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ABSTRACT

This thesis consists of a survey of the linguistic features of datable aljamiado manuscripts, taken as nearly as possible at twenty year intervals from 1429 to 1597, with the purpose of ascertaining to what extent Morisco writings in Arabic character shed any light on contemporary Spanish pronunciation and whether any chronology of sound-change in Castilian can be recorded from the collated evidence. The chief features examined are initial $F$, the sibilants, the plosive and fricative value of $\partial$ and the possibility of early instances of yafismo. On the whole it has been found that the Moriscos were not innovators and the language of even late sixteenth-century manuscripts still shows forms current at the beginning of the century. The thesis includes transcriptions of extracts from MSS B.N.5319, J.1, B.N.5073/6/7/12, B.N.4908/1, B.N.5364, T.13, T.16, B.N.5223 and J.30. There is also a Glossary.
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ABBREVIATIONS

adj. = adjective  
Ar. = Arabic  
Arag. = Aragonese  
Cast. = Castilian  
Cat. = Catalan  
Cl. Ar. = Classical Arabic  
cons. = consonant  
dem. adj. = demonstrative adjective  
dem. pron. = demonstrative pronoun  
fem. = feminine  
Hisp. Ar. = Hispano-Arabic  
Lat. = Latin  
masc. = masculine  
Med. Sp. = Medieval Spanish  
Mod. Sp. = Modern Spanish  
Nav. = Navarrese  
n. = note  
O. Arag. = Old Aragonese  
O. Cast. = Old Castilian  
O. Sp. = Old Spanish  
Sp. = Spanish
INTRODUCTION

The manuscripts

In attempting to carry out a linguistic appraisal of the language of aljamiado manuscripts, we were limited first and foremost by one consideration. How many datable manuscripts are there extant? Professor Harvey has calculated that excluding fragments and small documents there are 113 extant aljamiado manuscripts¹. Of these we selected 25 as being of possible use. In addition 5 of the manuscripts listed by Eduardo Saavedra² but rejected by Professor Harvey in his calculations were included. These are collections of loose papers (notably Saa. 38/B.N. 5073) which as regards phonological data are as informative as the longer manuscripts.

The greater part of the extant manuscripts had, often regrettably, to be rejected because they could not be dated in any way. Of the remainder, they fall roughly into two major periods: the second half of the fifteenth century and the second half of the sixteenth. There is an irremediable gap between 1510 and 1563, with only a few marginal notes in the intervening period. The earliest date is 1429 (Saa. 18/B.N. 5319), then 1462-1510, and lastly 1563-1597.

As far as subject matter is concerned, the manuscripts were fairly representative of the scope of aljamiado literature, including four religious treatises, a series of legal documents (marriage and birth records, inheritances, sale of land contracts), as well as doctors' notes, directions on how to calculate the phases of the moon, and an escape route (albeit very confused) for Moriscos trying to reach Italy.

It was our original intention to select manuscripts at twenty year intervals in order to attempt to draw up a chronology of sound changes within aljamiado literature. The fact, however, that the manuscripts are grouped together in such a way has somewhat altered the original plan. Eight manuscripts have finally been chosen and their dates are as follows:

1429, 1462, 1482, 1510, 1542, 1563, 1577, 1597/8.

The last manuscript exists in two versions and reference will be made to both.
Our first intention with manuscript B.N.5319 (1429), as indeed with all of them, was to transcribe a couple of folios from the beginning of the manuscript but to take the bulk from the conclusion. This would ensure that the material transcribed would be as close to the dated folio as possible. In the case of B.N.5319 we did transcribe six folios from the very end of the manuscript, but the pages are in such poor a condition that the result was somewhat unsatisfactory. We have therefore added five folios immediately preceding those we originally chose.

The next manuscript is the Kitab segobiano or Brebiario gunni, dated 1462. This manuscript written by Iqa de Gebir, is a compendium of religious and legal texts housed in the Escuela de Estudios Arabes under the catalogue number J.1. Saavedra also records a version of the same manuscript in the Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid. From J.1. we have selected six folios.

The only manuscript dated 1482 that we have been able to trace is one of a collection of "papeles sueltos" (Saa. 38/7, B.N.5073). Saavedra describes it as follows:

"Acta de finiquito entre Ahmed Albeitar y Ydcuf el Ferrero, vecinos de la morería de Agreda en el año 887."4

Practically all the "papeles sueltos" in the bundle numbered B.N.5073 are of the same length, one or two folios only.

They range from 1467 to 1494 and are all legal contracts of differing kinds. Of the seven dated manuscripts three are in a poor condition and out of the remaining four our choice was dictated more than anything by the consideration of date.

The next date is 1510. This manuscript is from another group of loose papers, (Saa. 24, B.N.4908/1), and although Saavedra makes no reference to the dating, it is nevertheless clearly stated in Arabic in the middle of folio lv.

The next manuscript is B.N.5364 (Saa. 135), in which the only dated material is unfortunately marginal notes, for the year 1542. We were obliged, regretfully, to abandon an interesting manuscript (T.15) in the library of the Real Academia de la Historia, because of the impossibility of arriving at an exact date for it. The manuscript is a series of doctor's notes, in which reference is made to remedies
and cures which proved effective on certain dates. Lines 3, 4, 5 of folio 1v read as follows:

"...fu(w)e fecho esto a kinza de nobi(y)enb(e)re año 1530 por el maest(o)ro mayor y (y)el dotor Rroyo item en el mes de abril año 1518, adoleçi(y)o Çaleği Xama al Qefib..."

It is obvious from this brief extract that the doctor's notes are retrospective; all we can assume is that they are post 1530, but it is impossible to say more. The date 1518 occurs two or three times in the manuscript, but the presence of 1530 invalidates this.

The following manuscript T.13, housed in the Real Academia de la Historia, is a copy of a letter from the Mufti of Oran to the Andalusians. The original is dated 910 A.H., (1505) but the copy is clearly marked 1563. We are only too aware of the drawbacks of relying on a copy of this kind, but the alternatives are not more promising. T.16, dated 1568, is an interesting escape route for Muslims trying to reach Italy, but it consists of little except place names. The other alternatives were once again short contracts, most of them dated in the 1570's and consequently a bit too far removed from 1542.

Nevertheless, on account of the disadvantages in T.13, (the letter from the Mufti of Oran) we decided to compensate for the inadequate material in the middle of the 16th century by taking a look at another manuscript dated 1577.

This manuscript (Saa. 36, B.N.5223) is a magnificent codex of prayers, 251 folios in all, with illustrated pages and extremely carefully written. From this we have chosen seven folios for transcription.

Finally we come to manuscripts J.30 and J.52, which we will consider together. They are dated 1597 and 1598 respectively, and are practically identical. The earlier of the two is in a much poorer state of repair, particularly towards the end of the manuscript which was precisely the part we were working on. The paper is so fragile that it is impossible to turn over a folio without some fragment falling away. Moreover the paper has considerably browned with age and the ink has faded. The later manuscript is much more complete, and clearer. Despite the fact that the two manuscripts are practically
identical there are nevertheless some differences which merit attention and which will be indicated when occasion demands.

It would be unfortunate that through adhering rigidly to the manuscripts we have chosen, we were to omit some interesting or valuable data from those that we discarded. We have therefore decided that if one of the latter has any extra information to offer, it will be included where necessary, though it will not be analysed as a whole.

D. Lincoln Canfield, discussing the way one should set about collecting and assessing phonological data, has asked:

"Since speech habits are usually formed early in life, would not the date of an author's birth be more pertinent in an estimate of the pronunciation of his generation than the date of his published reactions?" 5

We fully agree with this sentiment, as we also feel that it is of equal importance to know the provenance of a manuscript, but unfortunately, though the latter is sometimes possible with our manuscripts, the former is quite impossible to determine, as the scribes are by and large anonymous.

Reinhold Kontzi, writing about the study of aljamiado manuscripts, has said:

'El castellano ofrecido por estos textos tiene interés para nosotros, pues dicha lengua en aquella época se encontraba en transición del sistema fonológico medieval al sistema fonológico moderno. Como los textos fueron escritos en letras árabes, podemos observar la 'revolución fonológica del Siglo de Oro' en un sistema gráfico distinto." 6

The purpose of this thesis is to shed further light on the language of the Moriscos and to assess to what extent they do reflect the 'revolución fonológica' of the Golden Age. In the course of the study, we shall also refer, where appropriate, to the solutions found by Jewish scribes in their Hebrew character Spanish manuscripts. This will, we hope, provide a useful comparison with aljamiado.
The Arabic Script

The Arabic alphabet consists of 28 consonants, namely:

1. ٩ hamza  
   voiced laryngeal plosive
2. ٛ bā'  
   voiced bilabial plosive
3. ٖ tā'  
   unvoiced dental plosive
4. ٠ thā'  
   unvoiced interdental fricative (dental in North Africa)
5. ١ jīm  
   voiced palatal affricate (probably fricative in North Africa)
6. ٢ hā'  
   unvoiced laryngeal fricative
7. ٣ hā'  
   unvoiced post-velar fricative
8. ٤ dāl  
   voiced dental plosive
9. ٤ dhal  
   voiced interdental fricative (dental in North Africa)
10. ٦ rā'  
    voiced dental vibrant
11. ٦ sāy  
    voiced palatal affricate
12. ٦ sin  
    unvoiced post-dental fricative
13. ٦ shin  
    unvoiced palatal fricative
14. ٧ sād  
    emphatic ṣ
15. ٧ dād  
    emphatic ā
16. ٧ tā'  
    emphatic ṭ
17. ٧ sā'  
    emphatic ẓ
18. ٨ yin  
    unvoiced laryngeal fricative
19. ٨ gyn  
    voiced velar fricative
20. ٩ fā'  
    unvoiced labiodental fricative
21. ٩ qāf  
    unvoiced post-velar plosive
22. ٩ kāf  
    unvoiced palatal plosive
23. ٩ lām  
    voiced lateral alveolar fricative
24. ٩ mīm  
    voiced bilabial nasal
25. ٩ nūn  
    voiced dental nasal
26. ٩ hā'  
    unvoiced laryngeal fricative
27. ٩ waw  
    both semi-consonant and semi-vowel
28. ٩ yā  
    both semi-consonant and semi-vowel

Of these, a number are never or very rarely to be found in Aljamia:

The only occasion most of them occur is in Arabic words.
The script used in the aljamiado manuscripts is North African, magrebī script, and a particular feature of this is that َّ (fa') is written with the dot beneath: َّ, and ٢ (qāf) is written with only one dot above: ٢.

The vowels are three: َّ (fatha) = [a] (above the word) ٢ (kasra) = [i] (below the word) ٢ (damma) = [u] (above the word)

In addition these vowels can be lengthened by a following 'ālif, yā or wāw of prolongation respectively.

As well as the omission of certain consonants in aljamiado manuscripts, the Moriscos were also obliged to make a number of adaptations, in order to represent sounds not present in their own language. In Arabic the addition of a ta'dīd ٢, represents gimation. In the aljamiado manuscripts a ta'dīd is added to the following consonants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonant</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Ch</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>د</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, the 'ālif of prolongation is used to represent e, which does not exist in the Classical Arabic vowel system.

The feature peculiar to the aljamiado manuscripts is their disregard for the unity of Spanish words. Some are linked together: e.g. konello. Others are divided in the middle of the word: e.g. t(s)res lado, suBre be, where the scribe may be influenced by the familiar tres or sobre. Not all examples can be explained in this way, some are divided because they include one of the six consonants which cannot be linked to a following consonant: ورذأ

In all these cases we have used the normal Spanish word division in the transcriptions.
The transcriptions

Another major problem to be solved before embarking on this work was that of the system of transcription to be adopted. The two systems which we considered were those of Al-Andalus with the necessary adjustments suggested by Professor Harvey in order to accommodate aljamiado peculiarities, and of A. Galmés de Fuentes in his Historia de los amores de París y Viana.

Of the Al-Andalus system we agreed with Galmés de Fuentes in rejecting the symbols כ for כ, ס for ס, ד for ד, and ה for ה, and replacing them with ג, †, ס and ב respectively. As Galmés de Fuentes says:

"...he prescindido, en la medida posible, de signos diacríticos, que estorbarían a la comprensión, y que desde el punto de vista fonético no ofrecen ninguna ventaja..." 8

He goes on to say, however,

"Excepcionalmente, ... utilizo los signos diacríticos cuando por ausencia de un takdīd, el ס ... o el כ ... valen como x de la grafía medieval española ... o como ch de la lengua antigua y moderna..." 9

We have not followed this procedure as in dealing with manuscripts from a purely linguistic point of view it might be dangerous to assume that certain orthographic signs have values not immediately apparent to the eye. In fact the only place where we have departed from this principle is in the transcription of כ, where to write ѣ consistently would give rise to unnecessary confusion, without shedding any more light on Morisco pronunciation; x and ch are reserved exclusively for כ and כ.

Whereas we agree in the main with the improvements wrought by Galmés de Fuentes on the Al-Andalus system there are certain innovations which, though valid in principle are difficult to carry out. First and foremost, he makes a distinction in the transcription of a number of Arabic letters, between Romance and Arabic vocabulary: (р/бб; ч/ж; rr, xx; z/zs; 11/1.1; nn/nn). It is not always possible to state categorically that a word is Spanish or Arabic in these manuscripts. Galmés de Fuentes himself admits that even when he transcribes an Arabic word differently from a Romance one, there was most probably no distinction made in the mind of the Morisco who
wrote or pronounced them:

"Por eso, en las voces árabes, para indicar el carácter geminado original empleo la grafía 1.1, ... y esto sin prejuzgar la pronunciación real de los moriscos, que bien pudieron haber conocido la palatalización de la doble l." 10

One wonders therefore at the need always to distinguish between the two. Obviously when a word such as gunna or aljannah occurs it forms part of a body of easily recognizable Muslim words. Can the same be said of alkitab, to give but one example? Should we write this alkitab or alkitib? What about Romance words created from Arabic? If we take the example of asajdar or acajdar? As a general rule we have preferred to treat as far as possible all words in the same way, whilst conceding that, given the lack of p in Arabic it would be foolish to transcribe an Arabic word with one, as this could in no way be indicative of pronunciation. We have at the same time, omitted to use the geminate forms suggested: r.r, and l.l.

With regard to the transcription of vowels the major difficulty is the intercalated vowels. Menéndez Pidal in his introduction to the Poema de Yáqub has this to say about them:

"Obedeciendo a particularidades de la lengua árabe, que no tolera sílaba que empaque por dos consonantes, en la aljamiá se suele acompañar de una vocal postiza o de sostén la primera consonante de un grupo inicial de sílaba o palabra ... Esta adición ... es de rigor ..." 11

Galván de Fuentes continues this same way of thinking:

"Por razones de la lengua árabe ... la literatura aljamiada utiliza una vocal postiza ..." 12

Their use of the word postiza to describe these vowels points immediately to an assumption about their nature and function that cannot readily be made. On what basis can they be considered false, artificial? As Professor Harvey asks:

"How far do these methods of writing indicate actual sounds, and how far merely scribal forms, empty reminiscences of Arabic orthography irrelevant in Spanish?" 13

The question remains unanswered, and as long as it does it would be prejudging matters to consider them as artificial or false; for
this reason we have retained them in the main body of the text, in
brackets. The same is true for intercalated و (w) and ی (y).

We also have disregarded the suggestion that ب should be
transcribed as either b or v according to modern Spanish orthography,
and as well as distinguishing between g before a, o, u, and before
e, i.

There are occasions when Arabic words, especially proper
names, are not vowelled in the manuscripts. When this is the case
the vowels have been added, and an explanation given in the footnotes.

Galmés de Fuentes, in his system of transliteration retains
the ی of the Arabic article al, even when preceding a 'sun-letter'
with a taṣdiq. We have not followed this suggestion, but any
irregularities of this nature in the Arabic, and there are many
(omission of taṣdiq, doubling of lām, are the more frequent ones)
will be indicated.

Finally, it was considered judicious to add capital letters
and modern punctuation for the sake of greater reading facility.

### Comparative systems of transcription

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Al-Andalus/ Harvey</th>
<th>Galmés de Fuentes</th>
<th>Revised System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Romance</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Romance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>nothing</td>
<td>nothing</td>
<td>nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l₁</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l₂</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b/v</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rr</td>
<td>rr</td>
<td>rr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Al-Andalus/ Harvey</td>
<td>Galmés de Fuentes</td>
<td>Revised System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Romance</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Romance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>ç</td>
<td>ç</td>
<td>ç</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>š</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>š</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>ĕš</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>ē</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>ç</td>
<td>ç</td>
<td>ç</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>ĝ</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ll</td>
<td>ll</td>
<td>l.1</td>
<td>ll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŋ</td>
<td>ŋ</td>
<td>mn</td>
<td>ŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w, or u</td>
<td>w only</td>
<td>w only</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y, or i</td>
<td>y only</td>
<td>y only</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

w, or u when vocalic
y, or i when vocalic
Notes

The notes have been compiled in accordance with the Modern Humanities Research Association Style Book, Leeds, 1971. Full details of publication will be given in the Bibliography. Further references in the notes will be to author only, except in those cases where more than one work is cited: when this occurs, an abbreviated title will be given also.

Some authors, Menéndez Pidal and Steiger in particular, use bold type for phonetic symbols instead of square brackets. As we are not able to reproduce these in typescript, square brackets will be used when quoting from these texts. Similarly, square brackets will be used instead of italics when the latter are used in quotations for phonetic symbols; this will avoid any possible confusion with our own text.
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CHAPTER I
The Treatment of Initial \(F^-\)

\(F^- > h^-\) in Spanish

The subject of Lat. \(F^-\) and its subsequent development to Cast. \(h^-\) has produced a wealth of literature too great to be dealt with here at considerable length. In the main, however, the discussion centres around two points, which are to a large extent interdependent. They are:

1. Was the sound shift \(F^- > h^-\) a result of Iberian or Basque influence (the substratum theory), or was it in fact a purely Romance feature?

2. Was the pronunciation of the \(F^-\) labiodental or bilabial?

As regards the first question, the majority of philologists are in favour of the substratum theory, whose major exponent is Menéndez Pidal. He bases his argument\(^1\) on the appearance of this feature both in Castilian and Gascon, areas bordering on Basque, a language which itself lacks \(f\). Menéndez Pidal is supported in his assertions by many others\(^2\) including W. von Wartburg\(^3\), H. Gavel\(^4\) who makes a careful distinction between Iberian, which he favours, and Basque, which he rejects, as the substratum in question, R. Lapessa\(^5\) and A. Martinet\(^6\).

In the opposite camp stand W. Meyer-Lübke\(^7\), J. Orr\(^8\) and W.D. Elcock\(^9\), among others\(^10\). Orr produces many examples of \(F^- > h^-\) in Northern and Eastern France, as well as Italy in support of his adherence to a purely Romance solution:

"... le prétendu isolement du gascon et de l'espagnol est complètement illusoire et ... l'argument tiré de la contiguïté géographique par rapport au basque perd tout son poids.
... c'est au latin parlé, plutôt qu'à telle ou telle influence ethnique, qu'il faut s'adresser pour trouver la solution du problème."\(^11\)

It is precisely the nature of the articulation of \(F_-\) both in Latin and in Romance which is at the root of the second problem confronting philologists. It is known that Lat. \(F_-\) was sometimes pronounced as a bilabial rather than a labiodental fricative.
P. Fouché speaks of early Lat. $F$- being bilabial, as well as later intervocalic $\overline{F}$-

"Tandis qu'à l'initiale, F latin, originairement bilabial (= [§]), était devenu labiodental dès les derniers temps de la République, il semble qu'en position intervocalique il ait gardé plus longtemps son articulation primitive. En tout cas, l'histoire phonétique du français laisse supposer que c'est un [§] (bilabial) et non un [f] (labiodental) que les Latins prononnaient, entre voyelles, au moment de leur entrée en Gaule." 12

W.M. Lindsay 13 and L.R. Palmer also give examples of dialectal Latin variants showing $\overline{H}$- for $\overline{F}$-

"Dialectal forms are found with $h$ for $f$: haba (faba) horda = 'pregnant cow' (cf. forpus < foro)." 14

This dialectal trait has however also been attributed to substratum influence, this time Etruscan 15.

Menéndez Pidal rejects Orr's arguments in support of Latin influence, firstly on account of Etruscan influence in the Latin shift $F$- $\overline{H}$-, and secondly because:

"... todo cambio fonético es natural y puede ocurrir en varias lenguas, pero siempre en cada una ocurre por precisas causas históricas determinantes; cambios lingüísticos semejantes han de tener en distintos países causas históricas distantes." 16

Lázaro Carreter supports Menéndez Pidal in his rejection of Orr's thesis, but with totally opposite arguments. He refers to the findings of Bühler, Jakobson and Grégoire 17 to show that the passage of $f > h$ is not a natural linguistic sequence. He discusses their research into infant language acquisition, and sums up:

"Como vértice inicial del edificio lingüístico aparece la aspiración; en sus últimos estadios, la $f$." 18

The reverse process of $f > h$ can only, therefore, in his opinion, occur in the context of a primitive language, as is the case with Basque, which has no /f/ in its phonemic structure 19. He also rejects the possibility of an intermediate bilabial pronunciation of $\overline{F}$.

"... porque ello hubiera exigido la creación de un nuevo fonema, del que no existen representantes ..." 20

Yet this is precisely the solution put forward by von Wartburg:
"Le basco-cantabrique oriental, comme le basque actuel, ne connaissait pas f, mais, comme ce dernier, il possédait un p. Le f latin fut donc rapproché de ce p qui lui était de toutes les articulations la plus apparenté; f étant une fricative, il fut prononcé comme le phonème fricatif le plus proche de p du point de vue articulatoire, c'est-à-dire un f bilabial." 21

Von Wartburg goes on to suggest a divergence of pronunciation of this bilabial phoneme to [h] in weak position and eventually to labiodental [f] in strong position, once it came into contact with the rest of peninsular Spanish, which had retained the original Lat. F- 22.

