. His *hiulcatio* refers to the phonetic level.

The discussion of *hiulcatio* precedes that of mytacism. Therefore it is but natural to expect that also the latter term refers specifically to the phonetic output. That this is indeed the case is evidenced by the Terentian line cited above as well as by the remaining part of our quotation from Sacerdos on mytacism.

According to our proposal, Sacerdos' use of mytacism does not refer to the -*m* in the -*um* ending (2a) which is to be elided in prevocalic position. Rather, the term pertains to what remains after the application of elision (i.e., to (2b)):

(2) a. Morphophonemic level

$$/ \#\text{prīmum} \#\text{animum} \#\text{ad-scrībendum} \#\text{applicaṭ} \# /$$

(elision) $\#\text{prīmʉ̶m̶}$ $\#\text{animʉ̶m̶}$ $\#\text{ad-scrībendʉ̶m̶}$ $\#\text{applicat} \#$

b. "Phonetic" level

$$[\, \#\text{prīm} \#\text{anim} \#\text{ad-scrībend} \#\text{applicat} \#]$$

In spite of the fact that the *-um* endings are eliminated by elision, the phonetic output (2b) still contains instances of prevocalic final *-m*, viz. *prim #anim #ad*.

It is exactly this situation which Sacerdos has in mind when he characterizes mytacism as involving an offensive juncture (*foeda dictio*). This is corroborated by Sacerdos' subsequent statement in which he points out that mytacism can be taken as being a sub-case of the *-C #V-* sequence. This was regarded as a fault by writers of rhetorical treatises who taught the preference for the *-V #C-* sequence.

To sum up, Sacerdos is using the term mytacism to refer to a specific type of phonostylistic, or euphonic, flaw, in which a phonetic [m] comes into contact with a vowel which in the speakers' mind belongs to the following word. The Bickel-Hofmannian definition would make Sacerdos contradict himself.

§. 3: How mytacism can be avoided

A glimpse at the nature of mytacism is provided by the grammarians' instructions as to how it can be avoided. A passage to this effect is to be found in Servius:

"Myotacismus fit, quotiens post partem orationis in *m* littera desinentem sequitur alia pars orationis quae inchoat a vocali, ut *hominem amicum*. hoc vitium vitare possumus aut per suspensionem pronuntiandi aut exclusione ipsius *m* litterae. sed melius est ut suspensione pronuntiandi hoc vitium relinquamus. si enim voluerimus *m* litteram excludere, vitamus quidem myotacismum, sed cadimus in hiatum" (4. 445. 14–19 K.).

According to Servius, mytacism can be avoided in two ways, viz.

     a. by *suspensio pronuntiandi*,

     b. by *exclusio ipsius m litterae*.

The content of the latter instruction is clear. It simply means that the final *-m* is deleted, e.g. when *hominem amicum* is pronounced *homine amicum* (cf. Pomp. 5. 287. 15–16 K.) or also *homin amicum*

(cf. Pomp. 5. 298. 20–30). What is meant by *suspensio pronuntiandi* is not immediately clear. According to Niedermann (1948: 9 n. 2) it involves making a pause after a word ending in *-m* if the following one begins with a vowel:

"Le *mytacisme* consistait à rattacher, dans les groupes syntaxiques comme *hominem amicum, oratorem optimum,* l'*m* final de *hominem, oratorem* à l'initiale vocalique de *amicum, optimum,* en disant *homine mamicum, oratore mopti-mum.* Cette prononciation vicieuse pouvait, théoriquement, être évitée soit par la "suspensio", c'est-à-dire en marquant un arrêt après *hominem, ora-torem,* soit par l'"exclusio", c'est-à-dire en supprimant l'*m* final de ces mots."

This interpretation also implies a definition of mytacism which is entirely different from that given by Bickel and Hofmann. In his interpretation Niedermann is clearly dependent on Pompeius, although he does not quote him:

"Myotacismus est, quotiens inter duas vocales *m* positum exprimitur, ut si dicas *hominem amicum, oratorem optimum.* non enim videris dicere *hominem amicum,* sed *homine mamicum,* quod est incongruum et inconsonans. similiter *oratorem optimum* videris dicere *oratore moptimum.* bonam rationem dixit Melissus, quo modo vitandum est hoc vitium, ne incurramus in aliud vitium. plerumque enim suspensione pronuntiatur aut exclusione: suspensione pronuntiatur, si dicas *homine mamicum, . . . oratorem optimum*; aut certe, si velis excludere, *homine amicum, oratore optimum.* nos quid sequi debemus? quid? per suspensionem tantum modo. qua ratione? quia si dixeris per suspensionem *hominem amicum,* et hoc vitium vitabis, myotacismum, et non cades in aliud vitium, id est in hiatum. nam si volueris dicere *homine amicum,* vitas quidem myotacismum, non tamen vitas hiatum" (Pompeius 5. 287. 7–20 K.).

