

How scribes wrote Ibero-Romance before written Romance was invented.

Roger Wright

Specialists in Historical Linguistics have usually preferred to investigate languages which have never been written or the prehistoric stages of literate languages. Trask's *Dictionary of Historical and Comparative Linguistics* (2000), for example, has surprisingly little to say about the way we should use written data in an analysis of speech. But this reluctance has not arisen because written documentation is irrelevant to the study of the history of spoken languages; indeed, the direct data are all written, and there are general points that can be made about their nature as well as individual cases which can be explored. Over the last 35 years (e.g. Wright 1982, 1995, 2003) I have argued that the development of Latin into the Romance Languages in the Early Middle Ages is not a special case, but broadly followed the general pattern; these arguments are summarized here.

When people are learning to write for the first time, including modern primary school children and early medieval apprentice scribes, their main difficulty concerns the spelling. There need be no problem about the syntax, because the word order and the constructions can be exactly the same in writing as they would be in speech and don't have to be altered. It is, of course, true that speech tends to operate in less formal registers than writing does, but there is no problem about reproducing the word order and constructions of any register of speech on the page if we wish. Nor need there be any great problem about the vocabulary, because there are very few words, if any, which can only be used in speech and never at all in writing, or vice versa. The great difficulty for the primary pupil and the early medieval apprentice scribe comes in the spelling of the words. The written forms of words are standardised, and even those developed within an alphabetical system are not phonetic script except, perhaps, at the moment in which they are initially invented. That is why it is, or was, normal for schoolchildren to come home from school with lists of words to learn how to spell. Although there are correspondences between sounds and letters which it is also essential to learn in the initial stages, these correspondences, in living languages, are not enough in themselves to enable us to read and write; if we try reading an English text aloud as if it were in a phonetic script, with a specific sound for each letter, we are unlikely to be intelligible.

When alphabetical systems are first elaborated, these sound-letter correspondences usually inspire the initial written forms of each word. In real life it is not always as simple as that in practice, but even so, when studying the past, to some extent we have to assume that the correspondences applied then. In the case of my own surname, for example, in which fifty per cent of the letters are silent, philologists of the future would be right to deduce that once upon a time those letters had not been so silent, and that there was a phonetic motivation for their existence in the fifteenth century even if there isn't now. A large number of English (and French) words have a standard written form which is not identical to any kind of phonetic or even phonemic transcription of their normal pronunciation. In the case of Latin, it is similarly assumed, probably rightly, that the way in which words were usually written had corresponded to the sounds that were pronounced in these words at the time of the standardization of their written form. In most cases, that

form was fixed more than a century B.C. But sound changes were in progress all the time, even then. For example, we can tell from the metrical conventions used by Virgil and his contemporaries that words beginning with a letter *h-* and those ending with a letter *-m* counted for practical versification purposes as if they respectively began and ended with the adjacent vowel. The evidence of the later Romance languages shows that all such words did at some point lose the final [-m] and the initial [h-] sounds (except for the final nasal consonant of a few monosyllables; e.g. Latin CUM > Spanish and Italian *con*, "with"), and it is likely that these developments were already under way before the turn of the millennium from BC to AD. Once the standard written form of a word has been fixed, schoolchildren and apprentice scribes naturally continue to be taught to use that form regardless of phonetic developments. In the case of Modern English and Modern French, this continues to be true; even though many English and French people make spelling mistakes when writing, the forms they are taught at school have only occasionally been updated to reflect the general phonetic changes which have affected speakers of any level of education.