Martinet agrees with von Wartburg's thesis, and suggests a Basque [f] developed either through *ph or b, eventually being pronounced [h]23. The fact that [h] is not represented graphically for many more centuries is explained by Martinet as owing to a sense of social inferiority felt by northern Castilian speakers when confronted with the accepted speech habits of areas further south, in particular the capital, Toledo, which still preserved [f]:

"Pendant des siècles, h a dû céder devant f dans le centre nord de l'Espagne romane. Mais un jour est venu où le processus de remplacement de [h] par [f] s'est arrêté et s'est renversé. Les communautés où l'on disait horno, unilingues depuis bien des générations, n'avaient plus le sentiment d'être socialement inférieures à leurs voisines qui disaient forno." 24

This is not to say that there are no examples of early written h- for F-. Menéndez Pidal has collected instances of the loss of F- from the ninth century onwards, (Ortico, 863 A.D., Hortico, 927 A.D. < FORTICUS, Haeto, 912 A.D., < FAGETU, ogo, 932 A.D. < FAUCE, etc.)25. He has also found examples in Aragón (Forti Hortiz, Forti Ortiz etc. Oge, and honasa)26, but these have been called into doubt by Manuel Alvar as they are of either Basque or Castilian origin27, whilst admitting that if genuine examples of F- > h- could be found in Aragonese, this would reinforce rather than invalidate Menéndez Pidal's substratum theory.

Menéndez Pidal has also found Basque examples of F- > p-, as well as in Leonese and writes:

"No es lícito decir que el caso f-h es de evolución gradual fonética y el caso f-p es brusca sustitución por equivalencia acústica; son dos fenómenos de igual índole en un pueblo que carece de f." 28
This evidence is complementary to Martinet’s and von Wartburg’s theories on the bilabial nature of Basque f.

Of particular interest in the context of this thesis is the recent discovery by Diego Catalán of the observations of an eleventh century Arab historian, writing in Rioja:

"El nombre de ilfante lo pronuncia ilhante, cambiando la F en H al hablar." 29

Diego Catalán comments:

"Aunque podamos justificar esta declaración suponiendo que tenía presente la grafía latina de la palabra o que conocía la pronunciación romance del vocablo en otras comunidades ajenas al cambio F > [h], lo cierto es que Abū Bakr b. 'Abd al-Rahmān consideraba la pronunciación [i(1)hante] como mera materialización fonética de un nombre cuya transcripción "fonológica" era, sin ningún género de duda, /i(1)fante/; para nuestro "dialectólogo" árabe la [h] riojana del s. XI era, por tanto, un alofón del fonema /f/." 30

The subject of the subsequent development of Lat. F- has been taken up in further detail by Anthony Naro and José Luis Rivarola.

Naro posits an intermediate stage of ich-Laut [ç] in the evolution of Lat. F- to Sp. h-, in those areas where the present-day pronunciation takes the form of J (jota). He bases his argument on the development of Spanish unvoiced [ç] to jota, claiming that F- must have followed the same process and at the same time 31. In other words he rejects aspiration in favour of palatalisation, and at the same time disagrees with any possible substratum influence.

Rivarola, in his reply to Naro’s article, doubts the validity of his argument, and stands firmly in favour of the substratum theory. Like Martinet and von Wartburg he prefers:

"... la hipótesis de la evolución de F a h a través de etapas intermedias (variantes bilabiales o labiovelares)..." 32

Rivarola also refers to examples of F before je, ji written as h in the Libro de buen amor, and this point is dealt with in detail by R.J. Penny in another article in the same publication. Penny argues in favour of Lat. F- becoming a bilabial fricative in northern Hispanic Romance, only to be replaced under later French influence by f-, in those words which still display a 'retention' of f- (i.e. f- before /r/, /l/, /j/, [w]). He disagrees with von Wartburg’s theory that...
[\(\phi\)] became \(\{f\}\) under N\={a}varabic influence. As regards Old Castilian he says:

"... the chief difference between Castilian and the northern dialects lies not in the fact that Castilian "aspirates \(F\)" while the other dialects "preserve \(F\)" but in the fact that Castilian levels the allophones \(\{\phi\}\) and \(\{h\}\) of \(\phi\) in favour of \(\{h\}\) while the other dialects level the same allophones in favour of \(\{\phi\}\)." 33

Penny bases some of his conclusions on the treatment of loan words up to the eleventh century, which show written \(\h\) for foreign \(\phi\), and after the eleventh century, which are written with \(\phi\). This he puts down to "the classic superstratum argument" of French and Provençal influence. The distinction between \(\{f\}\) and \(\{h\}\) was further increased by the introduction of learned words, and finally \(\{f\}\) alternated with zero articulation. In fact it was only when the allophones \(\{\phi\}\), \(\{h\}\) and \(\{h\}\) were no longer to be found in mutually exclusive environments that the need for orthographic distinction arose, and

"The appearance of huerte, huera, etc., can therefore only occur after the emergence of labiodental \(\{f\}\) in the standard language ..." 34

Penny's findings refer, however, to rural and popular Spanish. After giving examples of \(\{\phi\}\) and \(\{h\}\) pronunciations in rural areas, and especially Andalusia, he writes:

"The urban Castilian equivalents of the words cited above all have the same initial sound \(\{f\}\), whether before syllabic vowels (febrero), consonants (fregadero) or semi-consonants (fuego) ..." 35

Consequently, if we are to assume a certain level of education among the Morisco scribes, the occurrence of the features Penny has investigated will be occasional, rather than the norm.

Arabic and Judeo-Spanish testimony

If we now turn to Hispano-Arabic testimonies it is interesting to read what A. Steiger says on the representation of Ar. \(\mathring{\alpha}\), \(\h\), (transcribed by Steiger as \(\mathring{x}\)):

"El hecho de que el \(\mathring{x}\) sólo en siciliano se reproduzca por \(k\) con perfecta regularidad, en tanto que el ibero-románico prefiere manifiestamente la \(f\), nos lleva a sospechar que la \(f\) ibero-latina no fuese idéntica fisiológicamente a la actual \(f\) hispánica. De lo contrario no se comprendería que una fricativa labiodental constituyese el mejor sustitutivo para la fricativa posvelar." 36
E. Alarcos Llorach, discussing the value of $f$ and $h$ in Alphonsine transcriptions writes:

"Para los cultos, entre estas dos variantes había una cierta relación valorativa: la $f$ era más culta, la $h$ más rústica; ambos sonidos eran, pues, variantes estilísticas de un solo fonema. Esto explica que los colaboradores alfonzinos, mientras no confunden la una con la otra cuando las utilizan como "signos fonéticos" de los nombres árabes, empleen $f$ en representación de las aspiradas árabes o $h$ en representación del $h$ en los árabismos ...".

Cl. Ar. $ف$, $ف'$, is invariably labiodental and Ar. $ح$, $حا'$, is a voiced laryngeal or glottal fricative. Classical Arabic has no bilabial fricative, as has been posited for O. and Med. Sp. $f$, although Steiger attests both $\lbrack W\rbrack$ and $\lbrack p\rbrack$ in Moroccan Arabic. The latter can be represented graphically, the former cannot. On the other hand Steiger notes that:

"... en varios dialectos vulgares la $f$ tiene una marcada tendencia a la articulación bilabial ..." 39

It may well be, though, impossible to deduce any allophonic distinctions present in the spoken language from these manuscripts.

This confused state of affairs is surprisingly not reflected in Judeo-Spanish texts:

"$\lbrack f\rbrack$ did not occur in Peninsular O[ld] J[udaeo-] Sp[anish] for $h <$ Latin $f$; $\lbrack f\rbrack$ persisted in all the texts up to the Expulsion."

There are however, examples of $h$ for $f$ in post-Expulsion writing.

**The manuscripts**

Bearing in mind all this evidence and the different opinions put forward, we must now ask how much of it can possibly be answered by the evidence of aljamía manuscripts. The first major problem, namely that of the substratum versus Latin dialectalism, cannot be further elucidated by fifteenth-century and sixteenth-century data. Can one, on the other hand, deduce the nature of articulation of $f$ from them?

As far as literary Spanish is concerned $f$ lingers on a long time:
"In literary documents the f is written continuously throughout the Middle Ages, and there is no vacillation until we reach manuscripts of the fourteenth century. In the next century the hesitation between f and h indicates that the actual sound was an aspirate; and the fact that h makes hiatus in the verses of Garcilaso de la Vega, Luís de Leon, Ercilla and Herrera proves the continued existence of this aspirate in standard Spanish down to about the year 1580." 41

The aspirate is considerably weakened in Lope de Vega and virtually unknown to Calderón. This phenomenon is limited only to Castile, and the f- remains in Astur-Leonese, Navarrese and Aragonese.

The length of time during which the aspirate remained is open to more speculation. Menéndez Pidal states:

"La f se conservó en la lengua escrita hasta fines del siglo XV ..., pero luego fue sustituida por la h, que era verdadera aspirada en los siglos XV y XVI." 42

Alonso Zamora Vicente however, limits the continued existence of aspiration more than Menéndez Pidal; speaking of the area of Old Castile, he writes:

"La aspiración de la h se hallaba prácticamente perdida en la primera mitad del siglo XVI. El andaluz fray Juan de Córdoba recordaba desde América, a donde fue en 1543, que los de Castilla la Vieja 'dizen yerro, y en Toledo hierro, y dizan alagar, y en Toledo halagar'. Por este mismo tiempo Santa Teresa, en Ávila, escribía: asec, echo, yga, etc." 43

Only in NW Castile was the aspiration retained, according to Zamora Vicente, and this explains Garcilaso's use of it.

Taking the manuscripts in chronological order, B.N.5319 (1429) has no examples of f, only of f:

fablar (229v)
ficho (231r, 232v)
fagas (232r)
faga (233r)
fagan (233r)
fermosos (234r)
faze (237r, v et passim)
fuyendo (238r)
fazen (241r)
formigas (241r)
fare (242v)

Words which still have f- in Modern Spanish:
The uniformity of representation $f = \bar{f}$ leaves little room for speculation. If the Morisco perceived a distinction between his own labiodental $[f]$ and $[\bar{f}]$ he was unable to represent it. Moreover it is also possible that the scribe paid attention to Castilian graphic convention.

One point which Penyy mentions specifically is the late appearance of spellings of the type huerte, hueras, huerza, and huego during the fifteenth century. This is certainly not the case here, as the examples fu(\text{e})go, en fu(\text{e})ras de, and fu(\text{e})rga show. Moreover the scribe would have been perfectly capable of representing this. There are two possible explanations for this. Either the Moriscos were more familiar with urban speech habits, in which case they would reasonably be expected to use $\bar{f}$, or else $[h\bar{f}]$ was still acoustically closer to the labiodental fricative, and they paid no attention to Latin character orthographic innovations.

J.1 (1462) already shows some vacillation between $f$ and $\bar{f}$:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>with $f$</th>
<th>with $\bar{f}$</th>
<th>zero</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fare (4v)</td>
<td>hazer (5v)</td>
<td>\text{u}(\text{e})g\text{o} (216r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fasti(y)o (5v)</td>
<td>he\text{c}ho (5v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fenb(a)ras (215r)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fazes (215r)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fazen (215r,v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forka (215v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fazer (216r)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faga (216v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fizo (216v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Words with $f$ in Modern Spanish:

- fin (3v, 4r, 5v, 214v)
- de fu(\text{e})ra de (214v)
- fu(\text{e})ron (4r)
- uri(y)osos (215r)
- fu(\text{e})res (4v)
- fu(\text{e})ra de (215r)
- fatIgas (5r)
- felicidad? (216r)
- fallecimi(y)ento (5v)
- fines (4v, 5v)
If we consider these examples in percentage terms we arrive at the following sets of figures:

1. (excluding words with $f^-$ in Modern Spanish)
   - with $\pm$: 76.9%
   - with $\varnothing$: 15.4%
   - zero: 7.7%

2. (including words with $f^-$ in Modern Spanish)
   - with $\pm$: 88%
   - with $\varnothing$: 8%
   - zero: 4%

Either set of figures points to a gradual awareness of aspiration, or at least uncertainty as to the pronunciation of Cast. $f^-$ by the second half of the fifteenth century. If there were an intermediate pronunciation, somewhere between [$f$] and [$h$], the scribe could only register this by graphemic hesitation. Of particular interest are the examples of zero articulation: u(w)elgo and uri(y)osos. The latter, being a learned word, is of special interest, in view of the fact that even furioso is not documented by Corominas before 1490.45

B.N.5073/7 (1482) from the morería of Agreda, half way between Soria and Zaragoza, retains $\pm$ throughout, in keeping with Arag. $f^-$:

- faze (lr)
- ferreri(y)a (lr)
- feyto, os, as (lr,v,2r)
- Ferreroh (lr,v)
- fi(y)erro (lr)
- Ferrero (lv)
- fis(i)(y)eron (lv)

B.N.4908/1 (1510) has in fact very little to offer in the way of examples: fijo (2v), fajas (3r), hoja (4r). The doctor's notes (T.15) which we did not include in our final list, because of difficulties in dating, contain two examples of retention, and two of loss of $f^-$; the manuscript covers a period from 1514 to 1530, and the juxtaposition of fecho and hizo in the same manuscript is indicative of the hesitation registered during the same period in Castilian literature.
The marginal notes from B.N.5364 (1542) offer no examples of aspiration, but do have fillo (4r, 33v) and febrero (4r). The letter from the Mufti of Oran (T.13), on the other hand, is full of the same uncertainty as the doctor's notes, but on a larger scale. The manuscript is dated 1563.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>with  interceptions: 35.7%</th>
<th>with  diacritical marks: 42.8%</th>
<th>zero: 21.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fijos (28r)</td>
<td>hecho (28v)</td>
<td>acer (29r, 31r) 2 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fizo (28r)</td>
<td>hagays (29r)</td>
<td>ablarays (31r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fisi(y)eron (28r)</td>
<td>hazer (29v, 30v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fares (30r)</td>
<td>haze (30r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fijo (31v)</td>
<td>haremos (31v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we receive a clear impression of the linguistic confusion brought about by the change from \([f]\) \(\rightarrow\) \([h]\) \(\rightarrow\) zero. We said in the introduction that we were reluctant to choose this manuscript on account of its being a copy of one dated 1505. It would seem unlikely that there would be such clear indications of the loss of aspiration so early in the century (the \(h\) was described only a decade earlier by Nebrija as "hiriendo en la garganta")\(^46\). We can therefore take it that the copy is not a slavish one, but more probably the work of a scribe, who confusedly tried to update the orthography of the work he was copying. There seems no other answer to account for fares, hazer and acer being present in the same manuscript.

When we consider the next manuscript, B.N.5223 (1577), the picture is completely different. There is not a single example of initial \(\mathfrak{f}\), all words consistently beginning with \(\mathfrak{f}\):

- hijo (247v et passim)
- hab(a)re (247v)
- hartari(y)a(e) (247v)
- hartarte (247v)
- hazzer (247v, 248v)
- haz (247v, 250r, v)
- hu(w)elgo (247v)
- haras (248r)
- hiziste (248v)
- haran (248v)
- hazzes (248v, 250v)
- hara (249r)
- hizze (249r, v, 250r)
- hablador (250r 2 times)
- hogar (250r)
- hagas (250v)
- habla (250v 2 times)
- hez (250v)
- hazze (250v)
- hallaras (250v)
- hazzedd (251r)
- hazzen (251r)
- harra (251r)
- huyga (252r)
- hecho (253r)
Those words which retained initial F- are consistently written with &f;:

- (f)ri(y)o (247v)
- fu(w)ego (248r, v, 250r)
- fu(w)esa (248r, v, et passim)
- f(a)ranko (249r, 250r)
- fi(y)es (249v)
- (f)aravilcezza (250r)
- fu(w)erte (250v)
- formsse (252r)
- fegura (252v)

It would seem from this manuscript therefore that the scribe is representing aspiration of Lat. F- through his use of &f;.

According to Menéndez Pidal, aspiration was still current in the latter half of the sixteenth century. Zamora Vicente is of the opinion that aspiration disappeared about the middle of the century. The fact that the scribe consistently uses &f; would however point to the continued existence of aspiration. We would otherwise expect some examples without &f; as in the previous manuscript. B.N.5223 is however the only manuscript among those studied, including those not finally selected, to show this absolute consistency. Other manuscripts dating from the 1570's and 1580's do in fact show the opposite tendency and consistently have &f;.

Finally, J.30 (1597) and J.52 (1598), whilst showing some confusion between forms in &f; and forms in &f;, have a definite preponderance of the latter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>with &amp;f;</th>
<th>31.3%</th>
<th>with &amp;f;</th>
<th>68.7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fija (138r)</td>
<td></td>
<td>hazes (138v, 139r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feco (138v)</td>
<td></td>
<td>haga (139r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fazer (140r)</td>
<td></td>
<td>huido (139r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fizi(y)esedes (140v 2 times)</td>
<td></td>
<td>hago (140r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>also:</td>
<td></td>
<td>hablar (140v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>femarales (138v) (Arag.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>hamb(i)ri(y)entos (141r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hagais (141r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hamb(e)re (142v) 143r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>higad(os) (143r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.B.</td>
<td></td>
<td>hata (138r, 142v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J.52 offers no differences here, and neither manuscript has any examples of loss of aspiration.
There seems to be, from the evidence of the manuscripts, no difficulty in finding equivalent Arabic graphies for Sp. \( \text{f} - \) and \( \text{h} - \). The fact that in some manuscripts, T.13 in particular, there are instances of no consonant at all, could point to a definite survival of aspiration among the Moriscos, alongside a gradual awareness of loss among Christian communities. The process of loss among the Moriscos began much later, as can be seen from the persistence of \( \text{f} \) not only in the earlier manuscripts such as J.1, the Kitab segobiano, but in the very latest such as J.30, El libro de rogar por agua. The ratio is of course reversed: ten examples of \( \text{f} \) to two of \( \text{h} \) in the former; eleven examples of \( \text{h} \) to five of \( \text{f} \) in the latter. That the \( \text{f} - \) became an aspirate we can be sure; but it is not so easy to say with certainty how long it remained one. How sure can we be that the \( \text{h} \) did not become a traditional graphy that continued to the end of the century, when aspiration was already dying out? T.13 is perhaps the most problematic of the manuscripts in this respect. Not only do we find \( \text{f} \), \( \text{h} \) and zero side by side in a ratio of 5:6:5, but we also find ha (30r) and a (28r) as well as such unlikely examples as hanke (29r), hakello (31r), and halto (31v). What then is the value attributable to \( \text{h} \) in the manuscript?

We should consider briefly the question of \( \text{h} \) in Lat. \( \text{h} \). As Menéndez Pidal says:

"La \( \text{h} \) no se pronunciaba ya en latín, de modo que en romance no tuvo representación ninguna. En la antigua ortografía, más fonética que la de hoy, se escribía ombre, onor, eredero, como aún se hace en las reimpresiones del Diccionario de Nebrija hechas en el siglo XVI; pero en el Tesoro de Covarrubias (1611), ya se escriben con \( \text{h} \) estas palabras, para imitar la ortografía latina. En la ortografía de Nebrija la \( [\text{h}] \) representaba un verdadero sonido y se empleaba solo en vez de una \( \text{f} \) latina ..." 49

It would seem that there was a clear distinction in the scribe's mind between the two sounds, when we find a hecho (28v), ay (29r) and emos (31v); but this is immediately called into question by the existence of derrôkarse ha (30r). Is the scribe trying, again somewhat unsuccessfully, to imitate Latin orthography, as was the fashion by the end of the sixteenth century? This would appear to be backed up by the hypercorrections of hanke and halto. If this is
the case, did \( \text{-} \) in fact mean 'no sound' for the scribe? Was it merely an orthographic convention he was trying to adopt? If so, can we assume that the \( \text{-} \) for \( \text{h} < \text{Lat.} \text{ f-} \), in fact represented no sound either? It is probably safe to do so, or at least to say that aspiration by this time was so weak as to be scarcely noticeable.

The linguistic confusion of the manuscript is probably a fair indication that this scribe, unlike those of some of the other manuscripts we have considered, was trying to keep abreast of contemporary pronunciation. What on the surface may appear to be illiteracy, may well be a slightly haphazard attempt at phonetic representation. Other manuscripts, notably J.30, which is dated thirty years after still give no signs of loss of aspiration. Finally how does the evidence of the aljamiado manuscripts compare with that of Castilian literature of the same period? Firstly the development from \( \text{f-} \) to \( \text{h-} \) \( ( \text{F} > \text{H} ) \) is much later, lingering on into the second half of the sixteenth century. Consequently the loss of aspiration is also later. None of the earlier manuscripts attempt to replace the etymological \( \text{H} \) as does T.13, so that we can say with certainty that the \( \text{-} \) does represent aspiration in all of them. Why does aspiration take so long to disappear in the Morisco writings? The answer is probably twofold. On the one hand Morisco communities were often isolated from the influence of Christian communities, and therefore slower to adopt innovations. Secondly one must take into account the Muslim adherence to tradition and his dislike per se of uncalled for interference with it. This is constant throughout Morisco manuscripts, and does not merely affect this particular case of initial \( \text{f-} \). Many words which disappeared long before in Castilian literature remain in these manuscripts, and the same is probably true with reference to phonetic change.

It is interesting to note in this context the evidence of Albert E. Sloman for the pronunciation of Moorish characters in Golden Age drama:

"In Lope de Rueda's Armelina there is a heavy concentration of \( \text{xemz} \) for the farcical magic of Milien Bucar ... Here too there is an extraneous element taken from the Portuguese, the substitution of \( \text{f} \) for \( \text{h} \). The jargon passages of Juan de Timoneda's Paso are similar to those of Armelina, including the Portuguese \( \text{f} \) for \( \text{h} \), ..." 50
When we reach the period of Lope's drama, he remarks:

"The elements foreign to Moorish speech have been eliminated. Of such changes as r for l, h for f, f for h, and ch for ll, all in evidence in pre-Lope writers, I have found no trace of the last three and but a few exceptional examples of the first." 51

Could it not be that what Sloman refers to as "extraneous elements" are in fact indicative of the late disappearance in Morisco speech of initial [f]? The division between pre-Lope and Lope drama would seem to confirm to a large extent the evidence of Morisco speech found in the manuscripts (though we found no examples of ch for ll).