However, I am rather suspicious of Niedermann's interpretation. A false picture of mytacism suggests itself, because he takes Pompeius' statement at face value and, misguided by this false track, misinterprets the meaning of *suspensio*. It is true that examples such as *homine mamicum* seem comparable to pronouncing Engl. *an aim* as *a name,* but notice that Pompeius is not asserting that *hominem amicum* was actually pronounced *homine mamicum.* Rather he states that, in "mytacistic" pronunciation, *hominem amicum* sounds AS IF it were pronounced *homine mamicum* ("videris dicere"). Pompeius is here taking the standpoint of the hearer, not that of the speaker. The same point is made by Consentius, whose wording clearly refers to the hearer: "Mytacismum dicunt, cum in dictione aliqua sic incuriose ponitur vocali sequente *m* littera, ut, an ad priorem pertineat an ad sequentem, incertum sit, sicut plerumque passim loquuntur *dixeram illis*" (5. 394. 5–7 K.).

In order to understand what Pompeius is saying, we have to take a look at the allophonic distribution of the Latin /m/ phoneme. A description in broad outline can be found in Priscian: *"m* obscurum in extremitate dictionum sonat, ut *templum,* apertum in principio, ut *magnus,* mediocre in mediis, ut *umbra"* (2.29.15–16 K.). This distributional statement is, however, a bit too general. We learn from Diomedes (1.453.9–19 K.), Quintilian (inst. 9.4.40), Velius Longus (7.80.18–20 K.), and Annaeus Cornutus (in Cassiodorus 7.147.24–148.4 K.) that the final *-m* was reduced ("obscurum sonat") specifically in prevocalic position. What is relevant here is the fact that the phonetic realization of /m/ was dependent on its position in relation to a word boundary ($\#$):

$$(3) \quad \begin{matrix} \text{a.} \\ \text{b.} \end{matrix} \quad /\text{m}/ \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{matrix} [\text{m}] / \# \_\_\_ \\ [\tilde{\text{w}}] / \_\_\_\#\text{V} \end{matrix} \right\}$$

Before a word boundary (3b), /m/ was reduced to a bilabial nasal glide [$\tilde{\text{w}}$]. The allophonic distribution of /m/ being this, it is clear that the phonetic quality of /m/ served as a perceptual cue of how e.g. *hominemamicum* had to be segmented into words. If it sounded as [hominewamíkum], the word boundary was perceived as being before *amicum,* i.e. [hominew̃ $\#$ amíkum]; on the other hand, if it sounded as [hominemamíkum], the word boundary was perceived as falling between *homine* and *mamicum.* My claim is that this is exactly what Pompeius is trying to express. He characterizes mytacism from the perceptual point of view, but his instructions concern articulation, because faulty articualation is likely to result in faulty perception.

It has been made evident by the preceding discussion that mytacism cannot be interpreted as involving a faulty articulatory "attachment" of the final *-m* to the following word. The definition of mytacism given by Bickel and Hofmann are out of the question, because they are incompatible with what Pompeius wants to say. What kind of faulty pronunciation, then, is Pompeius referring to?

The above discussion already implies the answer. Clearly he is warning against spelling pronunciation of the final *-m* in prevocalic position. If the orthographic representation *hominem amicum* was pronounced [hominemamíkum], the norm of correct pronunciation was violated, and this is what "ab eruditis auribus respuuntur", as is stated by Donatus (4.393.2 K.) as well as by Diomedes (1.453.5 K.) in the discussion of the faults *iotacismus, labdacismus, mytacismus, hiatus,* and *collisio.* This kind of barbarism (which at the same time was a hypercorrectism) is amply documented in Bücheler (1895–1897); see also Diehl (1899: 123–139); e.g.

