

Part II:

Language and Texts in the Iberian
Peninsula before 1080

9 On Editing 'Latin' Texts Written by Romance-speakers'

EDITORS OF EARLY MEDIEVAL texts need to be continuously aware of the difference between *Grammatica* as used by Germanic- (or Celtic-) speakers and as used by Romance-speakers in the Early Middle Ages. The theme of this article is that modern editors of such texts from Spain are too often inclined to act as if the authors were not Romance-speakers, and follow a depressing and unhelpful tradition of seeing the early medieval Romance/Latin relationship as being analogous to the Germanic/Latin relationship. It was not.

1. FOR ROMANCE-SPEAKERS, GRAMMATICA = WRITING

The differences derive from the fact that *Grammatica* was taught in different ways in different language communities. The historical origins of the difference need to be appreciated. All early Medieval Education was based on the teaching and learning of *Ars Grammatica*. The words *Ars Grammatica* were originally connected specifically with writing. The *Ars Minor* and *Ars Secunda* (or *Ars Maior*) of the fourth-century Grammarian Aelius Donatus were compiled for the benefit of people who spoke as their native language fourth-century vernacular Latin; what philologists of some schools call 'Proto-Romance.' These works, plus the commentaries based on them, became the basis for linguistic education for

¹ This is the revised text of a lecture given at the Warburg Institute, University of London, in June 1990, and also at the University of Oslo, Norway, in September 1990. I am grateful for comments made by participants at these occasions.

centuries afterwards. The fifth-century grammarians, such as Consentius, Pompeius, Servius and Sergius, worked within the same atmosphere, still essentially considering the formal registers of a language which they and their readers already spoke. These grammarians were thus, in modern terms, not specialists in the teaching of Latin as a foreign language, but specialists in Linguistics, with particular reference to the demands of writing. In sixth-century Italy, Cassiodorus maintained, in his work on language, a similar focus on deciding which were the supposedly 'correct' forms to be used in written texts; his grammatical works were intended to help copyists at Vivarium, who were also native speakers of the language. In sixth-century France, Caesarius of Arles tried hard to encourage his flock to be literate in the language which they already had. In the seventh century, the first chapter of Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae* was essentially a derivative grammar based on the fifth-century African commentators on Donatus. He too, and his successors such as Julián de Toledo, were teaching their readers about the smart and formal way to operate and analyze the language they already spoke, that is, seventh-century Spanish. Early Romance/Late Latin (in this period we can as justifiably call their language the one as the other).

The grammarians mentioned hitherto, and others, were writing for the benefit of students who were native speakers of the language in question, training them in the arts of writing, reading, and to some extent analysing, the language they already had. The students could already be expected to pronounce it, use the normal grammar of speech, and know the basic vocabulary, and did not need to be taught that; features which had by and large slipped out of spoken Latin, however, such as many of the noun inflections, did need to be taught, which is why so much of the Grammarians' attention lay precisely there. But all, including the Grammarians, spoke the language of their time and place, and the techniques of writing professionally (*Ars Grammatica*) were aimed at producing respectably traditional-looking forms of that same language. Recent historical research suggests that in early medieval Romance communities few people could write, more could read, and almost everybody (then as now) could understand written texts read aloud

with care. To the Romance speaker, Latin texts were not in a foreign language.²

2. FOR NON-ROMANCE SPEAKERS, *GRAMMATICA* = ANOTHER LANGUAGE

The teaching of Latin-as-a-foreign-language only began, naturally enough, where there was a community of non-Latin speakers who wished to learn to read written Latin texts. It is in eighth-century England that we begin to see a change in the nature of grammarians' texts; everything about Latin had to be taught there from scratch, for the students there had no advance native expertise.³ The Anglo-Saxon scholars had some knowledge of the works of the Visigothic writers of Spain, and also some personal contacts with speakers of Early Romance from France and Italy. It is possible that there were native Romance-speakers around in Anglo-Saxon England who were able to demonstrate personally (in *Grammatica* classes) linguistic features that were taken for granted in the preexisting continental works of linguistics. This could be paralleled today, if a non-English-speaking community wished to learn English but only had the works of English-speaking theoretical linguists such as Halliday to guide them; the books are not totally useless for the purpose, but the students would need considerable extra guidance from native speakers who already know the language well, or they do not even get to square one. Yet the influence of Early-Romance speakers in Anglo-Saxon England was, so far as we can see, not decisive in the establishment of the nature of Anglo-Saxon Latin. In pronunciation, for example, the phonology of eighth-century Anglo-Saxon Latin owed more to the phonology of Anglo-Saxon than it did to the phonology of the native speakers of any part of the former Roman Empire. We can deduce this, at least, from the nature

² These arguments were developed at greater length in the first two chapters of Wright (1982).

³ The best work on the use of *Grammatica* in non-Romance countries is Law (1982). As she shows in another study (1987), these Grammarians were actively reshaping the received tradition for their own community's different needs.

of the alliterative and rhyming techniques of Early Medieval Insular virtuosos poetry.

There were other Anglo-Saxon intellectuals with pedagogical linguistic interests, but the key initial figure is Bede. He kept a notebook of useful points that had come up in his pedagogical experience, covering orthography, grammar, inflectional morphology, derivational morphology, lexis and semantics, and even phonetics, although it seems only in connection with syllable-division in the choir. This work is practical and pedagogical, although essentially addressed to other teachers rather than to his students, and collectively has the air of being an aid to the 'Latin as a foreign language' teacher. When he adapts details from his sources, he does so for the practical purposes of his own community. It is unfortunate that this work has come to be given the misleading title of *De Orthographia*, for it is not especially concerned with spelling.⁴ Bede established personally a tradition of eighth-century Insular Latin learning, which was in a number of ways rather different from that current in contemporary Romance-speaking Europe. Eighth-century written texts followed the same models, and ostensibly the same grammar, wherever they were written. But in the case of Germanic-speakers, including in due course those on the Continent speaking varieties of Germanic other than Anglo-Saxon, they were writing a foreign language that was self-evidently not their own vernacular. They were bilingual, and this foreign language was uniquely defined for them by the Grammarians (and their commentators).

They had to learn everything from teachers. This included pronunciation. The way the Anglo-Saxon speaker learned and was taught to pronounce was on the basis of written texts. They knew, as they learned, the written form of a word right from the first moment that they encountered it. The teachers offered it to them in written form, and they based their pronunciations on that preexisting written form. This had one significant consequence in particular; in the Germanic-speakers' *Grammatica* classes, every written letter in a word gave rise to a sound. There were to be no

⁴ Dionisotti (1982:122) sees it as "a reference work for the Library."

silent letters. This was a natural consequence of the general inability of the Early Medieval Grammarians, just like first-year language students today, to distinguish letters from sounds. Not only that, but each written letter (or digraph) was meant to give rise to the same sound in every circumstance, wherever it appeared in the written form. Thus, in the British Isles, the spelling determined the pronunciation. This is, of course, completely the opposite of what all people (including speakers of Early Romance) do with their own native language, where they pronounce the words first in speech, and only write them much later, if at all. Isidore's clientele knew their language anyway, having learned it in the ordinary manner as children, whether or not they ever learned later to read or write. Morphological features such as the paradigms demonstrating the endings of nouns (*declinationes nominum*), however, would have been useful in both traditions; in seventh-century Spain they were needed, and explicitly taught, because they were largely unused in speech, but encountered in reading and needed for writing.

3. EARLY ROMANCE

It is worth reminding ourselves of what the linguistic situation of seventh- and eighth-century Western Romance-speaking Europe was like. It was (*mutatis mutandis*) rather like that of Modern English or Modern French, a huge geographical area whose language, Early Romance, contained within it a wide variety of linguistic alternatives; there were alternative items of vocabulary, different grammatical ways of expressing the same idea, different phonetic ways of pronouncing the same word, but it still remained in essence a single speech-community.⁵ All such wide single speech-communities have within them enormous variety, not only geographical but also stylistic, sociolinguistic, contextual, and even variation between young and old, male and female, rich and poor, etc. Such variation within a single language is not only normal but useful for all sorts of practical purposes (what linguists now call

⁵ On this see several studies in Wright (ed., 1991) and McKitterick (ed., 1990), Herman (1988), Banniard (1989).

'pragmatics'. A large number of innovating linguistic features had arisen over the centuries, in the way they always do, for no spoken language has ever been fixed, unchanging and static, not even fourth-century Latin. Some of the old Classical forms and constructions were no longer in active use. But it seems reasonable to deduce that the old linguistic features had in several cases not yet dropped out entirely; they would still be understood by those listening to written texts being read aloud, and even active seventh-century Romance speech, for example, could well have included both the old-fashioned accusative and infinitive constructions and the new *quod* plus indicative constructions which seem in retrospect to have neatly taken their place, both the old-fashioned genitive endings of nouns and the new-fashioned equivalents with the preposition *de*, both old words such as *equus* and new words such as *caballus*. In general, then, the Romance language of the time contained both old and new grammatical features, but only the reconstructably evolved phonetics, writing and talking involved statistically different proportions of the relevant competing morphosyntactic and lexical forms (as in modern English) rather than any rigid apartheid between literate and illiterate, which (as Harvey and others have pointed out) is otherwise unattested and thoroughly improbable on many grounds.⁶ This was essentially the nature of Iberian Romance until the second millennium.

When speakers from this pulsating, lively, versatile, flexible, rich, complex, but monolingual Early Romance speech community came to learn to write—if they ever did, for most of them did not—they were hit at once by the artificial restrictions of the old Donatus tradition. Early Medieval Romance was—to the eternal disappointment of all Romance philologists—not permitted to appear neat on parchment as in an exact phonetic transcription. Prescriptive Grammarians, then as now, are always restrictive. They always interpret their function as that of specifying as 'correct' in a written context just some, out of the wide existing variety, of the forms, expressions, constructions and words available in the wider community. They see their job in moral terms; variations are not

⁶ See Harvey (1990), Herman (1990), Alarcos (1982), Wright (1991b).

merely formal versus informal, innovating versus archaic, characteristic of one geographical area rather than another, and so on, but—in writing, at least—as 'correct' or 'incorrect'. Whereas Latin for the non-Romance speaker was uniquely defined by the *Grammatica*, the Romance-speaker's language had a much wider range of usage of which the *Grammatica* only prescribed a sub-section as being acceptable in writing. The same happens today; native English-speaking University lecturers in Spanish-as-a-foreign-language usually have a considerably narrower idea of what is permissible Spanish than the native Spanish-speaking *lectores* who are their colleagues. As Franco (1985) has pointed out, for example, the rules that we teach students concerning the need to use *estar* rather than *ser* in locative senses are not always followed by native speakers (who can at times be heard saying *¿dónde es...?*).

This debilitating tendency to see a moral order in grammatical details hampers later generations of Romance-speakers who depend, when writing, on the earlier grammarians' prescriptions which have by then become traditional. The eighth-century spoken Romance community in general, and continuing to the twelfth century in the Iberian Peninsula, is alive and sophisticated, capable of communicating and interacting orally as well then as people are now, but Romance-speaking scribes were told in their training that in writing they ought to follow the traditional prescriptions and only include on paper those linguistic features that had been blessed as 'correct' in the fourth century A.D. (with in practice the addition of some declensional subtypes of ecclesiastical words taken from Greek). This limitation was by then doubly restricting, because several of these forms deemed 'correct' in the Late Empire had largely disappeared from most active speech four hundred years later (ablative cases of nouns, synthetic passives, etc.), and the proportion of available eighth-century variants that coincided with the fourth-century moral perceptions was lower than it had been originally. And yet, in Romance Europe, people did succeed in writing; the 'Renaissance' of Visigothic Spain had made Spain the most educated area of the seventh century, and its intellectual traditions continued, both in nominally Christian and nominally Moslem Spain, to flourish well into the tenth century, producing a large number of written works, some of which survive. Collins

deduced that tenth-century Leonese society was just as dependent on documentation as that of tenth-century Catalonia, despite the fact that Catalonia was, and León was not, an area where the Carolingian Latin-Romance distinction operated.⁷

4. THE PRACTICAL PROBLEM

Here we get to the serious practical problem. The original works of Isidore, Ildefonso, Eugenio de Toledo, Julián de Toledo, Eulogio de Córdoba, Alvaro de Córdoba, the ninth-century Asturian historians, and so on, were written by speakers of Early Romance; their speech was more versatile than were the written forms that they were taught were acceptable, and, although they knew their *Grammatica*, features of their ordinary speech habits are at times observable in the early manuscripts, including such erudite productions as those of the greatest scholar of the age [Isidore] and the texts of the Mozarabic liturgy. So we find there, for example, *se* used instead of synthetic passives, prepositions used instead of case endings, theoretically neuter plural nouns used as the feminine singulars that they had become in speech, theoretically third-conjugation verbs used with the fourth-conjugation endings that they had often acquired in speech, etc., etc. The writers had been taught according to an already ancient tradition about which features of speech could and could not be included, but as time had gone on more and more normal spoken features theoretically could not be written, and they were not always successfully kept out of the texts.

The problem is that subsequent editors have misunderstood the essential distinction that we need to make. These Early Medieval Romance-speakers were writing the language they already spoke, following ancient restrictions; unlike the Germanic-speakers, they were not trying to write in a foreign language. Those modern editors, from Ambrosio de Morales in the sixteenth century, who 'corrected' the voluminous original work of Eulogio de Córdoba out of all authenticity, up to the recent editors of Isidore's *Etymologiae* who scorn the readings of the early manuscripts, do an enormous

⁷ Collins [1985], cp. also, Collins [1989].

disservice to scholarship, assuming that these Romance-speakers had been taught Latin-as-a-foreign-language in the same way as the Germanic-speakers were, and that the Romance-speakers were trying to write in the restrictive foreign language rather than in an archaic but nevertheless 'correct' style of their own language which they had been led to believe was morally preferable. In short, I would plead with all editors of early medieval texts from Romance Europe—as do most of the contributors to the special issue of *Speculum* for January 1990 (on 'The New Philology'), and Law [1982]—not to emend their early manuscripts at all. Oroz Reta's comments at the start of his recent edition of the *Etymologiae* are little short of grotesque:

...creemos que el texto isidoriano que ofrece la Bibliotheca Oxoniensis, en muchos pasajes, podía corregirse sin dificultad...en modo alguno podíamos pensar en realizar un estudio o análisis de los numerosos códices isidorianos...para ofrecer un texto más puro y correcto...hemos tratado de uniformar las grafías variadas...hemos corregido...creemos que hay que uniformar...

He is, in short, proud to have distorted the original and rendered his edition useless for linguistic research. There is, however, one scholar above all who has aimed to edit these texts professionally: Juan Gil of Seville. As an antidote to the above, note his comment:

Normalmente, al editar la obra de un escritor visigodo, se suele modificar la grafía al uso clásico. Esta corrección, con todo, entraña no pocos peligros; falsea el aspecto externo de un texto, regulariza grafías que no regularizaron nunca sus propios autores, encubre fenómenos fonéticos y en ocasiones atenta contra los mismos usos ortográficos visigodos.

Gil is referring here not only to spelling but also to morphological features. This important article came out in 1973, but seems not to have had the effect it deserves.⁸

5. HOW THE ROMANCE WEST WAS LOST

Unfortunately, nowadays, in the Romance-speaking world, people do not think of themselves as Latin-speakers any more, and (like Germanic-speakers) they do now think of Latin as a foreign language, different from their own Portuguese, Catalan, Venetian, etc. The way in which this conceptual distinction arose is at the forefront of debate in contemporary Romance philology. I have long expressed, and still hold, the view that this conceptual distinction began at the point where the two traditions clashed, where the Germanic view of Latin as a foreign language, whose grammar was defined uniquely by the prescriptions of Grammarians and untouched by the enormous vitality of eighth-century spoken Romance, came into startled contact with the versatility and liveliness of that speech, and recoiled in horror. That is, to be more precise, the appointment of Alcuin of York to reform the Carolingian education system. The distinction between Latin and vernacular was obvious to a Germanic-speaker, naturally, and Alcuin and his group wished to introduce that distinction into the education system of Romance Europe as well. So they presided over the conscious invention of a new conceptual distinction, between Latin and Romance, and Romance-speakers in at least some of the Carolingian cultural centers of the ninth and tenth centuries began to be taught, on Anglo-Saxon lines, Latin as a foreign language, with a grammar, a vocabulary, and even a pronunciation distinguishably separate from even the most formal styles of their own native language as spoken in France, Catalonia and Northern Italy. [Incidentally, I do not wish to be accused of fostering a 'great man' view of history; the consequences of Alcuin's prejudices were almost

⁸ These quotations are from Oroz's edition of Isidore (1982:258-59)—of which Díaz y Díaz's Introduction is excellent—and Gil (1973:193), which is relevant for all texts up to the twelfth century (and sheds also an interesting light on the *Historia Roderici*, p.223).

totally pernicious.) Eventually this invented conceptual distinction spread out of the Carolingian Empire into the rest of the Iberian Peninsula, Italy, and elsewhere, and in due course it came to seem so obvious and natural and normal that Dante, in his *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, thought it had always existed. But the distinction, even in France, took time to become generally accepted and spread beyond progressive Church circles; on the whole it seems that students in France were not generally taught to make a conceptual Latin / Romance distinction till after the millennium, still previously on the whole being taught to write in a particular style of the language they had rather than being taught from scratch a whole foreign language.⁹ As suggested above, in Spain, this stage probably lasts until at least 1080 and for most purposes until after 1200; that is, in Spain, as in France, the eventual triumph of the dead hand of restricting Germanic pedagogy over the preexisting complex Romance monolingualism took a long time to be generally accepted. My own recent studies of the *Vita Dominici Siliensis* (of the 1080s) and the *Chronica Adefonsi Imperatoris* (c. 1147) suggest that the Latin-Romance metalinguistic distinction which seems so obvious to us now, as if it had always existed, was not consciously felt then (and, as Niederehe pointed out, was not entirely clear even to Alfonso el Sabio).¹⁰ This means that all texts from pre-12th century non-Catalan Spain, and quite possibly most of those from the 12th century as well, are in written Romance, rather than, as usually stated, corrupt and barbaric Latin.

I have discussed the implications of this reevaluation at some length elsewhere with reference to the *Chronicle of Alfonso III*. Fortunately this Chronicle (originally from the royal court of late ninth-century Oviedo) has been luckier in its modern editors than has poor Isidore; Bonnar's edition (1987) is stultifyingly classicizing, but the editions of Prelog (1980) and above all Gil et al. (1985) are intelligently and accurately presented in such a way that we can watch how successive adaptations of the text gradually formalized

⁹ See McKittrick (1989), Van Uytfanghe (1989, 1991), and the long Introduction to Guerreau-Jalabert (1982).

¹⁰ The references are to Wright (1993), Wright (1992b), and Niederehe (1987:102).

an original that began essentially in written Romance.¹¹ In France, the textual evidence of pre-reform compositions was often doctored ('emended') into apparent respectability by Carolingian and post-Carolingian scholars. They did this themselves to the Benedictine rule, for example, as well as to many of the texts of the early Fathers of the Church, and to their own *Annales Regni Francorum*, and almost certainly to large numbers of other earlier texts that only now survive in post-Carolingian manuscripts. And from being taught that this 'correction' was what they were supposed to carry out, gradually students and editors came to be taught that the original writers must have got it 'right,' and that everything which Donatus would not have approved of must have been introduced by careless copyists because they could not have been there in the original, hence Ambrosio de Morales' assumption that he was right to distort the evidence of his manuscript, as if Eulogio de Córdoba was a closet Anglo-Saxon, as if Eulogio had been writing a non-vernacular foreign language defined only by the *Ars Grammatica* tradition rather than writing a formal style of his own speech, such that Ambrosio de Morales presumed that all the non-grammatical features must be the fault of incompetent manuscript copyists. But we know, particularly as regards twelfth-century Spain (and later), that copyists were more likely to distort their originals by making 'corrections' of their pre-Reform originals, rather than by introducing errors. There is no need for us to do the same.

6. AFTER THE SEPARATION

We have seen that before 800, and in many cases later, Romance-speakers, if they were taught to write at all, were taught how to write acceptably the language which they already spoke, according to an ancient tradition which ruled out of acceptability a large number of features of their speech. Germanic speakers, on the other hand, were taught only that limited and limiting tradition, Latin as a foreign language, not usually including knowledge of how the language was actually spoken at the time. After 800 the two systems coexist in Carolingian France until eventually—perhaps

¹¹ Wright (1991b) considers this in more detail.

after a couple of centuries in several places—the view of Latin as being a foreign language became normal, in due course this conceptual separation became normal in the whole Romance-speaking world. In Spain the definitive dissociative process accompanied the invention and general spread of undisguised vernacular writing and the Latin-teaching reforms consequent on the Lateran Council of 1215 and the Council of Valladolid of 1228.

It was a Pyrrhic victory. For it was precisely in places where Latin was taught and learned and conceived of as a separate language from native vernacular that works were also written in a new form based on that vernacular; this explains why works in Germanic vernaculars seem to appear in written form before those in French, Provençal, Catalan, Sicilian, Castilian, etc. But this apparent precedence of Germanic texts is a mirage. Before the change in perspective in Romance areas, Romance indeed had a written form, but to us, looking back from much later, that form appears to be 'Latin.' The texts in consciously reformed nontraditional spelling and morphology that we call now 'Old French,' 'Old Provençal,' 'Old Castilian' (etc.) emerged from centers of expert Latinity only after this metalinguistic change, in places (such as St Amand, Fleury, San Millán, Palencia, Toledo, San Fernando's chancery, etc.) where it seems probable that Latin had recently started being taught and learned as a foreign language from the normal Romance vernacular, and as a result the vernacular came in due course to appear to need a new separate written guise. It cannot be pointed out too often that the earliest 'Romance' texts were in fact elaborated by expert Latinists in progressive cultural centers; the reason for that was that nobody else saw any point in making such a distinction until Latin [*Grammatica*] was generally conceived of as being a different language from normal speech. It is time to discard forever the ridiculous idea, still apparently current, that early texts in written vernacular form were produced by and for the illiterate; on the contrary, by definition, the illiterate could not write at all, and those that could read or write would (as in the modern English-speaking world) find a phonetic script harder to use than the traditional forms. (The practical mechanics of the changeover in the Iberian Peninsula have been illuminated by Emiliano (1988, 1991)). Eventually, in this new guise, written medieval Romance languages

were able to capture their own oral spontaneity, vitality and life (as we see in their literature)—which had been there in speech all along, but impermissible in writing—, whereupon the dead hand of reformed *Grammatica* could be left to the pedants.

7. AN UNSCIENTIFIC ANALOGY

Consider the following analogy. In the year 2000 a reform of the United States education system is entrusted to a politically powerful group of Arabs, who have only learned English as a foreign language uniquely defined by the Grammar books, use in speech as a result only the most formal grammar, and pronounce every written letter (such as to be often unintelligible to the natives), but write it according to the same rules as the English-speakers in the U.S.A. The Arab scholars' leader (Mohammed Al-Kwin) is empowered to insist that everyone in the best Universities should speak as he does (at least, in formal situations), and indeed, within a century or so this artificial system comes to be normal in U.S. higher education. This system, already normal in the non-English speaking world, effectively excludes the majority of English-speakers in the U.S. from understanding what used to be merely the written form of their own language. So eventually someone thinks of the idea of writing spoken U.S. English according to a reformed writing system—for, say, oaths sworn in court, sermons, popular poems. The new vernacular writing systems are taken up in the rest of the English-speaking world, until eventually, after another century, the distinction between English-as-a-foreign language (Grammar) and regional vernaculars (formerly seen as variants of English, but now separately called e.g., Australian, Indian, British, etc.) comes to seem natural everywhere. Meanwhile Arab and Arab-trained scholars rewrite the text of the works of American writers of pre-2000, in order that they can fit their preconceptions of how they 'ought' to have been written (excising *didn't* for *did not*, *gonna* for *going to*, *thru* for *through*, etc.).

Under such circumstances, would it be right for subsequent scholars to regard the surviving original versions of works by J. D. Salinger, Philip Roth, etc., as being in barbarous Grammar rather than merely in the written mode of their own vernacular? Would it not be preferable to edit them without such emendation? Let us not,

therefore, in the real world do the same to early Spanish medieval texts, for they too were originally in the written mode of their author's vernacular.

8. NINE CONCLUSIONS

1. All Spanish texts from before 1080, and most from before 1200, need to be edited without any emendation at all from the earliest manuscript(s), rather than changed as a result of what anachronistic preconceptions lead editors to think 'ought' to have been written instead. This applies not only to Histories, but all varieties of legal documents, including *fueros*, Church Councils (such as the 1055 Council of Coyanza), hagiography, and indeed everything else. Ideally, facsimiles of the manuscripts would be available (as the latest editors of Merovingian documentation realize: see the comments of Ganz and Goffart, 1990), but they are often not clear enough in themselves. Conversely, García Larragueta's (1984:123-46) attempt at a typescript facsimile of the *Glosas Emilianenses*, for example, clarifies Olarte Ruiz's photographic facsimile (1977), but would be misleading on its own (in that it resolves some abbreviations and is not free of misprints).