Latin was not immune from this. In much of Western Europe Latin continued to be a living spoken language after the Roman Empire, and the research of generations of Romanists, working with the knowledge of what the Romance languages were going to attest later, has helped show that many phonetic changes occurred in the first few centuries A.D. But spelling rules don't change until somebody authoritative changes them. Thus in the same way as written English spellings have gradually diverged markedly from spoken English pronunciations over the last five centuries, so Latin speech and writing gradually diverged from each other during the first millennium A.D. A normal written English text of the present day would seriously mislead a historical linguist of a thousand years in the future if he or she were to take it to be a phonetic transcription of what we actually say now; similarly, a Latin text of the tenth century A.D. from the Northern Iberian Peninsula, written at a time when most of the standard forms taught to scribes had not changed but the pronunciations had developed considerably (to be more like what we now think of as being Old Spanish and Portuguese), is misleading if we take it to be a direct phonetic transcription of the writer's speech. I refer here to the tenth-century Iberian Peninsula rather than to the Romance-speaking world more generally, because in the far North of that world, in Carolingian France, there had by that time already been implemented the important reforms in the nature of official writing and reading aloud which led to the creation of the separate ecclesiastical register which we now call "Medieval Latin"; these reforms only came to the Iberian Peninsula rather later (cp. Wright 1982, 2003; Van Acker et al., eds, 2008). And I refer to the Northern half of the Iberian Peninsula because the southern half was under Muslim domination, where many people of all religions were bilingual in Arabic and Romance but by then, if literate at all, nearly always only in Arabic.

So in the tenth century, with the exception of the intellectuals in Catalonia who were in touch with French culture, the Peninsular scribes who wrote the many texts which have survived to be studied a millennium later (by e.g. Davies 2007) had necessarily learnt to write words in their ancient traditional form while speaking the incipient Ibero-Romance of the age. They did not call it that, of course; it is, I think, legitimate for modern linguists to refer to the language spoken then in the Iberian Peninsula as "Romance", or by the tenth century "Ibero-Romance", but the speakers did not do so themselves, and we need to remain aware

that there can be awkward consequences if historical linguists refer to a language with a different name from that used by that language's speakers. Sometimes this is necessary; we don't suppose that the speakers of Proto-Indo-European called their own language "Proto-Indo-European", but we don't know what they did call it and we need to refer to it in some way. In this case, we do know that everybody still called their language "Latin", whether spoken or written. We should not be misled by the fact that we (the philologists of a millennium later) usually give their spoken language the name of "Romance" into thinking that the language they spoke and the language they wrote should be analysed as if they were two different languages. They still thought of it all as one language called *lingua latina*. This continued to be the case well into the second millennium; the word "Romance", all over the Romance-speaking world, still had to wait another couple of centuries before being used in a linguistic sense, and then when it was, it was first used to refer specifically to the new written Romance modes adopted in the late twelfth and early thirteenth century rather than to speech.

The document printed below, dated 18th August 991 A.D., comes from the monastery of Vairão in the diocese of Porto. Vairão is North of the River Minho, so is now in Galicia in Spain, but at that time Porto and the region around it were also in Galicia (and thus part of the Asturian-Leonese kingdom), since Portugal had not yet taken its own independence. The document is now in Lisbon, and was printed in the *Portugaliae Monumenta Historica* as no.163 (there are 184 documents from Portugal written before the year 1000 printed there).

(chrismon) dumuium quidem non est set multis mane pleuis acque nodisimu
eo quod ego abuit Intenzio sagulfu *presbiter* cum gontigio *presbiter* pro eglesia
uogauolum scō martinū q est fundata In uila uillaredi quia dicia sagulfu
presbiter quia era sua ereditate et sacauit gontigio *frater* suas escripturas et suas
firmidades In concilio et diuindigauit Ipsa *eglesia* de sagulfu et de alios suos
eredes quia conparara gontigio ipsa ereditate de et suos parentes de cencerigu:
et de alios todos suos eredes et fundauit asperigu ipsa *eglesia* et auidauit Ila p
plures et post relinq Ila In manu de suos filios nominib~ gontigio et amarelo
presbiter ingenua de alios suos eredes et otinuere Ila In faciem de suos eredes p
plures anos sine aliqua Inquiedatione oituenta anos sine aliqua Inquiedatione et
postea coliuat gontigio *presbiter* ipse sagulfu In sua casa pro li facere seruizio
bono et *placitum* rouorado In concilio que non abuse de Ilo aliqua sopusida
mala In ipsa *eglesia* et postea Inrubit Ipse sagulfus *presbiter* ipso *placitum* et
facia se eredarior In ipsa *eglesia* et fuit gontigio *presbiter* cum isto *placito* ad
concilio ante aluitum aluitizi gomeze benegas et gudinū beneegas ederonio
aluitizi truitesindu nantildizi et aliorum multorum filio bonorum et anouit se
sagulfu In ueridate et cedauit se sagulfu a pedes de dona domitria et de gontigo
presbiter et feceron se Ipsos Iudices rogadores et rogauerunt multum pro ipsum
placitum que rouorara et que eisisse sagulfu de ipsa *eglesia* et anplius non
fecese Inbidem alia sopusida et pro suo seruizio dederunt Inde de Ilo decimu
inter pane et a beuere lx modios p rogo per ipsas oras que disera In ipsa *eglesia*
et una sagia uizione et sup ipso *placito* adrouorabit alio ad domna domitria In
ipso conzilio et ista anuzione ante ipsos Iudices sagulfus *presbiter* in ac
escribtura manu sua +^s In ipse era xxviiiia cod erit xv kalendas setenbres