118   Martti Nyman

undecim et turmas messorum duximus annis (Bücheler, CE 2. 1238. 15;
cf. line 24 *et genu(i) et vidi iuuenes carosque nepotes*),
    nutritor plus quam genitor qui solam amauit (CE 1. 562. 11). It may be
noted in passing that the well-known Ennian line
    insignita fere tum milia militum octo (Ann. 332) may also be an early
instance of mytacism. In Ennius it was of course not a question of barbarism,
but of *metaplasmus* (cf. Servius 4. 444. 9 K.).

To Sacerdos, mytacism involved a phonetic [m] separated by a
word boundary from the following vowel. Now it is to be noticed that
the definition of mytacism which emerged from our interpretation
of the Pompeian passage, is well in keeping with Sacerdos' basic
idea. If there is a difference, it is not a difference of definition, but
a difference imposed by developmental tendencies of the language.
As soon as spelling pronunciation of the final *-m* grew to be a
sociolinguistic problem in the Roman speech community, the gram-
marians had to interfere with it. And for the characterization of
the spelling pronunciation of the final *-m* in prevocalic position
the term mytacism was readily applicable.

Let us now turn back to *suspensio*, which was one of the ways
of avoiding mytacism. Niedermann (mis)interprets *suspensio* as a
pause or cessation ("arrêt") made after the final *-m*. This inter-
pretation is a logical consequence of his antecedent definition of
mytacism. It even has a superficial justification in the fact that
Diomedes (in a different context: 1. 438. 29 K.) uses the word in
a similar meaning. The preceding discussion makes it evident,
however, that *suspensio* implies a description of how one can get
rid of the spelling pronunciation of the final *-m*. The target of the
correct pronunciation, which was "approved by the learned ears",
was of course the reduced pronunciation [w̃] visualized as a genera-
tive rule in (3b), and it was achieved by *suspensio pronuntiandi*
(sc. *m litteram*), i.e. by a reduced pronuncation of the *m* sound.
This interpretation is perfectly in keeping with what is stated by
Isidorus: "Motacismus est, quotiens *m* litteram vocalis sequitur, ut
bonum aurum, iustum amicum, sed hoc vitium aut suspensione *m*
litterae, aut detractione vitamus" (orig. 1. 32. 6).

As is stated by the grammarians quoted, the reduced pronuncia-
tion of the final *-m* was not the only way of avoiding mytacism.
The other way was to drop the *-m* altogether. This implies that
Rule (3b) must be supplemented as follows:

(4) a.
    b. $/m/ \rightarrow \begin{cases} [\tilde{w}] \, / \, \_\_\, \# \, V \, \langle \text{careful style} \rangle \\ \emptyset \, \, / \, \_\_\, \# \, V \, \langle \text{casual style} \rangle \end{cases}$

It is immediately clear that the choice between the sub-rules (4a)
and (4b) was conditioned by phonostylistic factors which may be
characterized by the cover terms "careful style" and "casual
style"[3]). That this is indeed a sociolinguistically real identification
is evidenced in vulgar inscriptions and manuscripts where the final
-*m* is often omitted (see Diehl 1899: 243–306).

§. 4: Conclusion

The focus in the present paper has been on the grammatical
aspect of mytacism. As a grammatical term it refers to those cases
in which a violation of the phonological realization rule formalized
in (3b) results in an unacceptable spelling pronunciation of the pre-
vocalic final -*m*. In rhetoric, mytacism has been applied to refer to
cases where a norm of euphony is broken by an unskilful word
texture effecting an overdose of *m* assonance (cf. Mart. Capella
33. 514). In the beginning of § 2 we pointed out the extremely thin
semantic relation that obtains between the grammatical and rhe-
torical uses of the term mytacism, if we accept the Bickel-Hofman-
nian definition (1a). The development of the one use from the other
would have to be described in terms of antonymy[4]), which is an
unnatural basis for semantic associations. The redefinition suggested
in the present paper establishes a natural relation between the two
uses: in both cases, an occurrence of *m* is judged as offensive[5]).

Allen, W. S. (1965) *Vox Latina. A Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical
Latin.* Cambridge: University Press.

Anttila, R. A. (1975) "The indexical element in morphology", *Innsbrucker
Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Vorträge 17.* Innsbruck: Institut für
Sprachwissenschaft.