This is in no way a revolutionary suggestion. It is, for example, what is prescribed by the *Asociación de Lingüística y Filología de la América Latina* for its forthcoming publications of documents. Quoting Gil again (1973:208): 'la tarea es difícil, pero la única manera de cumplirla es respetar al máximo—no me cansaré nunca de repetirlo—las gráficas de los manuscritos.'

2. This fidelity should include a resistance to any temptation to resolve abbreviations at all, for in practice the way abbreviations are resolved begs many questions. Abbreviations were intended to be recognized, but the unit to be recognized was meant to be the lexical word rather than the omitted letters, that is, for example, whether we resolve *nro* as *nostro* or *nuestro*, or *tēs* as *testis* or *testigo* (etc.), our decision probably results in giving a misleading impression.

3. Since the texts in question are written in the formal version of Spanish Romance, rather than a barbarously unsuccessful attempt at another language entirely, we should stop insulting

their language and their authors. We cannot seriously explain the language of the Rotense version of the Chronicle of Alfonso III simply with the theory that the Asturians were all barbarously stupid and corrupt, for we know from historical research how enterprising and resourceful ninth- and tenth-century Asturians actually were. Similarly, the present nature of the *Fuero de Valfermoso de las Monjas* is better described as the result of a serious attempt at formalizing the vernacular than of a crass attempt at writing another language entirely.

4. Etymologists should realize that all the texts in question are evidence for Spanish vocabulary. It is inappropriate that Corominas should adduce the first attestation of a Spanish word (in his etymological dictionary) as of necessity being one that is spelled incorrectly in cases where the same word 'correctly' spelled is attested earlier. *Camisa*, for example, is given by Corominas a first documentation date of 899, despite being attested as *camisiam* in Isidore's *Etymologiae* XIX.21.1. (Corominas & Pascual 1980:787)

5. The computerized dictionaries should therefore extend their corpus further back in time also. Not to do so is misleading. For example, the fact that *rege* appears in the late tenth-century *Nodicia de kesos* and also in countless documents and histories, etc., should not be hidden from the enquiring philologist who might otherwise think that the thirteenth century invented the lexical word itself rather than merely the orthographic form *rey* (and *rei*). Oelschlager (1940) glimpsed this truth.¹²

6. Likewise, the exciting CD-ROM project of all old Spanish texts (ADMYTE), sponsored by Professor Faulhaber, would ideally start earlier than it will, since its initial cut-off point depends on an anachronistic dichotomy.

7. Ideally, also, the Madison medieval Spanish publication enterprises should include all such texts (before, let us say, St

¹² Wright (1982:173) reprints the *Nodicia*; *rei* is the form used in what may be the first official document in "written Romance," that is, the Treaty of Cabreros of 1206.

Martin of León) as within their brief.¹³ A chronological line has, however, for practical reasons to be drawn somewhere: I suggest 500 A.D.

8. Let us altogether appreciate that (from the point of view of the authors) there is a greater linguistic continuity between the *Chronicle of Alfonso III* and the *Chronicles of Alfonso X* than between the former and Lucas of Tuy, despite its greater textual similarity with Lucas; that is, both Alfonsos (or their ghosts) formalized their vernacular in the currently prescribed manner.
9. It is thus up to the philologist to work out how notaries in (for example) tenth-century Galicia, speaking in the way that we can reconstruct tenth-century Galicians did, in practice learned to write their texts in the way they did (in particular as regards orthography and morphology). By a strange coincidence, that is exactly what I am currently investigating.

1994 POSTSCRIPT

The earliest version of this lecture was not specifically intended for a Hispanic audience, being delivered to a seminar on Medieval Education at the Warburg Institute, London, in June 1990, and then to another audience of medievalists in the University of Oslo, Norway, in September the same year. The invitation then came to contribute to the *Festschrift* volume for Dennis Seniff, who died in November 1990, so this paper was then expanded and made more specifically Hispanic; thus it was first published in *Linguistic Studies in Medieval Spanish*, ed. by Ray Harris-Northall and Thomas D. Cravens, University of Wisconsin (Madison), Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, 1991, 191-208. The "unscientific analogy" is close enough to make the point clearer, but not, naturally, an exact parallel. Even so, the analogy was used again in a plenary lecture to the 28th International Congress of Medieval Studies in Kalamazoo, Michigan, on May 7th 1993, and seems to have a suitably illuminating effect. The recommendation to

¹³ For St Martin of León, and why he deserves to be considered exceptional, see McCluskey (1989).

Hispanic medievalists to treat all non-Catalan texts from between 500 and San Martín de León as Romance is for practical purposes unlikely to be accepted, but the intrinsic point remains.

10 The Non-Existence of "Leonese Vulgar Latin"

I RECENTLY ELABORATED IN DETAIL (Wright 1982) the theory that the pronunciation of medieval Latin, as we have known it for twelve hundred years, was invented around the year 800 A.D. at the Carolingian court for the original purpose of establishing a fixed standard pronunciation of the offices of the Roman liturgy. According to this view, spoken medieval Latin was based then on the technique (which is still the one generally used today) of pronouncing one specified sound for each written letter of the correct orthographic forms, as if the spelling were also a phonetic script. This technique of spoken medieval Latin was not generally introduced into the Iberian Peninsula until after the adoption of the Roman rites, a process initiated at the Council of Burgos in 1080. Before then the local vernacular Romance was the only language spoken, although when it was written it tended to adopt more archaic morphology and vocabulary. In these centuries I suggest that they did not speak the Latin of the empire, nor the "Leonese Vulgar Latin" envisaged by Menéndez Pidal (1926, 1970: paragraphs 95, 109; subsequently renamed "latín popular arromanzado" by Lapesa, 1980: paragraph 40); all that they spoke was Romance, although naturally this contained within itself all the stylistic, sociolinguistic and geographical variation that all the vernaculars in the world normally do. This perspective, which has the virtue of being simple, and has solved some problems, does however raise further questions that need to be considered; for texts from the Iberian Peninsula, written between the fourth and the eleventh centuries, can hardly be taken to be exact transcriptions corresponding to spontaneous speech. If it is indeed the case that all the Leonese of the ninth century spoke ninth-century Leonese Romance, why did they write in such an

antiquated manner, so unlike their own native language (as we can plausibly reconstruct it)?

As far as spelling is concerned, there is no problem. The "correct" orthography is always the one taught, whatever it may be like. The tenth-century Leonese were taught the traditional orthography. Whether or not it corresponds closely to pronunciation, all such traditional orthographies can function in practice precisely because they are indeed traditionally taught, since the only practical function of any kind of orthography is to aid identification of the corresponding lexical unit. We can hardly believe that in those centuries they understood about or practised phonetic transcriptions in the modern sense, not even the Romans had managed to make clear distinctions between spoken sounds and written letters.

For Menéndez Pidal, the presence of correct orthography was a symptom of a Latin-speaking writer, and the presence of semi-Latinate orthography was a symptom of a similarly "semi-learned" one; but it is safer to limit ourselves to deducing that correct orthography merely indicates a well-taught writer, and semi-Latinate orthography indicates a less skilled writer, without either type of spelling being appropriately taken to be a phonetic transcription of the writer's pronunciation. They were trying to write as they had been taught, and some of them managed that better than others.

Their training had been based for centuries on the *Artes Grammaticæ* of the late Roman Empire; and these also included all the morphological inflections that were needed for correct writing, whether or not they were used in speech. In addition to this, notaries had at their disposal several formulae, and technical legal terms and phrases, which they had learned by heart and could use every day. This means that the formulaic parts of a legal document cannot be used as evidence that their constituent linguistic features belonged to the normal speech of the writers, neither in León in the year 900 nor now. (This distinction between the language of the formulaic and "free" parts of legal documents was cogently made in Sabatini 1965). In every country, the differences that there usually are between notarial language and normal vernacular are internal differences of style rather than between separate languages.

We can expect, then, that the "semi-Latinate" appearance of many texts (as of the one printed here) is caused by the professional training of the notary. The same happens today; lawyers do not want to write in a colloquial style, but neither do they have to learn a wholly different language in order to compose their documents. All they have to do is become skilled in the legal style of their native language. A millennium ago, Leonese lawyers similarly had to learn no more than a particular style of Romance vernacular. As a result, we now find many documents such as the following (taken from Floriano 1951, Vol. I, no. 76, pp. 314-15, slightly corrected to agree with the photocopy Floriano also supplied):

In dei nomine ego dalldi una cum marito meo dauil placuit nouis adque conuenit bono animo et propria nouis fuit uoluntas ut uinderemus uobis argemundo et uxori tue recolre uinea sicuti et uendimus In uilla que uocatur piasca In loco ubi dicitur Illa clausa ad Illo salice medietatem In Ipsa uinea et In Ipsa terra uacabile que Ibi est Iusta Ipsa uinea medietatem. de termino in termino. ad integritatem Ipsas medietates et In terra. et In uinea. cum sua. clusura de giro In giro adpreciatum In solido et quatuor. modios et tu dedisti nobis pro Ipsa uinea et pro Ipsa terra precium qui nobis plahcuit. Id est boue colore nigrum In solido et duos modios et karnarium In tria quartaria. et zibaria tria quartaria et oralem. In semodio et de ipso precio aderato aput uos deuitus non remansit ut ex odierno die et tempore abeat Ipsa uinea et Ipsa terra uobis perpetim abiturum et quitquit de Illut facere uel ludicare uolueritis sit. uobis de nos concessa potestas. si quis aliquis. an nos. aut eredes uel quoliuet omo de parte nostra contra unc factum nostrum uenerit uobis ad Inrumpendum qod non possitis Ipsa terra et Ips uinea post nomine nostro uindicare qualiter Inferamus uobis Ipsa uinea et Ipsa terra duplata quantum de uos fuerit melior[ta] Facta kartula uenditionis die. XIII kalendas Iulias In era docc...Et principe ordomio sedente In asturias ego dalldi anc scriptura uenditionis a me facta manu mea I-I-I feci d. dauit. cognomento. amorellus anc scriptura uenditionis qui fieri uolui manu mea I-I-I feci et testibus tradimus roboranda.

ermolgius scripsit (Signa)

Abbreviations have usually been resolved in my reproduction here as they would have been in the "correct" orthography, but *nfo*, for example, could as easily be resolved when reading aloud into [nwestro] as [nostro]. It was texts like this that encouraged Menéndez Pidal to hypothesize the existence of "Leonese Vulgar Latin," which in his view would have combined Latin grammar and medieval Leonese phonetics. This bill of sale seems to have been prepared on the 19th June 862, the date is unclear at the end, but from the photocopy it looks as if there is only room for one more *c*, or *ci* at most (although Floriano suggested 861, that is, an additional *LX^{viii}*). Here Daildi and her husband David are selling a vine field to Argemundo and his wife Recoire; Daildi and David wrote a cross and *feci* (or just *fe*) and Ermoigius wrote the rest. (These same people reappear in Floriano's documents nos 66 and 72).

This document includes mainly "correct" forms in the formulaic sections such as *In dei nomine*, the date, the final formulae, etc; but even here we can find the usual uncertainties, e.g. as between *b* and *u* in *nouis*, and the lack of a tilde over *scriptura* at the end. But neither in these parts nor in the free sections can we conclude that the details of the written form are close to being transcriptions of the speech of either Daildi or Ermoigius. This is not a transcription, but a stylized version intended thereby to be legally acceptable. Daildi told Ermoigius the relevant details in Leonese Romance, and the notary then "legalized" it. Lawyers in all communities polish their clients' speech in a similar way.

Even so, it is worth considering the further question of how this document would have been read aloud subsequently. Brian Dutton has pointed out—as we would anyway have expected—that legal documents were read aloud, and comprehensible when read aloud, even to illiterate interested parties. The lawyers cannot, obviously, have read the texts aloud as if they were written in phonetic script. That would in any event be extremely difficult, even for modern experts in phonetics. As soon as they recognized the written word, they would say it in its usual Romance phonetic shape, however it happened to be written in the text. Thus those words of this text that existed in normal vernacular in León in 862 would have been

read aloud with their normal phonetics. For example, diphthongization of original [ɔ] and [ɛ] had long been normal, and so when they were read aloud the words *loco* and *boue* automatically contained [we], and the words *terra* and *inrumpendum* contained [ie], as in their normal vernacular. Intervocalic consonants that were originally unvoiced had voiced centuries earlier, and so *loco*, *placuit* and *iudicare*, once recognized as lexical units, were automatically given a [g] ([lweɡo], [plogo], and in León probably [ɟulɡare]), and *duplata* both a [b] and a [d] ([doblada]). The same happens to American English -t- [tomato (təmeɪdɪ), etc.] What had been [t] and [k] in the Latin of the Roman Empire had become palatal affricates, and so *precio* (and *pretio*, if it was written correctly) would have been read aloud as the normal vernacular [pretsjo] and *adprecium* as [apretsjo]. For the same kinds of reason, *ipsa* would have been recognized as the written form of [esa] and automatically read aloud as such, *karnarium* as [karnejo], *salice* as [sawtse], *dedisti* as [diste], *facta* as [feta] (or in Castille [hetʃa]), *quantur* as [kwatʊr], etc. There is no problem at all in this, the English now read the word written *stationer* as [steɪʃnə] and could as [kud], etc., and modern French readers recognize and produce *noeud* as [nø], *quand* as [kɑ̃], *hameau* as [amo], etc. The problem would arise if we had to read them aloud as [stationer], [coud], [noeud], [kuand], [hameau], [loko], [plakuit], [adprekium], [ipsa], etc., and—obviously—when reading it does not ever occur to us to read these words in such a strange way. It is essential not to be misled by spelling, in English the words *you*, *too*, *do*, *shoe*, *grew* and *through* all end in [-u:], whether read aloud or in spontaneous speech, in the same way, there is no reason not to envisage that in tenth-century Castille the written letters -CUL- (as in *oculum*), -LI- (as in *filium*) and G- (as in *gentes*) all represented [ɟ] ([oɟo], [hiɟo], [ɟentes]).

Words that did not survive in the normal vernacular Romance would have been read aloud by analogy with other words spelled in the same way. In this way, *aput* (that is, *apud*) would have been read as [abo], in the same way as *caput* was recognized and read as [kabo], even though it seems likely that the word *apud* was no longer used in spontaneous speech, and we can plausibly suggest that *Kiŕs* would be read with a diphthong, as was *inrumpendum* ([enrumpendo]). (Lange 1966 discusses the vocabulary of two

Portuguese documents of 882 and 897; for *cibaria*, see p.108; for *medietate*, *modios* and *quartaria*, see p.249].

The same applies to the inflectional suffixes, which form a special case within the general vocabulary. They had no problem in reading -um as [o], -i as [-e], -am as [-a], etc. They may perhaps have had more difficulty with some nominatives such as *voluntas*, in which the vernacular form in [-ade] (< -ATEM) came from the accusative case of an imparisyllabic noun, but I suspect they in practice used when reading aloud the usual Romance form [voluntade] in ninth-century León; this is, after all, closer to the written form *voluntas* than are many spoken and written forms of the same word in Modern French, for example. Disyllabic nominal suffixes are interesting cases; -atum and -orum could have been read as [-aro] and [-oro]. These endings almost certainly no longer existed in normal Leonese Romance, but here we are not considering normal vernacular but an archaic register written and then read aloud. In any event, to some extent they avoided these forms in writing; there are none in this text. -ibus could have been read aloud as [-ijos] or [-esos], but I suspect it was read aloud simply as [-es], as in the normal plural of the vernacular word, which by now lacked any such distinctively dative or ablative form: *testibus* as [tjestes], say, or *nobis* as [nos]. (Politzer 1961 argues cogently that -ibus would have been spelled best by those who never used it in speech.) In my view, neither lawyers, nor monks, nor anyone else, is likely to have produced [-bu-] or [-su-] here, neither in speaking, nor in reading aloud a word whose written form ended in -ibus. English lawyers do not pronounce an [l] in *could*, nor French ones [llent] in *veulent* ([vœ:j]).

Verbal affixes could be read in a similar way; -quit as [-ó] (or conceivably still [-ód] in the ninth century), -etur as [-édor], -erit as [-jere], etc. The few words whose form when read aloud like this did not correspond exactly to normal vernacular (for example, synthetic passives), in some cases as a result in changes of word order, would have been thought of as peculiarities of the legal style, as the Spanish future subjunctive (in e.g. *viniere, fuere*) is thought of today. Spontaneously, [-edor] was not normally heard. Similarly, if a modern Spaniard reads Berceo aloud, he or she reads the letters -iere as [-jere], without that necessarily meaning that the future

subjunctive is a feature of their usual speech, and without our referring to them as users of "Ancient Vulgar Castilian."

From documents like this (and no other evidence), in which there are spelling mistakes attributable to vernacular phonetics (for example, here, *recio*, *zibaria*; other documents are "worse"), Menéndez Pidal deduced the existence of a distinct "Leonese Vulgar Latin," spoken by semi-learned people. For him, such forms represented the "voluntary yielding to a common language halfway between the Latin of the schools and the popular Romance" (1970:456, paragraph 109), rather than just being mistakes. In his view, this language had essentially Latin grammar with medieval phonetics (although the famous *Nodicia de kesos*, 1970:24-25, did not even have outdated morphology). This same combination of essentially "correct" grammar with evolved phonetics seems to me to be a distinctive feature of the reading aloud of written texts, and no more than that (see the extensive discussion in Wright 1982:165-73). Menéndez Pidal built up a whole linguistic system, distinguishable both from the normal Romance and from Latin, which belonged to a large number of people who happened also to be experts in phonetic script, but it is simpler just to see them as scribes of average ability who spoke the vernacular of their time and place. In Ninth-century León they spoke Ninth-century Leonese Romance. This Romance was not homogeneous, and naturally included stylistic and sociolinguistic variation, but was no more than one language. This is not a revolutionary idea in itself. In any elementary sociolinguistics textbook we can see that this is the usual situation, and that if the near trilingualism postulated by Menéndez Pidal had existed, that situation would be little short of miraculous. We can at last discard the hypotheses of Leonese Vulgar Latin, of spoken Medieval Latin in Spain before the reforms that were accelerated in 1080, and of the existence of many experts in phonetic script, and indeed of a whole bundle of venerable but unlikely explanations.

1994 POSTSCRIPT

Late Latin and Early Romance came out in 1982, just after the end of the Falklands-Malvinas War. The editor of *Incipit* had the admirable idea of extending possibilities of reconciliation through

inviting British contributors to the journal's forthcoming volume, and was kind enough to include me in the invitation. Thus the Spanish original of this article first appeared in *Incipit* (Buenos Aires, Argentina) 3 (1983), 1-7 as "La no existencia del latín vulgar leonés." The same volume carried a lengthy review of *Late Latin* by José-Luis Moure. For the article, I had no time to do more than elaborate one of the most important sections of the book, but other reviews have shown that that section was also one of the least well understood, so this exercise was worthwhile then and its reprinting is worthwhile now. The article had unexpected consequences; that, and the review, were the first news that scholars had in Spain of this kind of analysis, and while it repelled some (and still does) it helped considerably in the success of the proposal to produce a Spanish translation of *Late Latin*, and also led to friendships that I value among the Asturian and Leonese scholars interested in texts such as that of Ermoldus. Many of the ideas mentioned in this little article are expanded in later ones in this collection; the more that detailed analyses and general considerations can be undertaken together, the more we are likely to see clearly what actually happened in this fascinating period before the Europeanizing reforms of the late eleventh century.

11 Asturian Texts of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries: Barbarous Latin or Written Romance?

ARMANDO COTARELO VALLEDOR CALLED the second half of the ninth century in the Iberian Peninsula "a time of total literary decadence" (1933:583). Manuel Gómez Moreno called the text of the *Crónica Albeidense* "classic for its barbarism" (1932:565), and the "Rotense" text of the *Chronicle of Alfonso III* "barbarous in style" (1932:585). The language of this text has also been called "barbarous" by Valdeavellano (1952:480), Sánchez Alonso (1941:111) and others. Miguel Stero referred to its "clumsy latin" (1946:126). But King Alfonso III and his Court were neither barbarous nor clumsy nor totally decadent, and it is about time we began to reexamine in a more generous and sympathetic perspective the evaluation which we give to the texts prepared there. That is what this paper aims to achieve.

1. THE CHRONICLE OF ALFONSO III.

The two versions of the *Chronicle of Alfonso III* have been edited three times recently, by the German scholar Jan Prelog (1980), by Juan Gil of Seville (1985), and by the French scholar Yves Bonnaz (1987). As is generally known, the language of the earliest surviving version of this *Chronicle*, the late ninth-century version known as the "Rotense," is not very classical. Prelog edited it more or less as we find it in the oldest manuscripts, a procedure which did not commend itself to Bonnaz:

Although it is considerably better than earlier editions, it is accompanied by rather an unwieldy apparatus criticus, and the text has not been sufficiently cleaned of the incorrect forms and altered spellings found in the oldest manuscripts, whose preservation is not always justifiable. [viii]

Bonnaz does not follow this practice in his own edition:

So I have chosen in my own edition to print the classical Latin variant wherever that seems possible...I have, in short, made my own emendations. [xliv-xlv]

That is, Bonnaz prints what he thinks ought to have been written, even though, as he realizes, in this way he does not always reproduce the original text; he still presumes (as most editors used to think some time ago) that every non-Classical usage can be blamed on bad copyists, even though it is now widely realized that copyists are more likely to "correct" than deform their originals. Referring to the "extreme corruption" of the language of the oldest copies, Bonnaz asks the following question, which he wishes us to regard as rhetorical:

Should I have kept all these incorrect forms on the grounds that they come from ancient manuscripts, and their Latin would have been more like the Latin used in the ninth century? In reality, the fact that they are not systematically repeated in these manuscripts and that they cooccur with impeccably classical forms leads me to think that they are not always very significant... [xliv]

Juan Gil, on the other hand, would reply that it is indeed best to keep the original details as far as possible, pointing out that:

The reader is going to be confronted with a text that will at times appear to him to be barbarous and chaotic, very unlike the tidy classicizing editions that are usually produced...in this way, in its supposed barbarousness, the text seems stranger, and leads us into a quite different world... [59-60]

Thus even Gil refers to the supposed barbarousness, although he reproduces it.

Linguists, of course, prefer manuscripts to be edited without any emendations at all. We need all the authentic details, however insignificant they may seem to historians. This need is being expressed in ever more explicit and vociferous terms; a whole recent volume of *Speculum* [65.1, 1990] is dedicated to its articulation. If the texts are printed in a classicizing disguise, we will never be able to examine their language with the necessary exactness. What Bonnaz says, for example, about the insignificance of incorrect and inconsistent spelling is diametrically opposed to the truth. As is clear from the studies of József Herman (e.g. 1990), relative statistics, both comparing correct and incorrect forms in a text and comparing the separate incorrect ones, can be used as powerful evidence for the nature of Early Romance; recent studies by Erica García (e.g. 1985) show that changes in progress can be noticed precisely through changes in such relative statistics comparing the proportions of use of each variant; and as Cravens has shown in his recent acute study [1991], within texts that the author is trying to make respectable, every little error could have great significance. Yet we can see that at times Bonnaz, in his recent edition of the Rotense version of the Chronicle, has changed its spelling and morphology. Bonnaz is thus doing the same as Lucas of Tuy; as the sixteenth-century copyists of the Chronicle, who were unable to leave the text alone without "changing it to suit classical requirements" (Gil, p.59); the same as Ambrosio de Morales did when confronted with the works of Eulogio de Cordoba [thanks to which, the writings of Eulogio have little value for linguistic study]; the same as all editors of Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae*, including the most recent; and, indeed, the same as the writer of the so-called "Erudite" version [*Ad Sebastianum*] of the Chronicle of Alfonso III, which was made in the tenth century. All these editors have been classicizing a text which seems to them too "barbarous." Furthermore, we know that the tenth-century editor of the "Erudite" version of the Chronicle was not in fact correcting the actual surviving Rotense text, but another version even earlier than both of those; we can see this from the stemma, which seems now

to be more or less generally agreed ("the *Crónica de Alfonso III* comes from another Leonese manuscript which was polished up before being transcribed in the Rotense manuscript," Díaz y Díaz 1979:37). The Rotense version itself has corrections and additions written in by the copyist himself, even though it is taken to be a version elaborated on the basis of an earlier one; and even this earlier version is very likely to have been already polished up from the original first draft. That is, even the most "barbarous" of the surviving versions in fact represents a fairly high rung on this centuries-long ladder of classicization, which is still being climbed.