The witnesses are presented in three columns at the end; their signatures are not the originals, and all have been reproduced by the scribe of the surviving clean document.

gomeze benegas confirmans
aluitus aluitizi confirmans gudinu benegas confirmans
conf ederonio aluitizi confirmans
truitesindo nantildizi confirmans

menendus conf arcerigu
manuel *presbiter* maurgado *presbiter*
mido guandilizi ts
rizila ts aluitus gondesindizi
ermemiru ts cagidu gundulfizi
frogia arualdizi froila ts censoi ts

coram testes it sunt amarelo mestalizi ts
gundesindu mestalizi ts
astruedu ts gontado didazi ts
gondesindu cepa fafila uizoi astrulfizi
fredenando uizoizi ts

This concerns a lawsuit between a certain Gontigio (who was a priest, or perhaps a monk - the distinction was none too clear in Galicia at the time) and his adopted son Sagufe, over which of them owned the church of San Martín in the town which is now called Guilhabreu; here Sagufe accepts that Gontigio was in the right.

There is no space here to comment on all the interesting details of the language, because there are too many (more are explained in Wright 2010); I just wish at the moment to indicate that it is worth investigating the language from the point of view of the scribe, who was probably part of the clerical team of an aristocratic estate. His handwriting suggests that he had a strong and lively personality. We have quite a good idea, from much other evidence, about how people spoke in Galicia at that time, as regards their phonetics, morphology, syntax, semantics and vocabulary, and we can reconstruct something, at least, as regards the sociolinguistic variations of the age. It is instructive to compare these reconstructions, particularly the phonetic ones, with texts such as these which were written by those who spoke that way, and who had been taught to write according to the normal old-fashioned standards.

For their teaching does seem to explain a number of the textual peculiarities. I dedicated an article some twenty years ago to a reconstruction of how scribes appear to have been taught to write in tenth-century Galicia (Wright 1991; in English, Wright 1995). One facet of that study is particularly relevant; although many non-standard spellings can be attributed to features of contemporary phonetics, others are found rather surprisingly and commonly in words which had undergone no phonetic change at all in the relevant feature. One example is the word now written in Galicia as *sobrinho*, meaning "nephew"; this derived from Latin SOBRINUM, meaning "cousin", which in tenth-century Galicia was more often written with an initial *sup-* than with *sob-* (or than with *sop-* or *sub-*). In the 1991 article it was pointed out that the unrelated word *sobre*, meaning "on" and already pronounced at that time as [só-bre], developed from Latin SUPER, and the scribes were naturally told that the word should be written with the letters *sup-*; as it usually was, indeed (and as it is in the above document, in the phrase *sup ipso placito*). So it looks as if the scribes deduced that the word for nephew should be written with the letters *sup* in the same way, as if it were related to the word [só-bre]. In fact these two words were not related at all, but it wasn't a stupid guess to think that they were. It has occurred to me since that it is likely that some of the teachers who taught the scribes were under that misapprehension themselves, and had actually told their pupils to write the word that way. For all scribes had to have been taught by somebody, and

scribes in monastic and aristocratic houses would usually have been taught in a moderately formal context. In any event, it would be wrong for us to deduce from the written form *sup-* that anybody ever pronounced the word as [su-prí-no], with [u] and [p], at any time.