Bickel, E. (1937) "De moetacismo", *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie de
d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves 5* (= *Mélanges Émile Boisacq*), 69–76.

---

[3]) The sub-rules in question are also relatable to the terms "lento style"
and "allegro style", respectively, which have been defined by Dressler 1973.

[4]) Janson (1964: 164–165) attempts to trace the historical meaning
development by regarding the rhetorical use (Mart. Capella 33. 514; Greg.
M. Epist. 5. 53[a]. 5) as resulting from a misunderstanding of Donat's very
concise, and thus ambiguous, grammatical statement. This is indeed the
conclusion we are led to, if the testimony provided by Sacerdos is judged as
essentially comparable to the grammatical definitions given in Pompeius
and Servius. However, the discussion in § 2 indicates that Sacerdos' state-
ment pertains to rhetoric. While Donat's passage is still bound to remain
ambiguous in its intentions, it seems probable that the rhetorical use of
mytacism has a longer tradition.

[5]) I am grateful to Tore Janson and Klaus Strunk for useful suggestions.

120   Hans Dieter Bork

Bücheler, CE = Bücheler, F. (1895–1897) *Carmina Latina Epigraphica I–II*.
   Lipsiae: Teubner (*Anthologia Latina II. 1-2*).

Crusius, F. & Rubenbauer, H. (1961) *Römische Metrik. Eine Einführung*.
   6. Aufl. München: Hueber.

Diehl, E. (1899) "De *m* finali epigraphica", *Jahrbücher für classische Philo-
   logie, Suppl. 21*.

Dressler, W. (1973) "Pour une stylistique phonologique du latin. A propos
   des styles négligents d'une langue morte", *Bulletin de la Société de Lin-
   guistique de Paris* 68, 129–145.

Gröber, G. (1891) "Verstummung des *h, m* und positionslange Silbe im
   Lateinischen", *Commentationes Woelfflianae* (Lipsiae: Teubner), 171–182.

Hofmann, J. B. (1960) "*Moetacismus*", *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* VIII:
   9. 1332. 29–75.

Janson, T. (1964) *Latin Prose Prefaces. Studies in Literary Criticism*. Stock-
   holm &c.: Almqvist & Wiksell. (*Acta Univ. Stockholmiensis, Studia Latina
   Stockholmiensia*, XIII).

K[eil] = Keil, H. (1855–1880) *Grammatici Latini I–VII*. Lipsiae: Teubner.

Leumann, M. (1977) *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. München: Beck.
   (*Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* II. 2. 1.)

Niedermann, M. (1948) "*Iotacismus, labdacismus, mytacismus*", *Revue de
   Philologie* 74, 5–15.

Safarewicz, J. (1933) "Les voyelles nasales en latin", *Atti del III Congresso
   internazionale dei linguisti*, Roma 1933 (Firenze 1935), 176–179. (Also
   in Safarewicz 1974: 175–177.)

Safarewicz, J. (1960) "Notes de phonologie latine", *Studii Clasice* 2, 85–93.
   (Also in Safarewicz 1974: 177–187).

Safarewicz, J. (1974) *Linguistic Studies*. The Hague/Paris: Mouton & War-
   szawa: PWN. (*Janua Linguarum, Ser. Maior*, 76.)

Seelmann, E. (1885) *Aussprache des Latein*. Heilbronn: Henninger.

Sommer, F. (1914) *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*. 2. u.
   3. Aufl. Heidelberg: Winter.

Soubiran, J. (1966) *L'élision dans la poésie latine*. Paris: Klincksieck. (*Études
   et commentaires*. 63.)

Lateinisch-romanisch *auris / auricula / auditus*
und die partitiven Diminutiva

Von Hans Dieter Bork, Köln

Inhalt: 1. Bisher vorgebrachte Meinungen zum Absterben von *auris*. —
2. *auricula* und die partitiven Diminutiva. — 3. Die Verdrängung von *auris*
durch *auricula* und *auditus*.

1. *auricula* 'Ohr' gilt von jeher als eines der lateinischen Dimi-
nutiva, die im Vulgärlatein nach Ausweis der romanischen Sprachen
ihr Simplex ersetzt haben; zusammengefaßt wird dieser Vorgang in
der Formel *auris non oricla* der Appendix Probi. Die für die Ent-