Gómez Moreno referred to the "barbarousness" of the text, but also said that "all its defects...are valuable symptoms of spontaneity and liveliness" (1932:585). This can be accepted in part, but we cannot believe that the Rotense text is "spontaneous" in the sense of being a transcription of the spontaneous speech of its authors. It has been filled with references from the Bible and the martyrologies, with legal phrases, and the kind of literary stylistic effects that had pleased the Visigoths. These details must have been added because of a desire to raise the level of the style to one higher than the spontaneous. If we insist on thinking that all non-classical uses are by definition "barbarous," the original (lost) draft must have been one long barbarity.

The normal view that has been taken of these texts begs the question. It presupposes that the authors were indeed aiming to write Latin, conceived of as another language separate from their normal vernacular Romance. But it seems more likely that they were not trying to write "Latin" at all, neither the Classical Latin of the very distant past, nor the Medieval Latin of the unforeseeable future, but merely the most respectable style they could achieve of their own language, of their Romance vernacular. This was not easy, for they still had no other accepted way of writing than the old traditional one, for they had not yet invented either written Romance or phonetic transcription, and they were wanting to achieve, by a process of polishing and refining, a more and more respectable version; even so, in essence this is an Iberoromance text, written in a very high and occasionally tedious style, rather than a Latin text written in an extremely low style. [I merely say "Iberoromance," without wishing to be more precise; it is

misleading for us to adopt more precise geographical labels for their speech before the thirteenth century, and they do not seem to have done so themselves, that is why I refrain from calling their Romance "Early Leonese" or "Early Asturian"; see Wright 1992b]. In this way we can restore some professional self-respect to these Asturian writers, for they were not writing Latin badly, they were writing their Romance well, the Romance of their time and place. They were not irredeemably stupid, but intelligent professionals.

2. EARLY ROMANCE AND ROMANCE PHILOLOGY

It is worth remembering at this point how Romance Philology nowadays views the linguistic state of the Iberian Peninsula in the ninth and tenth centuries; and first we should recognize that the language they spoke cannot be described as "barbarous" in itself.

It has sometimes been suggested that both the development of the Romance languages from their origin in the spoken Latin of the Roman Empire, and their divergence from each other, were caused to a large extent by the political disintegration of the Empire. Some philologists of the first half of the twentieth century (e.g. Muller 1929) postponed this date, both for the evolution and the divergence, to the start of the seventh century. Such a late date seems improbable to historical linguists now, because we know for certain that linguistic change cannot just be stopped like that during whole centuries. Even so, unfortunately, some Latinists and historians still trust that dating. In its place, some of the philologists who work with reconstruction methods have preferred to move the date of both evolution and divergence to long before the end of the empire, or even before its start; De Dardel (1983), for example, dates the separation of Proto-Sardinian Romance from Proto-Romance in general to the second century B.C. This dating, in turn, understandably seems absurd to Latinists and historians, who see no evidence for the existence at that time of a need for interpreters between Sardinians and Romans. The result of all this has unfortunately been that the specialists in Romance historical linguistics and the specialists in Early Medieval History have stopped taking each other seriously.

But in fact it is quite easy to reconcile the two perspectives. Indeed, it is true that many Romance phonetic developments started

early, but for all practical purposes the geographical divergence happened very late. Alberto Varvaro (e.g. 1991) has been able to solve this fairly clearly, taking into account the sociolinguistic nature of modern speech-communities of similarly wide geographical extension, such as Modern English, French and also Italian. All these speech communities contain within them a great deal of variation, geographical, sociolinguistic and stylistic, and when new linguistic phenomena arise—which happens all the time—they manage to fit in to the single complex mosaic. Thus we can see that many of the phonetic, morphological and syntactic developments that the philologists wish to postulate did indeed start early, before the end of the Empire, without this meaning that the existing forms that fulfilled the same function necessarily had to disappear until centuries afterwards [if at all]. This is more or less what Menéndez Pidal proposed (in 1926) when he used the phrase *estado latente*, the “latent phase” of a change. Under this perspective we can postulate the existence of a single monolingual Western Early Romance speech community up to the eighth and even the ninth century. As time went by, this monolingualism became ever more complicated, but even so it does not seem that any of its speakers explicitly had the idea that difficulties in communication were so great that there must have existed separate languages, neither in a diastatic nor a diatopic sense (this conclusion has been independently reached recently by, for example, Herman 1988, Van Uytfanghe 1989, Banniard 1989). Complex, but monolingual.

In a recent book, the French medievalist Michel Banniard (1989) writes that the inhabitants of the Romance-speaking area in this period belonged to one *ensemble linguistique* (187), in which there was still a functional symbiosis between written and spoken forms of the language (197). The illiterate, for example, had nonetheless enough passive competence to understand homilies and Saints’ Lives and other texts that were read aloud to them (204). This monolingual perspective preserves Muller’s genuine insight, that in those centuries nobody made metalinguistic distinctions between “Latin” and “Romance,” without drawing the conclusion that Muller himself drew from this, that Latin managed to remain at the start of the seventh century more or less the same as it had been in

the first. There was surely never a state of linguistic immobilism. Latin, like every other language, has never been fixed in a state of stable perfection. It has kept on inexorably evolving, before the Empire, during the Empire, and ever since. It makes no sense to ask “When did Latin begin to change?” Its name may have changed, but whether we call it Indo-European, Italic, Latin, or Romance, the language has always been evolving. It is still evolving now, without our needing for that reason to describe any of the synchronic linguistic states as “barbarous.”

Even though it seems absurd, however, the speech of whole communities for centuries on end has indeed been described as “barbarous.” It has often been claimed that Early Romance was in itself “inferior” to the Latin of the Empire (e.g. by Salvador 1988:644-45). There is no sense in this claim, neither in general, nor with reference to phonetics, nor morphology, nor syntax nor semantics. Cultural changes had indeed taken place, naturally. For example, it is possible to deduce that the Romance-speaking communities between the fifth and eleventh centuries were in general less literate than those of the Empire. That is, they wrote less. Even so, as Banniard points out, since they were still using biodegradable materials such as papyrus and wax tablets, they probably wrote far more than we now appreciate, without wanting to preserve it down the centuries for our benefit. They also occasionally wrote on slates, a few of which happen to survive (see e.g. Díaz y Díaz 1986, Velázquez, in Fontán and Moure 1987:135-38).

Early Romance, if and when it was written, had in practice no alternative but to exhibit - at least in the first draft of any text - more features characteristic of oral registers than are normally visible in the artificial texts of “Classical” Latin. Such oral features are in themselves neither “bad” nor “decadent.” In oral contexts, every language has greater flexibility and more nuances than it has in writing. They offer chances for subtle effects of intonation, of word order, of topicalization, of the use of deictics, of pragmatic devices, of varying styles and registers, of effects based on the relationship between old and new information, of interaction with the listener or listening audience, etc. In sum, oral registers have an exuberance and a complexity which can hardly ever be achieved in writing, even by the best modern dramatists.

But all the surviving evidence is, of course, written. Written language is normally, almost necessarily, standardized. Standardization of written language nearly always involves a restriction of the options that are available in speech, choosing some from out of the extensive range of available spoken variation. The inevitable consequence of this is that many features of oral language that were not originally chosen as suitable for representation in the standard written form are bound to seem later, to Grammarians (who instinctively tend to see written standards in moral terms), to be cases of "decadence." So the features of oral language that were not chosen to be included in the standardization tend to disappear from texts, even if they continue to be alive in normal speech. This was the effect of the *Ars Grammatica* tradition; many perfectly straightforward features of normal speech were thought to have been decreed to be "bad" (by omission from the list of the "good") and were thus excluded from writing; and for this reason, as seen above, later copies of already written texts were changed on purpose to fit this norm.

The arrival of new morphological and syntactic features in Early Romance, so far as we can now perceive them, had often had the consequence of making available to the speaker greater flexibility and versatility than he had had before. For example, the new non-Classical possibility of combining verbal auxiliaries (Green 1982), on the lines of eventual Spanish constructions such as *habrían sido hechas*, or the availability of constructions including the word *se* with a semantically passive rather than reflexive function, brought with them the possibility of exploiting in speech a wider range of semantic nuances than there had been before. This was not barbarism; this was versatility. The arrival of the new alternatives enriched the resources of the language with new useful material that could be employed to create contrasts with the already existing possibilities, which often stayed in the language for centuries before falling into disuse.

After the Empire, and in the Iberian Peninsula up to the twelfth century, the techniques of writing (*Ars Grammatica*) still followed the tradition set by Donatus. This tradition had continued in Visigothic Spain through to Julián de Toledo, and survived after the invasion, both in Moslem and Christian Spain. Sometimes we are

able to glimpse the existence of other, more experimental, ways of writing, used for texts of little importance such as the famous list of Leonese cheeses (the *Nodicia de quesos* of the late tenth century); but if a text was intended to be kept for centuries, they naturally cleaned up its spelling and its morphology in order to be "correct" according to the traditional standard. For at that time, as at almost any other, linguistic alternatives were thought of in moral terms; different uses were not merely seen as old or new, spontaneous or tedious, formal or informal, etc., but as "correct" or "incorrect"; and they identified "correctness" as lying in conformity with the ancient precepts. Professional writers of this Early Romance, of this sophisticated monolingual mosaic, were aiming above all for "correctness."

Unfortunately for modern philologists, "correctness" did not consist in attempts to transcribe spoken language exactly. (Nor does it now, of course.) One of the most important tasks of those who undertook to write important works was to eliminate from the initial draft of their text any feature which would not have seemed "correct" to the grammarians of the fourth and fifth centuries. Inevitably, this meant that the versatility of their speech was severely restricted in their writing. That is why these Chronicles seem to us now to have such a clumsy style; the writers believed that it was necessary to write them like that. They believed that in this way they were achieving correctness.

In those centuries, they had no alternative. It is true that later on, at least after the year 1000, vernacular morphology, phonetics and syntax were represented occasionally in France on manuscript without their archaizing disguise, and some Spanish regions, those with French contacts, can provide us with evidence that they were aware of this strange French habit. The Riojan glossers, at least, seem to have imitated it (and we should all now bear in mind the work of Bézler, 1984 and 1985, who concluded that the original of the glossed Silos manuscript must have been written after the year 1060, and of Stengaard (1991a), who shows how glosses of different types in the San Millán manuscript were used to aid oral delivery). But before the arrival of distinctive Romance writing norms in the Peninsula, they wrote well by imitating ancient practice. In the Chronicle of Alfonso III, they were writing Early Romance well.

3. ROMANCE PHONETICS AND TRADITIONAL ORTHOGRAPHY

In general, there is no reason to complain about orthographic standardization. It has a sensible practical purpose, even if orthographical traditions sometimes hide phonetic variability from our view. For example, in tenth-century Asturian texts the letter *t* could represent a word-initial [t] (as in the word written *tenerel*), an intervocalic [d] or even a [ð] sound (as in the word spelled *pratum*; see Walsh, 1991), a [dz] sound (as in the word spelled *ratione*) or a [ts] sound (as in the affix written *-antia*) before a semivocalic [j], or even, word-finally, no sound at all (as in the word spelled *sunt*). When they read aloud a written text, this lack of biuniqueness caused no problem. The main practical purpose of a written form is to enable the reader to recognize the lexical unit, regardless of what the phonemes are; that is how logographic script such as that of Chinese is able to function, and to a great extent the reading of texts in the Peninsula in the tenth century worked the same way. Those who had learned to read at all had learned the usual traditional forms, and thus had no difficulty in recognizing the word written *teneat* as the one pronounced [tjéne], the written form *pratum* as representing [praðo] (or [prado]), the one written *sunt* as representing [son], etc. Those who had not learned to read at all would not have been helped in any way by the existence of a more "phonetic" type of orthography (that is, more isomorphic with the phonemes), and those who knew how to read already thereby knew how to recognize the old forms. This is what happens in modern French and English, where attempts to establish a new spelling system more closely allied to speech always fail, for such simple practical reasons. Thus, as is by now generally understood, forms written in a "correct" old way do not in themselves imply that the pronunciation has failed to change since the orthographic standardization, neither in the *Chronicle of Alfonso III* nor in modern English or Spanish works.

But we should also beware of being misled by the opposite case, when there seems to have been relative consistency in the pronunciation of a word but a variety of written forms representing it. As Alarcos Llorach (1982:25) pointed out, such variation does not mean - could not mean - that there existed exactly the same wide range of phonetic realizations as there is of orthographic. According to the apparatus criticus provided by Prelog, some words in the

Chronicle are given up to eight different spellings in the manuscripts, but we cannot deduce from this that the word was pronounced in eight different ways. For a small example, let us consider the ways in which the name of King Bermudo is written in the Rotense version. He is the syntactic subject of his two appearances in Chapter 20; we find the following forms: *Ueremudus*, *Ueremudo*, *Ueremundus* and *Ueremundo*. Prelog prints *Veremudo*, Gil *Ueremudus*, Bonnaz *Veremundus*. The Rotense manuscript itself has *Ueremudo*, and it is better to print it precisely that way, because apart from anything else we can be sure that they did not pronounce in normal speech either the [n] or the ending [-us], and the written forms that include *n* and *-us* do so merely in their determination to be "correct." The lack of uniformity in spelling is often the result of inconsistent attempts at achieving this "correctness." Many philologists nowadays have realized what is happening here, in cases where the confusion is orthographic rather than phonetic; see, for example, the two excellent studies by Puentes Romay (1986a, b) and the important article by Carmen Pensado Ruiz (1991). Pensado Ruiz investigated inconsistencies in the spelling of Leonese legal documents of this time, and deduced that these early Medieval writers were consistent at least in trying to write their own language as well as they could. The existence of spelling variation need mean no more than this. They were trying to write well, according to their rules (such as, "represent the sound [we] with the letter o"; "use inflectional affixes rather than prepositions," etc.), but they did not always succeed in applying these rules consistently.

The conclusion we can draw as regards phonetics and spelling is this: that the Latin of the Roman Empire, Early Iberian Romance, thirteenth-century Castilian, and modern Castilian also, all contain within them phonetic variation of a normal type, which is in no sense dysfunctional or problematic. There is no need for us to call tenth-century Romance phonetics "decadent" or "stammering" or "incipient" or "disintegrating" or "inferior" to that of Imperial Latin, or to that of Modern Spanish; and if the spelling was often not the same as that of the fourth century, nor yet instead a faithful transcription of their own phonetics, this cannot have been of great importance in practice.

4. MORPHOLOGY AND SYNTAX.

The same can be said of morphology and syntax: that there was a lack of isomorphism between speech and "correct" writing, but that this was not in itself a symptom of "barbarousness." It has already been shown above that the arrival of new alternatives in the speech of the late Empire gave rise to greater versatility and flexibility. Similarly, in the morphology and syntax of Early Iberian Romance there also coexisted old and new features, but this in itself did not cause problems any greater than there had been in the Empire or than there are now. This variation had, as we saw, practical advantages, particularly in speech. For example, in the tenth century we can reconstruct that there were available two "pluperfect" forms: *fiziera* (< *PECERAT*), the traditional form, and *avia fecho* (< *HABEBAT FACTUM*), the newer form created with the Romance auxiliary. At first sight, this coexistence might seem a case of decadence, or at least of confusion. But the different forms had different functions, and in this respect the medieval language turns out to have been subtler than either the modern language or that of the Empire. Chevalier (1984) argued that the forms with *avia* should be analyzed as the imperfect of the forms in *ha*, rather than the pluperfect of the present; and Lunn and Gravens (1991) have discovered that in the *Poema de Mio Cid* the two forms have different pragmatic purposes, in that *avia fecho* indicates to the listener "pay attention; this information is new," whereas *fiziera* indicates "this is old information within the discourse." This distinction has value above all in speech.

It is also now very fashionable to study apparently redundant clitic pronouns. Riho (1988) examined these uses in an exhaustive investigation and concluded that they had no strictly grammatical function, but caused no problem in context, being a sign of the exuberance of speech rather than of decadence or confusion. Silva Corvalán (1984) analyzed them in the *Poema de Mio Cid*, concluding that they reflected oral usage, fulfilling the function of directing the attention of the listeners in an appropriate direction. Oral versatility can look like redundancy when transcribed in texts; these pronouns were symptoms of an oral register, and they also probably existed in the speech of the tenth century. But in the tenth century the writers also knew that such features should not be

included in a "correctly" written text, so they did not put them in; that is, they on purpose hid from our view the "spontaneity and liveliness" that Gómez Moreno claimed to see there, because in this way they were writing their own language well, as they had been instructed to do. Thus Díaz y Díaz (1976:225) referred to the "expressive poverty" of the Rotense, but that was what they were aiming to achieve; in that way they were exhibiting discipline, rather than any lack of discipline.

The conclusion to be drawn as regards morphology and syntax is the same as that concerning phonetics; there was no morphological or syntactic collapse, nor was the speech community less efficient than it had been. The language served the needs of its users. But here, as in phonetics, the relationship between speech and writing was getting increasingly complicated. The available morphological and syntactic variants in the Romance spoken in tenth-century Asturias were, over time, coming to coincide less and less with what they were told was acceptable in writing. This problem arose when they wrote, but not when they read aloud, nor did it greatly hamper their ability to understand a text read aloud by somebody else. It seems reasonable to conclude that people could understand many constructions which they rarely or never used in their own active speech. In other words, their passive competence in understanding existing texts, in reading or in hearing them read aloud, was considerably wider than their active competence. Thus there were features of spoken morphology and syntax that rarely appeared in writing, as well as features of writing that rarely appeared in speech, but even so, in general, the traditional written forms of the language, including in texts of serious practical importance, remained comprehensible not only in Asturias but even in Carolingian France, as McKitterick (1989) has established convincingly. This also fits Banniard's pan-Romance view (e.g. Banniard 1989:190). As Green (1991) and Stengaard (1991b:5.2.1) have argued, for example, the synthetic passives could be understood on the whole in the tenth century, even if almost nobody then used them spontaneously. There always is a gap between active and passive competence; modern Spaniards understand their future subjunctive without using it, modern Frenchmen understand their preterites without using them.

In tenth-century León such discrepancies were gradually increasing. The traditional *Artes Grammaticae* concentrated most on morphology, and it was possible by consulting them to write correctly such inflections as *-ibus* or *-atuz*. In the *Chronicle of Alfonso III* we find many uses of the synthetic passive that appear to be quite unnecessary; the authors would have felt proud of them, for they showed how important and serious their work was. For an example, consider "arma adsumunt, eriguntur fundiali, abantur funde, migrantur enses, crispantur aste hac incessanter emittuntur sagitte," ch.10 (Gil, p.128). The word written *emittunt* in the earliest manuscripts of the Rotense version was turned into *emittuntur* in the "Erudite" version, and also in later copies of the Rotense itself, for the greater glory of its syntax. They had less success, though, with their nominal inflections. They seem to have known how to use these affixes in writing, without being at all sure of which was necessary when. For that reason we can find the normal vernacular form, usually derived from what was once the accusative (but which often looks like the ablative) in any syntactic position at all (as with *Veremudo* ending in *-o* in subject position, already discussed above).

5. LEXIS AND SEMANTICS

In the same way, most people in these Early Romance societies could also understand many items of vocabulary that they were unlikely to use spontaneously themselves. As writers strove for "correctness," they often consciously imitated texts from the past. This is what lawyers always do, of course, but modern research has established that ancient models can often be found for the phraseology of ninth and tenth-century texts, even for phrases that seem of little significance. Bonnaz has presented several such discoveries in the notes to his edition of the *Chronicle*, for example, without it always being clear if the earlier phrase is the model or a coincidence. (Working in our post-romantic age a millennium later, we tend to feel that this carefully unoriginal technique is counterproductive.) In the *Chronicle of Alfonso III* it was not merely a question of imitating earlier Histories that served as sources; Gil has shown, for example, in his edition (ch.9), that the conversation between Pelayo and Oppa before the Battle of Covadonga follows detailed models in the Bible and in hagiography.

Neither we, nor the first readers of the *Chronicle*, are in a position to know whether there was any underlying truth in the details presented in this way, but that was not the point; in this way they were writing "correctly."

This is one more example of the discrepancies between speech and writing. It has no consequences in itself for our evaluation of their speech. The idea which has so repeatedly been put forward, that the Romance speakers of the time had no more than a barbarous and stammered language, seems only conceivable if we are also to suggest that for centuries on end nobody actually spoke at all. It seems to have been taken for granted in some philological traditions that everyone who lived in the Christian areas of the Early medieval Iberian Peninsula was extremely stupid, so much so that there is no need to try to construct a reasonable explanation for the nature of the texts they left behind them. Such a hypothesis does not seem attractive to the historians of the age, who can glimpse that there were many intelligent individuals, trying successfully to overcome practical obstacles of all kinds in their lives, not merely in their writing systems. For on the whole the Christians in the Iberian Peninsula in these centuries were not suffering from total intellectual barbarousness, linguistic decadence and general stupidity. It was a time of essentially oral culture; differences between speech and writing (which exist everywhere) were growing slowly more marked, but individuals were not in general less intelligent than we are. It could be argued that the first part of the thirteenth century was the only time when it was possible to write in a style that could genuinely be called more or less "oral," without the limitations and pedantry inevitably imposed by standardization (as was also the case in France; see Fleischman, 1990).

6. THE LANGUAGE OF THE CHRONICLE

I hope to have shown by now that the language spoken in ninth and tenth-century Asturias was not in itself "barbarous." What is it then, that this much-mentioned "barbarousness" in the texts is supposed to consist of? It seems that the features that have been so identified are merely the symptoms of the writers' intense efforts to write in the way they were trained to regard as "correct": often

discarding constructions normal in speech for words and phrases found in venerated ancient texts, and following the traditional spelling which had by then become almost logographic in nature. This is seriousness, not barbarousness.

But even though these texts are thus in disguise, we can see that they were written in the Ibero-Romance of their time, from details which it was not possible for them to write in the "correct" manner, or which it could not possibly have occurred to them that they needed to change. Obviously, Arabic personal names, for example, had no "correct" form. The writers had to improvise. The same applies to arabisms; Corominas (among others) has explained convincingly that the word written *mollite* (ch.25: *alium mollite nomine Alporz*) is the one that turns up later as the toponym *Murélides*, and which is usually now rendered as *muladí*.

Semantic changes attested in these texts are also important evidence (cp. Wright 1987). Semantic changes were not mentioned in the Grammars, nor in the scribes' training. For example, in the Chronicle they used their normal vernacular word [poblar] (which had by then the meaning which *poblar* still has, "populate", spelling it correctly as *populare*, without realizing that centuries earlier this word had instead meant "devastate" (see Bonnaz, 135-36). Quoting Gil's edition:

...quum ciuitas Useo et suburbis eius iussum nostrum esset
populatus (ch.7, p.122).

These words of the Rotense version have been slightly "corrected" in the "Erudite" version, but the editor of this is not aware of any semantic anomaly:

...quum Useo ciuitas et suburbana eius a nobis populata esset
(p.123).

There are further similar uses of the same word in chapters 11 and 14, both endowed with impressive but unnecessary passive morphology. There was no problem in achieving this passive morphology; that was an established trick of their trade, nor in achieving the correct orthography, which in this case was much

more straightforward for them than is that of many words in Modern French, for example; but they had no means even of suspecting the existence of the semantic change. (Both versions also used the Ibero-Romance word [despoblaron], which would later be endowed with a reformed orthography as *despoblaron*, spelling it here "correctly" as *depopulauerunt*.)

It has also been pointed out that the word written *consuubrinus* has in this Chronicle the modern meaning of "nephew" rather than the original one of "cousin".

Cindasuindus rex magnifice suscepit et in coniungio
consuubrinam suam dedit (ch.2, p.116)

Magno uiro Egicani consuubrinino Bambani Regi (ch.3, p.118).

These really were nephews. But it looks as though in this case the semantic change was not totally complete. The change may have happened in the unprefixed form (which was to survive in the written form *sobrinu*) because of its use to designate a cousin of a younger generation ("once removed"). An example of this can be seen in ch.20, where the word *subrinum* is used to refer to the future Alfonso II, son of King Bermudo's cousin:

Ueremodus...subrinum suum Adefonsum...sibi in regnum
successorem instituit.

The same applies to semantic change in morphological affixes. For example, in Romance the passive participle was tense-neutral, but earlier it had been used specifically to refer to the past. This meant that in Romance, to form the pluperfect passive they added to the now tenseless participle of the lexical verb the pluperfect forms of the auxiliary verb, whereas earlier the Romans had added those of the imperfect. At the start of the Rotense version we see the words *sepultus fuisset* (Gil, p.114); in that century the word pronounced [fwese] (later to be written *fuere*) still carried pluperfect meaning. Earlier, to mean "had been buried" in the subjunctive, the Romans had used *esset*. In the sixteenth century, the copyist of

manuscript M changed *frisset* into *esset*, but no copyist did that before then. In the text we see the form with its Romance meaning.

The point is not that these phenomena represent the "influence" of the spoken language, they just are the spoken language, nothing more than that. They need no further explanation. What does need further explanation is the existence in the text of features that were probably not present in their normal speech, and the explanation for these is to be sought in the writers' neurotic need to be "correct."