Perhaps brief reference should be made to yet another instance of aspiration. Papers /7 and /11 of B.N.5073 show a few examples of final -h, written as Δ, e.g.

/7 Ferreroā (1r, 1v)
    demandah (2r)
/11 adeبدء (1v)

Alongside Ferreroā there is also one case of Ferrero. We have not found similar examples in other manuscripts, but it is not always possible to be sure whether one is in fact reading Δ or whether it is merely a scribal flourish. One can moreover do little more than register their existence, since they seem to have no bearing on Castilian pronunciation, and are probably due to the influence of Arabic word-endings on the scribe.
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CHAPTER II

The Romance groups from Latin P'T, P'D, B'T, V'T

Romance groups

On the subject of occlusive groups Menéndez Pidal writes:

"En el grupo de labial y dental, cuando es latino, ...
 ... se asimila; y cuando es romance, conserva su
individualidad ... P'T, P'D, B'T, y V'T se agruparon
reducidas a [bd], cuya b era todavía pronunciada por
Valdés; pero en su tiempo ya se antecuaba; y desde
entonces se vocaliza en [ud], que tras vocal
posterior se reduce por asimilación a [d]..." 1

Lapasa dates the vacillation between forms such as dubda and duda
in the first half of the fifteenth century, but agrees with
Menéndez Pidal that one could still find in the first half of the
sixteenth:

"... la conservación, muy decadente, de algunos
grupos de consonantes que en el habla llana se
habían simplificado". 3

He goes on to say that the form in bd only survives today among
Spanish speaking Jews 4, which gives a clear indication that the b
was still current by the end of the fifteenth century.

The manuscripts

The examples are not numerous in the aljamiado manuscripts we
have consulted, and the range of words is limited. The most frequently
recurring is deudo, followed by codicia and ciudad. The ratio is
nevertheless significant; of the fifteen examples (excluding
repetitions) only three have lost the b. Taking the manuscripts one
by one, the instances are as follows:

B.N.5319 (1429)

déabão (229v, 230 v, 236v)

kobdòs (238v)

kobdizi(y)o (243r)

skobdizi(y)a (244r)

J.1 (1462)

çibdañ (4r, 216v)

bi(y)uña (214v)

déabões (215v, 216r)
B.N.5073/7 (1482)

dabdo (1r 2 times)
dabdoa (1v)
dubda (2r)

(There are no examples of bd in either B.N.4908, B.N.5364
or B.N.5223)

T.13 (1563)
ciwdad (28v)
dabdo (29v 3 times)
dabdo (30r)

J.30 (1597)

çibâaf (138v)
kodzi(y)ando (139r)
rrî(y)ebta (142r)

J.52 (1598)

çî(y)uada (372r)
kodzi(y)ando (372r)

Corominas records dabda in 1206⁵, but adds that the change
to the u is already present in Alonso Fernández de Palencia⁶. The
word daudo is found in Castilian texts until the end of the sixteenth
century, but again in the vocalised form. Vocalisation is registered
by Nebrija, and Corominas mentions earlier examples too. Likewise,
coodo is to be found as codo in Alonso Fernández de Palencia, but the
old form does persist into the sixteenth century⁷.

Of rato Corominas writes:

"La forma antigua con bt o pt cayó en desuso antes
del Siglo de Oro, si bien queda una huella de la
misma en el juduoeop. de Bounis ariftar ..." ⁸

Gavel, also on the subject of the same verb, writes:

"Quant au verbe rebtar, il faut probablement voir
un indice de ce que, pour certains copistes, le
b y était devenu muet dans ce fait qu'ils se
trompent sur la place à lui assignée, écrivant
par exemple retebdes pour rebtades." ⁹

As regards the remaining examples, codicia is not recorded
until Nebrija and some earlier authors, and then with a b, which
makes the forms in B.N.5319 perfectly logical. On the other hand, the verbal form codiciar is documented as far back as Berceo without a b, which explains its absence in J.30 and J.52. On the subject of dubda, Corominas writes:

"... dudar se halla ya en mss. del S.XIV ... pero dubdar sigue siendo usual hasta el siglo siguiente." 11

He also cites examples of dubda in El Cantar de Mío Cid but dua in Berceo. The only example which undergoes any change in the manuscripts is gidad. This form is found in the 1462 and 1597 manuscripts, whereas ciudad and gi(y)udad are found in the 1563 and 1598 manuscripts respectively. The latter is in fact a scribal correction of gidad in J.30, a possible attempt to bring the manuscript more in line with contemporary pronunciation.

Bi(y)uda (J.1) is really a case apart, and as Corominas says:

"... se podría dudar de que la -b- interna de la forma vibda ... correspondiera realmente a la pronunciación, pues si viuda pasó directamente a viuda más bien podríamos creer que la -b- fuese una ultracorrección meramente gráfica, según el caso de eibdad, cabdillo, cabdal, más tarde pronunciados con y." 12

The earliest example of the change b'd > d is to be found in 1563, the date of the letter from the Mufti of Oran, (with the exception of viuda). Although, as we have seen, these archaic forms do survive in the sixteenth century, one would expect evidence of vacillation from a much earlier date. It is unfortunate that there are no examples from the first half of the sixteenth century to enable us to draw a more accurate picture, but even the manuscripts which were finally 'discarded' are not any more forthcoming. All that can be said is that firstly one would expect some vacillation between the old form and the new. Secondly when one eventually finds examples at the end of the sixteenth century one would no longer expect to see such a preponderance of the older form. It would appear, nevertheless, that if the Moriscos did write bd, then the (b) was not 'una ultracorrección meramente gráfica', but must be a feature of their speech. This is, yet again, a pointer to the archaic nature of the Moriscos' language.
Before concluding this chapter, a word should perhaps be said on the development of the Latin group PT. As Menéndez Pidal says, this group becomes very early. Nevertheless there are two words which recur in a few of the manuscripts which deserve attention, because they contradict this. Firstly the word cautivo; it occurs in a section of B.N.5073 not otherwise dealt with, in the form kataba (B.N.5073/11 fol. lv, 1467). Corominas gives the first documentation of the form cativa in 1131, and the form cautivo in 1250-71. He adds:

"La variante cautivo vivió hasta muy tarde, (todavía en Sta. Teresa, Rivad. LIII, 51; en Lope, Pedro Carbonero, v. 1200, como forma de moriscos)." 13

Here then is interesting confirmation of a Morisco form. In the other manuscript where the word occurs, however, the form katabos is found (J.30 138v, J.52 572r). Corominas gives no examples at all of this archaic form, but both cautivo and cativo occur in the Libro de buen amor 14. On the other hand, the scribe does write kodi(g)(y)ando, but this form, as we have said already, existed as early as Berceo. More interesting perhaps, is the case of J.52, where the scribe obviously corrected gibad, but left katabos unaltered.

There is also the example of esk(i)ribto and esk(i)ribturas in B.N.5223 (1577). Corominas says that:

"En el participio fue común la grafía cultista escrita desde antiguo." 15

but he provides no evidence for the voicing of the p. Esk(i)ribto occurs three times in the manuscript (252r, 253r) and esk(i)ribturas once (249r). Unfortunately there are no examples of the development of Romance groups for the purpose of comparison, but they do add to the evidence of the persistence of archaic forms in the latter half of the century, when one would expect the opposite, were the Moriscos using Christian Spanish as a guideline. In fact one is forced to ask whether the Morisco communities were aware of changes in the language spoken about them, for when changes are recorded they are certainly very sporadic, as is the case of gibbad/chi(y)urad or as, in the previous chapter, in the registration of the change from \textit{f-} \rightarrow \textit{h-}.\)
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CHAPTER III
Spanish \( j, g \), Arabic \( c \)

Spanish \( j, g \)

The major problem in assessing the significance of the Arabic use of \( c \) for Sp. \( j \) and \( g \) is the lack of certainty about the precise articulation of both sounds. There has been considerable discussion to date about the fricative or affricate pronunciation of O. and Med. Sp. \( j \). Ford's view is this:

"Whether the unvoicing preceded the loss of the stop, or vice versa, it is hardly possible to say with absolute certainty. Assuming that Spanish favored the retention of dental sounds, as it has done in the case of \( ch = [t\emptyset] \), and that it early showed its very marked repugnance for voiced sibilants we might consider the development to be \( [d\emptyset] - [t\emptyset] - [\emptyset] \). But proceeding on this theory, we should expect to find some confusion of a written \( j, g \) having the transition value \( [t\emptyset] \) with the written \( ch = [t\emptyset] \)." 1

Martinet favours the possibility of variations of articulation according to position:

"It is ... likely that most standard Castilian speakers at the end of the fifteenth century used \( [d\emptyset] \) initially and \( [\emptyset] \) intervocally ..." 2

He bases this assumption on A. Alonso's findings, both as regards Hispano-Arabic and Judeo-Spanish pronunciation. A. Alonso, while showing there is strong evidence for \( [d\emptyset] \) in all positions 3 has found a clear distinction drawn between \( [d\emptyset] \) initially and after consonants, and \( [\emptyset] \) intervocally 4.

As to the development of \( j \) in the sixteenth century, Ford concludes that the occlusive element was lost prior to unvoicing. He goes on:

"The latter assumption squares well with the fact that in the sixteenth century \( j \) and \( x (= \emptyset) \) were confused, while \( j \) and \( ch \) were not then or at any time confused." 5

Ford dates this confusion in the middle of the sixteenth century, and most linguists would agree with him. Martinet, and Alonso certainly do and, though Menéndez Pidal dates voiced velar fricative pronunciation "a comienzos del siglo XVI" 6 and unvoicing
and confusion with \( x \) considerably later, "a comienzos del siglo XVII" 7 he also concedes that "la confusión, pues, se hace dominante hacia 1550 en la mitad sur de España". 8

The different conclusions can best be summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ford:</th>
<th>not:</th>
<th>Menéndez Pidal:</th>
<th>Alonso:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[dz]</td>
<td>[dz]</td>
<td>[z]</td>
<td>[z] (dz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[k]</td>
<td>[tʃ] (z)</td>
<td>[g]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Martinet sees this not so much as a whole-scale sound shift but as:

"... l'écroulement d'une tradition linguistique, longtemps conservée par les classes supérieures, mais trouvant de moins en moins d'appui dans la masse de la population d'une aire toujours croissante..." 9

He draws a parallel between the progress of \( F \rightarrow h \) southwards from Cantabria and the unvoicing of all Spanish sibilants 10. This is also the opinion held by Tracy Sturcken 11.

It is not possible for the manuscripts to throw any light on this last assumption, nor is there any likelihood of the process of velarisation being represented in any way in the manuscripts if the general view that this last change was not widespread until the beginning of the seventeenth century is accepted. It could theoretically be possible, however, to find evidence of firstly, either an affricate or fricative value for \( 0 \). Sp. \( j \), and secondly of the mid-century process of unvoicing.

**Arabic \( ه \)**

We must now consider the value of Ar. \( ه \). In Classical Arabic the true value posited for \( ه \) is [dz], a yotacised \( d \), still found in Egypt and Algeria, and originally probably [g] 12. W.H.T. Gairdner attributes three values to \( ه \), namely [z] alveolar fricative, [ʃ] palatal plosive, [g] velar plosive, while distinguishing between Syrian [z] and Classical [dz] 13. Staiger argues in favour of Hisp. Ar. [ş] (= [z]) on the basis of present day North African
pronunciation [z], but how far can we be sure that this is indicative of pronunciation in fifteenth and sixteenth century Spain? Unfortunately the problem cannot be further elucidated by an examination of the pronunciation of Judeo-Arabic. The language of North African Jewish communities is more archaic than that of present-day Muslims, and could consequently provide an answer to some of our questions, but as Joshua Blau says:

"The deviations from Classical usage in the domain of phonetics are scanty, compared with those in morphology and even more in syntax." 15

However, while it is true to say that in the main [z] is a fricative, there is at least one exception, in the Tlemcen dialect:

"Cette prononciation ([z] = [dj]) se retrouve dans certains dialectes orientaux, mais dans le Maghrib elle est exceptionnelle et le [z] est d'ordinaire prononcé [z] (j français) à Tripoli, à Tunis, au Maroc, et dans les dialectes ruraux de l'Oranie." 16

Galmés de Fuentes is also of Steiger's opinion:

"... el árabe clásico no contaba en su sistema con una prepalatal, fricativa, por lo cual, aunque la j del texto morisco fuese ya fricativa, no se podía utilizar para reproducirla otro signo que el [z] ([jim]); y, de otra parte, hay que considerar que la realización africana del [z] ([jim]) pertenece casi exclusivamente a la lengua literaria; por ello es de suponer que el valor fonético del [z] ([jim]) árabe español coincidiría, desde hacía tiempo, con el de los dialectos magrebíes actuales, igualándose, por tanto, a una fricativa prepalatal." 17

A. Alonso on the other hand disagrees with Steiger, and stands firmly in favour of an affricate articulation (as he also does with Sp. j, though conceding the possibility of intervocalic [z]). He bases this assumption partly on Pedro de Alcalá's transcription of final [z] as -ch, not as -x, and concludes that

"... hemos de admitir en el [z] una articulación más energética y dura que la j romance ... Ese plus de energía es el que llamaba la atención de los oídos españoles, y, buscando el casillero adecuado dentro de su propio sistema, les hacía recaer en la ch, como la reproducción ... más satisfactoria." 18

We are obliged therefore to accept that Arabic testimony will be for the most part inconclusive, as the values of both Ar. [z] and Sp. j
are open to doubt. We are left with this highly unsatisfactory system of correlations:

Spanish [d\^e] or [\^e] = Arabic [d\^e] or [\^e]

Fortunately, although this is the usual correspondence in our manuscripts, there are exceptions, and these will be studied in detail in the hope of finding evidence of the exact articulation of Sp. j in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, and of unvoicing by the middle of the century.

Judeo-Spanish testimony

Amado Alonso's findings for Modern Judeo-Spanish are confirmed by Spiegel's research. In Judeo-Spanish there is only one Hebrew character to cover the values [\^e] and [\v^e] or [d\^e], and that is \^H. No differential use is made of diacritics as in Ar. \^C and \v^C. The diacritic over \^H distinguishes the values [\^e], [d\^e/\v^e] from the original value of [g],19 A further distinction is however made by Modern Judeo-Spanish by the use of a raphe on \v^T, (true value [z]) for the intervocalic fricative, \v^T. The affricate remains unaltered, and the very fact that it is the fricative that required new representation would seem to indicate that it was the never sound of the two, and would confirm the process of depalatalisation posited by Ford.

Be that as it may, Spiegel argues in favour of the affricate and fricative values of Sp. j being apparent through scribal errors in which \^H is used for 0.Sp. voiced s [z], and even for z [\v^e], e.g.

"... qo\^a ... dige ..."

Dige is either an orthographic error on the part of the typesetter for dize as he confused [z] and [\v^e] or he mistakenly meant the preterite form of the verb."21

The manuscripts

Initial j- and g-

All manuscripts use \^C, with one exception only:

chusti\^ci(y)a (J.1, 5r)

This is obviously far too early for unvoicing, but could possibly
point to an initial affricate pronunciation. It is a pity that there are no more examples which would confirm this.

**Romance groups c'1 and g'1**

The picture is as regular as that for Lat. J- and G-. There is only one early example of ǧ for ǧ in B.N.5319. ǧ is the character used by Morisco scribes to render [ċ], ch, and this particular manuscript also shows some hesitation in representing the latter, providing several examples of ǧ without tashdīd for Sp. ch. The example in question is:

```
ocho (Mod. Sp. ojo) (237v)
```

This time ǧ is used for Sp. ද, and would therefore seem to run counter to the theory that intervocally ḏ was fricative, not affricate. Again, however, this is a single example, and it would be dangerous to jump to conclusions on such slim evidence.

There is an interesting distinction made, however, between the writing of viejo in J.30 and J.52 (1597 and 1598). The former has bi(y)ejo (137v), bisjos (139v), but the latter has both bi(y)ejos (572v) and bi(y)echo (571v). Does this 'correction' on the part of the second scribe only a year later point to his awareness of the change in Spanish pronunciation? Is it an attempt to represent unvoicing? (If he had wanted to represent a velar articulation, quite possibly current at this time among some speakers, he would have had ǧ at his disposal.)

**Arabic words with ǧ**

Again, as is only to be expected, ǧ is almost consistently written as ǧ, though it is not always the case that Arabic words are spelt correctly. The very nature of the Morisco communities makes it likely that they would sometimes be unsure of the spelling of their own language. There is nevertheless one example of ǧ for ǧ, in B.N.5223:

```
chahannam (250r)
```

The ǧ is all the more curious in view of the fact that in the two previous examples of the word, the scribe has written jahannam without tashdīd. It would be nice to find in this example evidence of
unvoicing, but it must surely be unlikely that this would occur solely in an Arabic word, which since it forms part of the Morisco’s linguistic and religious tradition would be more liable to retain its voiced character in the mind of an Arabic speaker.\textsuperscript{22}

\textbf{Latin -LY-}

As regards the rendering of \textit{-LY-}, the picture is slightly more varied. In B.N.5319, the distribution is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With $\theta$</th>
<th>With $\epsilon$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>major (231r, 236r, 242v, 243r)</td>
<td>ficho (231r, 232v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tajado (236v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mujeres (237v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mujer (238r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taja (240r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In J.1 we find a single example of \textit{t(a)rabachos} (5r), Gisela Labib, in her analysis of manuscript B.N.5301, finds alongside six examples of $j$ for various Latin groups, three which do not conform to the usual pattern: \textit{t(a)rabaxos}, \textit{t(a)rabachos} and \textit{congoxa}. She argues against the likelihood of these forms representing an unvoiced velar fricative on the grounds that the manuscript is too early, though we can find no clear indication of dating in her article. She goes on however to suggest that:

"Die damit implizierte Gleichsetzung der genannten Graphien [\textit{x, ch, $\xi$}] hätte sich in einer wahllosen Vertauschung von $\epsilon$ und $\theta$ in der Handschrift niederschlagen müssen."\textsuperscript{23}

To take the two points separately, whilst we would agree that it would be most unlikely to find evidence of a velar unvoiced fricative, it would be more than possible to find evidence of a palatal unvoiced fricative, even if we assume the manuscript to be dated some time in the middle of the sixteenth century, which is what Gisela Labib suggests. Secondly the fact that she finds six examples of $j$ to two examples of $\theta$ and one of $\chi$, would by no means make the evidence of the last form insignificant. When a sound is undergoing a process of evolution, one cannot expect that change to be represented uniformly from the outset. Confronted with a 'new sound' the scribe must inevitably hesitate in the way he represents it. A ratio of 3:6,
or in other words 33% of the examples is by all accounts significant.

Rejecting the possibility of scribal error, she goes on to suggest that the forms may be an expression of 'voluntad de autoafirmación aragonesa', reacting against Castilian forms. If this is so, it is by no means the only reason, given that our example of t(a)rabachos is to be found in J.1 which is certainly not an Aragonese text, but written in Segovia.

To conclude merely that in addition to Aragonese self-assertion, the form t(a)rabachos shows that is a graphic variant of seems to be understating the case. Even if, as is probably true as regards manuscript J.1, the dating is too early for unvoicing, we can at least, as in the treatment of Lat. (V. Chapter IV) see evidence of scribal hesitation between the fricative and affricate quality of 0.Sp. j.

j from other sources

The remainder of words with j comes mainly from French directly or through Catalan. Here, at last we find a slightly more encouraging picture emerging.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M.S.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>With j</th>
<th>With ch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.N.5319</td>
<td>1429</td>
<td>linaje (242r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>linajas (241v, 242r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>monjaç (242v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.1</td>
<td>1462</td>
<td>erejes (215r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.N.5073/7</td>
<td>1482</td>
<td>dereytaje (2r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.13</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>deritajes (28r)</td>
<td>delittache (29v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>deritaje (29v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>deraytahhe (30r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.N.5223</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td>ospađaje (320v)</td>
<td>omenacha (574v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.52</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The form deraytahhe is more likely to be on account of the omission of a dot rather than any attempt at phonetic representation. 1563 is certainly too early for any signs of a velar fricative. It would be therefore legitimate to consider this example as a case of ch. From this chart it is clear that here we have definite evidence of that
unvoicing process for which we have vainly searched in \( \ddot{\imath} \) from different sources. Moreover they are at the period where one would expect such evidence. So far the examples have been sporadic, and too early to be convincing, especially in view of the ultra-conservative character of Morisco language as a whole. In view of the fact that the process of devoicing was most probably \([\ddot{d}\ddot{k}] > [\ddot{d}] > [\ddot{s}]\), we would have hoped to find examples of \( \dddot{\imath} \), but at least we can be sure that the examples we have do bear witness to the phonetic evolution of the period.

**Manuscript T.16: a definite case of unvoicing**

The evidence furnished by this manuscript is so demonstrative of the process of unvoicing that was taking place in the latter half of the sixteenth century that we considered it worth while diverging from the selected list of manuscripts to examine this one in detail. T.16 is a manuscript of an escape route for Morisco refugees, and consists in the main of lists of place names.

The examples of the rendering of \( \dddot{\imath} \) and \( \dddot{\alpha} \) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With ( \dddot{\imath} )</th>
<th>With ( \dddot{\alpha} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mijerola (3r)</td>
<td>Chalasa (6r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jibaw (5r, 23r)</td>
<td>Chuman (6r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Soraje (6r)</td>
<td>fiasco (7r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont Jinebro (7r)</td>
<td>Chursus (8r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jerbas (9r)</td>
<td>Bi(y)echo (10r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jirona (11r)</td>
<td>Chunkara (11r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeddà (14r)</td>
<td>machor (21r, 22r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major (21r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We originally decided to abandon this manuscript on account of the difficulties of deciphering the names of some of the towns on the route. Despite this problem, however, we feel the manuscript must be looked at. With the rendering of foreign place names, a further difficulty arises, because of the different evolution of French and Italian. Nevertheless, even if we take this into account, the right-hand column is still indicative of unvoicing. Whether in fact it is representative of an affricate in the mind of the scribe we cannot tell,
but so far all the examples have been with a $\overline{\text{róż}}$ rather than $\overline{\text{ż}}$ or $\overline{\text{至尊}}$. The percentage of examples with $\overline{\text{róż}}$ is 49, which is considerably higher than on any of the other manuscripts 26.