Another instructive example concerns the Latin word *ipse* in its various morphological forms; in the above document from Vairão there are *ipse*, *ipsa*, *ipso*, *ipsos*, *ipsum* and *ipsas*, and in all the lexeme turns up seventeen times. In earlier times it had meant "the same", but in Ibero-Romance its semantics had changed to mean "that"; it had also come to be pronounced without the consonant [p] (it is now Spanish *ese*, Galician *ise* and Portuguese *isso*). But the scribe had no hesitation in writing the letter *p* every time. From this we can deduce that he been taught to write this word that way in his training; his teacher had simply said "this is how you write the word [í-se]". The letter *p* represented no sound in that written word then, any more than it does now in the written form of the English words *psychology* and *pneumonia*, which we are also taught to write with a *p* in our training. Whenever we find a word in these documents whose written form hardly ever changes (except in the inflections), we can assume that the scribe has been taught to write it that way. And if the document was read aloud later, as most were, the reader would have been trained the same way and would have no problem in reading the word written as *ipse* aloud as [í-se] in Galicia (or [é-se] in Castilla).

The main point to be made in connection with reading aloud is that, in all literate societies, readers are interested in identifying the words and their meanings rather than their sounds (cp. Wright 2005); thus the fact that the written form was not a direct transcription of the spoken form was of no more significance to the reader-aloud than the fact that if you read my surname aloud you say [rájt] rather than [wríght]. Indeed it would be completely wrong to read *wright* as [wríght], and it would have been wrong to read *ipse* as [ip-se]. In documents of this kind, this technique is most obvious in the cases of abbreviations and numerals. Standard abbreviations had necessarily to be taught as whole units, so we consistently get the word *ecclesia* (meaning "church") written as *egle~*, *sancto* ("holy") as *scō* and the word *presbiter* ("priest") as *pr~* (whatever their syntactic function); if they recognized the forms, readers would as usual be led straight by them to their own lexical entry, where the phonological information is stored for every word, and read these words aloud in unabbreviated form, in their usual Romance pronunciation, as (here in Portugal) [i-gré-3a], [sã-to] and [prés-te]; reading the words as [e-gle], [scō] and [pr] couldn't even have occurred to them. Similarly, the number sixty is written in the document as *lx*, but could never have been read as [lks]; in the Vairão area it would have been read aloud as [se-sa-ě-ta]. This is obvious, but it is only an exaggerated example of what happens in reading with every word; if the reader recognizes the written form, then he or she pronounces the word in the ordinary vernacular way.

It is also worth stressing that a reading aloud would include all the lexical items in the text without changing them. The performance was not a question of translating Latin into Romance, as has sometimes been suggested, but simply of reading aloud in the ordinary way, as we would read an English text giving the words of the text their normal contemporary pronunciation.

There are interesting semantic features here too. We can be sure, for example, that the written form *ipse* in these documents corresponded to the spoken [í-se] or [é-se] of the time because it has the semantics of that age; it means "that" and not "the same". In some uses in the Vairão document the old meaning would be all but impossible. Such cases are instructive; when a word in these documents combines the traditional written form with the more recently evolved semantics, that shows without any doubt that the text is in the written mode of the scribe's speech, rather than any kind of attempt at

reproducing the language of a thousand years earlier. An example which I once studied at length (Wright 2004) is the form *sedeat*. *Sedere* was regularly used in the Iberian Peninsula as a suppletive verb for *esse*, "to be", including providing the forms of the present subjunctive, where it developed phonetically to Ibero-Romance [sé-ja] (and subsequently Modern Spanish [sé-a]). It also developed semantically, from the original meaning "be seated" to simply "be", and was often used as the passive auxiliary. In the Ibero-Romance documents of this period the word is usually spelt in the old way, having been taught as such, but used with the developed meaning and grammar, as an auxiliary with no trace of sedentary semantics (Wright 2004: 284-90). In the same way, the *parentes* of our document are "relations" (the meaning which the word had in the tenth century) rather than "parents" (the meaning which it had had a thousand years before). For semantic changes happen all the time, regardless of the word's spelling. Scribes and writers are not often likely to be aware of these developments, and rarely want to achieve the antiquated semantics of such words; there is not a single word in this 991 document which seems to have an anachronistic meaning that did not exist in tenth-century Ibero-Romance. The technical legal terms are certainly those of the tenth century: *intenzio* "dispute", *concilio* "meeting" or "tribunal", *firmitades* "guarantees", *placitum* "lawsuit", *soposida* "bad faith", *rogadores* "investigators", *decimu* "tithe", *anuizione* "admission of error" (as in Portuguese *carta de agnição*), etc. It would have been absurd, from every point of view, legal, linguistic and practical, for the scribe to try to latinize the terminology semantically.