CONCLUSION

How should we then describe the language of this *Chronicle*? Some commentators have said it is in "barbarous Latin"; Díaz y Díaz has even called it "ulcerated latinity" [1976:225]; Stero referred to its "poverty-stricken style," etc. I prefer to call it "Romance written in a high style." Modern investigators have become used to making a conceptual distinction between Latin and Romance, but this conceptual distinction had not yet been invented at the Court of King Alfonso III. They thought they had one language only, and in my view we should agree with them (1). It may seem, though, that for this very reason it does not matter much whether we call the language of the text "Latin" or "Romance." But it is indeed important; for it affects the evaluation we make of it. Calling it "barbarous Latin" suggests that the authors were barbarous, an implication that is totally lacking if instead we call its language "Romance written in a high style." Talking of "barbarousness" would only be at all reasonable if all the Asturians at the court of Alfonso III had been stupid, incompetent and uneducated. But I do not believe, and see no reason to believe, that they were all like that, and presumably modern Asturians would not wish to think so either. They were building remarkable churches, they were preparing impressive manuscripts, they were travellers, they had a genuine interest in the past and they were planning a reconquest of the Peninsula for the future, they had an active and complex life. If we can be in a position to conclude that they were writing well the only language that they had, a multifaceted, versatile and lively language, and we can call the language of their texts "well-written Romance"—which seems to me not only more fair but also more accurate—we will be able to come to the conclusion that at least

some of the Asturians at that Court were intelligent, serious and skilled professionals. That is more generous, more importantly, it is also more plausible.

Note.

1. They used the word *vulgo* (and cognate terms) to refer to the normal language of the time, without thereby making any meta-linguistic synchronic distinctions, although occasionally contrasting modern and ancient usage (see Van Uytanghe 1989, for France; Wright 1993, on the *Vita Dominici Siliensis*, etc.). The only use of *vulgo* in this *Chronicle* is this, at the start of the Rotense:

...in uillam propriam uenit, cui nomen erat Gerticos, quod nunc a bulco appellatur Bamba (Gil p.114, Prelog p.5).

Moralejo translates this well (p.194): "...que ahora es llamada por la gente Bamba," "which people now call Bamba."

After preparing this lecture, I have read Collins (1990); I am delighted to see that, for completely different reasons, Collins comes to a conclusion similar to mine.

1994 POSTSCRIPT

This is a translation of the lecture given on the evening of Thursday October 25, 1990 to the conference on "Asturian as seen by the Romance Philologists" held in Oviedo University by the Academia de la Lengua Asturiana. A penultimate version had been delivered to the Annual Conference of the Historians of Medieval Iberia in Birmingham the previous month. The Spanish lecture was published as "Textos asturianos de los siglos IX y X: ¿Latin bárbaro o romance escrito?" in the Academia's journal, *Lletres Asturianes*, 41, 1991, 20-34. For this English version all the translations from other scholars are my own. I am grateful to José Luis García Arias and his colleagues for inviting me to Oviedo, even though I explicitly warned them that the paper would contain nothing about Asturian, for such geographical labels, of doubtful value even now, can be seriously misleading when applied to these early centuries.

In November 1993, I visited the magnificent exhibition in Oviedo cathedral entitled *Orígenes*. This demonstrated effectively

how impressive the early medieval culture of Oviedo had been, but perhaps the most remarkable aspect of the exhibition lay in the huge numbers of people visiting it. The reevaluation of their written texts should be part of a general increasingly favorable appreciation of the culture of the late ninth century and in particular of Oviedo at that time, which is long overdue. The wider cry for genuine unemended texts is still growing; Suzanne Fleischman's excellent plenary at the 11th International Conference on Historical Linguistics in August 1993, on the early Romance texts from France, deserves to change the general practice. Without the chance survival of the early Rotense version, the process of composition of the Chronicle would be hidden from us; we can be reasonably sure that this method of composition was used for other texts whose early drafts are unfortunately now unavailable to us.

12 Sociolinguistics in Spain (8th - 11th Centuries)

THE IBERIAN PENINSULA IN THE year 700 was a theoretically unified Visigothic state. The Visigoths had come into the peninsula in the fifth century already speaking Latin (Old Romance), even if they were still also speaking their Germanic language then, they had stopped speaking that long before 700. The extensive Jewish communities of the peninsula left a few inscriptions in Hebrew, but Hebrew was only a written language; at one time they had spoken Aramaic, but by 700 they too were Romance-speaking. Perhaps the only communities of 700 that did not speak Romance at all were the Basques, who may have covered an area that spread further to the East than the modern Basque country, and were not entirely Christianized, but even many of them were probably in practice bilingual (Basque - Romance). Writing was usually carried out on wax tablets or papyrus, which have not survived the centuries, but the seventh-century writings on slates found in Salamanca province seem to attest both literacy and numeracy in ordinary communities. Seventh-century Visigothic Spain was the most educated and literate area of the former Western Roman Empire, continuing as a society essentially based on literacy, which formed the basis of literate culture in the whole peninsula until the end of the eleventh century.

The Moslem invasions began in 711. By 718 most of the Peninsula, except the North-Western mountains, were under Moslem domination. The official language of the invaders was Arabic, but most of the military personnel were not originally Arabic-speaking, being Berbers from the Maghrib. The inhabitants of the North African coastline largely spoke Romance before the Moslems came in the seventh century, and it is a reasonable

supposition that many of the Berber invaders of the Iberian Peninsula were already speakers of Romance, either as a first or a second language, and mutually intelligible therefore with the previous inhabitants. They were not necessarily all Moslem, and the Berber languages which they otherwise spoke were probably not all mutually intelligible with each other. It is not clear how long the Berber languages continued to be spoken among the communities descended from the original invaders and settlers; on the other hand, Berbers were continually immigrating, being in particular recruited by Almanzor in the late tenth century, and as time went on the originally Romance-speaking communities of the North African coastline seem to have lost their Romance to Arabic, so the later arrivals probably did not speak Romance. The court slaves, many of Slavonic descent, seem to have learnt Arabic.

In many aspects of life, as Collins has pointed out, there was continuity between the seventh century and the eighth. Romance was the main working everyday language of Al-Andalus, in fields, markets, streets, offices and homes, since the invaders were mostly men and thus mothers were mostly Romance-speakers. Many inhabitants were consequently bilingual and of mixed descent; Caliph Abd-el-Rahman II (d. 852 A.D.), for example, is said to have had 87 children, mostly by native women. The Romance spoken there is now usually called *mozárabe*, after the term which was not used then but later applied to eleventh-century exiles, but the community at the time called it [ladino] [written still as *latínus*], and the Arabs referred to it with a form borrowed from that same word. Studying this *mozárabe* now is not easy, for much of the written evidence is in the Hebrew or Arabic alphabets, but increasingly the scholarly consensus suggests that in most respects *mozárabe* was like Northern Iberian Romance. When literate Christians left Al-Andalus to work in the North as notaries or scribes (and others as carpenters and farmers), as happened often from the late eighth century, they leave us no hint in the surviving documents of any incomprehension between Asturian clients and *mozárabe* writers. It has proved possible for Galmés de Fuentes to hypothesize details of the geographical variation that must have existed in the mozarabic Romance area (from Portugal to Valencia, from Málaga to Zaragoza), but, as commentators have pointed out,

much of the evidence is less clear than Galmés suggests, being in essence confined to vocabulary and such phonology as can be tentatively deduced from that.

The Romance speakers in Al-Andalus came increasingly to be Arabic-Romance bilingual, and much of the community probably remained bilingual until at least the traumatic events after 1085 (when many mozarabs had to flee before the Berber Almorávides). The nature of the relationship can be seen to have changed, however. At first the Romance-speakers continued to read and write in the old-fashioned manner of the Roman Empire, and the Cordoban ninth-century scholars seem in essence to have been educated in the tradition established by Isidore, and exemplified by Julián de Toledo in the late seventh century. Albaro's famous lament (852) that educated Christians preferred to be literate in Arabic, however, indicates the change that was under way; to begin with, bilinguals continued to be primarily literate in Romance/Latin, but eventually they preferred to be primarily literate in Arabic. The Bible and some Christian church Councils were turned into Arabic, and there is a tenth-century Christian history written in Arabic, although tombstones survive in good traditional Latin form even into the eleventh century, and presumably it was felt that people could still read them. Van Koningveld's research established that there was a serious intellectual community of bilingual Christians probably literate only in Arabic in Toledo at and after the time of its fall to the Christians (1085). Christians in Moslem Spain were thus largely cut off from the linguistic and other reforms of the Frankish empire, but in compensation were more in touch with the Christians of the East.

It is possible that it was the venerable administrative literacy of the Christians which eventually raised the level of literacy among the Arabic-speaking community once Christian conversions to Islam became common, in the tenth century. Native Spanish-born Moslems were similarly bilingual but only ever literate in Arabic, so the sociolinguistic differences between the different religious groups were slowly disappearing as the Christians inverted the social diglossia. Arabic itself had sociolinguistic gradations unknown as yet in the mozarabic world, with dialectal variations enabling andalusies to be identifiable from their speech in the rest of the

Moslem world, and there was increasing divergence between official (Classical) Arabic and colloquial speech. No original eighth-century composition survives from Al-Andalus, but later caliphal Córdoba shone at a serious intellectual level in many fields; books were widely read and written, and translated from Latin to Arabic, and its library was one of the largest in the Moslem world. At a simpler level, much social interaction was probably macaronic, and the Romance grammar may perhaps have simplified as a result of social circumstances; and although it may often have been unclear to a listener whether participants in a conversation were speaking Arabic with Romance loanwords in or Romance with Arabic loanwords in, the languages are sufficiently different in structure for no genuine mesolectal hybrid to be envisageable, even though bilinguals may only rarely have been 100% fluent in both. There is a hint of this insufficiency in the fact that so many Spanish lexical borrowings from Arabic took the definite article (/al-/) as well as the lexical item, for sandhi prevented the word boundary from being always phonotactically distinguishable; that is why such words tend to begin with [a-] (e.g. *alcázar*, *albaricoque*, *ajedrez*, *arroz*, *acequía*). The phonological systems are so distinct that the earliest written forms in Romance of such Arabisms often vary wildly from each other as well as from the Arabic etymon. Attempts to attribute phonological or syntactic peculiarities of subsequent Andalusian Spanish or Valencian Catalan to mozarabic have given a meager harvest, but that is probably both because the Northern forms came to overwhelm native Southern speech habits after the Reconquista, and because there were far fewer mozarabs in Moslem Spain after 1100 than there had been earlier. Attempts to view the possibly-Romance forms of the *kharijas* as evidence for mozarabic Romance are probably over-optimistic, mainly because the readings are so uncertain; some literati seem to have operated with a sociolinguistic scale with perhaps three or even four varieties of Arabic superimposed upon a prestigeless Romance basilect.

Romance and Arabic involved two alphabets, and the presence of Hebrew (only as a written language) provided a third. In theory, and perhaps in practice, any of the three languages could be written in any of the three alphabets. This is problematic for modern scholars. Perhaps it was also for the inhabitants of Al-Andalus. The

best *kharija* texts, mainly Arabic but with possibly Romance components, are in the Hebrew alphabet. Hebrew was not spoken colloquially, but texts were recited in the synagogues, and Jewish scholarship flourished in Moslem Spain from the tenth century. Menachem Ibn Saruk produced an important dictionary of Hebrew at that time, when a school of learning was founded which was to lead to one of the great flowerings of Jewish cultural history, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The Jews were not all scholars, diplomats and businessmen; there are fairly reliable records of artisans and farmers with Jewish names, but the existence of Hebrew in reading and writing rather than in speech may perhaps have largely confined the literate aspect of Jewish culture to an élite. Recitation was taught letter by letter, such that their pronunciation was based isomorphically on the pre-existing orthography. Even for them, original composition was often in Arabic, sometimes in the Hebrew alphabet, as the Jews also changed from Romance to being predominantly Arabic speakers.

Visigothic culture continued to the north of the religious divide as well as the south. In the eighth century the independent Christians were largely confined to the Northern mountains, but after 800 they became confident enough to re-establish political capitals further south, in Barcelona (801), Pamplona (after 824), Burgos (884), and León (914); settlers went from Galicia to Coimbra, in each case the new inhabitants of the expanding city came mainly from several valleys to the North, and a sociolinguistically simpler interdialect formed, usually only perpetuating in the prestigious capital city the highest common factor of such regional diversity as already existed in the northernmost mountains (which is why the speech of the mountain valleys is even now linguistically more complex than their related dialects to the south). The continuing repopulation movements were later to reinforce mutual intelligibility several times through the Middle Ages. For much of the period under consideration, Asturias (León) was politically dominant in the North. The Basques were mostly in the separate kingdom of Navarra. There is perhaps something to be said for Menéndez Pidal's view that the influx of Christians from Al-Andalus (not necessarily from the south) from the ninth century formed the basis of an expansion in Asturian literacy.

The Romance speech was by then largely losing, for example, all nominal cases other than the originally accusative, synthetic passive and future verb forms, *ut* clauses, etc., and gaining analytic future and perfect forms created with auxiliary *habere*, new definite articles from *ille*, extended use of prepositions to compensate for the loss of nominal case, neologisms with diminutive suffixes, etc. Yet the traditional written norms were still those taught and learnt, and Astur-Leonese society still ran on a general assumption of literacy, and its lawcourts on documentation, although not many people could write, many more could read, and almost everyone (then as now) could understand texts, letters, orders, sermons, documents, prayers, Saints lives, tombstones, etc., if they were read aloud to them. Probably each village had someone, not necessarily a cleric, who could read aloud to his neighbors when necessary, and perhaps who could also write on their behalf. Legal transactions were made with the help of a notary, who might in practice belong to a local monastery. There were many small monasteries and churches, and the number of surviving documents suggests that at a practical level this still operated as a literate society. At the time of the Moslem Invasion, the Romance of the peninsula would still in general have been intelligible elsewhere, the period of relative isolation from 711 to 1020 is probably the period in which the Romance of non-Catalan Spain became generally more distinct from that of the other Romance-speaking areas, including Catalonia.

It is probably anachronistic to visualize separate dialects with clear boundaries in the Iberian Romance-speaking areas of these centuries. There were, naturally, differences between the speech habits of Romance-speakers in different places, but in the age before the thirteenth-century standardizations these were essentially statistical variations in the distribution of competing allophones or allomorphs. It is reasonable, for example, to hypothesize that in Galicia the first syllable of the word spelled *alteros* was [out-] more often than [ot-], whereas further East in Castile it was [ot-] more often than [out-], but neither of these forms were found on 100% of the occasions of the word's use in any one place, and the sociolinguistic situation was that normally found in monolingual societies everywhere; gradual geographical variation within a monolingual continuum. Texts cannot be definitively located

geographically from such variants. As Alarcos Llorach pointed out, all speakers could communicate with Iberian Romance-speaking neighbors when they needed to, both from within the Christian kingdoms and further south. The Castilian Count Sancho García (reigned 995-1017) spoke eloquently to the nobles of nearby Moslem-ruled Tudela.

The evidence for Romance pronunciation of the time comes largely from backwards reconstructions based on the subsequent texts in reformed spelling (in the thirteenth century); although spelling mistakes in pre-reform documents are often interesting, they are too often inspired by misapplications of the traditional orthography to be taken as any kind of direct phonetic transcription. In their monastic schools spelling was taught then, as now, of course, one word at a time; teaching apprentice scribes to spell [ésa] as *ipsa* or *ipsam* and [óguero] as *alter* or *alterum* was no harder than teaching Modern French apprentices to spell [ém] as *aime*, *aimes* or *aiment*. The old-fashioned morphology and grammar encountered in texts and needed for independent composition seems to have led a kind of twilight existence, in which it was generally understood passively but rarely used actively (like the Past Preterite in Modern French). When important texts had to be written, such as the official histories prepared at the Asturian court in the 880s, they went through many drafts in which such half-surviving stylistic tricks as synthetic passive verb-forms and oblique nominal cases were inserted in order to make them appear more professional. This was often achieved by imitating earlier works. Hymn-composers did the same. Even eighth-century Asturias had not seen the loss of such techniques entirely, unless the place of origin of Beato de Liébana's strikingly well-informed Commentary on the Apocalypse (c.780) has been wrongly located by modern scholarship (which is possible). Unofficial texts were not so treated, as the chance survival of the late tenth-century Leonese quartermaster's account of cheeses in the Rozuela larder shows us. As a result, the sociolinguistic nature of tenth-century Iberian Romance was unusually versatile and sophisticated in its exploitation of variants, old and new, and the surviving clumsy documentation is presented in merely an unflatteringly limp disguise. We are not now in a position to carry out technical sociolinguistic analyses of the statistics of variability

in class, age, context, social network, etc., in the modern sense, but a knowledge of sociolinguistics shows us that the tenth-century Spanish Romance-speaking community was similar to that of Modern France; there was a great deal of variation in any one place, hidden from us by a traditional written norm.

The Castile-Navarra border area gives us our first surviving evidence from a writer who is consciously not trying to write correctly in the usual way. The Riojan glosses of San Millán and Silos were once ascribed to the tenth century, but are now thought to be of the eleventh, even (in the Silos case) of after 1060. Two manuscripts contain marginalia, some in an apparently reforming orthography, and often also in Romance morphology. For this purpose, at least, the usual stylistic tricks were thought inappropriate, and the purpose was probably to facilitate reading aloud (sermons and a penitential). This new way of writing can hardly have aided a native Riojan, who knew how to pronounce his own speech without such prompting, and may have been intended to help one of the many visitors from further North-East, since by 1060 the idea of writing the Occitan way was generally accepted in Catalonia and Provence, and the letter-sound correspondences would actually have been helpful then. That experiment was not apparently followed up, however. No other texts describable as Romance seem to survive from the peninsula before 1100.

Two of the Riojan glosses are in Basque, its first written examples, although there is confused evidence in a partly bilingual document from Guipúzcoa in 1055. The glosses can only have been experimental, for Basque literacy cannot be postulated for that time; any Basque who wrote was bilingual. Outside the mountainous areas where Basque still survives, Basque speakers were probably all bilingual. There was a clear case of bilingual diglossia, similar in 1100 to what it had been in 100 A.D., and as usual the lower language in the pair was much more influenced than the higher: Romance influence in Basque is more pervasive than vice versa. They were not weak, however, as their crushing defeat of the Franks at Roncevaux in 778 showed, and this independence was probably what led Basque to survive at all.

In those centuries, Aragón consisted only of a few high Pyrenean valleys, whose Romance was for geographical reasons sufficiently

isolated to preserve some distinctive features, such as unvoiced intervocalic consonants. The Ebro valley to their south was still in the Moslem-ruled area. Further east, however, was Catalonia, or as it was known after 800, the Spanish March of the Frankish Empire. Catalonia had had little direct Arabic influence, and came during these centuries to be part of the French rather than the Iberian cultural sphere. It is noticeable, for example, that the isogloss that can with some legitimacy be drawn (south of the mountains) between Catalan and Aragonese corresponds roughly with the Frankish boundaries. This too was no great barrier to intercommunication. There was no real boundary between Catalan and Occitan at this time, nor for long afterwards, and Catalans were to be part of the driving force of Provençal culture. The Catalans also imported one of the major inventions of Frankish Romance culture, the conceptually separate language which we now know as Medieval Latin, used only in formal and at first exclusively ecclesiastical contexts. The use of Medieval Latin in ninth and tenth century Catalonia was probably patchy, as was the Caroline script that seems to have been imported with it, but in the early eleventh century Catalan Medieval Latin culture came to shine. The sociolinguistic implication is that a variety of diglossia between related varieties of the same language existed in eleventh-century Catalonia—as with Arabic in Moslem Spain—but not in other Iberian Romance communities. Even then, it is legitimate to wonder if they really thought Medieval Latin was entirely separate from their native Catalan, rather than still being as before a veneer to be fitted on top.

The end of the eleventh century saw many changes in Iberian sociolinguistics. The conquest of Toledo (1085) led to meetings between Arabic-speaking scholars, Jewish interpreters, Castilian clerics, French bishops, Medieval Latin-speakers from further north, joining native mozarabic-speakers and Romance speakers from elsewhere, in a city whose sociolinguistic patterning is still unclear to us; although the old idea that the mozarabic community was persecuted now seems to be groundless. The resulting prestige speech was to be another interdialect (as earlier in Burgos and later in Sevilla). The Leonese decision (in 1080) to adopt the liturgy generally used elsewhere in Europe had unexpected sociolinguistic

consequences, as French clergy had to be imported to teach the new non-vernacular Medieval Latin pronunciation their liturgy required, and that imported distinction eventually led to the same Latin-Romance diglossia as already existed in Catalonia. In the twelfth century the script also Europeanized. The arrival of pilgrims from many lands, both Romance-speaking and otherwise, made Santiago a cosmopolitan and multilingual center, and Galician Romance was the first to show signs of influence from Occitan lyric. The political split of Portugal from Galicia began, although a linguistic boundary did not exist at that border (or probably anywhere else in the continuum from Galicia to Aragón) for at least another century. The arrival of the Almorávides into Moslem Spain [after 1086] ended much of the bilingual culture there as Christians came north to Toledo and elsewhere, and Moslems increasingly used Arabic alone. A whole age ended between 1050 and 1100, and the sociolinguistic state of the Iberian peninsula changed drastically with it.

1994 POSTSCRIPT

This article was published in French, as "Sociolinguistique hispanique [VIII^e - XI^e siècle]," in *Médiévales* 25 (Autumn 1993), 61-70, at the invitation of Professor Michel Banniard, the volume's editor. The above is the original English text, which was translated into French for the volume.

13 Logographic Script and Assumptions of Literacy in Tenth-Century Spain

Much has been discovered in recent years about the linguistic differences between literate and non-literate societies, and historical linguists have been able to relate these discoveries to our two types of evidence about linguistic situations of the past, that is, texts and reconstructions. But some societies fall into neither category, in that they have only a small proportion of literate people but nonetheless preserve some general assumptions from a more literate past. Tenth-century Spain is such a case. Furthermore, when we try and use their surviving texts as evidence for the nature of their speech, it is probable that our analysis is hampered by the fact that their originally phonographic orthography was probably taught and learned in an essentially logographic manner (as in Modern Britain): that is, one word at a time, rather than one letter at a time.

The way that we should analyze the social assumptions that lie behind the existence of texts written in the distant past is not at all self-evident (cp. Wright 1992c). At times writers wish to transcribe speech with some directness. For example, the earliest texts intentionally written in a Romance language, in the central Middle Ages, were prepared with morphology, syntax, vocabulary and spelling that were intended to be more or less isomorphic with at least some style of the regional vernacular. But before the invention of such specifically Romance writing methods, such language planning as there was, if any, was not based on this ideal of isomorphism with speech, and writers' intentions were nearly

always in principle to attain the written features that had been deemed as correct centuries before by the late Roman grammarians. I intend to refer here, as examples of our difficulty, to texts of tenth-century North-Western Spain. These were written towards the end of the period that predates the language-planning reforms in that area, which would later lead to the existence of written Galician, Leonese and Castilian. Thus they were prepared according to an orthographical system that corresponded to a long-distant stage of the language. For nobody can doubt that the vernacular of the area had developed considerably from that of a millennium earlier. In order to work out any details of the spoken language used by those who composed this documentary evidence, therefore, we need first to consider in general terms what happens to writing systems that survive into periods when both [a] the speech with which they were originally intended to correspond has developed markedly, and also [b] the proportion of people in society who are able to write has decreased appreciably, such that the skill may have been the province only of professionals. This has hardly been studied, in fact; the acquisition of literacy into a society has been investigated by several scholars, but the social and linguistic consequences of such disparity and simultaneous professionalization remain to be assessed. And yet in some respects, this is what has happened to Modern French and Modern English (although their spelling was never entirely phonemic). The related problems have ramifications for the historical study of all levels of language, although the orthography-phonology interface is the one to be considered in this paper. Since writing is an artificial technique, whose acquisition depends on explicit instruction within an ad hoc kind of micro language planning, it is also of great importance to try to reconstruct the way in which writing and spelling were actually taught, at various places and times in the past. In the case of tenth-century North-Western Spain the near total absence of explicit evidence from any contemporary commentator means that our best available method is to deduce details of that teaching process from comparing genuinely attested (unemended) written forms with reconstructable pronunciations. Some printed versions are useless for this purpose, having been distorted ("emended") by modern editors; others are more reliable. The texts I have in mind are those such as in

Mínguez Fernández 1976, Ubieto Arteta 1976, García Leal (forthcoming). One of Mínguez's is reproduced here as an Appendix.