Why is this so? The other manuscript with a high incidence of $\overline{\text{róż}}$ is T.13. If we compare the subject matter of these two manuscripts with the others of the second half of the sixteenth century it will be seen that B.N.5223 and J.30 and 52 are based on traditional Muslim texts. T.13, the letter from the Mufti of Oran, and this present manuscript are examples of 'original' sixteenth-century writing. Is it possible that when a scribe is confronted with the task of copying or translating a 'traditional' text he himself is more likely to be influenced by conventional orthography? In the case of T.16 we are certainly not dealing with an accomplished scribe. The writing is irregular, and takes the form of notes scattered here and there on the page. Many words are crossed out and re-written, as if the writer were not too sure of his spelling. This type of writing is all the more valuable because of its spontaneity and lack of adherence to any stabilising body of tradition. It is probably inevitable that when dealing with a more traditional text the scribe's fear of bida'a (innovation) will weigh heavily on his orthography, thus preserving in writing archaic forms and pronunciation which the scribe himself would probably not use in everyday speech. This is true not only with doctrinal texts but with legal documents, which like the former, are strongly bound by traditional linguistic conventions.
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CHAPTER IV

Spanish ch, Arabic ㅊ

Spanish ch

The result of Lat. CT in Castilian is [ç], written ch, and in Aragonese [t] or [it]. As regards pronunciation there is really no doubt as to the value of ch, but from the point of view of orthography it is interesting to note that [ç] posed problems for the early Christian scribes, for they used either g, or gg, and sometimes ih or x, as was also the case for [dçi] and [dçi]. The graphy gg is of particular interest as it involves a process of gemination similar to the use of taaday, as well as being subject to the same vacillation as in aljansa as regards the representation of either the voiced or the voiceless sound.

Arabic ㅊ and Judeo-Spanish testimony

Morisco scribes represent the Castilian sound [ç] by ㅊ, that is, by the addition of taaday to ㅊ, the voiced palatal (either fricative or affricate). This is the usual form found in the manuscripts though it will be seen that early examples tend to use the unaltered ㅊ, in the same way as Hebrew, up to the time of the Expulsion, used ꙗ for [ç] as well as [dçi/çi] (v. Chapter III).

Amado Alonso has gathered some conclusive evidence for the existence in Granadan Arabic of [ç] used only in Castilian loan-words:

"Los árabes granadinos que cumplieron el cambio at > ch en palabras romances no lo hicieron en las patrimoniales." ²

Writing elsewhere of Mozarabic Spanish, Alonso says:

"... las retranscripciones del árabe en letra castellana debidas a Pedro de Alcalá nos prueban que ahora, para la j, el čm conserva su valor patrimonial de africada sonora palatal rehilante. Una misma letra ㅊ ocultaba, pues, dos valores fonológicos distintos...: el patrimonial de [j] para las voces propias y para los hispanismos con j, g, y el advenidizo de [ç] para los hispanismos con ç, ç, ch." ³

Alonso is nevertheless writing solely about Granadan Arabic and Mozarabic dialects, and it is a mistake to assume that Muslims
throughout Spain necessarily spoke a common dialect. Even if [k] had entered the language of Muslims in all areas, the Moriscos might still hesitate over how to represent it, and might not always be certain how to pronounce the new sound, especially if it was only used for foreign words.  

The manuscripts  

Aragonese is represented by [k] or [h], as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fol 1r</th>
<th>Fol 1v</th>
<th>Fol 2r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>feyto</td>
<td>p(e)leyte(y)o</td>
<td>feytos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sobredito</td>
<td>feytas</td>
<td>dita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dito</td>
<td>dito (5 times)</td>
<td>feytas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dita</td>
<td>sobreditos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The one exception is ocho(y)entos, which surprisingly occurs in the compound numeral ocho(y)entos i gu(w)eytanta (fol. 2r). Manuel Alvar gives examples of hueyto and guwyto from the thirteenth century onwards, but also gives an example of ocho from 1464.  

Alonso Zamora Vicente dates the change to Castilian usage as follows:

"La castellanización -it- > -ch- se registra en los documentos de Zaragoza a partir de 1452 esporádicamente, y total desde 1480-81."  

This manuscript, dated 1482, shows therefore the usual characteristics of the aljamiado manuscripts, in being slow to adapt to innovations of speech.

The result one would expect for the Castilian manuscripts, namely [c], is not always to be found. In the earliest document, B.N.5319, the forms fluctuate between [c] and [ç]. In other words, between [ch] and [j]. The examples stand in the ratio of 3:15, 3 with [ç], and 15 with [c].
The weighting is so heavily in favour of \( \overline{\text{c}} \) in this manuscript that one is obliged to ask what value the \( \overline{\text{c}} \) represented for the scribe. In manuscripts J.1, B.N. 4908/1, B.N. 5223 and J.30 and J.52 the problem does not arise (though it will be remembered that there were a few instances of \( \overline{\text{c}} / \text{c} \) confusion in the representation of \( \{\text{zh}/\text{dzh}\} \)). There is no hesitation between \( \overline{\text{c}} \) and \( \text{c} \); the scribes consistently represent ch by \( \overline{\text{c}} \). The only other instance of confusion occurs in T.13 (1563):

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{with } \overline{\text{c}} & \text{with } \text{c} \\
\hline
\text{noje (29v)} & \text{hecho (28v)} \\
\end{array}
\]

Galmés de Fuentes, in his analysis of the aljamiado manuscript of París y Viana, finds only one case of ch written as \( \overline{\text{c}} \), and he makes the following comment:

"Sólo en un caso se echa de menos el taşdīd, ojo ... por ocho, que en esta ocasión obedece, sin duda, exclusivamente a un olvido del copista, pues los sonidos, uno sonoro y otro sordo, representados por el \( \overline{\text{c}} \) (jím) sin taşdīd y el (chím) con taşdīd son tan diferenciados, que no cabe el empleo espontáneo de un mismo signo para los dos. Por otra parte, hay que tener en cuenta que se trate de una sola excepción en todo el texto aljamiado."

Our texts, namely B.N.5319 and T.13 present a different picture though.

It must be borne in mind, in the first place, that the difference between the two sounds, \( \{\text{zh}, \text{dzh}\} \), the voiced fricative (or affricate) and \( \{\text{ch}\} \), the unvoiced affricate, are distinguished in Arabic script
solely by the addition for the latter of a ta’dīd. One could argue then that in these two manuscripts the scribe was merely forgetful. In B.N. 5319, however, the scribe then 'forgot' more times than he remembered.

Moreover, it could be argued that the scribe was wrestling with the problem of representing a phonemic difference in Castilian (/v, dh/ and /θ/) which he himself had difficulty in perceiving as the latter is foreign to Classical Arabic. The case for a hesitant scribe is more plausible therefore than that for a 'forgetful' one. At least in the case of B.N. 5319 uncertainty is only to be expected, as this is a very early manuscript, and no orthographic conventions had as yet been firmly established.

We referred in the previous chapter to Ford's view that the development of [ð] followed a process in which the occlusive element was lost prior to unvoicing, and consequently only j and x (= [θ]) were ever confused, not j and ch. Yet this is precisely what does occur here, and could well point to the fact that [ð] developed firstly not to [θ] but to [θ], i.e. it unvoiced before loss of occlusion, and was consequently open to confusion with ch.

It is also possible to see in the confusion a purely graphic hesitation, and this is a point considered by Gisela Labib:

"Bei der Substituierung θ für θ (g für [ch]) dürfte es sich zweifellos um graphische Varianten derselben präpalatalen stimmlosen Affrikate [ch] handeln." 9

Arabic θ , she goes on to say, has a symbolic value as the graphic variant of θ , whilst representing at the same time the real value of voiced O. Sp. j. This must always be taken into account:

"Demnach wird sich bei einer Interpretation von ar. θ immer die Frage stellen: Besitzt es symbolischen oder phonetisch-phonologischen Aussagewert?" 10

Since there is no historical evidence for the existence of forms in j resulting from Lat. CT, perhaps this is the only solution one can reach: that, given the extent of uncertainty about, firstly the nature of O. Sp. j, and secondly that of Peninsular Arabic θ , one is forced to conclude that for some Morisco scribes there was
sufficient affinity between $\zeta$ and $\zeta$, be it graphically or symbolically or phonetically, for there to be hesitation in their representation of $\check{ch}$, [\c].

Whilst it must always be borne in mind that in Castile and Aragon at this period the Muslim community was basically Romance-speaking, the Moriscos were nevertheless using an alphabet system belonging to another language, so that even if they had forgotten Arabic to a large extent, and could hardly for that reason be termed bilingual, they must all the same have come into fairly frequent contact (the educated ones at least) with Arabic in the practice of their religion. It is quite possible that the phonology of Arabic had been completely adapted to their Spanish vernacular as has been the case with Latin and Hebrew among Christians and Jews in different speech communities. This is certainly the case for late sixteenth-century Valencia, where although Arabic persisted as the primary language much longer than in Aragon or Castile, it was very much subject to alteration. As Professor Harvey asks:

"What ... was the sound-system functioning in Arabic in Valencia in 1595? There are the strongest indications that this system was not greatly different from that of the Romance-speaking Christians: that there had been a wholesale replacement of the characteristically Semitic pattern of sounds brought to the Peninsula." 11

Nevertheless the Moriscos, however familiar they may have been with Romance sounds, still had to grapple with the problem of adapting their own alphabet to them, and were sufficiently aware of the values of the Arabic letters to determine which Romance sounds had fairly exact counterparts and which required adjustment in order to be represented with some accuracy.

Bearing this in mind, therefore, it is still interesting to consider that the problem faced by the scribes in the representation of [\xi/\dxi] and [\xi] must have been similar to that described in general terms by Leonard Bloomfield in his discussion of cultural borrowing:

"In phonetic substitution the speakers replace the foreign sounds by the phonemes of their language. In so far as the phonetic systems are parallel, this involves only minor differences." 12

This is the situation for a large number of Arabic and Spanish
phonemes. On the other hand, he goes on,

"If the borrowing people is relatively familiar with the lending language, or if the borrowed words are fairly numerous, then foreign sounds, which are acoustically remote from any native phoneme, may be preserved in a more or less accurate rendering that violates the native phonetic system." 13

With slight modification, this seems to be the case here. The extent to which Moriscos could still be said to be borrowing Spanish is highly debatable, but it would nevertheless be true to say that they attempted to render "more or less accurately" a foreign phoneme by violating their own system, and in turn tried to rectify this violation by the addition of diacritic marks which they were not always sure how or when to use.

The process outlined by Bloomfield is more systematically reviewed by Uriel Weinreich when he distinguishes four basic types of interference in languages in contact, namely the underdifferentiation, overdifferentiation or reinterpretation of phonemes and "actual phone substitution" 14. In the case in point we would appear to have an instance of partial underdifferentiation, in that some scribes manage to represent the difference perfectly well, whereas others fail to make a consistent distinction. As Weinreich says:

"Underdifferentiation of phonemes occurs when two sounds of the secondary system whose counterparts are not distinguished in the primary system are confused." 15

There is also a certain degree of reinterpretation in that the /\$\to/\$/ opposition of Castilian is altered to a /\$\to/\$/ opposition in aljamia.

It is moreover possible to see in the hesitation between \t and \t not only for Sp. [\$/d\$] but also for [\$] evidence inadvertently provided by scribes of the unvoicing of Sp. [d\$/\$] since there must have come a time when the voiced/unvoiced distinction they represented graphically by \t and \t was no longer there. Perhaps the interchange between \t and \t rather than \t and \t points to the need for a reassessment of the traditionally held view that Sp. [d\$] lost its occlusion before unvoicing and not vice versa.
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Differentiation of the voiced and unvoiced \( s \) was represented graphically in the Alphonsine period, but it was not until the time of Nebrija that this distinction was universalised through the advent of printing. Dating the process of unvoicing of \( s \), Amado Alonso writes:

"La generalización de la cultura y, sobre todo, la imprenta, hicieron que la ortografía de Nebrija se adoptara inmediatamente, aunque en pocos casos con entero rigor. En cambio duró poco en la práctica, porque en el siglo siguiente, con la alteración profunda del sistema fonético de la lengua, se ensordecía la \( -s- \) sonora y ya no hubo distinción fonética con \( -ss- \)."  

It is generally accepted that this change took place during the second half of the sixteenth century, although at different times in different parts of the Peninsula. Martinet places the major sibilant shift towards the end of the sixteenth century\(^2\), and accepts an apicoalveolar pronunciation for /\( s/\) and /\( z/\) during the period in question, as it still is for /\( s/\) to-day\(^3\).

Ford, writing about the distinction between \( s \) and \( ss \), remarks,

"... contrary to the tendency of Spanish to simplify double consonants, \( ss \) is often written where, for phonetic reasons and on the analogy of the other Romance languages, we expect the voiceless sound, and that \( ss \) does not appear where, on the same grounds, we expect the voiced sound."  

He assumes a "voiceless function" not only for the results of Lat. \(-SS-, \) e.g. \( massa, passa, \) but also for all consonants + \( s, \) e.g. \( assi, señoř (in sentence phonetics)\(^5\). He dates the unvoicing of /\( s/\) as mid-sixteenth century\(^6\). Whilst Menéndez Pidal and A. Alonso would agree in the main with this, the latter points out that:

"Ford, 105-107, equivocadamente iguala el grupo latino \(-ms- (mensa) \) con los otros de consonantes + \( s. \)" \(^7\)
Nenéndez Pidal, also dating the change towards the end of the sixteenth century concurs with Alonso:

"Ya NS en latín ... se reducía a S ... y esa S era sonora, como lo indica la sonora del toscano ... En el romance antiguo era también sonora, esto es [z] ...: pensare pesar ..." 9

With the necessary adjustments to Ford's system therefore, the functions of /$$/ and /$/$ divide as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>-SS-</th>
<th>S-</th>
<th>cons. + S-</th>
<th>/$$/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/$$/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>-S-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/$/$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/$/$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some</td>
<td>-RS-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/$/$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, Lat. X, -STY-, -SY- all give /$$/.

Arabic

As regards the Arabic representation of Cast. /$$/ and /$/$, a word must be said about the distinct nature of the /s/ phoneme in both languages. This involves a discussion of Cast. ç and z ([ts] and [dz]), which by rights falls within the domain of the next chapter, but which must be considered here also in order to view the sibilant question as a whole.

Cast. /$$/ was certainly alveolar in its place of articulation, whereas Arabic $ was and still is dental. Whilst agreeing on this point Steiger and Alonso disagree as to whether $ and were apicodental (Alonso's view11), or predorsodental (Steiger's view12). Others are more hesitant as to the exact nature of the Ar. $ - Gairdner for instance, writes:

"The most notable difference between the Arabic sibilants and the corresponding English ones, is that in Arabic the hiss is very much stronger and more sibilant ... It is not possible to describe the exact position of the tongue-point in making this strong hiss ..." 13

Alonso registers surprise at Steiger having based his predorsodental
definition on this passage of Gairdner's. Galmés de Fuentes however, 
has studied in great detail not only Steiger's evidence and that of 
Alonso but also the descriptions of Arab phoneticians. In his 
reinterpretation of these he provides conclusive evidence that 
Ar. س is not apical but predorsal, and it was this predorsal/apical 
distinction which prevented the Cast. س being represented by س . 
That the Moriscos found no phonetic affinity between the two /s/ 
phonemes is paralleled by the Arabic borrowings of a much earlier 
period; Latin loan-words with s are to be found in Arabic with س (spico-alveolar emphatic) and occasionally س (palatal fricative) 
but never س . So was reserved exclusively for the 
Castilian dental affricate ق [ts].

Arabic in fact concords with Martinet's remarks on sibilants 
in general:

"Dans les langues qui connaissent deux ordres de 
siffillantes, on s'attend ... à ce que, selon le 
principe de différenciation maxima, ce soit les 
deux types extrêmes [s] et [z] qui soient mis à 
contribution ..." 18

And this, surprisingly, did not occur in Castilian Spanish:

"La, où, comme dans la péninsule ibérique en 
général, /s/ est très ancien, on aurait pu 
s'attendre au passage à la prononciation 
predorsale qui s'est finalement produit en 
français. Mais ... rien n'indique que la chose 
se soit jamais produite dans le domaine 
traditionnel du castillan." 19

Of the Arabic sibilant system only س, د and س concern 
us here since س merged with س in Hispano-Arabic and is very 
rarely used in aljamiado writing. When it is used it must be 
understood as an exact equivalent of س. Most people would agree 
that since س and د were reserved to represent س and د ([ts] or 
[ds]), ([dz] or [ds]), there remained only س for [s] and [z]. 
This immediately produces the problem of how to distinguish between 
the latter two, as the voiced equivalent of س is ج (if we 
accept its fricative articulation) and this was already reserved for 
سل. Moreover, we have clear evidence that س in all positions 
was pronounced by Moriscos in the same way as س [s], and this is 
substantiated by the fact that س is used for not only س [s],
(its 'real equivalent'), but the [ḍ] and [ṭ] in question.

In the Poema de Yúguf the scribe makes no distinction between s, -ṣ-, and ẓ, all three being represented by ẓ. Gisela Labib asks whether this feature is a 'criollismo lingüístico' of the Morisco scribe. She is unconvinced by the evidence of the Poema de Yúguf, as it is interpreted by Menéndez Pidal.

"Aus den von Menéndez Pidal im Poema de Yúguf zitierten Fällen einer Darstellung von asp. ṣ durch ẓ, W. und ṣ zu schließen, hat wenig Überzeugungskraft, da es sich hierbei fast ausschließlich um etymologisch entwickeltes primär ṣ handelt, das durch ar. ẓ ume Schreibung wird, ..." 22

She goes on to say that in order to be sure that the Moriscos did in fact pronounce [ṣ] and [ṭ] alike, one must be convinced that they had a means of differentiating between them graphically, and adds:

"Es ist auch nicht recht einzusehen, warum der Morisco einen Lautwert des Spanischen fallenlassen sollte, der ihm aus der arabischen Sprache vertraut war." 23

Whilst saying that in the last analysis the problem cannot be solved, she does go on to say that it is more than possible that the ẓ did cover two sound values, and that we are in fact dealing here, not with a phonetic value, but rather with a symbolic one, "eine zwischen Grammatikern und Schreibern getroffene Vereinbarung" 24.

Is it enough though, to dismiss or to answer the problem with a "symbolic" solution? If, for example, we follow the analogy of the use of ṭa[lk]d[t] with ḫ, [ḍ] to represent ch [č] or with [b] to represent p [p], it is quite possible to argue that a judicious use of ṭa[lk]d[t] with other Arabic characters could have produced a system much more in keeping with the Old Castilian phonemic structure: ḫ could have been paired with ẓ to cover /dz/ and /ts/ respectively, thus releasing ẓ for /s/ and /k/ (with or without a differentiating ṭa[lk]d[t]) and ẓ could have been retained solely for /ṭ/.

This would have produced a system like this:


The argument against such a system is, of course, that ẓ and
were so obviously felt to be a pair that it would have represented too violent an attack on the Arabic phonemic structure to put it into effect, or even to have considered it a possibility: (one can on the other hand argue that if  the violation of the system to pair it with . It might also have been possible to make use of somewhere in the system. All this is, of course, pure speculation, the purpose of which is to demonstrate that the choice of symbols for the range of Spanish sibilants was not an arbitrary one, based on a principle of "first come first served" in which some characters were "lucky enough" to have each a separate equivalent value in Castilian, while others were left with the task of doing the rest of the work in a somewhat haphazard fashion (e.g. combining phonetic and symbolic graphies), but were based rather on a choice which corresponded as closely as possible to the Moriscos' perception of Spanish phonemes in terms of their own.

If we consider the system of Old Spanish sibilants,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ts} & \quad (\xi) \\
\text{dz} & \quad (\varepsilon)
\end{align*}
\]

and compare it with the aljamiado representation of them:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ج} & \quad \text{ش} \\
\text{ز} & \quad \text{ش}
\end{align*}
\]

it will be seen that for the Moriscos the phonemic structure of Spanish sibilants was as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ts} & \quad (\xi) \\
\text{dz} & \quad (\varepsilon)
\end{align*}
\]

In the first pair the Arabic fricatives fit neatly with the Castilian affricates, especially in view of the fact that by this time the affrication was fairly weak and is eventually lost during the period in question. The opposition between /\varepsilon/ and /\xi/ is apparently lost and merges with /\xi/; the /\varepsilon/ \rightarrow /\xi/ opposition which led to \text{x/\text{j},} confusion in Latin character is now lost, and /\xi/ is paired with /\varepsilon/ with which it is confused in Arabic character (v. Chapters III and IV).
The question of ות will be discussed later in the chapter; at this juncture it is sufficient to note that certain manuscripts make use not only of ות but of ות (with ta'amid).