The vocabulary of the document is that of the age, not of a thousand years before. Almost all the personal names are Germanic, as is the second part of the toponym *villaredi* (< VILLA FRITHS); so is the verb *sacar*, which had a precise legal significance in Germanic. There are derived forms, composed of free morphemes and affixes which existed but had not been combined in the Roman Empire, such as *diuindigauit*, *inquiedatione*, *adrouorabit*; the root and the affix are not new but their combination is. The ecclesiastical terms are of Greek origin. That is, the scribe used the vocabulary of the time, even though it was written in unreformed spelling.

Inflectional morphology is of interest, too. Except in the pronouns, there was no nominal morphology in Ibero-Romance other than markers of number and of gender. But the main traditional inflections were taught to scribes in their training, so they knew what they were; yet, in most of the texts of this time, it becomes clear that the scribe had only a hazy idea of when to use which ending. That is, they knew their morphology but not their syntax. This may be connected with the fact that the main Grammar book, if they had one at all, was the fourth-century *Ars Minor* of Aelius Donatus, which concentrated on morphology and had nothing to say about syntax. So some of the morphological choices can look chaotic, as if the scribe had chosen the endings more or less at random; in this document, for example, ... *de suos filios nominib~ gontigio et amarelo pr~* But he does know what the actual endings were; he doesn't, for example, invent endings that didn't exist (such as an ***-erum* or ***-irum* on the analogy of *-orum* y *-arum*).

The verbal morphology, however, looks far more like the older Latin; this is because Ibero-Romance had not changed the verbal inflectional system in the same wholesale way as the nominal. Thus the spoken ending [-ów] which had developed in Galicia from the original -AVIT was represented by the letters *-auit*, which had been taught to the scribe as a whole unit, in the same way as the form *ipse* had been taught him for [í-se]. The original final [-t] of these verb forms was no longer pronounced there, but in the third person past verb forms the letter *-t* is written here every time: *abuit*, *sacauit*, *diuindigauit*, *fundauit*, *auidauit*, *coliuuit* (in error for *coluit*), *fuit*, *anouit*, *cedauit* (although the original form had been the irregular *cessit*), and *adrouorabit* (with the letter *-b-* more

usual in the future, although here the word has past meaning); there is also the form *inrubit* ("broke") with *-bit*; while the eleven other cases of the third person singular (that is, those that did not end in *-uit*) all lack the normative but silent final letter *-t*: *mane*, *dicia*, *era*, *comparara*, *relinqui*, *abuisse*, *facia*, *rouorara*, *eisisse*, *fecese*, *disera*. Among these there are three third-person singular forms of the past subjunctive, in which the inflection then pronounced in Galicia as [-í-se] is written in three different ways, all wrong: *abuisse* with *-ise*, *eisisse* [ej-çé-se] with *-isse*, and *fecese* with *-ese*. We can deduce from all this evidence that the scribe had been taught to use the written form *-uit* for the past indicative, but had received no such instruction concerning the past subjunctive (or if he had, he hadn't taken it in: the correct form of the inflection would have been *-isset*).