Tenth-century Christian Spain was a society which functioned on a basis of written texts (documents of sale such as the one reproduced here, charters, sermons, letters, Saints lives, laws, liturgy, etc.) which were intended to be read aloud. Compared with the proportions for modern societies, it seems that not many people could write, but we have to bear in mind that the chance survival of several pieces of slate from the Salamanca area on which shepherds (probably) the seventh century noted practical details in respectable written form, onto an untypically non-biodegradable surface, suggests that the ability to write in Visigothic society was more widespread than is often now assumed. The relative proportion in society of those who could write may well have declined by the tenth century, even if we include the mozarabic immigrants often thought to have boosted their numbers. Even then, many more people could read without being able to write; and even those who could not read were not thereby cut off from the literate world, for historical research has come to suggest that most texts, however old-fashioned, seem to have been expected to be generally comprehensible when read aloud sympathetically (see e.g. McKitterick 1990, Wright 1992), as they often are to children and illiterates today. Thus the social role of the reader-aloud (lector) in a community was an important one. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that Isidore of Seville had recently devoted careful consideration to the habits of a good lector, largely on that assumption of intelligibility if the lector did his job well (Banniard 1976). Lectores could also work as scribes (see Ganz and Goffart 1990:917), so it seems reasonable to deduce that at least some of those who wrote had the needs of the reader-aloud much in mind. For example, in order to be binding, legal documents usually had to be first recorded in writing and then also read aloud by the actual scribe for confirmation by the interested parties. Several documents (such as the one in the Appendix) have near the end a first-person clause in which the first-person deixis refers to the depositor (rather than to the notary) including the words *relegente audivi* 'I heard it read aloud': in this case, *Ego Ermildi in ac karta bendiccionis que relegente audibi manu mea (signo) fecit ante testibus mul[tis]*

tera (*dj*/*dit* *roboranda*). Presumably the witnesses could largely follow the oral version as well.

Tenth-Century Christian Spain (and late Early Medieval pre-Reform Europe in general) is perhaps unusual in being a society of comparatively restricted literacy, in the sense that fewer people wrote than before, which had nevertheless maintained several social assumptions from an earlier time of much wider literacy. Yet it is probably more misleading than has been previously realized to analyze the nature of that restriction in the same perspective, and using the same terms, as those with which other societies are usually characterized, in which the proportion of literate people in society is numerically similar to that of the Late Early Romance world, but has in contrast developed from total illiteracy in the relatively recent past. For example, Stock (1983), Armistead (1986) and also myself (1990-91), have made what may be an unwarranted assumption that the work of anthropologists such as Goody, on the change from pre-literacy to literacy, will necessarily be relevant to societies such as those of tenth-century Spain. In this latter case, the continuing administrative and educational infrastructure, based on an inherited assumption of textual intelligibility, which continued to be valid, could well be more relevant to our assessment of the relationship between textual evidence and speech than are the actual numbers of writers. That is, the illiterate were not cut off from literacy then in the way that they are often seen to be in societies where the literate are pioneers in a new universe. The general population of tenth-century Europe need not be patronizingly dismissed as illiterate on merely comparative numerical grounds, if by that characterization we mean that it was untouched by literate culture (cp. McKittrick's comments, 1990:2, on Stock 1983). Their society, essentially post-literate rather than pre-literate, could thus in some respects be said to be more like that of Modern English than that of the modern developing world; there is much to be said for the "idea that written language has irreversibly changed the human mind" (Frith 1983:603), and that irreversible change was not reversed by the decline in educational standards in either Modern Britain or tenth-century León.

Historical linguists need therefore to investigate, if we can, the nature and role of literacy in a society before we can reconstruct

speech from texts with any certainty. This applies to all societies of the past, in fact, for writing never reflects speech exactly. In the first place, no hitherto devised writing system is in practice a complete biunique representation of phonetic output. Even the narrowest transcription of tape-recorded natural vernacular is unlikely to represent exactly in its detached written units every detail of the speed, pitch, intonation, rhythm, resonance, and frequencies in a section of continuous speech. An orthography has a different function from an acoustic spectrogram, for orthographic texts are intended to communicate meaning, but a connected text in spectrogram form would communicate nothing at all. Such a direct textual representation of the sound alone is no help in practice, because what readers want are not such phonetic details but immediate indications of what the morphemes and the words are. For in reading, everything else is secondary; the immediate practical function of reading is to recognize the words rather than the sounds. As the modern specialists in teaching reading and writing stress, we "read by eye" even if in part we "write by ear" (Sampson 1985:208; Frith 1980; Savin 1972). This is a linguistic universal, albeit of a vague kind; yet it is not the sort of universal that diachronic linguists are used to operating with, even if we subscribe to merely the weaker varieties of uniformitarian principles, because in fact although orthography and phonetics never match exactly, the closeness of the fit between speech and writing can vary widely at different places and times. This wide variation is largely the consequence of disparate manifestations of human inventiveness, sometimes institutionalized as socially purposive Language Planning. Apprentice writers are not usually taught phonetic script. That is always advanced study. Instead, apprentice writers are taught "correct" written forms of words and morphemes. Thus in order for modern historical linguists to use those written texts as evidence for the phonetic or morphosyntactic nature of contemporary speech, we need to work out, if we can, how far each writer wrote his text according to set conscious principles of what he thought he "ought" to write, and how far, if at all, he was directly trying to reproduce what he would say himself. As regards Late Early Romance, Pei and Muller and others have already been criticized extensively for expressing the latter view [sixty years ago].

There is no need to dance on their graves any more, merely to point out that, in the light of subsequently-acquired sociolinguistic expertise, the writers could hardly have been able to express their own vernacular directly.

This remark presupposes that the results of sociolinguistic research into the present have direct relevance for societies of the past. In other words, it implies the Uniformitarian hypothesis. This is not, in fact, an invention of sociolinguists; it was used first by geologists, and then by Philosophers of History (see e.g. Dray 1989). These latter have been discussing at length whether we are likely to understand events in the past better by analogy with similar and already well-understood phenomena of the present, or by detailed study of the original context. Clearly, we need to do both if we can, but at the very least those of us who are considering the sociolinguistic state of Early Romance communities should not postulate phenomena that directly contradict what we know about similar societies in the twentieth century (cp. Wright 1988). On the other hand, linguistic universals can only strictly apply to events outwith the conscious control of the language user, and Philosophers of History would mostly agree now (if not in their behaviorist phase) that to understand historical events that are even to some extent in the conscious control of the participants we need to try and get into their conscious minds. This is often, of course, impossible, in any strict sense, which is why historiography is always going to remain in large part a sequence of ifs and buts. Even so, despite the uniformitarian validity of some general principles, we need for present purposes to put to one side the search for universals, and look at the specific society that our texts come from to see what the authors thought they were doing. Different societies, different writers and different orthographical systems need to be assessed differently by the investigator.

Sometimes writers have consciously tried to reproduce speech. This has probably always been the initial intention of those who first invented (or adapted from elsewhere) writing systems for their own language. Speech, however, is a vague term. As is generally known, orthographical systems fall into two main categories. These are (a) the logographic systems, such as the one devised to transcribe Chinese, whose original intention was to signal morphemes as

phonetically unanalyzed wholes; and (b) the phonographic systems, such as the Roman alphabet, whose original intention was to signal units of sound. The theoretical distinction between the two is clear. But the picture tends to become confused, because, over time, most systems become a mixture of the two. Research suggests that texts prepared with the logographic systems tend to be easier to read (by those who have learned how), but that on the other hand the phonographic systems are easier to learn to write. It is not the case that either should be regarded as intrinsically more advanced or desirable than the other (Sampson 1985; Coulmas 1989). It seems plausible to propose that readers and writers in tenth-century Spain, like those in the Modern English-speaking world, living in a society where speech sounds and the orthographic units of the traditionally "correct" written forms often fail to correlate closely, operate a system that, although it was originally phonographic (using sounds as the basic unit), has come to work, at least partly, in a logographic manner (seeing words as the basic unit). This is not meant to be seen as in any sense a process of decay or corruption. Our present system works, and the important practical matter is to operate a system that works, whether or not it has a phonographic basis. It is conceivable, for example, that future generations will laugh at our own clumsy naïveté in operating with a writing system for Modern English that makes no attempt to reproduce on paper the nature of acoustic formants. It is already the case that Korean script could be seen as more advanced than ours, in a phonographic sense, in that it includes direct representation of distinctive features. An acoustic-formant-based writing system seems as odd a concept to us as written vocalic representation would have seemed to a Sumerian, because we are all used to operating with what we have been taught. But we can infer from the work of Schmandt-Besserat (e.g. 1991) that the Sumerians' system was a sufficient and practical one for their perceived needs. So is ours now. So was that of tenth-century Spain. Chomsky and Halle made the sensible comment that (1968:49) "orthography is a system designed for readers who know the language" (and cp. Klima 1972). Orthographies are not designed to assist philologists of a millennium later. Let us assume that the strange appearance of documents such as many of those from tenth-century Spain corresponds neither to a desire to mystify, nor

to endemic total stupidity and incompetence, nor to improbably precocious expertise in phonetic script (Wright 1991c, 1992), but to a practical purpose.

At a slightly later period than the one I am centrally concerned with here, several approximations to spoken usage can be seen to be intentionally made in some eleventh and twelfth-century documents in the Iberian Peninsula, at a time when the ancient systems were still in theory the only ones in use; these came to be used as the basis for the consciously isomorphic thirteenth-century standardizations of written Castilian, Catalan and Portuguese (Wright 1982: ch.5). We cannot assume, of course, as Penny has showed (1991), that the correspondences they operated with were those of modern phonetic alphabets, but this was at least a period of phonographically-inspired spelling reform.

Most texts, however, are not prepared during or just after reforms of the writing system. Indeed, even if they are, reforms are sometimes specifically directed towards not representing speech, as with the late eighth-century reforms at the Frankish court which eventually led to the separate concept of Medieval Latin, (Wright 1991b), aiming to revive "correct" written forms, that in fact reflected the speech of a whole millennium earlier: or several of the orthographical decisions taken in the eighteenth century by the newly established Royal Academy of the Spanish Language. The nature of a spelling system can change unintentionally as well as being consciously invented and reformed. As a result, many writing systems work in practice on both semantic and phonetic levels. In the first place, logographic systems, over time, tend to acquire phonetic components. This has, in fact, happened to Chinese script (DeFrancis 1984; Coulmas 1989:109), which nowadays aids the reader with both phonetic and semantic indicators. Conversely, on the other hand, phonographic systems, over time, become naturally more logographic as the inevitable consequence of phonetic change. This has happened to words written with the Roman alphabet in many languages, including modern English and French, and also tenth-century Spanish Romance (see the studies by Emiliano and Varvaro in Wright, ed., 1991). In Sampson's words (1985:203): "the fact that the Roman letters originally stood for segmental sounds would not in principle be any bar to constructing a purely

logographic script with them". Thus in both kinds of system there is often a simultaneous appeal to recognition of both words and sounds. This fact has practical consequences for teachers. One method used in teaching reading in British schools, for example, involves the use of what are known as flashcards; the teacher says, for example, "this word is [nat]", holding up a card with the written word *night*, and with this technique the pupil is encouraged to learn the word's written form as a whole. Pupils still need to be able to recognize the individual letters, of course (Besner et al. 1984), but there is no intermediate stage of mentally allotting particular sounds to each individual letter. This is just as well, because such a process would be positively unhelpful in words such as *night*. As a consequence of this method of teaching, when reading aloud words we know, at least, the word (and its lexical entry) is always the basic unit that inspires our pronunciation, rather than the individual letter. It may even perhaps be a universal truth, concerning the consumers of ostensibly phonographic scripts, that the letter-sound correspondences are utilized in reading individually, that is, sounded out as separate entities, only when we encounter a word we do not immediately recognize as a whole. Spelling-pronunciations, therefore, are due to poor readers, those who cannot read well enough to recognize the word concerned immediately ("by eye"), and thus have to have clumsy resort to piecemeal phonographic correlation. This simple and indeed obvious deduction is, even so, diametrically opposed to that which is standardly taught in University classes on Romance Philology, in which spelling-pronunciations ("mots savants", "cultismos") are usually diagnosed as being the result of specifically erudite influence rather than of the reading incompetence that they actually attest (Wright 1992a).

Accordingly, it is worth considering the hypothesis that when people in tenth-century Christian Spain were taught to read (for they must have been taught somehow), they were indeed taught to recognize the letters, but as an aid to reading logographically; that is, the aim was to enable the apprentice reader to recognize whole, without clumsy piecemeal phonographical analysis, the written forms of at least those words that occurred commonly in their ordinary speech. That is, that the orthographic forms would have

been taught as single phonetically-unanalyzed units. There is no immediately obvious way of knowing for certain if that was indeed the case, but the modern evidence suggests that it would at least have been a sensible method to use. The teacher in tenth-century Castile, as it were, might have held up a card or slate or plank or piece of bark or stone or leaf or parchment bearing the written letters *IPSA* and said "this is [ésa]"; held up a card inscribed *UPER* (or even perhaps its abbreviation *sup*) and said "this is [sópre]"; held up a card with the letters *PETRUS* and said "This is [pédro]". These are three words commonly found in documents, although only *ipsa* is in the one in the Appendix here. The fact that the written letter *P* in these three words actually corresponded in tenth-century Spain to an unvoiced bilabial plosive in *PETRUS*, a voiced bilabial fricative in *UPER*, and to nothing at all in *IPSA*, might never have occurred to the pupils, and possibly not to the teacher either, who was not a theoretician of linguistics. In tenth-century Spain, we can reconstruct plausibly many such phonetic forms whose phonetic transcription would not have been exactly the same as their traditional "correct" orthography. Words that a scribe was likely to read and write often, such as the word reconstructably pronounced [komplógo] in 933—with possible variations—and written *complacuit* in the text reproduced here (and also in that of 908 in Wright 1982:166-67), would have been much simpler to teach and learn as whole units, particularly for those who were only learning to read rather than also to write—which was always the case, for it seems that it was normal practice to learn to read first and to write later if at all. More general principles of individual sound-letter correspondence would only be broached for recognizing words that were less common and less easy to recognize whole. For those who are learning only to read, in any language, such correspondences are only secondary; reading has to be based on a logographic recognition of the words and morphemes when (as in Modern English) the fit between the traditionally correct orthography and the speech sound is so often awkward and indirect. Since reading in tenth-century Spain seems to have been very often reading aloud, and intended to be immediately intelligible, it was essential to have a direct procedural link from the recognition of the written shape of the lexical item, to its oral production with its

normal vernacular phonetics. In practice the oral rendering of both modern English and these tenth-century texts would be greatly confused and indeed stultified by any attempt to read traditional spellings one letter at a time as if they were phonetic script. This is only common sense, and yet many Romance philologists have assumed that the reading of these texts can only have been phonographic, allotting one sound to each letter. Research evidence suggests that we do not after all read in that way, and that normal logographic reading could render the words, at least, intelligible to an unlettered audience, although the word-order might occasionally have been a problem (but see Blake 1991, and even if it was, cp the transposition techniques proposed by Stengaard 1991, Korhammer 1980).

Since writing was usually taught only to people who had already learned to read, as Riché established, writing would have been taught most practically on the basis of the already learned reading techniques. Having already learned to read, for example, the word written *IPSA* as [ésa], the apprentice scribe would probably have found it a comparatively simple operation subsequently to reverse the direction of inference and learn to write the word [ésa] as *IPSA*, still as a largely unanalyzed whole. For the apprentice, morphology, of course, produced additional complications, since logographic script based on whole words is inherently insufficient for languages with non-syllabic morphemes such as the plural-marking final [-s] of Old Spanish. We can hypothesize that the root was taught as one logographic unit, and the suffix, however brief, as another. There is some evidence for this: orthographical treatises of that age devote a great deal of energy precisely to the operation of these combinatorial techniques. For example, for a scribe to know when to add in writing a final silent letter -M to nouns and adjectives, needed extensive explicit teaching. So he received it, in, for example, Cassiodorus's *De Orthographia*, aimed at his protégés in Vivarium, Italy. In addition, the fact that many words were commonly written in the same widely accepted abbreviated form can only imply that these abbreviations were also taught as wholes (Bischoff 1990:150-68; for Spain, Millares Carlo 1929: ch.5); it is no great extension of the argument to propose the same for many words in unabbreviated form also.

An internal analysis of some written forms in tenth-century Galicia (Wright 1991a, partly based on Veiga Arias 1983 and the study of León in Pensado 1991) led me to the conclusion that the written form of a number of words was indeed taught in this way without phonetic analysis, during the teaching of writing as well as that of reading. These words probably included those commonly used in formulaic expressions; if so, this would explain why the words in question are comparatively rarely misspelled in texts. The written forms of some other words were not taught whole in this way. For the written representation of words whose integral form they had not learned, scribes had to fall back consciously on a loose piecemeal collection of rules of thumb, probably comprising both sound-letter and syllable-multigraph correspondences. The existence of the latter type of syllabic correspondence seems possible in the light of the fact that the units are syllabic rather than phonemic in the late eleventh-century *Artes Lectoriae* from South-Western France (Kneepkens and Reijnders 1979) and the fact that modern Spanish schoolchildren are often taught that way as well. To make such an analysis, of course, modern investigators need to be able to trust editors to reproduce the textual evidence exactly as it is written. Unfortunately, there are still editors around who aim to "emend" the spellings of their originals, we still apparently need to beseech them not to do that grotesque and unscholarly disservice to academic advance (Wright 1991d). The particularly interesting cases, in the tenth-century Spanish spellings investigated, are those in which phonological features which had not changed since the days of the Roman Empire, and were thus still broadly speaking isomorphic with the traditional orthography, were nonetheless often spelled in an incorrect way; in these cases the incorrect spelling can be ascribed not to a phonetic variant (as has been a common reaction of philologists in the field) but to an inappropriate use of those rules of thumb used for writing less common words.

Since teaching people to write always involves some kind of consciously transmitted technique, it is tempting to wonder whether any general Language-Planning ideas were around in tenth-century Galicia, as they were going to be later in Alfonso the Wise's Castile or the eighteenth-century Academy. Individual monastic centers had their own spelling habits, however, and vary

between each other as to which words are liable to be misspelled and which are not (cp. Pensado 1991:199). We can deduce from this that there were teachers, probably monks, who talked to each other, but not the wider standardization that would imply the presence of teacher-training colleges. The situation was thus quite different from that which prevailed in France at the same time. In France, the Carolingian reforms, intended to be uniform over the whole empire, were leading by then to a clear distinction between Latin and Romance (French) as conceptually separate languages. Yet many details remain unclear, even in France. For example, when we consider the relationship between scribal technique and reading aloud in the transitional period of the ninth century, Nelson's (1985) study of Nithard and the Strasbourg Oaths is going to have to lead French philologists back to the drawing-board, for the whole of Nithard's *History*, not just the Oaths, seems (in Nelson's persuasive analysis) to have been intended to be read aloud intelligibly to French-speakers with no great experience of higher education. How was it in fact read, with the new Medieval Latin pronunciation, or as normal Romance? What does this apparent intention imply? It continues to seem appropriate to believe that the reason why the Old French Oaths were originally prepared in the way they were (perhaps by Nithard himself, despite Nelson's tolerant skepticism of this suggestion) was in order to aid Germanic speakers who had already become used to reading aloud in the new reformed way (producing a sound for each written letter), to read the text aloud as intelligible vernacular French. For the situation in ninth-century France was confused (and probably into the tenth century as well, in many places); despite the increase in educational levels, the Carolingian Reforms had brought unforeseen complications. Language planning often does. Its effects are often catastrophic. It can be argued that the results of Alcuin's prejudices were almost entirely pernicious (cp. Wright 1991c). On the other hand, further south and west, the contemporary Christian Spaniards, still fortunately unaffected by these reforms, still worked within a metalinguistically monolingual framework, which involved writing a somewhat ad hoc mixture of logographic forms and sound-letter correspondences. That makes life difficult for us, the philologists of a thousand years later, but it was a very reasonable attitude for

them to take, and in keeping with the versatility, sophistication and flexibility that tenth-century Spanish Romance had in general (Wright 1991d). Philologists of the thirteenth century will have similar problems with texts from twentieth-century France.

CONCLUSION

Linguists like to think there are linguistic universals. Maybe in the event there is a diachronic universal which we can see at work here, in tenth-century Spain (but not in tenth-century reformed France). Societies that continue to function on a basis of documents generally expected to be intelligible, even when literacy is more restricted than it used to be, and that have inherited traditionally correct and originally phonographic written forms from that much earlier time of wider literacy, may always find it most practical to operate largely logographic systems of reading; and to some extent also of writing. Discovering whether this actually is a universal development is an empirical issue, which I invite specialists in other fields with comparable circumstances to consider. As a consequence of this, it is reasonable to conclude that post-literate societies are different in kind from pre-literate societies even with the same proportion of literate members.

APPENDIX

1st March 933. Ermildi sells Nina and his wife Juliana her daughter's inheritance in Ebas and Lores.

AHN, *Clero*, Sahagún. carp. 873. no. 1.

(Christus). In Dei nomine Domini.

Ego Ermildi.

Placuit mihi bono animo et ispotania nobis benit bolu[m]tas ut binderem tibi Nina et uxori sua Juliana ereditate de filia mia Sendina in Ebas, in Lores bel in alios lorares binias, terras, pumares bel pumifera in monte, in fonte acesu bel que recre ab omnia intecitate foras una binea que comudabi in Taberneio. Et tu dedisti nobis precium pro ipsa ereditate duas ceramenes kabiane sirguacata, quartario de cebaria, emina de bino in sub unum in setemedio

qua[n]tum nobis bene conplacuit, et de ipso precio abut te debitus non remansit. Ut in ac die bel te[m]pore abeas, teneas ac defendas tum et filis tuis bel progenie tue, tum et filiis tuis bel progenie tue belis abere, belis donare.

Sit aliquis te inquietarem benenit pro ipsa ereditate aliquis omo de parte mea aut de subrogita persona mea qui in iudicio bindicare non potuero post nomine meo tu[n]c abeas potestate de meo adpre[n]dere ipsa ereditate duplata qua[n]tum a te[m]pus fuerit meliorata.

Facta karta bendiccion[i] ipsas kalendas marcas in era DCCCCLXXI. Regenate domno Rademiro in Legione.

Fredena[n]do Gontesalbes comite in Kastala.

Ego Ermildi in ac karta bendiccionis que relegente audibi manu mea [signo] fecit ante testibus mult[is] tera[di] dit roboranda:

Agane: Dulceidius confirmat manus [signo]; Argiso testis [signo]; Dominus testis [signo]; Ervigius testis [signo]; Serenus [signo]; Aragildus [signo].

Arias [signo] scripsit.

1994 POSTSCRIPT

This paper was delivered at the special colloquium held to mark the retirement of Professor Glanville Price, at Gregynog, the country house owned by the University of Wales, on the morning of Tuesday July 14th, 1992. Professor Price was the general editor of the Year's *Work in Modern Language Studies*, to which I contributed [with a colleague] an ever expanding section on "Spanish Language" for eleven years, and a more pleasant and efficient colleague it would be impossible to imagine. The proceedings of that superb occasion are published as *The Changing Voices of Europe*, ed. Mair Parry et al., University of Wales, 1994, chapter 8, and this paper is reproduced here with the permission of the University of Wales Press. It represents a reworking of part of the paper delivered (under the title "Approaching writing—then and now") to the Tenth International Conference on Historical Linguistics at the Free University of Amsterdam on Wednesday, 14th August 1991. The other part, less concerned with Early Iberian Romance, was eventually reworked as "La escritura—¿foto o disfraz?" in *Actas del Primer Congreso Anglo-Hispano*, Vol. I: *Lingüística*, Junta de

Andalucía / Castalia, 1994, pp. 225-33. The increasingly logographic nature of reading and writing in this community holds the key to many of the problems in the field, I suspect; it deserves eventually a more thorough consideration.

14 The Teaching of Orthography in Tenth-Century Galicia

Dr. Amable Veiga Arias did Romance philologists a great service with his book entitled [with unnecessary modesty] *Algunas calas en los orígenes del gallego* (1983). With this study he has begun to fill the gap that existed to the West of the field of operations of the famous *Orígenes del español* of Ramón Menéndez Pidal (1926). With the data and ideas presented in these two studies we can now begin to try to understand the problems faced by notaries and others in Early Medieval Galicia when writing. Of course, it is not easy for us to enter the minds and intellectual perspectives of a thousand years ago, but if we want to make a reasonable interpretation of the evidence of the surviving texts of the time, that is what we need to attempt: to reconstruct their "orthographic consciousness" [what Gribomont, 1963, called their "conscience philologique"].