Judeo-Spanish testimony

While it will be seen that the aljamiado system represents the Castilian sibilants in such a way as to do least damage to the Arabic phonemic structure and to represent Morisco speech habits accurately, it fails to provide a very satisfactory insight into the actual stages of development of the Spanish sibilants themselves, or to register some of the distinctions inherent in them. In this respect, it could be argued that the Hebrew alphabet was better suited. Moreover there is no indication in contemporary writings that the Jews failed to distinguish between /ʃ/, /θ/ and /ð/. In fact, however, the situation is little different. As Spiegel points out:

"The Masoretes had distinguished י [s] unvoiced alveolar or post-dental fricative from י [ʃ] unvoiced prepalatal fricative by the employment of diacritics in pointed texts." 26

However in the early Judeo-Spanish period the diacritics were more often than not omitted, possibly in imitation of the Arabic system.27. Even where the texts are pointed there are many omissions, although Spiegel adds:

"Despite the variety of diacritical marks used with י, it is clear that the intent of the writers was always to indicate [ʃ] when the diacritics were used." 28

While some sort of a distinction is maintained therefore between ʃ and /θ/, there was still no differentiation between the voiced and unvoiced s until after the Expulsion:

"It is only after the Expulsion that י began to be replaced regularly by ʒ to represent the voiced s, and such is still the practice in M[odern] J[udeo]-S[panish]." 29

The manuscripts

If we turn now to the manuscripts we have studied, it will be found that the evidence is equally mixed:
B.N.5319 (1429)

The scribe consistently represents both \textit{s} and \textit{-ss-} by $\text{ش}$, e.g.

\begin{itemize}
  \item kosa (233v, 237v)
  \item podaroso (233v, 235r)
  \item pasan (234r)
  \item amansadres (236v)
\end{itemize}

There is however a certain amount of vacillation in the representation of Latin $\text{X}$:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{with} $\text{ش}$
    \begin{itemize}
      \item diseron (230v, 231r, 235v)
      \item $\text{داس}$an (231r)
      \item diso (231r et passim)
      \item masilla (232v)
      \item $\text{داس}$a (238v)
      \item bendiso (241v)
    \end{itemize}
  \item \textit{with} $\text{ش}$
    \begin{itemize}
      \item $\text{داس}$exo (233v)
      \item $\text{داس}$exo (236v, 238r)
    \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

J.1. (1462)

There are no cases of differentiation between \textit{-s-} and \textit{-ss-} in this manuscript, \textit{Med. Sp. x} (Latin $\text{X}$) being given the same treatment as well:

\begin{itemize}
  \item diso (4r)
  \item disi(y)eron (4r)
  \item est(a)raños (4v)
  \item ensep(o)los (215v)
\end{itemize}

The same is true of manuscripts B.N.4908/1 and 5073/7, which make no distinction between Cast. \textit{-s-, -ss-,} and $\text{x}$. 

T.13 (1563)

This manuscript has very little to offer in the way of examples of the result of Lat. $\text{X}$:

\begin{itemize}
  \item diso (30r)
  \item ensalço (31v)
\end{itemize}
The latter example stands in contrast to *enxalco* in B.N.5223 (251v). The scribe of T.13 likewise makes no attempt to distinguish between *s* and *-ss-*.

**B.N.5223 (1577)**

This manuscript shows no difference between *s* and *-ss-* both being written with ئ٣, but a distinction is consistently drawn between them and /ʃ/. Out of twenty-one examples of words with *x* in Castilian, only one is written without a *t̥̊d̥̊d̥̊*. This one instance of *disse* (252v), occurring as it does alongside five examples of *dixi* and ten of *dixo* is surely a scribal error with no other significance.

**J.30 (1597)**

There is no use at all made of ئ٣ in this manuscript.

**B.N.5073**

This is in fact a series of loose papers, catalogued together, but which show different results in their representation of *-s-*, *-ss-*, *-x*. Paper 7 shows nothing of great significance for this particular feature, but there are other papers in the same folder which deserve special attention:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Fol.</th>
<th>Latin S and -SS-</th>
<th>Latin X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1467</td>
<td>1r</td>
<td>kasala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>asi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fermoxa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kasado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kasami(y)ento</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kasara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kasmi(y)ento</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>koxa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>meses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fermoso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kosa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>puxo</td>
<td>sisanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kasami(y)ento</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Fol.</td>
<td>Latin S and -SS-</td>
<td>Latin X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1469</td>
<td>1r</td>
<td>kaxado</td>
<td>juxo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1v</td>
<td>uxo (2 times)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kaxadoh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kaxador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kaxala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>puso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kaxami(y)ento</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pasadero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>despoxada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>di(y)esen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>paso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td></td>
<td>kaxo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kasas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kaso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kamixa (2 times)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kamisa (2 times)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kasa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>1r</td>
<td>mandasen</td>
<td>disi(y)ese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>depoxados</td>
<td>disi(y)esen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ellox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p(e)exas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p(e)esen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>suxodichos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p(e)resenci(y)a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1v</td>
<td>suixo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>1r</td>
<td>kasas</td>
<td>seis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t(a)rabesero (2 times)</td>
<td>sisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1v</td>
<td>t(a)rabesero</td>
<td>ciici(y)entos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>seiseno (6 times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1v, 2r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition there are a number of cases of being used to represent Lat. CT, namely:

sobredixo, dixo, and oxo(y)entes.

How can we assess this evidence? Looking back over the manuscripts that we have consulted, it will be seen that they fall into three main categories:

a) No distinction between s and -ss-, written used solely for x.

b) No distinction between s, -ss- and x; used throughout.

c) Both and used for s, -ss- and x.

Amado Alonso discussing the early distinction between Spanish s and -ss-, remarks:

"La correspondencia con la etimología, descubierta por la moderna filología pero ignorada por aquellos escribas, prueba ya de por sí que la distinción de -s- y -ss- no podía ser una mera convención gráfica, sino una práctica real de la lengua hablada. Y en efecto, así lo declaran ... entre otros, Nebrija, en 1517, ... el Anónimo de Lovaina en 1559, ... el Brocense en 1592." 30

In contrast to this however, we have evidence from the sixteenth century that a peculiarity of Morisco speech was that they pronounced s and x alike. Amado Alonso writes:

"... en la simplificación fonémática del chapurreo - hecho común en todos los dialectos criollos y afines-, los moriscos de todas partes igualaron en un sonido común la z, la ç, la s, la ss y la x castellanas y el sonido de igualación fue otra vez la característica [s] cristiana, acomodado por ellos al sonido más próximo de su sistema, el ſ. Hablaban, pues, el castellano con ſ, 31

Testimonies of Morisco pronunciation on this point abound. Cuervo quotes examples from numerous sources, from grammarians such as Nebrija:

'Los moros siempre la ponen (la x) en lugar de nuestra s; y por lo que nosotros decimos San Señor Simon por s, ellos dizen, Xañor Xan Ximon por x." 32

Menéndez Pidal has collected examples from writers and dramatists of
the sixteenth century, which also concur with Nebrija's statement.

However not all of the examples quoted by Menéndez Pidal show examples of \( \zeta \) and \( \varsigma \) being rendered in an identical way, which would therefore seem to stand in contradiction to Amado Alonso's statement, that the Morisco rendered \( \varsigma, \zeta, \varsigma, \varsigma \), \( \varsigma \) and \( \chi \) by a 'sonido común'. In fact this is extremely rare in our manuscripts, the only example of \( \varsigma \) being used for \( \varsigma \) is the case of \( \textit{cig(i)yentos} \), and we have found no examples of the reverse process. This is not to say that these forms do not exist, they do. Galán's de Fuentes quotes examples in his transcription of the Historia de los amores de París y Viana but with one exception (\( \text{neccidad} \), where the preceding \( \varsigma \) could have influenced the scribe) there are only cases of \( \varsigma \) for \( \varsigma \). Gisela Labib finds only two examples in her manuscript of \( \varsigma \) for \( \varsigma \). Menéndez Pidal finds examples of both processes in the Poema de Yúcar, but on the whole in the three works mentioned the distinction is clear. For the moment, therefore, the representation of \( \varsigma \) and \( \varsigma \) will be put to one side, and dealt with in a further chapter.

If, as is generally believed to be the case, the Morisco pronounced \( \varsigma \) and \( \chi \) in the same way, as \( [\varsigma] \), one would expect to find a more widespread fusion of both in aljamiado manuscripts, assuming that the Morisco scribes used purely phonetic graphies. One must therefore ask whether, in the case of some of the manuscripts under discussion, they are not also influenced by Castilian orthographic conventions. This is certainly the case with B.N.5223. In those manuscripts where the result is \( \text{\textbullet} \) throughout, as in J.1, B.N.4908/1, and B.N.5073/7, everything points to an identification of the \( \varsigma \) and the \( \chi \). We say this reservedly, because we cannot be sure that the scribe was not aware of the difference between voiced and unvoiced \( \varsigma \), though we can be fairly sure in the case of unvoiced \( \varsigma \), that it did have the same value as Sp. \( \chi \), i.e. \( [\chi] \).

Finally we come to the examples provided by B.N.5073. These prove to be of the greatest interest. Here we have evidence of the 'merger' as it was taking place. If, as Amado Alonso says, the unvoicing process took place in the north first, and we have no reason to doubt this, given the characteristic innovatory nature of north Spanish speech habits, then it would not be untenable to find late fifteenth-century examples of this process, despite the fact
that for the most part evidence of this is limited to the sixteenth century. Denise Cardaillac, in her study of manuscript B. N. 4944, compares the use of gemination for x in this manuscript, which she dates at the beginning of the sixteenth century, with that of V. 6 and Le historia de los amores de París y Viana:

"Peut-on avancer encore beaucoup sa date approximative? (of B. N. 4944). Certainement pas: il y a ... deux raisons à cela. Le premier vient du systeme de transcription: V 6, comme le manuscrit de París y Viana, distinguent dans l'orthographe entre "s spico-alvolaire" et "x" de l'ancien espagnol, car ils mettent sur le second le signe arabe de la gemination. Ils sont tous les deux de la seconde moitié du XVIe, époque à laquelle s'est sans doute créée cette habitude; or B. N. 4944 n'en porte pas trace."

In contrast to this, we have found taldid used as early as 1429 (B. N. 5319), and even if the dating of this manuscript is open to doubt, we have further examples from B. N. 5073, though J. 1 and B. N. 4908/1 (1462 and 1510) make no use of the sign. This would seem to point not so much to a general orthographic habit which can be located in time, but rather individual preference. For, even in the manuscripts from the latter half of the sixteenth century, the dichotomy persists, namely between B. N. 5223 which clearly distinguishes and uses taldid, and T. 13 which makes no use of it.

We are therefore forced to ask whether the taldid is in fact reliable as evidence? It seems certain that it cannot be used as an indication of date, but its use must nevertheless point to an attempt to distinguish between voiced and unvoiced s, and x.

To return to B. N. 5073, a quick glance at the list will show that even if such an attempt was the original intention of the scribe, the identification in his mind of voiced and unvoiced s led to much uncertainty in his script. Kase, kamisa, seiseno, kasado, occur both with and without taldid. Conversely we have a single example of disi(y)ese without gemination. If we look at those words which should have been written in Latin character with -ss- or s- or -s (all unvoiced), we find extremely few final and initial s written with س:

eollox

xu
All other cases are with \( \mathfrak{v} \) and have not been listed. Similarly verbal forms occur with \( \mathfrak{v} \):

\[
\begin{align*}
disi(y)ese & \quad \text{di(y)esen} \\
disi(y)esan & \quad \text{mandasen}
\end{align*}
\]

Also we find:

\[
\begin{align*}
paso & \\
pasadero
\end{align*}
\]

As regards those words which should have had voiced \( s \), from \( -S- \), \( -NS- \) and some cases of \( -RS- \), the result is mixed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>with ( \mathfrak{v} )</th>
<th>with ( \mathfrak{v} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>kasala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>así</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kasado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kasami(y)ento</td>
<td>kaxami(y)ento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 times)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kasara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fermoso</td>
<td>fermoxa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kosa</td>
<td>koxa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>puxo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>puso</td>
<td>kaxado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>uxo (2 times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kaxadoh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kaxador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kaxala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kaxami(y)ento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>despoxada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>kasas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kaso</td>
<td>kaxo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kasa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kamisa (2 times)</td>
<td>kamixa (2 times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>p(e)resen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p(e)resenci(y)a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p(e)rexas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>suxodichos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>suxo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition there are no cases of gemination for non-intervocalic
a (unvoiced), e.g. \textit{eskakeado} \((/\text{a}/ 1\text{r}).\)

The examples of the rendering of Lat. X, C. Sp. \([\text{X}]\) are
difficult to assess in this collection because they are so few.
\textit{Disi(y)e}se is the only clear cut one. Those words which are derived
from Lat. \textit{SEX} are extremely problematic. As Corominas says:

"La X en las demás palabras dio primero is en
todas las posiciones, fundiéndose luego los
dos sonidos en \(x\) (pron. \(\text{X}\)), pero en posición
ante consonante no se produjo la fusión: de ahí la conservación de -\(\text{i}x\)- en combinaciones
mayoritarias como \textit{sex capras} > \textit{seis cabras},
tratamiento generalizado a las demás." \(^38\)

Moreover the -\(\text{ss}\)- of \textit{sesenta} appears to have disappeared very early:

"\textit{Sesenta} \([\text{sesenta}], \text{Cid; doc. de 1186, Oelschl.;}
\textit{sesenta}, 1219, F. de Guadalajara; nótese la
grafia \textit{sesenta}, constante en Nebr.] de
SEXAGINTA . . .\)" \(^39\)

Corominas merely notes the occurrence of \textit{seiseno} without further
comment; but if its history is connected with that of \textit{seis}, the -\(\text{s}\)-
was probably not palatalised. Why then the almost consistent use
of \(\text{\text{n}}\) in the case of this word? Why did the scribe feel the need
to distinguish between \textit{sisa}nta with \(\text{\text{n}}\) and \textit{seixeno} (mostly with
\(\text{\text{n}}\) )?

Leaving this aside for the moment, if we try to assess the
remaining information in terms of percentages, the following picture
emerges:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{lcc}
\hline
 & with \(\text{\text{n}}\) & with \(\text{\text{i}}\) \\
\hline
\text{Latin} -\(\text{SS}\)- & 100\% & \\
\text{Latin} -\(\text{S}\)- & 52.5\% & 47.5\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

The curious feature about these figures is that there would appear to
have been no hesitation in the case of \(/\text{a}/\), only in the case of \(/\text{a}/\).
Why is this? While it seems certain from contemporary documents that
the Morisco pronounced \(/\text{a}/\), \(/\text{a}/\) and \(/\text{a}/\) alike, as \([\text{X}]\), it is still
possible that he could distinguish acoustically between the voiced and unvoiced varieties of $\theta$ while being unable himself to reproduce them. So that even if $/\theta/$ and $/\psi/$ were identified in his perception as one phoneme, as being both unvoiced, $/\theta/$, voiced, would still remain as a sound he tried, albeit with difficulty, to distinguish. Is this the case here? In the B.N. 5073 collection $/\theta/$ is almost always reproduced as $\theta$, $/\theta/$ wavering between $\theta$ and $\theta$, while $/\psi/$, which rarely occurs is usually reproduced as $\psi$. Two other instances of the use of ta'dīd (to distinguish [b]/[p] and [x]/[ç]) function as indications of unvoicing. On this occasion the reverse would appear to be the case. If we accept that the ta'dīd must represent something, then the distinction in this case must be either one of unvoiced/voiced or hissing/hushing. As external evidence points to a merger of the hissing and hushing sibilants in Morisco speech, and the internal evidence of words with an original Lat. $X$ and $-SS-$ being both written $\theta$ confirm this, it should follow that the ta'dīd was used to represent voice.

The evidence against this supposition is the fact that there is no instance of confusion of $/\theta/$ with $/\psi/$ (even if Sp. $\chi$ is sometimes written $\chi$ and $\psi$ $\chi$, we know of no examples of $/\theta/$ rendered as $\chi$),40. Moreover the opposition inherent in the distinction of $\theta$ and $\psi$ is not solely one of voiced/unvoiced but of, most probably, fricative/affricate. It is perhaps therefore legitimate to consider the possibility of an attempt to distinguish in the case of $\theta$ $\psi$ not only the unvoiced/voiced opposition but also a difference of strength of articulation. If this is the case, and the figures would point to an attempt to make a distinction of sorts, the final result is nevertheless not clearly defined. This is because, whilst the scribe was trying to distinguish between the voiced and unvoiced sibilants, he was unwittingly registering through his own hesitation the gradual take-over of the voiced by the unvoiced in late medieval Spanish.

Finally the problem of seixeno ceases to be one if, on the analogy of seis, seixeno was not palatal but apicoalveolar, and being intervocalic $-s-$ was voiced; it is then clear that the use of ta'dīd in this case also represents not Lat. $X > /\theta/$, but Romance $/\theta/$ in the process of unvoicing.
One must remember that these manuscripts are from Aragon and Rioja, where the process of unvoicing took place towards the end of the fifteenth century. This still leaves unexplained the evidence of the other manuscripts. If unvoicing took place earliest in the north, why does J.1 (1462), written in Segovia, make no distinction at all? Why does B.N.5223 (1577) still retain the distinction between א from all sources and the result of Lat. X? By this time the unvoicing process should be fairly widespread in the peninsula. T.13 and J.30, 52 make no distinction at all, using נ constantly. One could argue that once the unvoicing had taken place, there was no longer any use for נ with tadděl; but this is not solely found in the later manuscripts (J.1 shows the same treatment).

We must return now to the question posed at the beginning of the chapter, as to whether נ was in fact a phonetic or a symbolic graphy, depending on which sound it represented. It would seem that the answer should differ from one manuscript to another, and that no solution can be found on a purely chronological basis. Where נ is to be found alongside נ we must ask whether the scribe was not attempting to find a phonetic solution to the problem of differentiating in his representation of voiced and unvoiced א, (albeit through distinctions not identical to those of Spanish). Where the same mode of representation is used throughout we must decide, before concluding that we are dealing with a phonetic graphy, that there was in fact a distinction which could be made by the scribe. If we are dealing with a mid- or late sixteenth-century manuscript, the fact the scribe uses נ or נ consistently is no longer of great significance. He only had one sound to represent. The question of a shortage of equivalents in the Arabic alphabet does not arise. In the earlier ones we do have, at least in the case of B.N.5073, evidence of an attempted distinction. It is obvious that one cannot find a solution to the whole problem, but we do seem to have proof that while the scribes did not always have recourse to phonetic graphies which have an exact equivalent in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Spanish, they nevertheless did try to draw distinctions, where necessary, in accordance with their own perception of the Spanish sibilants.
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CHAPTER VI

Spanish 产 and 且, Arabic ะ and ฆ

Spanish 产 and 且

In the previous chapter we discussed the fact that ะ and ฆ were not used in aljamiado writing to represent Sp. /θ/ and /δ/, but instead were used for 产 and 且. We did not, however, dwell at any length on the value attributed to the latter.

Two of the major questions asked about their value are:

1) what was their place of articulation?
2) were they affricates or fricatives?

As regards the first question, Ford considers both 产 and 且 to be a "dental stop + sibilant". Steiger's view is that 产 was predorsodental, whilst defining ฆ as an interdental. In early editions of his Manual de gramática, Menéndez Pidal favoured the existence of an interdental articulation from the beginning of the sixteenth century, but later changed his mind and considered the 产 to have been dental for a much longer period. A. Alonso, basing himself on the evidence of sixteenth-century grammarians and on the correspondence of 产 and ฆ to Ar. ะ and ฆ (which he considers identical to the Spanish phonemes in their place of articulation), favours an apicodental articulation, a definition which Martinet preferred to call dorsoalveolar in his first essay on the Spanish sibilants, although he omits any direct discussion of Alonso's thesis in his revision of the same article.

As far as the question of affrication is concerned there is an equal amount of disagreement. Cuervo first defined 产 as a plosive, though Sarothandy considers Cuervo really meant affricate here; Sarothandy himself considers 产 and ฆ to have been fricatives by the sixteenth century, although they were originally affricates in the medieval period. A. Alonso defines 产 as "cuasi ta", ฆ as "cuasi dz" for the late Middle Ages and until the mid-sixteenth century, and considers that at least 产 remained affricate for much longer:

"... se hacen fricativas y adquieren una pronunciación casi a la moderna, la ฆ en la segunda mitad del S.XVI, y unos decenios más tarde la 产 ..." 仍

Galmés de Fuentes however refutes Alonso's theory not only of an
apicodental articulation but also of an affricate one, and basing himself on both Jewish and Morisco testimonies concludes that Sp. ç and z were not only predorsodental but fricative; he illustrates both his and Alonso's conclusions thus:

Alonso

[ç] apicodental = [z] apicodental
[ç] apicoalveolar = [z] apicoalveolar

Galmés de Fuentes

[ç] predorsodental = [z] predorsodental
[ç] apicoalveolar = [ç] apicoalveolar 13

Because the opposition between two apical sibilants would be too weak to survive, he concludes:

"... la consideración del carácter fricativo temprano de ç y z nos hace pensar, una vez más, en la articulación convexa o predorsal de las dentales sibilantes del español..." 14

Canfield, moreover, considers there is no evidence whatsoever of affrication at any time in Latin America 15, and points to the need of sixteenth-century Spanish priests to invent graphies for transcriptions of affricates in Mexican languages as proof of this 16. This viewpoint is true of all those who hold to the theory, now increasingly valid as new data continues to antedate the first occurrences of seseo 17 that Latin American seseo was an importation from the Peninsula and not as others, A. Alonso among them, would have it, a separate development. This obviously must point to an early loss of affrication as it is a prerequisite of the merger of predorsodental and apicoalveolar sibilants.

The question of whether z unvoiced and merged with ç prior to any widespread occurrence of interdental articulation has been yet another source of differences between linguists; more recently however, some people have preferred to see the series of sound-changes and in particular the process of unvoicing in the central Castilian system not so much as a phonetic process but rather as a phonemic merger or takeover of central Castilian speech habits by already existing northern ones. As Lapesa (among others) has stated, there
was certainly a great difference in northern and central speech:

"Las diferencias de pronunciación entre Castilla la Vieja y Toledo eran bien claras. Fray Juan de Córdoba, que había salido de España hacia 1540, afirma en 1578: 'Los de Castilla la Vieja dizen hazer, y en Toledo hazer; ...'" 18

In his opinion the spread of unvoicing came, as is usually the case, from the north, and imposed its norms on the pronunciation of the south. Lapesa speaks of "progresos rápidos a partir de 1560" 19.