As regards the syntax of this document, we can see that the preferred word order is VSO, Verb-Subject-Object, particularly, but not only, in subordinate clauses: e.g. ... *quia dicia Sagulfus presbiter quia era sua ereditate* ("[VSO] which said Sagufe that [VS] was his inheritance"); *et sacauit gontigio frater suas escrituras* ("and [VSO] drew out Gontigio his documents"); ... *quia comparara Gontigio ipsa ereditate* ("that [VSO] had bought Gontigio that inheritance"); ... *et postea coluit gontigio presbiter ipse sagulfu* ("and then [VSO] raised Gontigio that Sagufe") ... *et postea inrubit ipse sagulfus presbiter ipso placitum* ("and [VSO] then broke that Sagufe that agreement"), etc. Verb-Subject-Object was the unmarked order of speech at that time, but it had not been the unmarked order of the language of a thousand years earlier. Word order is not mentioned in the grammars: nobody has said anything to the scribe about that in his training, so he naturally writes in his normal word order (Blake 1991/96).

So we see that the morphology, the semantics, the syntax and the vocabulary of this document are those of the speech of tenth century Galicia. That speech is usually referred to by modern specialists as being Ibero-Romance, so it would seem to make sense to say that this document was written in Ibero-Romance. The only aspect of the text which isn't Ibero-Romance is the spelling, the written form of the words, because the scribe was not trying to reproduce the phonetics of his speech in a direct transcription but to achieve the traditionally correct forms which he had been taught. That is merely normal. When we write a modern English text now, we represent on the paper the modern English morphology, semantics, syntax and vocabulary, using an old spelling system which is far from being a transcription. But that mismatch doesn't stop our text from being in modern English. That just is the way we write our own language. In the same way, even though the scribe would have referred to his own language as being Latin (pronounced [la-dí-no]), I see no good reason for modern analysts not to call the language of a text like this "Ibero-Romance". It is true that a new systematic spelling system was not going to be invented for the language for another couple of centuries, but that seems a comparatively irrelevant consideration. Those semantic, lexical, morphological and syntactic features of this kind of text which look like Ibero-Romance need no further explanation for the way they appear; such as, for example, the meaning of the word written as *ipse*, which has the meaning which it has in these texts because the scribe had such semantics in his lexical entry for, and in his use of, the word. Those aspects of these documents which do not look like reconstructable Ibero-Romance can usually be explained through the scribe's training; for example, *ipse* has a letter *p* here because he was told to write it that way. Unsurprisingly, the same general truths applied in 991 A.D. as they do today.

Latinists, however, do not see it this way. They tend to see the language of such a text as being Latin, arguing solely from the orthography. Yes, they call it "bad Latin", "corrupt Latin", "decadent Latin", even "barbarous Latin", but always "Latin", even though from this perspective these texts have been written with astounding ignorance,

incompetence and stupidity. But historians would prefer not to think that the royal, ecclesiastical and aristocratic houses regularly employed scribes who were incompetent, stupid, ignorant, barbarous, corrupt, decadent and bad. Emiliano (e.g. 2002, 2003, 2005, 2008) has demonstrated without any doubt that the scribes of this time and place were not barbarous, but working intelligently in a difficult context where the written language as taught was ever diverging from the one they spoke. And this is a theme worth stressing: most of the scribes of the tenth-century Asturian-Leonese kingdom were intelligent. They were not capricious barbarians making daft errors at random. If we do our best to work out from their texts how they were taught and what they were trying to do, we can use their evidence as crucial aids to understanding the language of the time (this is the essence of sociophilology). And thus, as long as we remember that they were trying to achieve the spellings standardized over a millennium earlier, we can take the semantics, the vocabulary, the syntax and even to some extent the morphology of documents of this type at almost face value.*

*Wright (2010) is a related study in Spanish of these and several further aspects of the same document; we are grateful to the volume's editor, Ana María Cano, for permission to develop some of those arguments here. The present chapter is itself expanded, including a suggested phonetic transcription of a reading of the document, in one currently in press with the proceedings of the 59th *Settimana di Studio* of Spoleto.