We must assume that tenth-century Galicians had no idea of what was going to happen in the future. They could not foresee the later lines of evolution of Galician Romance, nor the metalinguistic distinctions [diatopic and diastratic] that would be erected later. Nor could they then have foreseen the future political dominance of the Romance spoken in Castilla, three hundred kilometres or more to their East. Nor were they specialists in etymology. But neither were they all stupid, illiterate and uncultivated barbarians [see, for example, Sánchez Albornoz 1944, García Alvarez 1965, Wright 1991b, and for the tenth century in general, Riché 1981:ch.15, and López 1951, although these do not refer to Galicia]. They spoke their own language, and operated within their own chronological context. Some people knew how to read, and had been taught therein how to recognize lexical items. Some learned to write, always after learning

to read; they were still taught the old traditionally correct written forms, because there were as yet no other acceptable ones. This means that in theory, at least, they would have been reproducing in their own writing forms which they had already previously learned (in most cases) to recognize when reading. In order to write the formulaic sections of a new document, they almost certainly had textual formulae to follow, or even learn by heart (similar to those in the famous Merovingian formulary of Marculf, Riché, 1981:ch.14, reminds us that Marculf composed this in his old age *ad exercenda initia puerorum*); the formulae have considerable philological interest in themselves (cp. Uddholm 1955), but this study will concentrate on the "free" sections, whose wording had to be prepared quickly on the spot without the help of such formulae.

In the case of a common normal word, used regularly as much in Galicia in the tenth century as it had been in the second (even if phonetically different), there was no real problem. For example, when they learned to read they found out that the form written *super* was that of the common word which they pronounced [sóbre] (or even perhaps [sóbre], if we accept Walsh, 1991), and if they had to read that word aloud, they could read it in the normal phonetics without hesitation. For this reason, most Galicians of that time could have understood texts read aloud to them, even if they were illiterate, more or less the same as now; and for this reason the view of the Romance-speaking Early Middle Ages that tends to be given to us nowadays, that theirs was a community untouched by literate culture, is needlessly ungenerous. We know that notarial documents had to be read aloud to the interested parties for them to sign afterwards, thereby confirming them. For example, nine of the tenth-century documents that survive from Sahagún (printed in Mínguez Fernández 1976) have a phrase at the end explicitly including the word *audivi* (or *audivimus*); e.g., "*nos supra nominati sive hunc testamentum sive cartam vendicionis quod iussimus facere et audivimus legere roboramus*" (doc.299, from 979); and 21 of them have the vaguer phrasing of *cognovi* (or *cognovimus*), which also refers in practice to having heard it read aloud. There is evidence of other kinds to the effect that at this time, even within the Carolingian Empire, texts written in the traditional way could still be understood when read aloud, even if the vocabulary used did

not tally closely with the words found in the listeners' ordinary active speech. Society could still work on a basis of written documentation, of a legal, ecclesiastical, administrative and hagiographical nature, etc. Theirs was still what Riché (1981:ch.6) called a "civilisation de l'écriture" [with reference to seventh-century France]. On this point it is worth also consulting Alarcos 1982, Dutton 1980, Collins 1985 and 1990, Wood 1990, Bannard 1989 and 1990, McKitterick 1989, Nelson 1990, Guerreau-Jalabert 1981, Wright 1991 and 1993, etc.

On the whole, modern specialists in historical linguistics and sociolinguistics prefer to operate with the same general principles when studying the past as when studying the present. If we can accept this, we can realize that nowadays even children and illiterates can understand texts read aloud to them, and thus postulate that also in the tenth century normally most people could understand texts read aloud to them—although not necessarily perfectly, then any more than now. And almost everything then was read aloud; the so-called "mozarabic" liturgy, the homilies included in the services, the *Lives* of Saints, notarial documents, orders that came from the Court to the regional officials, even perhaps the official Histories (it seems quite likely that the *Chronicle of Alfonso III* was intended to be read aloud to the Court, for example). To achieve this, we can presume that the reader aloud had to recognize the written lexical units and pronounce them in a normal comprehensible manner. On such occasions readers aim now, and aimed then, for intelligibility. There was in most noble homes, villages, offices and military camps, etc., someone who had precisely the job (among others) of reading out any communications that turned up, and all those who had some kind of access to this person were not in fact cut off from literate culture, even if they were illiterate themselves. They could also use his professional services as a writer if the need arose.

A mere three centuries earlier, Isidore had given advice to lecturers to read slowly and clearly enough for the listeners to follow; he assumed that thereby the text would be intelligible. Similarly, in the tenth century we can presume that a reader would already know how to recognize the word written (for example) *super* (or its abbreviated form *sup*) and automatically read it aloud as [sóbre] (or

[sóbre]: This lexical item, pronounced as either [sóbre] or [sóbre] by everybody, and found in texts in the written form *super* [or *sup*], was part of the general common vocabulary. The fact that the usual spelling was not exactly the same as a phonetic transcription would have been had they known the International Phonetic Alphabet would not have worried them at all. They are unlikely even to have noticed the anisomorphism; the English word that has (in part) the same meaning is pronounced [əbʌv] and written *above*, but it would not occur to an English-speaker to complain about this; it is just a fact of the language, which is taught to children at school, that this ordinary word is written *above*, and there is no further problem. It is normal for the established spelling not to change, even if pronunciation does.

A few people also learned to write. It does not seem to have occurred to anyone anywhere to teach writing before reading. For that reason, they were already able to recognize the written form *super* [or *sup*] as being the same word as that pronounced [sóbre] or [sóbre], before they ever had to write it [if they ever did]. It could not have been difficult in this case, then, to train the notaries to write the word later in the correct way when it was their turn to write texts of their own. Learning to produce the written form of such a common word cannot have seemed problematic to them. And so, to remain with the same example, when we find the phrase *super agro de Scourietum* in an unpublished document of 934 from Celanova (quoted in Veiga Arias, 198), we can draw no phonetic conclusions at all from the existence of the form *super*. This written form was the correct written form, however it was pronounced; the notaries were aiming for orthographic correction as they wrote, and in this case he achieved it. [Veiga Arias tells us nothing about the abbreviations in his text, unlike the scrupulous Menéndez Pidal, but this observation is just as valid if the form in this document happens to be *sup*]. The same applies to the written form *Scourietum* in the same phrase; if indeed it is true that this is the officially correct form, in itself its use tells us nothing at all about its pronunciation, and if we wish for other reasons to postulate that it was pronounced at that time more or less in the manner indicated by the written form *Escouredo* found in a document from Penamayor of (perhaps) 1188, the existence of this other,

orthographically more correct form, is no reason not to do so. In general, in any language, words spelled correctly tell us nothing about phonetics. But they may, however, be usable as evidence of the manner in which the writers were taught.

The most frequent words are the ones usually spelled best. This is not because they are less likely to have changed phonetically, but because their written form is easier to remember. This may well seem obvious, but it is the opposite of what is often said about the Iberian Peninsula of a thousand years ago, where unevolved orthography has often been thought to be evidence of unevolved phonetics (Blake, 1987, makes this point well). It has not prevented, for example, the influence of the Aragonese spoken in the High Pyrenees being invoked to account for written forms that include intervocalic -t- -p- or -c- in some of the Riojan Glosses, which in fact corresponded straightforwardly with Romance words spoken with [d], [b], [g] [or [d]], [β], [ɣ]: e.g., *Gl.Em. 2, lueco*, representing [lwégo]. The correspondence [g] with /-k-/ was normal. These are "culto" forms in the obvious sense that they were written by an educated person (by definition), but no more than that. The mythical "Leonese Vulgar Latin" was invented in the twentieth century to explain something that needs no explanation at all, that is, the commonly found coexistence of correct and incorrect spelling; see Wright 1983 and 1989, Marcos Marin 1984, if, as we write, we can remember the correct spelling on some occasions but not on others, that does not mean we are speaking some other hybrid language.

But sometimes they had to write words which were less common, or words whose "correct" spelling was not as straightforward as in the case of [sóbre]-[sobre]. Sometimes the words did not even have a "correct" traditional form: many names of people and places, particularly those of Germanic origin, had no such form (as Menéndez Pidal pointed out, of course). Even though the orthographic form of commoner words could be learned whole as logographic units, without any conscious analysis of their phonemic structure, some tricks of the trade seem to have arisen and established themselves in a more or less conscious fashion in order to give a more correct (or more formal) appearance to words whose traditional correct form the writers either could not

remember or did not exist. It seems unlikely that the notaries worked with a dictionary or other reference tome actually open on their desks. Dictionaries did not exist, and the collections of glosses [glossaries] had a quite different function, being comparatively useless in cases of orthographic uncertainty. The notaries often had to write quickly, following the dictation of their client, at a speed more suited to speech than to erudite composition. In such a case, they had recourse to tricks of their trade, which were based on the most frequent cases. There were, for example, verbs formed with the prefix [sofre-] (or [sobre-]). In the *Poema de Mio Cid* we find, for example, *sobrevenida* ["surprise," 1.2281], *sobrelevo* ["I guarantee," 1.3478], *sobrepelelitas* ["surplices," 1.1582]. These words derive respectively from *SUPERVENTA*, *SUPER + LEVARE* and *SUPER + PELLIS + ITA* (*SUPERPELLICIA*, according to Menéndez Pidal). As Menéndez Pidal (1946:855-56) points out, the form of the second of these words [*sobrelevo*] is presented as *superlevare* in the *Fuero de Cuenca* XX, 4a. They would have done the same in Galicia and in preceding centuries, derived verbs formed with the prefix [sofre-] (or [sobre-]) were written as *super*; notaries knew that, whether or not they knew the whole word, and even if they may have made spelling errors in the following root.

To investigate whether what happened in Galicia was exceptional, I shall briefly also glance here at some documents from nearby territories. In the first place, I consider the two documents from Portugal that were closely examined by Lange (1966: from São Pedro de Cete, 882, and Pedroso, 897). The second one (pp.50-52) includes: "...filios meos iam superius nominatos...que ibi sunt auitantes uel que ibidem Dominus superduxerint et in uida sancta perseueraberint sub manus de ipse abba et de ipsa filia mea iam superius nominata...et insuper auri talenta et a rex au comite alio tanto." It looks as though this scribe recognized the morpheme spelled *super* inside the combinations *superius*, *superduxerint* and *insuper*. The other scribe, however, seems to make a lexical distinction between *super* and *subra* (pp.4-5): "...ad ista ecclesia adque Sacrosancto altario quod subra taxatum est"; and possibly also between *insuper* and *insubra*: "et insubra parient tantum et alium tanto quantum inde abstulerit et insuper auri talentum post parti testamenti et coram pontificum." [Menéndez Pidal, 1926:para.45.1,

mentions iam subra dictos from León, 962, and subra, from Esionza, 1005.] The opposite is also found; the Romance word [sofrare] (nowadays written as *sobrar*) had its etymological origin in *SUPERARE*, but some scribes may not have recognized it: Lange offers us [1966:145-46] *superatum* [955] and *soberado* [Coimbra, 1108], plus the toponyms *Superato* [1070] and *Sobradu* [1102] (cp. Lötstedt, 1959:58, *superatum* "attic," from San Millán, 956).

In addition, to set up some comparisons with the lands to the East of Galicia, I have looked for comparable evidence in the documentation from tenth-century Sahagún (Minguez Fernández 1976, Herrero de la Fuente 1988). These editors have prepared beautiful editions, but make no indications of abbreviations in the sources. In these 372 documents there are 84 cases of *super* (plus 1 of *siper*), 48 of *insuper*, 28 of *superius* (plus 1 of *superuis*), 11 of *desuper*, 1 *superfata*, 1 *supertaxatum*, 1 *superest*, and 1 *superdictum*; there are also 90 *supra*, either on its own or used as a prefix (that is, both 17 *supradict-* and 15 *supra dict-*), plus *superato* and *supratos* (= subsequent "sobrados"). There is not even a single case here with the letter *b*. In Sahagún, it looks as though they were well trained in how to write [sofre], even when it was only part of a longer word, and even if these data in fact include many cases of the abbreviated form [sup], that form also must have been taught to them as a whole unit.

This is the explanation, in my view, for the strange forms of [sofrino] (= subsequent Galician *sobriño*, "nephew") presented to us by Veiga Arias as beginning with *super-*. They must have thought it was the prefix. It was not. The correct written form of [sofrino] was *sobrinus*. Even so, the forms *superinis* and *superino* from a document from Xubia, 1191 (Veiga Arias, p.60, seems to imply that here it is not an abbreviation to *p*) are the only ones that include a letter *e* out of the 36 written cases that Veiga Arias mentions. He refers here to the "restitution of a pretonic [e]," but that seems unlikely; this letter *e* was entirely "silent," written without anyone having pronounced this word with an [e] (we should remember that there was no [e] in the original form). Out of the 20 written representations of [sofrino] that contain the written letter *p*, among those that Veiga Arias reproduces in his book, the other 18 do not contain an *e*. So that it is easier to understand what happened when

they tried to write this word [soβrino], here are reproduced all the forms mentioned by Veiga Arias [pp.58-60]:

6 *sobr-* (*sobrinus* 1, *sobrinum* 1, *sobriño* 2, *sobrina* 2).

2 *super-* (*superinis* 1, *superino* 1)

16 *supr-* (*suprinis* 2, *suprini* 2, *suprinos* 8, *suprino* 1, *suprinus* 2, *suprinum* 1)

10 *subr-* (*subrino* 4, *subrina* 2, *subrinis* 1, *subrinas* 1, *subrini* 1, *subrinos* 1)

1 *sopr-* (*soprina*)

1 *supl-* (*suplinum*)

Sometimes, as Veiga Arias points out, there is variation within the same document.

If these are all the forms of this word that are to be found in this documentation, which is what Veiga Arias implies, we can see that on only six occasions [out of the 36] did the notary succeed in reproducing the correct spelling of the word. They never hesitated in representing the [n] as *n*, which is no surprise at all [as Dr Veiga Arias also made clear] because that was the normal spelling of this ending. It was the anxiety to be "correct" that led the other notaries to the other 5 guesses [or 4, if we ignore the metathesis of the scribe who wrote *suplinum* in a document from Oseira of 1098, and we allot this form to those with *supr-*]. It is clear that they did not know the form as an integral whole, and they had to make guesses on the basis of the tricks of their trade. In this case, we are fortunate enough to be looking at a word that did not suffer, and had no reason to expect to suffer, any phonological change in its first two syllables [assuming for the moment that it was [β]], that was merely allophonic, which is, I realize, debatable! the Ibero-romance development of *SOBRI-* to [soβri-] is what we would expect, and is indeed what happened. We cannot believe that any of the five

phonemes concerned changed phonologically [except eventually the [β]], nor even indeed that there could have been many variants in its pronunciation [neither diatopic nor diastatic] that were later to disappear, and even if there had been some variation, we cannot believe that this word can ever have been pronounced with a [u] or a [p] in the speech of any Galician of a thousand years ago. This variation was merely orthographic.

There is never any variation in the spelling of the initial [s-], because there was never any alternative available. The sound had not changed before a vowel, so [sV-] was always correctly written s-. Before a consonant at the start of a word, it never existed in speech; some of them knew that when [s] appeared before a consonant and after word-initial [e-] they should ignore the latter in writing; that was achieved, correctly, by the aforementioned notary who wrote [eskouredo] as *Scurietum*. Since this was merely a trick of the trade, there were times when they missed the [e] out of the written form and thereby got it wrong; that explains why we so often find the incorrect form *ste* rather than the correct *iste* in the card-index of Visigothic Latin compiled by the Latin department of the University of Santiago de Compostela; and *Spania* [rather than *Hispania*] in the "Rotense" text of the *Chronicle of Alfonso III*, for example (Gil et al., 1985).

Intervocally, we can sometimes find -ss- [e.g. in *fuisset*]. But in the case of our word [soβrino], there was no reason to encourage the notary to write anything other than s-, and that is what we find every time. In the same way, the [r] and the [i] presented no difficulties. But the written representations to be given to the other two phonemes were not so easy to work out.

There were many words in the Romance spoken in Galicia a thousand years ago in which the sound [o] was correctly spelled with the letter o. [monte] was correctly written as *mons* or *monte*, for example. We know from the note that Veiga Arias dedicated to this word (1982) that they apocopated the word in the toponym *Monféro*, and were sometimes unsure as to the correct inflectional morphology to give this word (that is, the inflection appropriate to the sentence the word was in), but it seems that the vowel of the first syllable was never written with any letter other than o. But in other words, in order to achieve orthographical correction, it was

necessary to represent the sound [o] with a letter u [as in *super*, representing [soʃre]]. They seem to have been aware of this anisomorphism, and, either assuming that it would be preferable to make a mistake through overeagerness rather than through apparent ignorance, or remembering the case of *super*, or both, 29 of the other 30 writers chose the letter u rather than o to represent the first [o] of [soʃriɲo].

There were also complications with the representation of the [β]. There were many words in which a [β] or [b] was correctly written with a letter p, as in *super*, or *Riparia* ([ripejra]: Veiga Arias, 103-04), etc.; and others in which it would have been correctly written with a b [as in *beber*] or a u [v] [as in *vivir*] or even bb [as in *abbas*]. Often, in an intervocalic position, they had success in opting for a -p (e.g. *Riparia*, three times) instead of the -b (7 times in that case) or the -u (Rueira is found once). In the case of [soʃriɲo], on ten occasions the writer chose -ub- and fourteen times -up- or -op-. This is only an orthographical variation, of course, but interesting even so.

If it had merely been a question of having to choose [when writing [soʃriɲo]] more or less at random between two pairs of orthographical alternatives, u / o and p / b, we would expect to be confronted with statistics something like this: 9 times -up-, 9 times -op-, 9 times -ub-, 9 times -ob-. The statistics that Veiga Arias actually offers us here are so different from these that it is reasonable to suggest that they may even be significant. In the first place, the 6 "correct" uses of *sobr-* are less than the 9 we would have expected if the notaries were merely choosing at random; so perhaps we were wrong to make the deduction made above, to the effect that these six writers did know the orthographically correct form. Maybe these were guessing just as much as the others were, but happened to guess right. A reminiscence of the written form *super* could well explain some of these forms, but is not enough to explain why the form *sopr-* is found only once and the form *subr-* ten times; it looks as though the reasons they felt for representing [-o-] as -u- were some ten times more powerful than those they felt for representing [-β-] [-b-] as -p-.

This discrepancy can perhaps be explained by the instructions they had been given for representing inflectional morphology

correctly; written forms of nouns were so often correct if the writers represented [o] with -u- that this formalizing trick [writing u for [o]] was used, correctly, in many other words as well. [This is a guess, of course. Besides, in some areas the final vowel of these nouns might have been [-u], at least in some words that had a high vowel in the root]. On the other hand, in inflections -p- was never correct; whereas in imperfect verb forms [aβa] was written correctly as -abat [-abam, etc], and the correct form of the future indicative of many verbs—a paradigm which seems to have hardly ever been written, unlike the future subjunctive—also included a -b-. In the future tenses, this letter may well no longer have corresponded to any sound at all in the Romance of the tenth century; *amabit* is likely to have in effect represented [amará]; although earlier the -b- indeed had corresponded to a [β], when the [β] of the postposed auxiliary *habeo* was still pronounced, and it may be reasonable to hypothesize a slight residual [β] even in this tenth century [that is, it could have been [amaráβe]]. The same was true, *mutatis mutandis*, of the -ibus which sometimes had to be written but which [in the tenth century] was no longer used in speech, not even [I suggest] in reading aloud; I follow Politzer 1961 and Green 1991 in saying this, rather than Löfstedt 1983. Pensado (1991:198-99) noted that in her corpus the commonest suffixes were written in the orthographically correct form more often than other morphemes, although she did not find that as a consequence of this the t was written in other morphemes more often than p and c (the other letters usually representing unvoiced consonants). Even so, it could be that reasoning such as this (not necessarily conscious) led them to think in cases of uncertainty that b was more likely to be correct as the written representation of [β] than o was of [o]. If this was so, then the combined statistical predominance of -ub- over -op- in the forms that we have attested of our word could be explained as a consequence, either conscious or unconscious, of their training. And even if we were right, on the other hand, to see the forms written in *sobr-* as lucky guesses, we still have a ratio of 20:16 for p:b (56%:44%) but 29:7 (81%:19%) for u:o, and the second figure is still striking.

The written forms of this word in Lange (1966:129) are *sobrinis* (Celanova, 842), *sobrinas* (Livre de D. Mumadona, 982), *sobrinum*

[Livro Preto, 1005], and *subrinos*, *subrinum*, *sobrina* (1101). In the tenth-century documentation from Sahagún there are 5 *sobrinno*, 1 *sobrinno*, 3 *sobrinis* (= 9 *sobr-*, 27%); 2 *subrinno*, 2 *subrinis*, 3 *subrinno*, 9 *subrinis*, 1 *subrineas* (?![n]) (= 17 *subr-*, 51%); 1 *suprina*, 2 *suprinis*, 1 *suprimis* (= 4 *supr-*, 12%) plus 1 *superinum*, 1 *subsuprinis* and 1 *consoprinis*. These percentages are not unlike the ones from Galicia, and we can deduce that, in this case, in Sahagún as in Galicia apprentice scribes were taught the spelling *super* (or *sup*) as an integral whole, but not *sobrin-*. It might be that the reason for this was that *super* was often found in various semi-formulaic phrases, but *sobrinno* was not. (There are also 5 *tio*, 1 *tios*, 1 *tiu*, 1 *tia*, representing the converse, "uncle".)

What conclusion should we draw from this, then? That at least some of the scribes learned the equivalence of [soβrɛ] and *super* (or its abbreviation) during their professional training, but they did not usually learn the equivalence of [soβrɛ] and *sobrinus*; and also that they learned the equivalences of [-β-] and [-b-] with *p* or *b*, and of [o] with *u* or *o*, as some of the formalizing tricks of their profession. That can explain the surprising statistic that in Galicia *super* was very often written correctly, despite its phonetic evolution to [soβrɛ], and *sobrin-* was only written correctly one time in six, without ever having undergone any phonological change. There is no need to conclude that *super* was always taught in this way in every center, nor that they always learned it right; for example, I have studied elsewhere (1982:166) a tenth-century Leonese document containing the form *suber*, and Jennings (1940:63) noted the form *desuber* in a 982 document from San Vicente de Oviedo.

It is, in passing, of great interest to observe what happened to a similar word in tenth-century Sahagún: [aβadesa] (now written *abadesa*, "abbess"). The masculine *abba* "abbot" was written correctly with no problem, yet the feminine [aβadesa] was written there 7 times *abbatissa*, 2 *abbatissa*, 1 *abbatisi* (= 10 *bb*, 38%); 6 *apatisa*, 1 *apatisse*, 2 *apatisa*, 3 *appatisa*, 1 *apatesa*, 1 *aparesam*, 1 *apase*, 1 *apa* (= 16 with *p* or *pp*, 62%). It seems that they knew that the [d] (or [dʰ]) of this word should be written as *-t-*, as in so many suffixes, but, even given the analogy of *abba*, and in the absence of any prefix analogous to *super-*, the letter *p* exerted its

attraction on more than half of these occasions. Here, as with *sobrinno*, the word had always been pronounced with a voiced consonant (it comes from the Greek, which had β), and we cannot envisage the existence of any [p] (and certainly not of [pp], obviously).

These data show that we cannot just trust the spellings of these times to be faithful transcriptions of anyone's speech. To quote Pensado (1991:197, my translation): "the intention of writing correct Latin removes any evidential value from archaizing forms." But the mere fact that they wrote, and did compose new texts, is a guarantee that they must have been taught how to write. It is impossible to write without having been taught how to choose spellings. We need to investigate how this training was done: every letter, every word, every phoneme, possibly every syllable, needs individual research. This is what Puentes Romay has begun to do, over a wider geographical range than this, studying the letters *b* and *v* (1986a); and, more adventurously, the representation of the reconstructable phoneme /ts/ (1986b). Puentes concludes that "some very definite tendencies can be established" (1986a:348), which could well be attributable to the way the writers had been taught. In her important study, Pensado (1991), working with a huge Leonese corpus to study the orthographic variation of *p* and *b*, *t* and *d*, *c* and *g*, discovered that some of the commonest words were never written incorrectly; for example (staying in the field of kinship terms) it is noticeable that she assures us that *pater* and *mater* were never written with a letter *d* (p.200), and we can deduce from this that if there was indeed such a list of written words learned whole, these two words must have been on that list. Pensado has not yet studied those cases (such as *sobrinno* and *abadesa*) in which the correct orthography included *b* (or *d*, or *g*) but the word is sometimes found written with a *p* (t, c) which cannot ever have corresponded to an unvoiced sound. (Jennings, 1940:47-48, refers to the letter *p* of the form *suprino* in a document of 990 from Oviedo as being due to the confusion that there was in the contemporary pronunciation of the word; an absurd explanation, for there was never any such confusion. In fact, he has misunderstood a comment by Muller and Taylor 1932:45-46).