Tracy Sturcken agrees in part with Lapesa, whilst dating the process slightly later, but criticizing the way people tend to describe sound-shifts as if they happened overnight:

"Within apparently two generations ..., at the end of the sixteenth century, three phonemic contrasts are lost as unvoicing brings on the merger of a series of voiced and voiceless sibilants, and /ŭ/, /dŭ/ and apicoalveolar /û/ are lost." 20

Diego Catalán dates the merger thus:

"The disappearance of the phoneme /z/ (and the generalisation of /ç/ in its place) occurred in the court speech of Philip II's (sic) Madrid around the middle of the 16th century ... Toledo followed shortly in the Court's footsteps." 21

He also states categorically that this is a phonemic shift, not a phonetic process:

"One should not talk of an evolution, or of an unvoicing [dû ñ] > [tû ñ ñ ñ], but rather of the loss by the system of the correlation of voice in sibilants (a disappearance that also brought on the identification of /z/ > /ç/; /û/ > /as/; /j/ > /ç/)." 22

Martinet, likewise, sees the merger of voiced with unvoiced phonemes as a phonemic shift, traceable to the lack within the Basque phonemic system of voiced/unvoiced opposition in its sibilants 23.

As regards interdental pronunciation, Robert Spaulding and Beatrice Fatt, who trace the development of theta and iota through the descriptions of foreign grammarians are not at all convinced that ç and ñ were interdental by the end of the sixteenth century:
... the lack of agreement concerning the value of \( \theta \) and \( \phi \), the almost unanimous insistence upon its sibilant quality... lead us to suspect either that \( \theta \) was not yet standard in Castile by 1700, or that its identification with the th of thing has not always been an entirely accurate measure of its nature." 24

As we have seen Menéndez Pidal considers interdental pronunciation to be current in some areas at the beginning of the sixteenth century though not many people would favour such an early dating. The majority consider that the change had taken place by the end of the sixteenth century; Martinet, "moins d'un siècle plus tard [than 1500]"26; Canfield dates \( \theta \) probably in Burgos, possibly in Toledo by 1550, definitely in Burgos, probably in Toledo by 160027. Alonso on the other hand considers that \( \phi \) and \( \theta \) were by no means generally interdental by 160028, a conclusion which Galmés de Fuentes in turn refutes in his own interpretation of the same evidence. For him there is ample evidence of interdental pronunciation "no sólo en el habla popular, sino también en la lengua culta" from 1550 onwards29.

Arabic \( \phi \) and \( \theta \)

To what extent, then, can it be said that Ar. \( \phi \) and \( \theta \) presented characteristics identical to Sp. \( \phi \) and \( \theta \)? In the medieval period \( \phi \) was often represented by \( \text{ṭ} \) [ḍ] or [ḍ], which as Alonso explains, must indicate the early palatal articulation of both consonants:

"En siglos remotos tuvieron que ser palatales, [ḍ] y [j], etapa fonéticamente necesaria (excepto en los casos de base ti) entre el sonido latino k y el dental ... Tanto la \( \phi \) como la \( \theta \) sin hacer entre ellas diferencia, se transcriben y se reproducen en árabe en primer lugar con la letra jīm, y en segundo con las letras sin o sad ..." 30

Galmés de Fuentes, who sees the identification as one of predorsodentals, bases himself on a more critical appraisal of Arabic and Spanish phoneticians, in particular Sibawayhi31, manuscript 98 of the Junta collection32, and Bonet33, as well as the identification of \( \phi \) and \( \theta \), \( \phi \) and \( \theta \), both in Pedro de Alcalá and the Doctrina Christiana34. To sum up, he writes:
"... creo que se puede afirmar que las sibilantes árabes e (ṣīn) y z (ṣāy) eran ... predorsodentales o coronales, pero no ápico-dentales ... las correspondencias e (ṣīn) y z (ṣāy) de un lado, y ç y ş de otro, eran prácticamente unánimes, pues si bien es verdad que los árabes de la edad media ... emplearon ... preferentemente el ṣ (ṣīn) (única africana de su sistema), ... los españoles ... emplearon siempre para reproducir el e (ṣīn) y el z (ṣāy) de los árabes sus consonantes ç y ş; por otra parte, los moriscos, en toda la literatura aljamiada de los siglos XIV al XVII, cuando ya la africación de las sibilantes españolas era caduca, utilizaron ... las equivalencias ç = s (ṣīn), z = ş (ṣāy)." 35

It seems though, that whilst Alonso favours an apicodental correspondence and Galmés de Fuentes a predorsodental one, there is nothing in the ç - ş, z - ş equivalence in aljamiá which can in itself elucidate the matter. Nevertheless, we can still ask ourselves in considering the aljamiá manuscripts whether there is any graphemic evidence of the affricate or fricative quality of ç and ş; whether the phonemic takeover of the voiced/voiceless opposition by a system of voiceless phonemes can be in any way detected in orthographic changes, and whether there is any sign, especially in the later manuscripts of the much disputed dating of interdental pronunciation of both ç and ş.

Judeo-Spanish testimony

Before looking at the manuscripts, a brief survey of Judeo-Spanish testimony is called for. This evidence would seem to point to a fricative pronunciation of ç and ş. As Galmés de Fuentes points out:

"El hebreo, como es sabido, es una lengua rica en sibilantes, y entre otras, posee, de un lado el samech sorda fricativa, y, de otro, el tsade, sorda africana." 35

Spiegel notes that in Judeo-Arabic texts ŋ (samech) is used for ş in this period just prior to 0[ld] J[udeo]-Sp[anish] 37. ŋ is occasionally confused with š (ṣīn, unvoiced palatal fricative) 38. He goes on to mention the existence also in Hebrew of tsade:
"... the affricate $\xi$ [x], which could have represented $\sigma$ very well if $\sigma$ were an affricate as many scholars believe. $\xi$ was an affricate according to the traditional pronunciation and its use in Judaism-Arabic for the emphatics $\sigma$ and $\psi$ indicates the similarity of affrication and intense articulation." 39

(We would however question the affrication of $\psi$ in Arabic, and even, in Spain, its emphatic quality in view of its identification in Spanish Arabic with $\mu$). Spiegel continues:

"The preponderance of $\sigma = \xi$ from the late thirteenth century to the end of the fifteenth century demonstrates that $\sigma$. Sp. $\xi$ was considered a fricative by the Jews in Spain. $\xi$ was not used for any other Spanish sound and therefore was available for use, and it was not a forgotten character since it was ever present in Hebrew and in Judaism-Arabic." 40

Here, then, we would appear to have evidence, far more conclusive than Arabic testimonials could ever hope to be, of the fricative quality of Sp. $\xi$ and $\sigma$. We say "appear to have evidence" because not only is the $\sigma / \xi$ equivalence unconvincing from the standpoint of Arabic as evidence of affrication, but Irene Carbell's investigations into the pronunciation of Medieval Spanish Hebrew cast some doubt on this. Her findings are that whilst in Moorish Spain $\xi$ was equated with $\sigma$, in Christian Spain and Catalonia it was used alongside $\sigma$ for $\xi$ and $\sigma$ 41; (Spiegel does have a very few examples too, but so few as to be negligible in his opinion 42).

She concludes:

"This indiscriminate use of $\xi$ for the transliteration of both fricative and affricate sounds, together with the use of $\sigma$ for the rendering of undoubted affricates, leads one to the conclusion that the value of $\xi$ (at least in the 13th-14th centuries) was in a state of transition between the affricate $\zeta$ (which was undoubtedly the old value of $\xi$ in all Romance countries ...) and the fricative $\sigma$." 43

From the fourteenth century onwards she assumes a purely fricative articulation for $\xi$, in Castile, possibly affricate in Aragon. From this it would appear that the use or non-use of adds little to an elucidation of the value of Sp. $\xi$ and $\sigma$, since
Hebrew, at least by the late medieval period had, like Arabic, no affricate with which to represent Cast. ḡ and ḡ even if this were needed.

The manuscripts

We have felt it necessary to dwell at some length on current opinion about sixteenth-century Spanish sibilants, in order to give a comprehensive though by no means conclusive picture of the background against which we must assess the evidence of our aljamiado manuscripts, which present the following features:

B.N.5319 (1429)

Arabic words

The retention of س in Arabic words is consistent:

e.g. ascále (229v et passim), acúuna (229v)

We do also find س for س in the case of muçayyib (240v)

This is not unexpected, as س and س merged in Hispano-Arabic. We also found two examples of makîna (235r,v); the Arabic would lead one to expect a form with ت, but it is nevertheless interesting to see that the scribe was not influenced by the س in the current Medieval Spanish spelling. Of the more usual form, mesquita, Ford writes:

"This س is only graphic for ḡ, which it was the practice of the scribes to write within a word only when a vowel followed and never at the end of a word. The value of this graphic س is, therefore, [ts]." 44

Castilian words

As far as ḡ from Lat. cons. ḡ is concerned, س is always used, e.g.

komençar (229v) alça (242r)
fu(w)erça (233v et passim) konfi(y)ança (244v)
kaça (239r, 2 times)

There is also consistency in the rendering of learned words with
A case similar to that of *megkida* is to be found in the first person singular indicative of inchoative verbs. In Medieval Spanish, as Ford says:

"... *z* is substituted for the *s* of the combination -sc-. This *z* is due to the analogy of the other persons of the present indicative ... As the *z* is merely graphic for *s*, it naturally has here, in Old Spanish, the value [ts]." 45

In these instances the scribe has paid more attention to phonetic than orthographic considerations, for we find the following forms:

ammanguko, in agreement with amanega (231v)
amojeqko, " " amojeqa (231v)

Similarly we find *x* in *ipki(y)arda* where the scribe is merely representing phonetically Basque *x* which had an unvoiced value, although *x* was retained in Castilian.

The only other examples of note are in words from Lat. -TV-, which one would expect to find as *z* in Castilian texts. In this manuscript the evidence is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With <em>j</em></th>
<th>With <em>s</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rrazonaron</td>
<td>rraçonaron (231v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(230r, 233r 2 times, 236r)</td>
<td>rraç(i)onan (231v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k(i)ri(y)azon (236r)</td>
<td>kabeça (235r)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conversely, there is one example of *z* for *ç* in *lansado* (241v), from Lat. cons. CV.

Here it would appear that we do have evidence of the process of unvoicing. Is 1429 too early for this to be happening? Although it is rare to find evidence of unvoicing before 1500, there are sporadic testimonies. Dámaso Alonso quotes examples of unvoicing in the thirteenth century, both in the *Fuero de Alba de Tormes* and in the *Fuero de Madrid*. Moreover, in folio 232r we find alkanfas which would appear to be a representation of alcanzas. If this is the case here it is a unique instance of Ar. *j* being used. Is it
really an example of an Arabic voiced interdental fricative indicating unvoicing or is it merely a scribal error for \( \ddot{\imath} \) ?

It is unfortunate that we do not find similar cases of inconsistent orthography, but all examples of words derived from Lat. \( -c^e,i \) are written with \( \ddot{\imath} \):

- dizen (230v)
- dize (230v)
- bezes (233r 2 times, 233v)
- faze (237r, v et passim)

Despite the lack of evidence from other sources, the \( g/z \) hesitation cannot be disregarded, even if the dating is surprisingly early. Perhaps, since the Muslim scribe was not necessarily bound, as his Christian counterpart by the traditions of orthography, he was more in a position to be aware of phonetic change, and certainly more in a position to record it. This would seem to contradict our findings elsewhere, where the scribes seem to hold on to archaic forms longer than would appear to be the case in Latin character texts. For this reason, the fact that the change is registered is all the more significant.

**J.1 (1462)**

Because of the nature of this work there is a large number of learned words, we have counted at least twenty two, in our extract, which regularly show \( g \), e.g.

- p(o)robi&nfi(Y)& Ov) manosp(o)»lpia(y)ado-a (214v)
- dek(a)laraci(y)on (4v)
- ofici(y)os (214v)

Likewise the majority of non-learned words show perfectly regular treatment. There are, however, two words which merit some attention. There is one case of \( mraqones \) (5v), but unfortunately no parallel form with \( z \). We also found one example of gemination of \( z \) in \( trikasses \) (5r); this problem will be dealt with in the discussion of B.N.5223, where the phenomenon occurs regularly.

As regards the representation of Arabic words, the scribe is again faithful to the original, rather than taking any Castilian orthography into consideration:
The medieval Spanish is moslem, but here again the $z$ has an unvoiced value as in mesquita.

B.N. 5073/7 (1482)

This manuscript shows no interchange of $q$ and $z$.

B.N. 4908/1 (1510)

Again there is a consistent distinction drawn between $q$ and $z$, but there are in addition cases of gemination:

- $q_{\text{osqnas (1r)}}$
- $z_{\text{ozze (3r 2 times, 3v)}}$
- $q_{\text{ozze (2r, 2v, 4r)}}$
- $z_{\text{ozze (2v)}}$

Moreover, it would seem that Castilian orthography has influenced the scribe in his rendering of final $z$ with $j$; it is a conventional graphy for $q$ in this position, e.g. $\text{di(y)ez (1r 2 times, 1v)}$, $\text{Di(y)az (1r)}$.

(On the other hand, final $z$ does remain voiced in parts of Aragon, and this is a northern text). Conversely we do find $\text{Albrig (1r)}$ (= Alvarez?), $\text{Martineç (2v)}$ and $\text{Di(y)ac (3r)}$, which would point to the use of a phonetic graphy.

B.N. 5364 (1542)

This collection of notes has very little to offer, on account of its brevity. The examples are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>with $\zeta$</th>
<th>with $j$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>naçî (4r)</td>
<td>Zzohra (4r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naçî(y)o (33v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>çinko (4r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>çinkko (33v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T. 13 (1563)

There are several interesting graphies in this manuscript. Those derived from FACERE divide as follows:
In addition we find "koraçones alongside korazones (31r), and "kabeza (31r) instead of "kabega. Moreover, in final position we find two examples with "j:

k(u)rusç (31v)
di(y)ac (32r)

There are no examples of final "j, which would indicate more attention being paid to phonetic reality than to conventional Castilian orthography.

Lastly, alongside "forçaran (three times), forçados, forçado and fu(w)eresa we find one single example of "forçaran (30v). This is the only time we find "j being used instead of "s for ç, but this isolated example is interesting, in that it confirms again the identification in Peninsular Arabic of the two sounds.

B.N.5223 (1577)

There are no examples of confusion between ç and s in this manuscript, but in the representation of the latter we come across a curious feature which we have found only in isolated cases up till now. This is gemination of the "j. We felt it worth while listing in full the examples from our extracts, so that the frequency can be appreciated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Geminated &quot;j 84%</th>
<th>Single &quot;j 16%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>247v</td>
<td>pobrezza</td>
<td>rrrikeza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p(a)lazzer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hazzer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248r</td>
<td>hazzer</td>
<td>bezino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248v</td>
<td>hazzer</td>
<td>gozar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hazzes</td>
<td>hiziste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249r</td>
<td>hizze</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sinrrazzon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professor Harvey, in his study of a letter in Valencian Arabic, dated 1595, has found two such forms:

"Of considerable interest for the Romance philologist are the graphies ifranqizza ... and botizza ... Since two Romance words in -eza are represented in this way, one must conclude that the tadjId is being employed to differentiate from the plain 'ay some characteristic and non-Arabic sound. It is well known that the Romance sibilants and fricatives were undergoing rapid evolution at this period, and the interpretation of the value of this unusual graphy is a delicate matter ... In the aljamiado manuscripts ... extensive use is made of ... the 'adda, in order to create means of representing ... non-Arabic sounds, ... but this particular graphy of the double z does not occur in many of them." 47

It is certainly difficult to assess the value of the gemination of ). If this were the only manuscript where this is to be found, one could consider that it was merely a peculiarity of the scribe, and that ) in his system equalled ) in the others. This is not possible, however, for not only have we found isolated examples of the form elsewhere, but B.N.5306, another manuscript we consulted (dated 1589) offers numerous examples of the same feature. Moreover,
is not a separate Arabic sound, there could be no danger of scribal confusion.

Is it possible that the gemination is indicative of unvoicing? One is obliged to ask why, if the Morisco wished to illustrate this process, he did not avail himself of the ٞ used to transcribe the unvoiced counterpart of ٨. Moreover there is no confusion between ٧ and ٨ at all.

What in fact are we dealing with then? Amado Alonso suggests that the loss of affrication in ٧ and ٨ did not take place contemporaneously, and that the shift was really as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{\`c - z (\` - \^c como ts - da) > despues de 1550} \\
\text{\`h - z o \`h - z > \`h - \^h > \^h - \^h} &= 48
\end{align*}
\]

Could it be then, that gemination in fact represents that intermediate stage between voiced affricate and unvoiced interdental which did not really coincide with the unvoicing process undergone by ٧? It seems hard to see how a voiced dental fricative could become an unvoiced interdental fricative without passing through some intermediary period of unvoiced fricative or voiced interdental. On the other hand, it is curious if we are dealing with a loss of affrication illustrated by an increased articulation.

Could this be a means of representing interdental pronunciation? In Classical Arabic it would be possible to represent both voiced and unvoiced interdental fricatives by means of ٨ and ٧ respectively, but as far as we know the interdental quality of these two consonants was lost in Peninsular Arabic, to merge with their dental counterparts. (But v. above B.N.5319). Consequently there was no effective way in which the scribe could illustrate an interdental fricative if he so wished.

Gisela Labib, whilst pointing to the difficulties of recognizing loss of affrication when the Arabic graphies involved are fricatives, nevertheless appears convinced that this is in fact what gemination represents:

Can we really be so sure that the Arabic graphies do fit exactly into these three categories? If this were the pattern found in all aljamiado manuscripts of the period, we would feel more able to state with certainty that this is the case; but whilst it would appear that gemination does represent some stage in the development of affricate voiced \( \zeta \) to interdental unvoiced fricative, we cannot say for sure that it is the voiced fricative period which the scribe was distinguishing. Moreover, there are a number of questions left unanswered. In B.N.5223 the problem does not arise, but in J.1, B.N.5306 and in the manuscript studied by Gisela Labib (B.N.5301) \( \zeta \) and \( \zeta' \) appear side by side as representations of Spanish \( s' \). It is also worth asking why, if gemination was used to show loss of affrication for \( \zeta \), we do not find a similar process for \( e \) in the gemination of \( s' \). This is never found. Perhaps the most we can say is that some scribes were more sensitive to the nuances of sound change which Castilian was undergoing than others, and given that the two manuscripts where most of the examples occur are dated in the latter part of the sixteenth century, they must represent a stage, probably that of voiced fricative, in the sibilant sound shift, but we can go no further than that. The very nature of the Arabic consonantal system and in particular the limitations of Peninsular Arabic prevent us from making any absolute judgement.

J.30 and J.52 (1597/8)

Any conclusions one might reach about the value of \( \zeta \) or its development as a late sixteenth-century aljamiado graphy are immediately tempered by the evidence of this manuscript; for here we find no cases whatsoever of gemination. What is more there is no evidence of any confusion of \( \zeta \) and \( e \), except in three instances of final \( \zeta \) written with \( j \): box (138v, 139v), di(y)es (140v) (c.f. T.13). In fact the distinction maintained between them obliges one to ask yet again whether this manuscript is really as late as it claims to be. There is even no difference between J.30 and J.52 in this matter.

If this is the case, it would make the argument in favour of gemination as a late sixteenth-century feature more plausible. There certainly are archaic forms in the manuscript which would point to its being the copy of a much earlier original, and the fact that it is a religious text and therefore more traditional in its form and
content would explain its more archaic language. This is certainly a factor which must be borne in mind when dealing with dated manuscripts, and one cannot automatically assume that a date is an indication of composition and not merely copying. However, we must still ask why it is that there is no sign of unvoicing in the manuscript, especially in view of the fact that manuscripts apparently from such early dates as 1429 show at least some indication of the shift. One can also be fairly sure, since it was found in Almonacid de la Sierra that it is a northern manuscript, and consequently should have even more reason to show unvoicing, since the process took place earlier in the north. On the other hand, it is just possible that gemination was a feature of Castilian aljamiado which was not adopted in Aragon.

A note on ç for s

We referred briefly, in the previous chapter, to the single example of ç[ç]entos found in B.N.5073/12 (1v). Given that it is an Aragonese manuscript where confusion is extremely rare, it seems likely that the second ç influenced the scribe. We have found very few examples of ç for s, though they do occur with frequency in some aljamiado manuscripts. We have nevertheless come across one example in T.13: çufræ[ç]y(a) (28r) and one in J.30: egbaç[y]alçades (142v). Could the same be true of these two forms as of ç[ç]entos, namely the influence on the scribe of the presence of ç in the same word, or are we in fact dealing with a sporadic case of ççeo. With only isolated instances of the phenomenon it is impossible to be definite in one's conclusions.

Earlier in the chapter we said we must look for the answers to a number of questions about the pronunciation of ç and ç. We can be certain that we have found evidence of confusion in some of the manuscripts between ç and ç, although it is not possible to determine from the evidence of aljama alone whether we are in fact dealing with a phonetic or a phonemic change. It must, however, remain open to doubt whether we have also testimonies of the loss of affrication and/or interdental pronunciation in the enigmatic use of geminate ç. The former is more likely to be the case, but it must also be remembered that the Morisco scribe had no adequate way of distinguishing between a dental and an interdental fricative, and what we may have here is
the early stages of the latter. It would be tempting to make a definite statement on the subject, but until we have further evidence it is impossible to deduce from these manuscripts, whether in fact unvoicing occurred before or after the shift from dental to interdental articulation.
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CHAPTER VII

Spanish d, Arabic ٠ and ت

Spanish d

In his discussion of the value of Sp. d, Menéndez Pidal divides it into two categories; firstly as a dental stop:

"Se halla una d oclusiva cuando es inicial: duele, ... o cuando va precedida de n o l: donde, bando, caldo, baldón. Precedida de r o s puede ser también oclusiva, ... pero lo corriente es que se haga fricativa." 1

In other positions the d is fricative and interdental.