References

- Robert Blake, 1991/96, 'Syntactic aspects of Latinate texts of the early Middle Ages', in Wright (ed.), pp.219-32.
- Wendy Davies, 2007, *Acts of Giving: individual, community and church in Tenth-Century Christian Spain* (Oxford, Oxford University Press).
- António Emiliano, 2000, 'O mais antigo documento latino-português (882 a.D.) – edição e estudo grafémico', *Verba* 26, 7-42.
- António Emiliano, 2003, 'O estudo dos documentos notariais latino-portugueses e a história da língua portuguesa', *Signo* 11, 77-126.
- António Emiliano, 2005, 'Representational models vs. operational models of literacy in Latin-Romance legal documents (with special reference to Latin-Portuguese texts)', in Roger Wright and Peter Ricketts (eds), *Studies on Ibero-Romance Linguistics dedicated to Ralph Penny* (Newark [Delaware], Juan de la Cuesta), pp.17-58.
- António Emiliano, 2008, 'O conceito de *latim bárbaro* na tradição filológica portuguesa: algumas observações gerais sobre pressupostos e factos (scripto-)linguísticos', in Javier Elvira et al. (eds), *Lenguas, reinos y dialectos en la Edad Media ibérica* (Madrid, Iberoamericana /Frankfurt, Vervuert), pp.191-231.
- Tom Finbow, 2008, 'Limiting logographic Latin: (non-)separation of orthographic words in Medieval Iberian writing', in Roger Wright (ed.), *Latin tardif ~ latin vulgaire VIII: actes du VIIIe colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif* (Hildesheim, Olms), pp.521-31.
- Alexandre Herculano de Carvalho e Araujo and Joaquim Jose da Silva Mendes Leal, 1867, *Portugaliae Monumenta Historica, Diplomata et Chartae* (Lisbon, Academia Real das Ciências).
- József Herman, 2000, *Vulgar Latin* (Pennsylvania, Penn State Press).
- Ramón Menéndez Pidal, 7a ed., 1972, *Orígenes del español* (Madrid, Espasa-Calpe).

- Henrique Monteagudo, 2008, *Letras primeiras: o Foral de Burgo de Caldelas, os primordios da lírica trobadoresca e a emerxencia do galego escrito* (A Coruña, Barrié de la Maza).
- Carmen Pensado, 1991/96, 'How was Leonese Vulgar Latin read?', in Wright (ed.), pp.190-204.
- Maurilio Pérez González, 2008, 'El latín medieval diplomático', *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* [*Bulletin du Cange*] 66, 47-101.
- Birte Stengaard, 1991/96, 'The combination of glosses in the *Códice Emilianense* 60 (*Glosas Emilianenses*)', in Wright (ed.), pp.177-89.
- R. Larry Trask, 2000, *The Dictionary of Historical and Comparative Linguistics* (Edinburgh, University Press).
- Marieke Van Acker et al. (eds), 2008, *Latin écrit - roman oral? De la dichotomisation à la continuité* (Turnhout, Brepols).
- Roger Wright, 1982, *Late Latin and Early Romance, in Spain and Carolingian France* (Liverpool, Francis Cairns).
- Roger Wright, 1991, 'La enseñanza de la ortografía en la Galicia de hace mil años', *Verba* 18, 5-25.
- Roger Wright, 1995, 'The teaching of orthography in tenth-century Galicia', in *Early Ibero-Romance* (Newark [Delaware], Juan de la Cuesta), pp.181-208.
- Roger Wright, 2003, *A Sociophilological Study of Late Latin* (Turnhout, Brepols).
- Roger Wright, 2004, 'La representación escrita del romance en el Reino de León entre 1157 y 1230', in José María Fernández Catón (ed.), *Orígenes de las lenguas romances en el reino de León, siglos IX-XII* (León, Archivo Histórico Diocesano), vol.I, pp.273-93.
- Roger Wright, 2005, 'El léxico y la lectura oral', *Revista de Filología Española* 85, 133-49.
- Roger Wright, 2010, 'Gontigius, Sagulfus, Domitria y el hijo de muchos otros buenos', in Ana María Cano González (ed.), *Homenaxe al Profesor Xosé Lluís García Arias* (Oviedo, Academia de la Llingua Asturiana), pp.407-20.
- Roger Wright (ed.), 1991/96, *Latin and the Romance Languages in the Early Middle Ages* (London, Routledge; reprint: Pennsylvania, Penn State Press).