As we saw in the data from Sahagún, the difficulty experienced

by Galicians as they tried to write [soŕino] was also felt slightly further East in writing [soŕino] (where the nasal had not palatalized). In the famous tenth-century list of cheeses from San Justo y Pastor (León) we read the form *soprino* (Menéndez Pidal 1926:24-25; Wright 1982:173). In the *Chronicle of Alfonso III*, written in Oviedo at the end of the ninth century, we read *subrinum* (Gil et al. 1985: ch.20, pp.138-39), *consuŕinam* (ch.2, pp.116-17) and *consuŕino* (ch.3, pp.118-19); they all turn up in the same spelling in both versions (the Rotense and the "Erudite" one of the tenth century), without having been further corrected in the Erudite version, whose editor "corrected" many other details of this kind. There is no way of knowing whether they used the lexical item [konsoŕino] in active speech at that time, but it is entirely possible; it also appears in document no.251 from Sahagún (of 967), and Isidore had used it shortly before (for its semantic change, see the notes in Bonnaz 1987, and my own assessment of the language of the *Chronicle*, Wright 1991b). The cheese-loving Leonese monk wrote *sopr-*, and all the Oviedo historiographers wrote *subr-*, both forms being "incorrect" in just one detail, but we can feel sure, in this case, that they all said [soŕ-] or [sobr-] (both in [soŕino] / [sobrino] and in [soŕe] / [sobre]).

This is a significant example, because it involves a word whose first two syllables never changed phonologically, but which were written in Galicia in six different ways (according to the data provided by Dr Veiga Arias); and another word whose first four phonemes were pronounced the same way in tenth-century Galicia (in [soŕe]), but which apparently was regularly spelled in a manner both correct and unlike phonetic transcription. We cannot be sure of the statistics of this form in tenth-century Galicia, however, until all the data used by Dr Veiga Arias are available in a form accessible to those of us who do not have the good fortune to work in the beautiful city of Santiago; all those of us who live elsewhere but are interested in Galician hope that they can be published soon, because for the moment we have to be content with the brief phrases quoted in the works of Dr Veiga Arias. There are not many words like Castilian [soŕino], in which there had been no phonological change (apart from in the final inflections, of course). As we saw earlier, *montes* is another (being [móntes], or at least [móntes]), in the first

century, the tenth, and still now), and, so far as I am aware, the first syllable has always been written as *mon-*, although the word was occasionally apocopated to just that in toponyms. These three letters, *mon*, are those that always appear in the forms mentioned in the *Orígenes del Español*, although we can presume that sometimes the /n/ was represented in writing with a tilde [mō-]. The first vowel in [móntes] is the one that interests us here. It was [o], the same as in [soŕino], but in this case it seems that it was never written with u (**mun-*). So there were some words which they could always manage to represent "correctly" with a u representing the [o] (as *super*, or *supl*), and others which they could [nearly] always manage to represent "correctly" with an o for the [o] (such as *montes*), while there were also others which they did not know beforehand how to represent the [o] in, and thus they had to make a guess, choosing from the two possibilities offered by the correspondences they had met elsewhere (as with [soŕino]). These facts can be best explained by the hypothesis—which is merely a hypothesis; there is no polemic or dogma to be derived from this—that in their professional training they often had to learn by heart correct forms of frequently-used words, including those found in formulaic or semi-formulaic phrases that occurred often, learning them logographically as whole units without phonemic analysis; whereas for less common words, they had learned sound-letter correspondences that they could later use when writing quickly to dictation. This hypothesis is not at all unlikely in itself. Modern English children are taught to read, and at times also to write, with the same mixture of techniques; it is practical. So it is not particularly adventurous to suggest it also for the Galicia of a thousand years ago. I am referring here merely to the methods they used in writing their own language, so there is no need to discuss antiquated words that were found in previously written texts that they may have had to read aloud, but were otherwise outside the active competence of the tenth-century writer and not written in new texts; I have already considered the methods they seem to have used to read aloud archaic items in Wright 1982:165-73 and 1983a; Pensado (1991:191-92) also considers them.

Three words, of course, cannot prove anything. So let us consider another case, this time of words and sounds that indeed

changed. The letter *t* for example, had room for more confusion than the letter *p*. As did the *p*, at the start of a word the letter *t* represented an unvoiced plosive, both in words inherited from the Empire, such as *terras* and *tauros*, and in those that had come from elsewhere, such as *taleiga*; Dr Veiga Arias presents us with three written forms of this latter word [211-12], without variation in the initial *t*. They knew nothing of its etymology, of course; such a distinction is only made by us. In post-consonantal position the letter *t* also represented [t] (e.g. *monte* and *portum*; Veiga Arias, 122). In these two positions, syllable-initially, there seem to have been no problems: [t] was represented with *t*. At the end of a word, this letter probably represented no sound at all, in the Romance spoken in tenth-century Galicia, although it is true that we cannot be sure of the century in which the final [d] (written *-t*) disappeared from the end of verbal affixes. By the eleventh and twelfth centuries, at the latest, we can feel sure that there was no dental sound at the end, for example, of words such as the ones written *dicunt* or *stat*, which represented [dizen] and [está] (*dicent* is actually attested in Sahagún, doc. 258, of 970). In La Rioja, the famous eleventh-century Glosses seem to show that the final plosive fell out of use there after the plural [-n] earlier than in postvocalic position, but not even these Glosses were actually written in a manner systematically isomorphic with the phonemes. Let us suppose that at least often, and perhaps always, in "correctly" written forms from the Galician data the final letter *-t* represented no sound. It would be possible, under these circumstances, for a written final letter *-t* to be equally "silent" in other words, as for example in the forms *Eytat*, *Heitat* or *Erit* (Veiga Arias, 123) or in *Roderiquit* or *Miguit* (mentioned in Dr. Veiga Arias 1989:13 and 24). This possibility, that such forms are "hypercorrections" of this type, is only mentioned here because it is one more of the many possibilities in such difficult cases.

In intervocalic position the letter *-t* usually represented [d] (or [d]); *pratum* represented [prádo]. This phoneme was also sometimes represented by the letter *d*, at the start of a word (*de* [de]) or of a syllable (-ando [-ando]), but there were so many morphological inflections in which [d] (or [d]) was represented by *-t* (e.g. [-ades] by *-atis*, [-ída] by *-ita*), and perhaps still [-edor] by *-itur*, if the synthetic passive was indeed still occasionally used in high-style speech—that

probably they would statistically be more likely to be correct on average if they chose to represent the phoneme with the letter *t*. Meanwhile, intervocalic [-t-] was hardly ever heard; if such a word was to be written, sometimes it needed *-tt* (e.g. *guttal*), sometimes *-pt-* (e.g. *scriptos*) or sometimes *-t-* (see below).

In Castille, they had a special problem with words beginning in [ot-]. It is possible to reconstruct that there, in the tenth and eleventh centuries, the words that began that way were [otópo] (< AUTUMNUM), [otorgás] (< AUCTORICARE), [ótro] (< ALTERUM), [otéro] (< ALTO + RIUM), and—in some styles and some regions, at least; perhaps in all—[óto] (< ALTUM). That is, not a single one of the words that began with these two phonemes could be written correctly with either an initial letter *u*- or *o*-. *octo* represented [oitó] at that time [oit-], more or less as in Modern Galician, and it seems likely that *october* then represented [oit-] as well, since its first nakedly Castilian documentation, in the thirteenth century, begin with *och-*.¹ *AUT* > *o* had already lost its [-t-] (see the form *au* in the quotation above from Lange, for example). The only word in the Latin of the Empire that had begun in [ot-] had been *otium* (and its derived terms, such as *otiose*), a word which did not survive in speech; if [ódio] existed in the tenth century, which is not certain, it was written *odium*; the words that had begun in *ut-* had either disappeared from active speech (e.g. *urum*) or seen that consonant voice [ódre] (< UTER), and the form written *ut* was probably rarely if ever used in active speech, although it certainly still remained in

¹ Corominas and Menéndez Pidal offer us the forms *ochubre* and *ochubrio* from that century, as well as *octubre* with the traditional correct spelling of *oct-* (and so, as we have seen, this latter form cannot be used as evidence for phonetics), and, later, *otubre* (from Santander, 1380 and 1419; Menéndez Pidal 1966:34), that is, that the phonetic history of "octubre" developed parallel to that of "ocho" until after the thirteenth century. In tenth-century Sahagún they always wrote this word with *oct-*, nearly always in the form *octobris*, but twice as *octubrias*. There, dates including an 8 were written in numerals [VIII] except two cases of the year 970 (era 1008), with *octaba* and *octava*, later, in the already quoted *Fuero de Valfermoso de las Monjas*, there appear *oitabas* [107], *oictavas* [198] and *octavam parrem* [199] (vernacular "octava, ochavas").

the passive competence of listeners; yet it would have been said and read as a clitic with [o], or maybe [od], but never [oc]. The consequence was the well known fact that the vowel [o] of words that began in [ot-] was written in all sorts of different ways [see the data in *Orígenes*, paras. 20-21], but that the [t] of these words was always written as *t*. So far as I know, we never even find it geminated into -tt-.

And we can now see from the studies of Dr Veiga Arias that the Galicians had a similar problem. It was not exactly the same problem, because there the normal pronunciation of the initial phonemes of such words was [out-]: the three initial letters of the modern written forms *outono*, *outorgar*, *outro* and *outreiro* probably represented more or less the same sounds then as they do now. They also had stylistically-motivated variants of *alto*, and first it would be best to solve this ancient philological puzzle. The variation we find in the texts, but which on this occasion it is also justified to reconstruct in their speech, seems to imply that this word found itself at the end of the queue for the lexical diffusion of this phonetic change [alt-] > [aut-] > [out-] and/or [ot-]—perhaps because it was the only one with tonic stress on that syllable—and the variation which is always found during a sound change continued right up to the twelfth-century in this case. As we know from the superb study by Malkiel (1975), in that century the multitude of available forms derived from DULCE was simplifying out to the benefit of the spoken form [dúlse], which happened to coincide with the phonetic form given to this word in Church pronunciation (the new "Medieval Latin" introduced into the peninsula at that time; cp. also Hartman 1980, Wright 1982:34-36). I suspect that in *alto* we have a similar case, in which a word had available several competing phonetic variants [alto], [auto], [outo], [oto], and this phonetic indeterminacy was solved in that same twelfth century in favor of the [-lt-] which members of the Church were being taught to pronounce during their training in that century (but not before), since this is also a word used in the Christian liturgical offices. That is, the "culto" effect is not a reactionary conservative one, but a reflection of the progressive Europeanizing reforms of the twelfth century. So [alto], in Galicia as elsewhere, eventually survived as the independent lexical free morpheme, but

at times [oto] or [outo] survived in placenames, either as a separate word or as a morpheme inside a compound word [where it may not have been recognized], both in Castille [Menéndez Pidal refers to *Villota*, in Burgos province, etc.] and in Galicia (e.g. *Montouto*, *Outomuro*, etc.; mentioned by Dr Veiga Arias, 182) and elsewhere. *Alto* ([alto]) is indeed the genuine Galician vernacular form, as Fontanillo and Rodríguez (1985:34) point out; the written literary variant "outo, which has been adopted by several writers, is a literary creation, invented to be different from the Castilian..."; we need to take care not to be misled by this kind of invention.

We are used nowadays to making the diagnosis that forms [of these words] in [ou] are Galician and those in [o] are Castilian (and elsewhere). But in this case, as in most others, it does not seem in practice that the evolution was so neatly geometrical, nor obeying political boundaries with such clarity. We can easily reconstruct that there was a long time when both forms (as well as the preceding form [au]) were found all along the Cantabrian range, and probably elsewhere also. A synchronic sociolinguistic study carried out in the tenth century would have discovered, I suspect, that the two phonetic forms of these words existed in both Burgos and Compostela, but that in the latter area [ou] was more common than [o]—80% to 20%, say—whereas in Burgos [o] was more common than [ou]—again 80% to 20%, perhaps. Then later, at the time of the linguistic standardizations (in the thirteenth century) it is understandable that in each area they chose (either consciously or not) to standardize the variant form most frequently used there. For this reason I am in complete agreement with Dr Veiga Arias when he says that written forms of such words in o- found in Galicia (such as e.g. *otero*) should not be described as "Castilianisms." Neither should forms found in Castille with the letters ou- be described as "Galicianisms."

It would be useful to be able to study in detail the Galician word *outro* in the tenth century, but Dr Veiga has not provided quotations of this word, so the necessary data are not immediately available. (Neither are there many attestations available of *outono* and *otoño*, < AUTUMNUS). In *Orígenes*, 20.4, Menéndez Pidal offers us the forms *altas*, from Sahagún, 1097, and *autra*, from León, 1163, and in several paragraphs considers the competition

between the different written forms. On this occasion, as with *alto*, it is probably justified to postulate a connection between written variation and spoken variation. *Autra* is also found in Modern Galicia (Fontanillo and Rodríguez 1985:429). Among the Riojan Glosses we find *altra*, *altros*, and *altros*, and perhaps there was in the Rioja a spoken form including [l], although this *l* is attributed to "cultismo" by Menéndez Pidal. (If that is indeed the explanation, we could well wonder why this supposed "cultismo" was not also written with an *e*.) In the tenth-century documents from Sahagún I only found 1 *alteros*, 1 *alteram*, 2 *alterum*, plus 1 *alterum* in a text that was almost certainly rewritten much later.

In theory, [outorgar] should have been written as *auctoricare* ("grant"). Although it seems that this word was never found in this written form in the Empire, the two component morphemes, *auctor* and *-icare*, are venerably ancient. In Galicia, according to the data of Dr Veiga Arias (189-93), there are for this word 28 written appearances of *auct-*, four of which are also found with *-iz-* (e.g. *auctorizare*) which Dr Veiga Arias diagnoses as being a separate lexeme from *auctoricare*, without providing the semantic contexts that lead him to this conclusion; there are also 7 written with *oct-*, 2 with *aut-*, 7 with *ot-* and one with *obt-* (and, in the event, *-iz-* also: *obtorizare*). We can hardly attribute the domination of the forms in *auct-* to the possibility that in this case they had been taught the orthography of the word whole as a logographic unit, because there is not even a single case of the "correct" *-ic-*; as well as the four with *-iz-*, two are written with *-g-* (e.g. *auctorigare*) and the rest with just *-g-* (e.g. *auctorare*). Although the syncopation process must have been completed in this word by then (Harris-Northall 1990:97-101), it is hard to believe that they can actually have been taught to write the word as *auctorgare*, and there is no need for us to come to that conclusion, since, according to the correspondences which they either knew explicitly or intuited inductively, [rg] could be written as *-zg-* without any problem (e.g. [largal], [largal]). It could be suggested that they were indeed taught how to write the complete morpheme *auctor*; this word was written this way in the *Fuero de Avilés*, for example; but it does not seem to have been a frequent word in daily notarial usage. It is also possible to suggest that there might have been an idea—less

formalized than their tricks of the trade, presumably—that words beginning in [out-] (and, where appropriate, [ot-]) could be given their correct form with the letter *c*. This is how we can explain the forms of this word written with initial *oct-*, while those that began with *aut-* owe that form to the operation of the common sound-letter correspondence of [ou] with *au* (e.g. [kout-], *caut-*); and those with *ot-* may well represent directly the sociolinguistic variant glimpsed above. There is not a single case of written *out-* for [outorgar] in the data from Galicia provided by Dr Veiga Arias; neither he nor I nor anyone else doubt that it was indeed regularly pronounced [out-], and so once again we can discard the possibility that the notaries were dedicated simply to using phonetic script.

Even so, in the data from tenth-century Sahagún all we find is *auctori-*, 1 *auctorizamus*, 2 *auctorizare*, 2 *auctorizaverimus*, 4 *auctorizemus*, and (all in documents that seem to have been revised much later) even 1 *auctorizabit*, 1 *auctorizationis*, and 1 *auctoricare*. In that monastery at that time it looks as though they had been taught the spelling of this lexical unit whole. But that did not happen everywhere within León, in the *Fuero de Valfermoso de las Monjas* (of 1189), as photographed in 1983 by J. C. Villaverde Amieva and A. D. Laca, we see *otorguet* [1.57] *otorguet* [60-61], *otorgan* [119], *otorgamento* [122, var. *-mientol*], *otorgant* [144] and *outorgarent* [186, 187]. Lapesa (1985:54-55) relates the forms in *ou-* with *mozarabic*.

The only form left undiscussed in the data from Galicia, *obtorizare* [of 929], represents the same confusion among supposed prefixes that is found exactly 850 years before in the *Graffiti* from Pompeii, in which we read [oskultat] written as *OBSCVLZAT* instead of the correct form *AVSCVLZAT*. *Escuchar*, and the forms in the Glosas Silenses *scuitara* [120] and *scuita* [125], come from a postulated **SCULTARE*, which lost its initial syllable via backformation because this was wrongly identified as being a prefix, wrongly, because in fact this word had originally been a compound of *AURIS*. This phenomenon is found in other cases also: for example, in Sahagún we can see, as well as many written forms with *aqueduct-*, those with *adque-* and *atque-*, *adqueductibus* [p.145], and *atqueductum* [p.280], similarly attesting misidentification of a prefix. The converse form *auctinuerit* [that is,

written mistakenly for the correct *obtinuerit*), which Dr Veiga Arias [181] presents, guarantees that the letters *obt-* could represent the same sound at that time as *auct-*. This idea, that [ot-] and [out-] could be correctly written as *auct-*, or at least as *oct-*, was not a new one; I have discussed elsewhere [1982:63] the form, found in eighth-century Italy, *octumnio* [that is, instead of *autumn-*, "autumn"]; and, in fact, in the tenth century the only words that this correspondence could be correctly applied to were *auctor* and its post-classical derivative *auctoricare*.

Yet this correspondence was also applied when writing the word [outeiro] ["hill"]. If this had been written "correctly" we can only suppose that it would have been written as *altarium* (its etymological equivalent). Unfortunately, this written form was already regularly in use, to mean "altar." In the tenth-century documents from Sahagún we find 22 cases of *altario*, 31 *altarium*, 3 *altariis*, plus 1 *altari* and 5 *altariibus*, and they all refer to altars, none to hills. It is the same in Lange 1966:4-5. It would seem from this that a spoken form [altarjo] with the meaning of "hill" never existed; *outeiro* and *otero* represent Early Medieval formations, that is, *out-* plus *-eiro* and *ot-* plus *-ero*. We can hardly expect them to have written *altarium* to mean "hill" since they already knew this written form well; for it is often used in these documents (the depositors regularly want a candle to be placed on an altar). And, indeed, Dr Veiga Arias never found the word [outeiro] written with a letter *-i-*. There are 15 cases of *aut-*, 14 of *auct-*, 3 of *out-*, 7 of *oct-* and 2 of *ot-*. It seems unlikely that they can have been taught in Galicia to write this word as a unit with a letter *c*; these 41 forms must be the consequence of the sound-letter correspondences they intuited as being relevant to this initial syllable (and as a result, it seems even less plausible to give the logographic explanation for the form *auctorgare*).

Further East, in the documents from tenth-century Sahagún, placenames including this word were spelled with *Au-*: *Autero*, *Auteros*, *Autero Maurisco*, *Autero de Aquilo*, *Autero de Lopus*, *Autero de Sallas*, *Autero de Sendino*, *Auteros de Rege*, *Auterolo de Legione*. In a non-toponymic use, there is one case of *autero* [doc.167] but also one case of *otero* [333]. It seems possible, therefore, that in Sahagún, unlike in Galicia, they were taught a

single orthographic unit, *Autero*.

It looks as though all the wide orthographic variation we find in these words can be simply reduced to this: on the whole they said [out-] in Galicia, although some may well have sometimes said [ot-]; they knew that [ou] could at times be correctly written as *au*, but also that [out-] could at times be written correctly as *auct-*. That may be all there was to it, although possibly some writers in some centers had also learned the separate written unit *auctor* whole, without any analysis of sound-letter correspondences.

And if we come to the same conclusion for Castille, where they usually said [ot-] but we find the same wide range of written forms, we are unlikely to be far out. Menéndez Pidal considers [with reference to [otorgar]] the written forms *auct-*, *aut-*, *obt-*, *oct-*, *at-* and *ot-*. As we saw above, there was no problem with the correspondence of [ot-] with *ot-*, and maybe they only rarely said there [out-]. Even given these six written alternatives, there is no reason at all to hypothesize the existence of six phonetic alternatives also; nor for us to call any of them "learned" ["culto"], nor "semilearned," nor "hypercorrect," nor "Latin," nor "Vulgar Latin," nor "Low Latin," nor "sporadic," nor "Church Latin," nor "Notarial Latin," nor "contaminations," nor "barbarous," nor "corrupt," nor anything else. There may in fact have existed in Castilla a variant in [a-]. In Aragón it is found written with *at-*—see Orígenes: parr.75.2 also in Sahagún (see *Cantar de Mio Cid*:485), although it is not attested there in this form in the tenth century; and in the *Poema de Mio Cid*, lines 198, 3411 and 3645, as well as *otorgar* [that is, with *ot-*] in lines 1303, 2340, 3670. Menéndez Pidal seems in his comment to be implying that the two are separate lexical items, although no real semantic distinction is perceptible. These forms written in *at-* suggest that this syllable may well have been pronounced at times as [at-], in which the pretonic diphthong simplified by losing the semivowel [w]. So far as I know, there is no sign of this development happening in Galicia. And perhaps we should add that although some of the scribes may well have been originally mozarabic (cp. Sánchez Albornoz 1944), it is not particularly helpful here to visualize mozarabic phonetic habits as underlying this variability, since they were probably not particularly different.

By suggesting in this way that the scribes were operating with a psychological correspondence of [out-] and [ot-] with *aut-*, rather than merely of [ou] with *auc/oc*, as has been suggested before, we solve a problem that remains unsolved if we consider merely the diphthong in isolation without its following consonant, for it seems that all the cases of written *auc* or *oc*, in which we would wish to postulate that the letter *c* did not correspond to any sound, precede a written letter *t*, representing [t].² This is also true of the few occasions when we find these written letters in the middle of a word, for example, the cases of *saucto*, *sauctis* (that is, representing [sót-], "copse") presented by Menéndez Pidal (1926:para.20.3), and of *sauctos* (representing [sót-]; Veiga Arias, 186: this form is not found in the tenth-century documents from Sahagún, where there are 10 *Sauto*, two *sauto*, two *soto*, 1 *saikos*, and 1 *saikul*; or of *coto* (that is, representing [kóto]), "hunting-ground"), in which, unlike Menéndez Pidal (par.21.1) I would prefer not to postulate a sound [u] (nor [w]) corresponding to the letter *c*. The form *alcetare* (for "altar") considered by Veiga Arias (176-77) could probably be best explained in the same way, although it remains peculiar even so.

One other word deserves comment here: *tomar*. In the Middle Ages they used this word (for "take") less than *prender*, but it is a vernacular word without any doubt. Its etymon is still debated; Schuchardt (1890) suggested **tumbare*, which is not impossible; Pío Rajna (1919) suggested that it could have been *AUTUMARE*, via **atomar*, reanalyzed as *a + tomar*; subsequently Jud (and Corominas) expressed agreement with this etymon, but without the intervening monophthongized form of the first syllable. They preferred to believe that the whole initial syllable had been dropped in another case of backformation through erroneous identification of a prefix. In sum, then, under any proposed scenario the spoken form in Early Iberoromance was never **[otomár]*; so it is not to be included in our list of words of the time which began in [ot-]. But

² In tenth-century Sahagún we find 2 *aucmentare*, 1 *aucmentaberit*, 2 *augmentare*, 1 *acmentare* and 1 *acmentum*, but no case without either *c* or *g*; we can provisionally deduce from this that in this word there may still have been some trace of the original velar consonant.

even if this was indeed the correct etymon, they do not seem to have been aware of this, for then the correct written form would have been *autum-*, but, so far as I am aware, the word has never been found spelled in this way in the Early Medieval documentation, nor even—so far as I am aware—spelled as *tum-*; as with the placenames and other words of uncertain origin (that is, uncertain to them at the time), this word must have seemed best written via the most appropriate available correspondences, in this case [t], [o] and [m] as *t*, *o* and *m*—, all helpfully unambiguous in this case, as we have seen. Malkiel (1990), in turn, prefers to propose *AESTUMARE* as the etymon, analyzed wrongly as *AES + TUMARE*, from which the second (hitherto non-existent) morpheme acquired a life of its own. All in all, though, it seems that this word does not qualify to be among those studied in detail here.

CONCLUSIONS

To understand what lies behind the written forms of the Early Iberoromance Medieval documents, we need to be able to reconstruct the phonetics of the vernacular Romance of the time and place concerned, collect together all the data that there are available (from the original manuscripts, and without making any "emendations," obviously), and then attempt to draw deductions from all this concerning how they were taught to move from phonetic forms (in so far as we have been able to reconstruct them) to the written forms (textually attested still). In this article, only those words that began with [soʃr-] and in [out-] in tenth-century Galicia have been considered in any detail, together with their cognates in Sahagún and in Castilla, and we can expect that the investigation of more words will lead us to more of the techniques and tricks of the trade that they learned; for the moment, we can provisionally conclude that they learned the orthographically correct written form of some common words and inflectional affixes as complete whole units, without bothering to analyze their phonology, while they learned how to write all other words according to professional rules of sound-letter and syllable-letters correspondence.