"Esta fricativa es la pronunciación habitual de la d intervocálica ... La d se hace siempre fricativa cuando es final de palabra: adviento, ... advertir ... Lo mismo sucede cuando es final de frase: decímos ... En posición final absoluta, la d se articula [d] en la pronunciación cuidada ... En fin se llega también a la pérdida completa ... desde el siglo XIII se hallan ejemplos escritos de heredad, mercé ..." 2

In Old Spanish [d] and [t] were not allophones of /d/ as they are to-day, but at least intervocally they were probably separate phonemes /d/ and /t/. As Martinet says:

"Il est difficile de se prononcer sur le degré d'indépendance phonologique réciproque de [-d-] et [-t-] et [-g-] et [-j-]. L'orthographe du vieil espagnol ne fait pas de distinction entre l'occlusive et la fricative ..., mais dans le cas de /d/ - /t/ ... nous remarquons une différence dans le comportement de -d- provenant de -t- latin, et -d- provenant de -d- latin. Le premier est parfaitement stable, le dernier peut à disparaître ... Nous posons donc deux phonèmes différents, /d/ et /t/ ..." 3

Alarcos Llorach doubts the existence of two separate phonemes /d/ and /t/ by the Alphonsine period 4, but he agrees with Martinet that certainly by the sixteenth century the distribution was as it is to-day. 5 Martinet traces the loss of /d/ and /t/ as separate phonemes to Basque, which only has [d] and [t] as allophones of the plosive phonemes, "avec une répartition analogue à celle de l'espagnol moderne." 6
A. Alonso has followed the descriptions of d through the sixteenth century in both Spanish and foreign grammarians, and finds particularly clear definitions in English and Welsh grammars of Sp. -d- and -d being fricative⁷. In the medieval period -d is often written -t and even -z or -th⁸. He also registers frequent instances ("aunque siempre de excepción"⁹) of loss of -d. Lapesa in his additions to Alonso's work notes also:

"En la terminación -ado esta /d/ fricativa, tal vez deilitada desde el siglo XV ... se omita ya a fines del XVII." ¹⁰

There is every reason to believe that by the sixteenth century Arabic no longer distinguished carefully between َ, voiced dental plosive, and ِ, voiced interdental fricative. In Alphonsine transcription َ is written d (t when final), in Pedro de Alcalá it is usually d, sometimes q, in the Doctrina Christiana we find d or dh. Very few borrowings have come into Spanish, but when they have it has been, as would be expected, with d¹¹.

As far as Valencian Arabic was concerned, Professor Harvey writes:

"Intervocalic d is sometimes fricatived and written tail: sayidi (R2) Cl.Ar. سيدى, but contrast sayidi تنوري (R1). In Romance loan-words the intervocalic forms are represented by tail ... It will be seen that the treatment of intervocalic d in Arabic words corresponds exactly to the treatment of d in this position in the Peninsular Romance languages." ¹²

In present day North African dialects َ and ِ are both dental plosives¹³, though the distinction is retained in the rest of the Arabic speaking world¹⁴. In the manuscripts we have studied there is evidence of confusion in Arabic words, e.g. B.N.5319 (1429) (237r): dikri for Ar. ذكر [dikr].

Nevertheless, the fact remains that in the majority of aljamiado manuscripts frequent use is made of both َ and ِ. In Spanish the difference between [d] and [q] is allophonic; in Classical Arabic it is phonemic. The fact therefore that the Moriscos did attempt to distinguish (not always logically or consistently as we shall see)
between the two allophones of Sp. /d/ is an instance of what Weinreich describes as over-differentiation, a process which

"... involves the imposition of phonemic distinctions from the primary system on the sounds of the secondary system where they are not required." 15

Judeo-Spanish testimony

In Judeo-Arabic, the Arabic phonemic distinction between ٌ and ٍ was maintained by means of diacritics ( ُـٌ، ُـٍ )16. In Hebrew ُ has two allophones not graphically distinguished:

"The treatment of ُ in Hebrew parallels that of d in Spanish. When initial or after a consonant ُ is a stop, ... The occlusion was occasionally indicated graphically in O[lid] J[udeo-] Sp[anish] printed texts by the Masoretic daghesh ( ُ ) and in the MSS. by the absence of a diacritic ( ُ ) ..." 17

Distinction, however, was not a common practice in Judeo-Spanish, though Spiegel does find examples of final ُ for -d18, a feature only found occasionally in Arabic aljamiado from Aragon.

The manuscripts

Gisela Labib in the manuscript she has studied finds a difference in the treatment of Sp. ُ by the two scribes involved. She writes:

"Der erste Schreiber veranschaulicht asp. ُ jeder Position durch ar. ُ ... Dies ist weiter nicht auffällig, wo es sich um wort- oder satzphonetisch intervokalische ... oder finale Stellung ... handelt oder um nachkonsonantische Stellung, mit Ausnahme von l und n ... Es ist aber auffällig nach diesen beiden Konsonanten ... und im absoluten Anlaut ... Demgegenüber tritt asp. ُ jeder Position in der Niederschrift des zweiten Schreibers sowohl als ar. ُ wie auch ar. ُ auf ... Bermerkenswert ist ar. ُ jedoch in wort- und satzphonetisch intervokalischer ... sowie finaler Stellung ..." 19

In the manuscripts that we have studied, the treatment of Sp. ُ is very varied, and consequently we shall deal with each one separately. Moreover, as the occurrence of ُ is so frequent we shall not discuss each extract in full, but take a couple of folios only, whilst
ensuring that every position of d is included. This should give a more than adequate picture of the treatment of d.

**B.N.5319 (1429) Folios 243 and 244**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervocalic</th>
<th>Post-consonantal and Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-o de (243r)</td>
<td>gu(w)ar(d)allo (243r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ada (243r)</td>
<td>-r de (243r, 2 times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atirador (243r)</td>
<td>-r d'ellos (243r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taladna (243r)</td>
<td>-s d'ellos (243r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a de (243v)</td>
<td>-b de (243r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pasado (243v)</td>
<td>-s de (243r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gi(y)ados (243v)</td>
<td>ad a- (243v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e departi(y)eron (243v)</td>
<td>en departir (243v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo(w)ado (243v)</td>
<td>k(uw)ando (243v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aña (243v)</td>
<td>-n de (243v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ke delibra (243v)</td>
<td>-s delibro (243v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o de (244r)</td>
<td>-s delibro (244r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-i de (244r)</td>
<td>CAbdullah (244r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a de (244r)</td>
<td>ab(e)rendallo (244r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yo damaño (244v)</td>
<td>g(a)rando (244r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aña (244v)</td>
<td>-s de (244v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayuda (244v)</td>
<td>-s damaño (244v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a de (244v)</td>
<td>-s derajos (244v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maro (244v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this evidence it would appear that the scribe paid little attention to the position of d in deciding how to write it, for d occurs not only intervocalically but after all consonants including n. The few occasions when he does use d however are, for the most part, in initial position, whether of a word or a syllable.

**J.1 (1462), Folios 3v, 4r, v**

The picture is somewhat different here. The scribe seems to distinguish quite regularly the d after n, but there are other irregularities:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervocalic</th>
<th>with</th>
<th>Post-consonantal and Final</th>
<th>with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-i ệmẹdami(y)ontos</td>
<td>-1 de (3v)</td>
<td>mandami(y)ontos (3v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e de (3v)</td>
<td>-s ña (4r)</td>
<td>-s de (3v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k(i)ri(y)aðor (3v)</td>
<td>gibly (4r)</td>
<td>-o depu(w)es (4r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>médi(y)o (3v)</td>
<td>de (initial, 4r)</td>
<td>-n de (4r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o de nada (3v)</td>
<td>kardenales (4r)</td>
<td>abenturado (4r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(o)robidängi(y)a</td>
<td>aktorídá ke (4v)</td>
<td>síso (4r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3v) g(a)rado en g(a)rado (4r)</td>
<td>-s del (4v)</td>
<td>-ñ de (4r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k(i)ri(y)aðos (4r)</td>
<td>p(y)aðet (4v)</td>
<td>benditas (4r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ourrado (4r)</td>
<td>-ñ dañte (4v)</td>
<td>eskondição (4r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sablet (4r)</td>
<td>-ñ delante (4v)</td>
<td>-o de (4r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-i del (4r)</td>
<td>-r dek(a)larachi(y)on (4v)</td>
<td>akopilando (4v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a de (4r)</td>
<td></td>
<td>mundo (4v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e de (4r)</td>
<td></td>
<td>enti(y)rendan (4v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a ñebinal (4r)</td>
<td></td>
<td>tubi(y)endo (4v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a del (4r)</td>
<td></td>
<td>g(a)randes (4v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e disi(y)eron (4r)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eskondição (4r)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>osado (4r)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aktorídá (4v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toda (4v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e de (4v, 2 times)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o debe (4v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a demost(a)rarr (4v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toñas (4v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pi(y)aðer (4v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayudá (4v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t(ε)reslado (4v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o de (4v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a de (4v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It would appear from this list that with the exception of abenturado all intervocalic -ð- is represented by the fricative \( ð \). Final -ð is also fricative. There is some hesitation when \( ð \) is initial before a consonant, since we find s-de both as occlusive and fricative.
Moreover, it would appear that the scribe distinguishes between -nd- within the word and n-d, making the former occlusive and the latter fricative.

**B.N.5073/7 (1482) and B.N.5364 (1542)**

Neither of these manuscripts make any use whatsoever of the fricative ɾ. In the latter the extracts are very short, and consequently not perhaps representative, but in B.N.5073/7 there is sufficient material for us to conclude that the scribe disregards the possibility of ɾ. As this is a northern text, from Agreda, the Aragonese tendency to retain intervocalic -t- unvoiced, and to preserve intervocalic -d- may have played a part in the scribe's choice of symbol, unconsciously rejecting the influence of Castilian which was currently being subjected on Aragonese.

**B.N.4908/1 (1510) Folio 1**

This is another Aragonese text, and the picture is similar, though not quite so regular, with the balance heavily in favour of the occlusive ɾ. With the exception of two examples, el ńicho (2v) and Pedro (3r), all the examples of ɾ are intervocalic, and even the latter is in keeping with Castilian, since ɾ is also fricative in final syllable position. On the first folio the evidence is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervocalic</th>
<th>Post-consonantal Initial, and Final</th>
<th>with ɾ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-s de (r, 2 times)</td>
<td>-r de (r, 2 times)</td>
<td>Pikañó (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mady (r)</td>
<td>-t de (r)</td>
<td>tajañó (r, 2 times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-s del (r)</td>
<td>su(w)eldos (r, 5 times) soldada (r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o dos (r)</td>
<td>-m de (r)</td>
<td>dukañó (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-s de (v)</td>
<td>-s dos (r)</td>
<td>-i dos (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o de (v, 3 times)</td>
<td>-n di(y)ez (r)</td>
<td>meñyo (v, 2 times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o di(y)ez (v)</td>
<td>soldada (r)</td>
<td>de ñu(w)eanas (v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-s de (r, 2 times)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-a dos (v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di(y)ez (r)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here the balance is the reverse of what we have seen in the earlier manuscripts, and this is all the more surprising since one would expect more examples of fricatives the later the manuscript. Nevertheless this is still a relatively early text, and although d was weakening considerably at this time, one must always bear in mind the way the Muslim scribes held on to features of the language which were undergoing change much longer than their Christian counterparts. It is therefore quite logical that he would put up a stand against any Castilianisation process. It is interesting to note that half the examples on this folio of fricatives are in fact past participles of first conjugation verbs. As Menéndez Pidal has remarked, these are usually the first to lose any occlusive force. Writing about the loss of this -d-, he says:
"... hemos de atribuir ... la pérdida al carácter secundario que en la palabra tiene la terminación, y a que -ado ocurre en el habla con mucha mayor frecuencia que -ado, -odo, -udo ..." 20

Given the fact that the d has almost been lost in modern speech, it is only fair to assume that this d was one of the weakest fricatives at the time the manuscript was written. Hence its almost exclusive representation as a fricative.

### T.I3 (1563) Folio 28

The evidence is similar to B.N.5073/7. There are very few examples of the use of the fricative, even for intervocalic and final position. The examples are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervocalic</th>
<th>Post-consonantal, Initial, and Final</th>
<th>with i</th>
<th>with o</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-I de (r)</td>
<td>s demandas (r)</td>
<td>enkojid (r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enkojidos (r)</td>
<td>Andaluçi(y)a (r)</td>
<td>walardon (r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aumentado (r)</td>
<td>addIn (r)</td>
<td>antepasados (r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a de (r)</td>
<td>bezindad de (r)</td>
<td>eskrebidor (v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g(a)rada (r)</td>
<td>dezidores (r)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a del (r)</td>
<td>s del (r)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desidores (r)</td>
<td>demando (r)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o de (r)</td>
<td>ad Allah (r)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yo demando (r)</td>
<td>gu(w)ardar (r)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayude (r)</td>
<td>s deritajes (r)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a de (v)</td>
<td>r d'asta (v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toda (v)</td>
<td>ciwdad de (v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-i de (v)</td>
<td>el demandante (v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salida (v)</td>
<td>s d'asta (v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a del (v, 2 times)</td>
<td>el d¡(y)a (v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ke da (v)</td>
<td>mercad de (v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o de (v)</td>
<td>addIn (v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-I de (v, 2 times)</td>
<td>-n del (v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e de (v, 2 times)</td>
<td>mandareys (v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ada (v)</td>
<td>bida (v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>judigi(y)o (v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abenturados (v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obligados (v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Certainly the fricative is the exception to the rule in this manuscript, and it is curious to note that the form ankojido appears both with an occlusive and with a fricative. Moreover rd appears with both: walardón, but gu(w)ardar. One would also expect, if there are some examples of intervocalic -d- to find some final fricatives as well, but the scribe seems to use the fricative very sparingly, and makes none of the distinctions found in J.1 for example.

B.N.5223 (1577) Folio 251

The preponderance in this manuscript is of examples of fricative ʕ, represented by ّ:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervocalic</th>
<th>Post-consonantal and Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>api(y)adañ (r)</td>
<td>Abed b- (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abenturados (r)</td>
<td>api(y)adañ l- (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a ñel (r, 2 times)</td>
<td>kump(i)liñ l- (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-i ñe (r)</td>
<td>Hazzad b- (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rrakontado (r)</td>
<td>walardón (r, 2 times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a donaci(y)on (r)</td>
<td>-ñ ñe (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onrrado (r)</td>
<td>-ñ ñ'ella (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaca (r)</td>
<td>walardón ñe (v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a ñe (r)</td>
<td>-r ñe (v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k(a)larenañades (r)</td>
<td>warrado (v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sityades (v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i ñe (v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leïbor (v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaca (v, 4 times)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g(a)radas (v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o di(y)ez (v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a ñel (2 times)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a ñ'esta (v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a ñixo (v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a ño disse (v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a ñe (v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warrado (v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i ñixo (v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It will be immediately apparent that the occlusive is reserved entirely for \(d\) after \(n\) and \(l\), the fricative being reserved for intervocalic and post-consonantal positions. It is interesting to compare this manuscript with previous ones and to see how far the scribe has gone towards a consistent representation of the pronunciation of Cast. \(d\) as we believe it to have been in the sixteenth century, and very close to what it is to-day.

**J.30 (1597) Folio 140**

Again, the scribe is consistent in distinguishing between the occlusive and the fricative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervocalic</th>
<th>with ()</th>
<th>Post-consonantal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>po(d)ar(i)y(o)</td>
<td>-s ()a(b)e(d)ami(y)ento(s)</td>
<td>()a(d)ami(y)ento(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ba(n)ado ()</td>
<td>-s ()a(b)e(d)ami()ento(s)</td>
<td>()a(d)ami()ento(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>()a(b)e(d)ami()ento(s)</td>
<td>-s ()a(l)yi(e)z</td>
<td>espa()ci(y)al(d)ades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>espa()ci()ado ()</td>
<td>os ()a(t)ubi(y)ese(d)es</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rr(a)y(n)ado ()</td>
<td>-s ()a(l) (()v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kabal(g)ad(o) ()</td>
<td>-s ()a(l) (()v)</td>
<td>seguda (()v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mal(b)est(a)d(e)s ()</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bibi()d(o) ()</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eng(a)rand(u)cido ()</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fund(a)(d)o ()</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ol(b)i(d)an(d)o ()</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(i)(d)a ()</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-i diskul(p)a ()</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a ()a(l) (()v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo ()a(s)ob(e)d(a)ci()es ()</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be(d)e (()v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>espa()ci(y)al(d)ades (()v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>()a(t)ubi(y)ese(d)es (()v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enb(i)(d)i(y)a (()v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mat(a)se(d)es (()v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fis(i)(y)ese(d)es (()v), 2 ()t(i)(m)es)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bebi(y)ese(d)es (()v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ko(m)i(y)ese(d)es (()v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o ()a(s)k(e)yese(d)es (()v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la ()a(z)ena (()v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>()a(m)t(i)(n)i(y)ese(d)es (()v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i ()a(s)ob(e)d(a)ci()es (()v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i ()a(s)ob(e)d(a)ci()es (()v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We have clear examples of occlusive \( d \) after \( n \) and \( l \); its distinction from intervocalic \( d \) is firmly maintained. There is only one exception: \( \text{espe\c{c}i(y)} \text{alda\~{n}es} \), which appears on 141r as \( \text{espe\c{c}i(y)} \text{alda\~{n}es} \). We have chosen this folio, not only because it shows this difference consistently, but also because it has interesting examples of the retention of \( -d- \) in the \(-\text{edes}\) ending of second person plural verbs. On this point Entwistle writes:

"The \(-d-\) persisted, however, when the accent did not fall on the vowel immediately preceding, so that Cervantes, Lope de Vega, Tirso de Molina and Quevedo prefer to write \( \text{amabades} \), \( \text{hariades} \), \( \text{amades} \). Villegas (1618) ignores this \(-d-\) also, and examples of its loss have been found as early as 1555." 21

Even though retained in the literary language of the time, it is obvious therefore that the form with \(-\text{edes}\) was already moribund. This is yet another confirmation of the conservative nature of the scribes in Morisco communities.

To sum up it may be said that although there are discrepancies, there is a conclusive distinction drawn in the majority of the manuscripts between the fricative and the occlusive Cast. \( d \), dependent on its word or sentence position, though the latter is not always influential. It would seem on the other hand that in some northern manuscripts the influence of Aragonese has prevented this distinction from being made. It should also be remembered that the Morisco or Muslim scribe, in using two symbols from his own alphabet to cover the different values of Sp. \( d \), was in fact making a phonemic distinction not always present by this time in the Arabic of the Peninsula.

As Gisela Labib says, with reference to her manuscript:

"Andererseits muß jedoch auch die Möglichkeit erwogen werden, daß eine Entwicklung des \( \tilde{d} \rightarrow \tilde{d} \), die sich im Arabischen vollzog, hier einen Niederschlag erfahren hat." 22

If the difference between the two phonemes was slight in Hispano-Arabic, then it is understandable that when the scribes came to use them in aljamiado manuscripts they were liable to make errors in their attempt to distinguish two sounds which were not firmly present in their own language. The fact that they did make the distinction proves that the difference between the occlusive and the fricative must have been clearly perceivable for them to have gone to the trouble of representing them.
with two Arabic symbols, and it shows moreover to what extent the
Morisco scribes were aware of Spanish phonetically rather than
visually, since there is no orthographic distinction made in Spanish
for the two allophones of /d/.

Weinreich's "over-differentiation" can then be redefined slightly.
It is here not so much a case of imposing phonemic distinctions
"on the sounds of the secondary system where they are not required"
(our italics), but of registering an allophonic distinction which
certainly did exist, though as is the case with allophonic variants,
it was not illustrated. It is in cases like these that aljamiado
can most clearly contribute towards a fuller picture of the sixteenth-
century phonological system.
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CHAPTER VIII

Spanish /k/, Arabic ﺟَ ﻭ ﻫُ and ﻗَ

Spanish /k/

Manéndez Pidal has pointed out that the value of /k/ in Spanish is in fact twofold: post-palatal before e, i, velar before o, u. It has an intermediate value before a. These, however, are non-distinctive variants of /k/ and there is really little else to say on the subject as regards Spanish.

Arabic ﺟَ ﻭ ﻫُ and ﻗَ

On the subject of ﺟَ and ﻫُ, Steiger has come to the conclusion that in the North African dialects, ﻫُ was pronounced as an unvoiced post-velar fricative, as opposed to the voiced pronunciation registered by early Classical Arabic grammarians.

"La pronunciación de ﻗَ = [g], hoy corriente entre todos los beduinos del dominio lingüístico árabe, ha de considerarse como la más antigua, al lado del fonema ﺟَ = [q], propio de las hablas ciudadanas, y de la lengua literaria (escuela alcoránica)." 2

Since the dialects of the cities remained unaffected to a large extent by the speech habits of the invading Bedouins, they can consequently be taken as a fairly accurate guide of the pronunciation of Muslim Spain. Although we can take it therefore that ﻗَ was unvoiced, Steiger does not explain whether ﻗَ and ﺟَ were consequently open to more confusion, except indirectly in a footnote:

"Hay conformidad completa entre el ﺟَ ﻫُ de los actuales dialectos occidentales y el lenguaje clásico. Sólo en algunos dialectos judíos de Argelia aparece sustitución esporádica ( ﺟَ = [g] y [d]). Esto depende manifestamente de la confusión de ﺟَ con ﻗَ [q], a consecuencia de la pérdida de la oclusión glotar propia de este sonido." 3

We cannot, however, be sure on this evidence alone that the two letters had the same value in Arabic Spain.