And that is all there was to it. It is time for us to discard inappropriate and misleading concepts of a diastatic and evaluative

nature such as, on the one hand, those of "cultismo," of Latinism, of "semicultismo," of hypercorrection, and of a general skill in direct phonetic transcription; at the same time, on the other hand, we should discard the concepts of linguistic barbarousness, corruption, degradation, decadence, contamination, etc., similarly, certainly before the turn of the millennium and preferably right up till the thirteenth century, let us also discard such misleading and anachronistic concepts as Galician, Leonese, Castilian (etc.), terms which were only valid at the time with a literally geographical reference, without, at that time, being used yet to distinguish between conceptually separate linguistic entities; all these concepts are modern inventions, and cloud our view. The inhabitants of the Iberian Peninsula (apart from those who spoke Arabic, Basque or Hebrew, but no Romance!) formed one large Romance speech community, complex but still monolingual; they spoke in their natural evolved vernacular, and writers had to start from that basis when trying to achieve the traditionally "correct" spelling. The same sort of thing happens nowadays in modern France, England or Argentina. It is not easy to learn to write in these present-day countries, working out how to fit the vernacular pronunciations to the respected standard orthography, but many of us do indeed learn to do so; and it is one of our duties as Romance philologists to try and find out how they learned to achieve this in the Galicia of a thousand years ago.

This may all seem obvious. I have been told that it is. But even if it is, it is not what we are usually told. A common assessment of the texts of this time, diametrically opposed to the one expressed in this article, has been neatly expressed by Díaz y Díaz (1981:71, my translation):

This reduction of Latin to the status of merely an autonomous written language used as a common "koiné," without the support of being the language spoken in any community... unlike any normal written language, medieval Latin was not the stylistic elaboration of a particular spoken language.

This is the right perspective for the period after the early thirteenth century, but it seems to be exactly the opposite of what happened in the tenth century (which is the century that Díaz y Díaz is considering in this study). Written language was at that time

still precisely "the stylistic elaboration of a spoken language," in the same way as the written Galician or written Castilian of the present day is the stylistic elaboration of spoken Galician and spoken Castilian. Spoken and written styles can vary considerably now one from the other, of course [for the manifestation of this in Castilian, see e.g. Klein Andreu, 1990]. Latin and Romance were not at that time, even though they were going to be much later, two separate "autonomous" languages. This anachronistic mirage has merely created unnecessary problems for philological analysis; stopping believing in it will help solve them.

Dr. Veiga Arias' book is much larger than this brief study by Díaz y Díaz. It is an interesting book, intelligent, full of information and ideas. It will have become clear from my conclusion, however, that I do not share his [p. 19; my translation]:

The result will be a decisive contribution to our knowledge of Galician in its initial stammering phase ["balbuceos"], and of the survival of Latin merely as a vehicle for written communication.

On the contrary, I do not believe that the tenth-century Galicians could only "stammer" their language. I prefer to agree with Alarcos Llorach (1982), who argued that the language used in the Iberian Peninsula a thousand years ago served the inhabitants as well for communication then as the present languages do now. There is no evidence of their having made a clear metalinguistic distinction at that time between speech and writing as autonomous and separate languages. It seems hardly even possible that they could have maintained at that time such a system of diglossia, which needs always to be underpinned by educational systems of a complexity we cannot postulate for tenth-century Galicia. It is not relevant either to compare their language with that of a long time earlier (calling it a barbarous corruption of Latin) nor with that of a long time later (calling it the incipient stammerings of Galician); their language has to be studied in their own cultural context. That

is what I have tried to do here.³

1994 POSTSCRIPT.

To mark my joining the editorial committee of the journal *Verba* (*Anuario Galego de Filoloxía*) in 1991, I was invited to write a review-article of Veiga Arias's book; that task got out of hand, but the editors of this journal are famously generous with space and were happy to publish the Castilian original of this discursive account whole as "La enseñanza de la ortografía en la Galicia de hace mil años," the initial article in *Verba*, 18, 1991, 5-25. The discovery that the data can be used and sensibly explained in the monolingual perspective makes this, in my view, the most important article in this section, although the individual assessments are in several cases merely provisional.

³ But this is less immediately important than the need to have the data published. For the purposes of this article I have trusted the transcriptions of Dr. Veiga Arias, which seem in general trustworthy, but there are also signs of what may well be printing errors: for example, sometimes the same phrase from a document is quoted slightly differently on different pages; and these are able to lead our analysis astray as much as do the hypercorrecting copyists of the twelfth century. Nor is it easy to follow his interesting later article (1989), because in this article there is no bibliographical help at all to explain the origin of the quoted phrases for those who may not have his book (not even the book itself is mentioned!). We need the documents published whole, so we can see all the data in context. So I end this study with a request; to help those of us interested in Galician, but not in Galicia, I humbly request that these data be published, preferably by *Verba*.

15 The Purpose of the Glosses of San Millán and Silos

The Monastery of San Millán de la Cogolla is situated in the wine-producing area of La Rioja. A party was held there in November 1977, to celebrate the thousandth birthday of the Spanish Language. More precisely, they were celebrating the existence of manuscript *Emilianense* 60, which is now in the Library of the Real Academia de la Historia, in Madrid. Twenty-one folios of this manuscript have annotations in the margin, some of them in a non-Latin form, in what could be described as Romance orthography and (sometimes) morphology. These are the famous *Glosses of San Millán* which Menéndez Pidal published at the start of his seminal *Orígenes del Español*, in 1926. Menéndez Pidal dated them to the second half of the tenth century. 977 is in the second half of the tenth century, which is why the millennium was celebrated in 1977. In the same year Olarte Ruiz published his facsimile of these folios.

If this were the right date, the glosses would come from the most interesting context of late tenth-century Rioja; the circle of the scribe Vigila and his mathematically-organized compositions, and the original home of the magnificent ecclesiastical codices now in the Library of El Escorial. But that date is not the right one. The year after that celebration, the best of all the Spanish Medieval Latinists, Manuel Cecilio Díaz y Díaz, published a short but excellent book (1978) in which he declared that there was no doubt that these glosses come from fairly late in the eleventh century, after 1020 and perhaps even 1050. It would be difficult to argue against this. But it is an ill wind; we can have another thousandth birthday party in the year 2020.

There are also other Romance-like glosses on a manuscript from

the Monastery of Santo Domingo de Silos, now in the British Museum in London (Additional Manuscript 30,853). The last section of this manuscript contains a European-style Penitential, glossed in a similar way. This is also of the eleventh century, but seems to be a copy of another manuscript with the glosses already in, which could have been of an earlier date. It is possible that its original could have come from San Millán, since the Monastery at Silos was re-founded at the start of that century with the help of the monks from San Millán.

Naturally, these isolated words do not in fact attest the "birth of the Spanish Language." This has often been said, but it makes no sense; Romance had been "born" a long time earlier, as is generally realized. Neither are they symptoms of ignorance, as is also sometimes said; it is clear that they were prepared by a writer (or writers) with an impressively enterprising spirit. Another idea which has gained wide currency is that these glosses were copied out of a pre-existing glossary; this seems very unlikely to me, but other investigators have taken it seriously. I have already written about this at some length (Wright 1982:195-207), but even so wish to return to the topic here.

Díaz y Díaz suggests that these glosses were taken from existing Latin-Latin glossaries, which we know to have been in circulation at that time. Three glossaries from Silos (published by García de Diego, 1933) and two glossaries from San Millán survive from the tenth and eleventh centuries. Unfortunately for this theory, though, glossaries were normally compilations of glosses already found in other manuscripts; there is no evidence that they were regularly employed as a source for other glosses to be added later to unglossed manuscripts. In general, glossers had prime recourse to their own experience, without having open in front of them a glossary, although they probably had seen glossaries, and memories of their contents could indeed have echoed in the back of their minds as they worked. In other glossed manuscripts of the age, the glosses tend to represent an item of vocabulary which was still in vernacular use, added in order to explain antiquated vocabulary in an old text. Such glosses were otherwise normally meant to be spelled in the traditional manner still.

Although Díaz y Díaz claims to see an "undoubted source" in

the Silos Latin glossaries for 22 of these Romance glosses, even they are merely 22 out of over 300 (in the Silos manuscript), and even then there is only an exact equivalence in the written forms in two cases. And even in these two, there is room for doubt. For example, in one of the Glossaries we find the word *pudor* explained as *verecundia*, both words being spelled in the correct traditional manner. This is understandable; *pudor* was not used at that time in vernacular, and the word spelled as *verecundia* was, even though in an evolved phonetic form closer to the Modern Castilian *vergüenza*. In gloss Em.17, the *pudor* in the text is glossed as *verecundia*, written that way. But in gloss Em.76 *erubescunt* is glossed as *se bergudian* (that is, "se averguenzan," "they are ashamed"); and in gloss Sil.171, *pudoris* carries the gloss *dela vergoia*; here it is the same lexical unit, but not the same written form. The glossary can hardly be the source when the word is written in the glosses in such different forms. Indeed, only two of the 513 glosses coincide exactly with one of the more than twenty thousand words in the Silos glossaries (this *pudor* as *verecundia*, and gloss Em. 118 *iter* as *vial*), and that proportion is less than we could have expected out of mere coincidence.

This theory of Díaz y Díaz's at least has the merit of being possible. Unfortunately, not even this can be said of Menéndez Pidal's suggestion that the glosses were taken from a now lost Latin-Romance glossary, of a type we do not find attested until some four hundred years later. It is not easy to believe in the existence of such Latin-Romance glossaries at that time. How were they compiled? Where would the words have come from? If they came from pre-existing glosses on other now lost manuscripts, which is the way glossaries were normally compiled, where did the glosses on these other manuscripts come from? How did these hypothesized early glossary-compilers decide what the "Romance" spelling was to be? If such glossaries had indeed existed earlier, their existence would attest to a conscious manipulation of the language and a technical mastery of phonetic detail that it seems hard to envisage for the period. Besides, there is clear internal evidence that they did not use any such Latin-Romance glossary. Some of the glosses are written in normal traditional spelling. Some words in the text have different glosses on different folios. Many words in the

text are given glosses which make good sense in the context, but would seem wrong outside that context: e.g., gloss Em.59 *occurpare* "parare uel apiccare"; Em.82, *offero* "dico"; Sil.163 *matrimonio* "prima iunctatione"; Sil.321 *coitu* "semen." Some glosses offer an explanation rather than a synonym: e.g. Em.9 *tertiis ueniens* "elo terzerio diabolus uenit"; Em.85 *exacurus* "de la probatione"; Em.131 *dicat etiam* "Esaias"; Em.137 *ayt enim apostolus* "certe dicit don Paulo apostolo"; Sil.300 *eos* "akelos qui tornaren." The same word in the Romance gloss can be spelled in a variety of ways: e.g., the word evolved from Latin *LACTARE* (now *Sp. echar*) appears in four different forms: Em.45, *respuat* "geitat"; Sil.43 *transmisit* "zetare corri"; Sil.53 *relictis* "jectatis"; S.102 *inici* "por iactare." It is also worth pointing out that the more traditional the orthography of the word, the easier it is to recognize what it is, whether or not it follows the phonetics closely. Four times we find in the San Millán manuscript the gloss *quomodo*, with the Romance meaning ("like," as in *Sp. como*) and the traditional spelling, but also on two occasions *quemo*: Em.25 and 50 *sicut* "quomodo"; Em.52 *uelut* "quomodo"; Em.83 *quasi* "quomodo"; Em.115 *non per speciem neque per uelamen* "quemo enospillo noke quemo eno uello." The upshot is that there is no need to look for a source at all; the glosses seem to have been prepared in a less organized way than that.

What can, then, be deduced from the way the glosses are written? In many details, they seem to be intended to follow the phonetic shape of the Romance word, even though in that way they become harder to recognize (as is the case with phonetic script nowadays). But it is not a carefully worked out script like that of the *Cantiène de Sainte Eulalie*; in general, in the Riojan glosses, we can say that a non-traditional spelling reflects evolved pronunciation, but we cannot deduce that unchanged spelling necessarily represents unevolved pronunciation. For example, the second gloss from San Millán offers *luco* for the word *repente* in the text. That word, as usual, has the meaning of the time (in this case, the same as the modern Spanish *luego*, "next," rather than that of its etymon *LOCO*, which meant "[in the] place"). The written letters *u* and *e* here represented together the Romance diphthong [we], which was the outcome of the open [ó] of the Latin of the Empire; we are able to conclude that here the new spelling represented the evolved

pronunciation, because without this they would not have thought of inventing it. But from the written letter *c* we cannot deduce that it was still pronounced there and then as [k]. It was quite normal at that time for the written letter *-c-* (intervocally) before a letter *o* to correspond to the sound [g], and it seems almost certain that this word was then pronounced [lwegol]. In the same way, the intervocalic letter *-t-* regularly represented a voiced [d], and an intervocalic letter *-p-* represented a voiced [b]. We even find the word *sabiendo* twice written in the glosses with the final letters *-co* rather than *-do* (Sil.134, 341). But this word could not possibly have been pronounced then with an unvoiced [s], both the Latin *SAPIENDO* and the Romance *sabiendo* have a voiced [d]. This spelling is what is sometimes called "ultracorrección." So for the same reason it is very probable that the written letter *-p-* in *sapiendo* represents a voiced [b] in these glosses. This all means that these glosses cannot be used as evidence to argue that the Romance speech of the area still had the original unvoiced intervocalic consonants; the glosses need have nothing whatsoever to do with the pronunciation in some areas of the Aragonese Pyrenees where such words still have unvoiced intervocalic consonants; the glosses are not evidence of the mythical entry "navarroaragonese," as Elcock (1975:416-22) and Lapesa (1980:ch.6) said, an entity which represents in any event a probably anachronistic view of the nature of Romance dialect boundaries.

Since it can thus hardly be maintained that the script is strictly "phonetic," the initial question becomes at once more interesting and harder to answer; what was the purpose of these attempts at a novel kind of writing? We now know something that previous investigators did not; that they are from the eleventh century, quite possibly from well into that century. They do not belong to the concentratedly Visigothic culture of the Rioja of the tenth century, but to the more open culture of the eleventh century, in which European ideas are beginning to have an influence. In the Peninsula, outside Catalonia, they still had their Visigothic liturgy, which had been standardized in the seventh century, and their Visigothic handwriting; it was only towards the end of that century that they would start to import both the Roman liturgy and the spoken "Medieval Latin" originally standardized by the scholars at

Charlemagne's court for the representation of that liturgy. If this seems a surprising claim, it is argued in great detail in Wright 1982.¹ In what now seem to be the relevant years for the context of the Glosses, the mid eleventh century, as in the 1970s, Northern Christian Spaniards were beginning to come out of a period of comparative isolation into the full light of wider European culture. As Lomax (1982) and Bishko (1969) have shown, for example, there were coming to León, Navarre and Castille scholars and clerics from Catalonia and France, and the numbers of pilgrims who crossed the Northern kingdoms to get to Santiago de Compostela were increasing. For these reasons, it seems quite likely that at that time aspects of European Romance culture were beginning to be known about in San Millán, Silos, Burgos and elsewhere in Castille and Navarre.

Already, one of the customs of that culture was that of sometimes writing words of their own vernacular with the morphology they had in speech and a more or less phonetic spelling (devised according to the already existing sound-letter correspondences used further North for speaking Medieval Latin). The first attempts at writing literature in Romance in Northern France and Provence, written that way in order to inspire a local Romance pronunciation in their reading aloud, happened at an earlier date than the one which we now know to be the correct date of these glosses. In Spain, on the other hand (outside Catalonia, which was part of the Provençal cultural sphere at that time) they had still not adopted that custom. Not because they were "backward"; the point was just that in Spain they did not need a separate Romance way of writing. Since spoken Medieval Latin had not yet been introduced into the Peninsula, when they read aloud a traditionally-written text they all read the words with the normal vernacular pronunciation anyway (as, for example, English speakers do automatically when reading words in traditional spelling). Dutton (1980) has already established that legal documents were read aloud in an intelligibly vernacular manner. For this reason, in the Peninsula at that time, they had had no need to invent a new spelling based on rigorous phonetic transcriptions in order to indicate that the text had to be read with Romance phonetics: they did that anyway. Meanwhile, though, after the general adoption of

the Carolingian reforms, in France and Catalonia they regularly read aloud the traditional spelling of words in the new way (Medieval Latin), and only the new vernacular spelling necessarily implied that the reading aloud would be vernacular. And yet, if the Spaniards of the time had no need yet to invent a new spelling, what were they doing when they wrote these glosses? That question has not been broached (even in Wright 1982).

Here I will put forward a hypothesis. More of an imaginative scenario, in effect. The glosses could be the result of a collaborative enterprise between a Riojan (or Navarrese or Castilian) monk and a visiting monk from Catalonia or Provence. Let us hypothesize that a monk came from Catalonia or Provence to an ecclesiastical center (in the Rioja, Castille or Navarre), and that he wanted, for some reason, to read aloud intelligibly there the homilies of the San Millán manuscript or the Penitential of the Silos manuscript (which are both of a European type). At this point I neither need nor dare wonder why. His hosts would already have known how to read and explain the texts to an audience of their own time and region. They did it every day of the week. Even if the native monks might have needed glosses to explain some of the archaic vocabulary, they did not at the same time need to have them presented in an unusual spelling. The visitor, however, did not know how to read the text aloud with the phonetics of that region. There was no need to give up his intention, though, he explained to his Spanish hosts that in his country they had invented a way of writing in which all the written letters corresponded to the sounds of words of ordinary local speech. Maybe he showed them an example. "How peculiar," they would have replied, just like a modern Frenchman or Englishman who sees for the first time a phonetic transcription of a passage of his own language. But together they had a try at adapting this newly arrived idea to the spoken forms of their part of the Peninsula, so that the foreigner could later read the texts aloud there and even explain them, through the glosses, with something like intelligibility (even the two glosses in Basque). Perhaps the glosses that remained in the old-fashioned form were ones that he did not wish to read aloud; when there are two glosses to the same word in the text, one written in the old way and one in a new way, perhaps the first explained the meaning to the reader and the second told

him how to explain it to the listeners. For example, in Sil.52 we find *strages* glossed by *occisiones* (which the stranger would have understood, but which did not form part of that region's vernacular) and then also by *matadas*, since the form [matadas] would have been intelligible locally. (Compare also Sil.243, *fundaberit*, glossed as *firmaret fieret*.)

This scenario comes from the imagination rather than from scholarship, I know. But it fits what happened in earlier similar initiatives. It seems likely that the *Strasbourg Oaths* were elaborated by a Romance-speaker in France for the benefit of a Germanic-speaker who already knew how to read Medieval Latin aloud but was none too skilled in French Romance, such that he needed some kind of phonetic script in order to make his reading intelligible to the Romance-speaking listeners (regardless of whether it was actually thus intelligible or not). It seems likely that the *Cantilène de Sainte Eulalie* was elaborated by a bilingual (German-Romance) writer in order to help Germanic-speaking singers who already knew how to perform texts aloud in the new Medieval Latin way but were also none too skilled in French Romance, such that they too needed a phonetic script of some kind in order to make their sung version intelligibly Romance (if indeed it was thus intelligible); see Wright 1982:122-35. Writing any language in an approximately phonetic script is nearly always done for the benefit of those who do not know the language; if they know the language, they do not need a phonetic transcription, and will recognize the written word more easily in its usual traditional orthographic disguise. New written forms are of no use to someone who cannot read at all, so we have to assume that the destined reader already knew how to read the usual spelling. The only people who could receive any practical benefit at all from having in front of them words written in a manner approximating the phonetics of speech in the Castille-Navarre area (as is the form of many of these glosses) would be those who already knew how to read words written in the ordinary way, but not how to read them aloud with the phonetics normal in that Castille-Navarre area. Some modern novelists do something similar; they invent a roughly phonetic manner of spelling to indicate to readers from elsewhere how people speak in Venezuela, Argentina, Murcia, etc. The fact that the glosses

were written in the monk's Visigothic handwriting would have been no great inconvenience for the subsequent reader, as we can tell from the fact that in the eleventh century even Cluniacs in Spain still used the Visigothic script.

There is no difficulty in suggesting Catalan or French involvement in this enterprise. Lapesa (1980:para.42) describes the eleventh century as a century of "French influence." Lomax and Bishko describe how the diocese of Palencia and some centers in the Tierra de Campos were refounded in these years by Catalans, with the blessing of the Leonese King. We know anyway that many of the earliest compositions written in a peninsular vernacular language (including the disguised vernacular found in many *fueros*), however authentically native they seem, were prepared at the stimulus of a French or Provençal prototype. Maybe the stimulus is to be found here for these glossers also.

This line of thought has led me to the theory that these Romance glosses were written by a Spaniard, to help a foreigner read and explain aloud the text in the vernacular manner of the Castille-Navarre region. However, even if this is wrong, there can no longer be any belief in the usual assessment of these glosses, as found, for example, in the preliminary pages of the facsimile edition (Olarte Ruiz 1977). The glosses are from the eleventh century. They are not from Aragon. They were not taken from a pre-existing glossary. They are the result of enterprise and initiative, possibly prepared under the stimulus of meeting an example of the Romance phonetic scripts by then used elsewhere; and it is possible that they were provided for a reader who did not know well the vernacular forms to which the written forms were designed to correspond. Of course, if this is the right scenario, it has to be admitted that they did not achieve a very clear result. Problems remain, naturally; but I hope here to have placed the frame of the picture in a more appropriate context than it has been given before. The details need more study yet.

1994 POSTSCRIPT.

The Spanish original of this paper was printed as "La función de las Glosas de San Millán y de Silos," *Actes du XVIIe Congrès International de Linguistique et Philologie Romanes*, Vol.9 (Critique

et Éditions de Textes), Publications de l'Université de Provence, 1986, 209-20; it was the verbatim text of the paper given to that conference on Wednesday morning, 31st August 1983. The style is thus that of a lecture rather than of a scholarly article, but it is still worth reproducing even though the intervening years have seen the argument move on. For example, Bézler (1984 and 1985) has convincingly postponed the date of composition of the original Silos penitential (the one copied as our surviving Silos manuscript) to later than 1060, which makes the French-contact scenario even more likely (Clunians themselves were around by then). García Larragueta's transcription (1984) of the manuscript has no new ideas, but often aids identification of textual details. Stengaard (1991a) has established the purpose of the numerical and alphabetical signs written above many of the words in the San Millán manuscript, signs which Wolf also (1992) uses to postulate a far northern origin for the manuscript, and Cano (1992:38-41) has produced an excellent analysis of the syntax of the glosses, which I have never considered. Neither Lloyd (1987) nor Penny (1991) consider the question, unfortunately. At the Third International Conference on the History of the Spanish Language (Salamanca, November 1993), Manuel Díaz y Díaz gave an impressive update of his present assessment of the Glosses. It is, in contrast, astonishing and depressing to see how little knowledge literary scholars wish to have of these matters; for example, Walsh and Deyermann (1992) are magnificently up to date in their literary references, but it has not occurred to them that linguistic research might have progressed since 1926.

It was only after this lecture went to press that I realized the modern analogue of what I was proposing (and it still seems to me to be the best of a bad lot of available scenarios); it is the phrasebook principle. I subsequently elaborated this in an article not published in the present volume (Wright 1988a). When British travellers go abroad, they often take with them a phrasebook to help say words in the foreign language. In this book, the foreign words are spelled in two ways; once in their normal spelling, and once in a spelling which aims to reproduce what the spelling could be if the word identically pronounced happened in fact to be part of English. This technique, of spelling words in a language that the reader does not know according to the spelling system used in a language that

the reader does know, is only partly successful, of course. The British traveller in Portugal wants to say "thank-you" to his friends in Portugal, opens his guidebook at *obrigado*: "oo-bree-gah-doo" (which is not, of course, in phonetic script, since that is unfortunately not yet on our national curriculum and would baffle rather than help), and says [ubri:ga:du:]. His friends laugh, but probably understand. If they see the form written in the phrasebook, they laugh much louder. Since the result tends to sound funny, it is not surprising that in our own scenario the Riojan experiment was not regularly followed up; French visitors would not wish to cause mirth when reading from the Penitential. I included a section on this phrasebook analogy when delivering the paper again in the University of Santiago de Compostela in April 1985, and it indeed caused astonished laughter there (also using the possible example of a Spaniard learning Welsh, discovering that the word for "six" is written *chwech*, but being helped by a phrasebook version as *ŷei*, which in turn would look absurd to a Welsh-speaker). The point, though, that such re-spellings help foreigners but not natives, seems well worth holding on to.

These glosses are *sui generis*, largely unlike the glosses and glossaries known elsewhere in the Early Romance world, or later in the Peninsula, but the attempt, once made, began a century-long tentative grope to a new reformed writing method. In that sense, the Glosses are indeed the "birth" of something, not of the Spanish language itself, but of intelligent attempts to reform its spelling. How ironic it is, then, that those who now praise the anonymous Glossers tend to be the very same people who argue strongly (and, on the whole, persuasively) against such spelling reforms a millennium later.

Part III

Language and Texts in the Iberian Peninsula after 1080