Writing about the constant permutations of ﺟَ و ﻫُ in the Latin transcriptions of Pedro de Alcalá, Steiger adds:
"A cierta arbitrariedad en el tratamiento parece someterse también el k (c) románico en nombres topónimicos, pues aparece de ordinario como ك, de cuando en cuando como ك." 4

Denise Cardaillac discusses the problem in the light of the Classical Arabic distinction between mahmūsa and majhūra. She continues:

"Cette distinction des anciens a pu être assimilée à la division de la phonologie moderne en lâches et tendues." 5

Galmás de Fuentes explains this further:

"Como las 10 consonantes mahmūsa son sordas y las 18 majhūra son, en su mayor parte, sonoras, los arabistas han identificado normalmente los conceptos mahmūsa = sorda y majhūra = sonora. Así por ejemplo A. Schaade, Wallín, M.A. Alarcón, A. Steiger, etc." 6

He also refers to an unpublished Morisco manuscript of the sixteenth century which elaborates on these two Arabic terms, with the expression "alharfes del aflaquecer" for mahmūsa and "alharfes del publicamiento y fuertes" for majhūra. 7 The distinction is therefore not solely one of voice but also of intensity. So we can say that whereas in Arabic it is the voiced consonants which are marked it is the unvoiced ones in Spanish. 8 The scribe is therefore presented with a problem of representation which, Denise Cardaillac suggests, he solves in this way: since ك is both marked and unvoiced, and consequently an exception to the usual distinction, he chooses this in preference to ك:

"Par besoin de compensation, le Morisque est amené à utiliser ce que sa langue lui offre comme phonème tendu et sourd ..." 9

In one manuscript, (B.N. 4944), Denise Cardaillac also comes to the conclusion that it is only for certain words, "des noms propres et des mots-clés du raisonnement" that the scribe uses ك in preference to ك. Consequently, she concludes that the scribe was guided by "le désir de donner de la force à l'articulation".10

Judeo-Spanish testimony

In Judeo-Arabic there is a clear correspondence between post-palatal ل = Ar. ك and velar پ = Ar. ق. 11
As regards Judeo-Spanish, Spiegel observes:

"The earlier examples of Old Judaeo-Spanish show hesitation between כ and פ for ק-ק, but by the fourteenth century כ disappeared from Old Judaeo-Spanish and פ became standard." 12

It is interesting to note, then, that for Hebrew character manuscripts the norm was the velar occlusive, whereas in aljamiada, as will be seen in the manuscripts we have studied, the norm was the postpalatal occlusive. It must be added, however, that Spiegel wonders whether by the later period of Judeo-Spanish writing כ and פ had distinctive values 13 and this doubt is increased by the observation by Marçais that within the Tlemcen dialect the confusion of ק and ק among Jews is frequent (as indeed it is among other Muslim communities throughout North Africa) 14.

The manuscripts

The majority of the manuscripts that we have studied show an occasional use of כ for ק. On the whole when כ is chosen in preference for ק, the scribe uses it only for a few or sometimes only one word. Looking at the manuscripts one by one, the cases are as follows:

B. N. 5319 (1429)

The scribe uses כ almost exclusively for ק, and then not consistently. We have found seventeen examples of this as against twenty-nine of ק. Sometimes cases of כ seem to occur in groups, and one wonders whether the scribe does not go through a phase of writing כ, only to revert to ק later on in the same folio. This is particularly the case in folio 240v:

"1 ק Qon los kaballos i ק Qon los
2 ... i Qon las sa(y)etas ke tiren
3 ... n Qoossa pongan ent(e)rellos"

In line 6 of the same folio קosa occurs, and in line 11 ק.

There is one curious instance of a parallel use of כ and ק in folio 231v:

"Señor, ק Qon ti amaneço
c K Qon ti amanço
cos "

It would appear from these examples that כ and ק are inter-
changeable, but evidence from other manuscripts seems to point to this not being the case. Moreover, one must ask why the feature is limited to certain words.

J.1 (1462)

We have only found three examples of the use of ő, namely qu(w)erpo (215v) (cf. ku(w)erpos 213v), q(i)ri(y)aturas (215v) (cf. k(i)ri(y)ador (3v) and k(i)ri(y)ados (4r)), and qu(w)enta (216r).

B.N.5703/7 (1482)

There is only one example in this manuscript, in the surname Qastellano (2r).

B.N.4908/1 (1510)

There are no examples at all in this manuscript.

B.N.5364 (1542)

There are no examples of ő in this manuscript, but there is an interesting feature which we have only found once elsewhere, and that is gemination:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kkomo (4r 2 times, 33v)</th>
<th>kini(y)entos (33v)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>çinkko (33v 2 times)</td>
<td>ku(w)arenta (33v)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T.13 (1563)

There are three examples here: aunqa (29r) and qon (30v). They appear to be exceptions, since aunka occurs four times (also haunke twice) and kou nineteen times. The third example is desq(e)reyenca which appears alongside kreyenca in the same folio (31r).

There is also one example of gemination of ū in this manuscript in kkaso (31v).

B.N.5223 (1577)

Here the examples of ū are more numerous, but are nevertheless few in comparison to the immense number with ū:
In contrast to these we find:

- ku(w)enta (248r 2 times, 249r)
- ku(w)ando (249r)

**J.30 (1597)**

This manuscript has no examples at all of كَتْبُ being used consistently.

How can we assess the value of كَتْبُ for the Muslim scribes? Could it be that in the early years of *aljamiado* writings, when the symbols were not regularised, كَتْبُ was in competition with كَتْبُ? The answer is surely no, since we find examples in manuscripts stretching from 1429 to 1577, towards the end of the period. It is nevertheless true that J.30 has no such examples, twenty years later.

If we look at other manuscripts which have been studied, it will be seen that in *La leyenda de Yüsuf* there is only one instance of كَتْبُ, in *gabega*.

As regards the suggestion made by Denise Cardaillac that كَتْبُ is used for a few chosen words, this must be rejected as far as our manuscripts are concerned. There is no indication whatsoever that the scribe used كَتْبُ solely for key words in his argument. On the contrary it is often the most common words which are represented by this, e.g. كَتْبُ, qu(w)ando.

If we take a closer look at the actual words which are represented by كَتْبُ it will be seen that the majority are followed by either أو or أو (both written ٔ in Arabic). They divide as follows:

- with *damma* (أ، أ) 31 (أ 21; أو 10)
- with *kasra* (ا) 1
- with *fatha* (أ، ب) 3 (أ 1; ب 2)

In other words 88.6% of the examples are with *damma*. Is there any
possible explanation for this? Given the considerable proportion of cases withamma it would appear that the quality of the vowel has played a part in the choice of consonant. It would seem that some scribes attempt to make a distinction between the two values of /k/. In using the Arabic alphabet, the scribe has an advantage over users of Latin character, since he has at his disposal not only a post-palatal, but a post-velar unvoiced plosive. This is not to say that Sp. k before a back vowel was an exact counterpart of the Arabic post-velar or uvular ئ; but we have seen in previous chapters how the Morisco scribes were obliged to compromise in the distinctions they drew between different Spanish sounds (as for example in the rendering of Spanish voiced and unvoiced a). The fact that this phenomenon is not universally found should not deter us from concluding that the scribes (or at least some of them) were representing k before a front and a back vowel differently. It is rare that we have found any feature of aljamiado used consistently in all manuscripts.

Should we consider the possibility of the influence of Castilian orthography in this matter? It would appear not. From among all the examples with ئ only amnq is written with a q in modern Spanish. It must also be borne in mind, however, that present-day Sp. c was not always written thus, and that there are many medieval examples of the retention of Lat. q. Cuando is found in 1425 and quatre documented in 1400. Quando is the usual sixteenth-century spelling however. Nevertheless this possibility must be totally discounted for there are other words which do not derive from Lat. q (e.g. goraqon, qu(werpo).

It would appear that some of the Morisco scribes were aware of allophonic distinctions in the value of Sp. /k/, distinctions which are not represented in Latin character and of which Spanish speakers would be unaware. Since their own language made a phonemic distinction parallel to the allophonic variants of Castilian, some Morisco scribes made use of both ئ and ئ to maintain a distinction they were familiar with but which in fact had no real function in Spanish. Here then is another instance of the Arabic system having a wider phonemic range than that of the Castilian being represented by the scribes. It parallels the occurrence of ئ and ئ for Sp. /d/, though in the present case the variation in articulation is much less easily perceived by the
untrained ear than that between occlusive and fricative /d/. Hence we have yet another instance of Weinreich's "overdifferentiation" and in this case the qualifier "where they [phonemic distinctions] are not required" is far more justified. Moreover, in our manuscripts this distinction was based, not only the importance of the words being used (often quite the contrary), but on purely phonological criteria: namely, the post-palatal or velar quality of the consonant in conjunction with a front or back vowel respectively. The influence of Castilian orthography must be discounted. In addition, it would seem that in the case of two scribes, this same strengthening of articulation was rendered by gemination of ć rather than by the use of Ć. Despite the different solution arrived at, for the problem of representing [k] and [ć], it can be fairly assumed that the purpose of gemination was similar to that of the use of Ć.
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CHAPTER IX

Spanish b, v and p, Arabic ب and ب

Spanish b and v

Martinet considers the confusion of the O. Sp. phonemes /b/ and /v/ to have originated in the north of Spain and to form part of the major sound shift directly attributable to Basque. Consequently the phenomenon is first documented in the north and only slowly spread southward:

"Jusqu'à la fin du XVIe siècle, les cas de confusion de b et de v se limitent en gros à la Vieille Castille et aux provinces septentrionales avoisinantes."

In the south the distinction remained, and this is confirmed by Nebrija who considered the v to be still labiodental and criticised its orthographic confusion with b. A. Alonso dates widespread confusion somewhat earlier than Martinet:

"Hasta después de 1550, la confusion b-v era propia del Norte de España ...

We must bear in mind therefore, when considering the manuscripts that b and v were fused in the north probably by the end of the fifteenth century, and not till perhaps a century later in New Castile.

Arabic ب

In aljamiado manuscripts the difference between b and p is shown by the addition of a tašdīd to ب for the latter. This is a convention of aljamiado orthography, since /p/ does not exist in Classical Arabic, and consequently has no symbol in the alphabet. One is faced therefore with similar problems as for aljamiado representation of j and ch by چ and چ, where the addition of a tašdīd is the only distinguishing factor. As regards the case of p and b, it could be argued that if we find a tašdīd omitted for a word with p in Castilian, we are merely dealing with a scribal error. As we also find the addition of tašdīd in cases where one would only expect to find ب for Sp. b, the argument that the scribe was forgetful is invalid.

Present-day Moroccan /h/ has in addition to its normal bilabial
occlusive pronunciation, two allophones: [b] and [p]. Of the latter, Steiger writes that it occurs only

"... en voces no arábigas, de origen románico preferentamente." 4

We do have evidence though that in the Peninsular the Arabs distinguished at least between b and p. In the Valencian dialect of 1595:

"No distinction is made between p and b in Romance loan-words: bidrinyal (R 5); bartida (R 16). This may be due either to a process of phonetic adaptation ... or else may be merely graphemic, the one graphy bā be used for both voiced and unvoiced labial plosives." 5

According to Steiger [p] only occurs sporadically in Hispano-Arabic, and then only in words of non-Arabic origin. Pedro de Alcalá's transcriptions of Arabic words however testify to the existence of [p] as a sound in Muslim speech6.

In his study of the thirteenth century Vocabulistain arabico David A. Griffin makes the following comments on initial b and p:

"La B y la P van representadas por [b] ... Pero no hay que pensar que se confundan los dos sonidos en uno ... Pero como las geminadas no existían en árabe sino en posición intervocálica, no se halla nunca (el taṣdīd) sobre la primera consonante de una palabra, siendo así que el uso del taṣdīd sobre la inicial de un préstamo ... hubiera dado un aspecto enteramente raro e insólito al vocablo." 7

This feature is not to be found in aljamiado manuscripts, as p (ق) is frequently written in initial position.

Arabic has no voiced labio-dental fricative, and consequently it was not easy for Morisco scribes to represent the distinction made in Latin character by y and b. Gisela Labib suggests that this might have been possible, had y not had an anti-hiatic function in aljamiado manuscripts:

"Eine Deutung der konsequenten Darstellung von frikativem "..." durch ar. ِ als Graphie einer phonematischen Opposition zu dem ar. ُ zugrunde liegenden Lautwert muss somit aus- geschieden werden." 8
It is true that b and v are not distinguished, but we should perhaps mention three cases of the use of ɡ : ɡiwda (T.13 28v), kawlebar (T.13 28r), rrebikwe (T.13 28v). All three occur in the same manuscript, and in each case the b involved had certainly weakened considerably; it must therefore be assumed that ɡ represents here the stage of vocalisation of b.

Why did Spanish Moriscos not attempt to distinguish b, v then? Galmés de Fuentes has pointed out that in Portuguese aljamiá b is represented by ٦ and v is written ٧ (= Ar. [f]). This fits with the correlation of voice drawn up by Cantinaeau for Arabic consonants. Galmés de Fuentes concludes:

'Tal divergencia entre los usos gráficos de los moriscos españoles y portugueses, revela, sin duda, que para los aljamiados españoles la v medieval castellana, aunque pudiera participar de cierta dentalidad, no era sentida, frente a la del portugués, como correlato sonoro de la (f) labiodental, y sí en correspondencia con la (b) bilabial. Ello prueba ciertamente ..., que la oposición v -- b del castellano medieval no era, sin duda, de labiodental a bilabial sino de bilabial fricativa a bilabial oclusiva.'

This assumption squares well with the evidence that the merger of the /b/ and /v/ phonemes took place before the sixteenth century in the north of Spain, since most aljamiado manuscripts are northern, either from Aragon or Old Castile. However, no need to distinguish was felt in any aljamiado writings, from any region of Spain. In a late fifteenth century Granadan manuscript we find for example:

bertuw'osoh
saber
abe'is
salbo

(though there is also one instance of ٧ : esqirifamoh)

Judeo-Spanish testimony

The problem of differentiation between b and p did not occur in Hebrew character, as Hebrew has both p (�) and b (ב). Any confusion would be between p (�) and f (י), which are only distinguished by a diacritic.

As regards b and v, they were usually represented with the same
character. 1 distinguished only by a diacritic, and hence were open to some confusion. Spiegel considers that despite the confusion the use of the diacritic

"... however infrequent, shows that the Sephardim were aware of the difference between the stop [b] and the fricative [v]." 14

However, Hebrew also possesses another character,  7 , traditionally a voiced labiodental fricative, and in some manuscripts this was preferred to represent initial v 15. Hebrew then distinguished in Judaeo-Spanish texts between bilabial occlusive, bilabial fricative, and labiodental fricative; the fact that the distinction however is not constant would point to an identification in Spanish of both b and v, and this would pre-date by at least half a century Alonso's supposition, and by more than a century Martinet's, since the manuscripts are not exclusively northern.

Mention should perhaps also be made of an early confusion of b and p in a Jewish Latin character text of the thirteenth century. Here we do find one example of confusion in the case of piyenas 16. In general, it must be said, however, that this is a purely Morisco feature.

The manuscripts:

If we look at the evidence, the scribe succeeds, in the majority of cases, in distinguishing between p and b with considerable accuracy. There are several cases, however, of initial b written as , and it would be nice to see in this feature an attempt on the part of some Morisco scribes to distinguish between an initial plosive and an inter-vocalic fricative. To do this however, would mean only taking some of the evidence into account, for  appears intervocally as well. In addition the reverse process also occurs. Examples of confusion are as follows:

B.N.5319 (1429)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ب</th>
<th>ب</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>albbarak (230r 2 times)</td>
<td>balabra (229v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pu(w)elba (230v)</td>
<td>bi(y)ada (230r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bbabi (231r)</td>
<td>bi(y)edras (230v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pu(w)elbo (232v)</td>
<td>berdones (232r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lonp(e)res (234r)</td>
<td>rrebi(y)entome (232v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From these lists it will be seen that the distribution is fairly equal: 21 examples of بـ for بـ، 18 of بـ for بـ.

They are not all, however, the sole form to be found in the manuscript for these words. Written in the more expected way we find:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With بـ</th>
<th>With بـ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lomb(e)re (232r)</td>
<td>pardonala (232r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kump(i)lidras (234r)</td>
<td>pardoname (232v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kombi(y)ene (236v)</td>
<td>espaçi(y)o (237r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bu(w)ellos (236v)</td>
<td>palabras (238r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bu(w)enas (238r)</td>
<td>pu(w)es (238r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaballos (240v)</td>
<td>pe(reyendas) (240v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bos (241v)</td>
<td>po(robi(w)eja) (244r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saber (241v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although we give only one folio reference for the above list, some of the words do occur more frequently, e.g. pu(w)es, bu(w)eno. The most curious of all the examples are perhaps the Arabic words: albaraka, bbabi and algaripes. بـ is not a sun-letter, so there is no possibility of this being a correct gemination, in the case of albaraka; algaribo does not occur again in the manuscript, but in other manuscripts we have never found بـ used for this word.
Also one must ask whether forms such as saper are not in fact Aragonese, where intervocalic plosives remain unvoiced, but the presence of saber in the same manuscript would seem to contradict this. Moreover, to what extent can one assess the value of p and b in words such as kostump(e)res and kumb(i)lidas where there is neutralisation of m and n?

J.1 (1462)

There are some examples of the same feature in this manuscript, though not as many:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>for د</th>
<th>for د</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pop(a)ladores (215v)</td>
<td>p(i)ringibes (4v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pu(w)enos (215v)</td>
<td>deçib(i)lina (214r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paladi(y)os (216r)</td>
<td>beones (214r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beskadores (214r)</td>
<td>berdurable (216v)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast to these we find:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>with د</th>
<th>with د</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bal(a)di(y)o (214v)</td>
<td>p(e)reçipales (3v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bu(w)enos (215v)</td>
<td>deçipulos (213v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfurable (216r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.N.5073/7 (1482) and B.N.5364 (1542)

Neither of these manuscripts offer any examples of this feature.

B.N.4908/1 (1510)

There is only one example here, of bu(w)erta (1v) alongside many instances of pu(w)erta (1v et passim).

T.13 (1563)

Again there is only one example, but it is a curious one: denbu(w)es (29v).

B.N.5223 (1577)

The only instance in this manuscript is not a definite one: biripas (250v), if it is a version of viboras.
There are only three examples in this manuscript, and the copyist of J.50 appears to have corrected them. We find:

- *posotros* (141v)
- *pu(w)est(a)ras* (142r)
- *eçboçi(y)alçada[s]* (142v)

In contrast we find fourteen examples of *bosotros*, (140r et passim), one of *beç(w)est(o)ros* (140v) and two of *espaçi(y)alçades* (140v, 141r).

On the confusion of and which Menéndez Pidal finds in the *Poema de Ydçuf*, he writes that such cases should be retained in transcription:

"... pues si pudiera creerse que todos eran un simple olvido del texdid, no hay duda que los moriscos debían confundir a menudo los dos sonidos de b y p ..." 17

He finds evidence of Morisco pronunciation of p as b in contemporary plays and writings. Moreover, on the subject of b and v in the *Poema de Ydçuf* he says:

"No creo que esta representación por de la b y v sea una confusión puramente gráfica, como la de la u y o; mucho antes del siglo XVII, en que lam b y v se confundieron completamente en la lengua literaria, la confusión existía ya en la pronunciación de ciertas regiones ..." 19

That the p was considered a foreign sound to the Arabs is certain, for they referred to it as "bā ajamī"; but we cannot be sure to what extent the Moriscos had assimilated the sound into their pronunciation of Spanish. It would appear that on the whole they were aware of the difference, since in the majority of cases they distinguish quite accurately between p and b, v in all positions.

The discrepancies are probably due to the fact that p did not exist in Arabic, and consequently the scribes were not always sure of its use. It is, in U. Weinreich’s terms, a case of underdifferentiation, though by no means as acute as, for example, the equation of with /ʃ/, /ʒ/ and /j/.

Another factor should also be taken into account, and that is that in the early days of aljamiado literature, scribes were not always certain of the way of representing Spanish in Arabic character.
By the end of the period, that is at the end of the sixteenth century and beginning of the seventeenth, certain orthographic conventions had been established. It would seem that this is the case here. The early manuscripts, B.N.5319 (1429) and J.I. (1462) display the most hesitation between ḫ and ḫ. The later manuscripts have very few, if any "misspellings". Since we have no evidence from other sources of confusion of p and b in Castilian at this period, we can safely say that the examples in the manuscripts are not indicative of contemporary pronunciation, but are rather evidence of scribal orthographic uncertainty, which was slowly eradicated as aljamiado literature established itself, and scribes became more adept at recognising and representing the difference between the "foreign" unvoiced plosive p, and the more familiar voiced plosive or fricative.
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CHAPTER X

Treatment of Latin L-, -LL-, -LY-

The case for yeismo and llismo

In this chapter we shall deal with those forms of -LY- which are not represented in aljamiado by either C or  pagina

Menéndez Pidal, in tracing the development of Lat. L-, -LL-, -LY- and -C'L- found documentation of palatalisation in Leonese and Catalan of initial L. He also quotes two possible examples of yeismo in the Mozarabic dialect. He comments:

"... como el árabe no tiene [ ], no sabemos si el yeismo representado en estas formas es sólo una equivalencia acústica propia de los árabe-hablantes, o si ya los mozárabes habían pasado de [ ] a [ ], cosa no improbable." 2

He argues in favour of the geographic continuity of this feature of palatalisation, stretching from Leonese to Catalan, the link being provided by Mozarabic. In Aragon and Navarra there is palatalisation of LY, C'L and G'L, though the orthography varies from lg to simply i. On the value of these graphies, Menéndez Pidal writes:

"En cuanto a la Rioja Baja, si bien domina la grafía que parece indicar el sonido castellano, maiolo 1169 ... maiuelo 1275 ... se ve la influencia navarra en minoría de casos, pero notables: Concillo ..." 3

He quotes examples of malliolo and mallolulu in documents from Sahagún. 4

On the subject of graphies with g or i he adds:

"Una grafía g o i aparece más rara vez, y siempre es dudoso si la i (y aun la g de la letra visigoda del siglo XI) representan el sonido [ ] propio del leones moderno ([] > [y]) o si representa [k] como en Castilla ..." 5

Amado Alonso distinguishes between two forms of yeismo: the Leonese development on the one hand

"... que se cumplió solamente en la posición intervocálica de una elle muy antigua, que se corresponde con la j castellana (muyer, pero lluna)" 6

and the much later process from -LL- and [ ] from FL-, CL-, and FL-
of which he writes:

"La más antigua documentación es de hacia 1680 para Lima." 7

Corominas likewise refutes the possibility of an early occurrence of yeísmo on the grounds that there is no evidence from sixteenth-century and seventeenth-century grammarians of any change in the pronunciation of -11- and 11-, although they do note the development of other sounds such as theta and jots and the unvoicing of -s-. 8

Corominas goes on to say that the frequency of examples of yeísmo in Aragon and East Castile, many of which are cases of 11 for y, most probably points to them being hypercorrections, and he adds:

"... lo natural es pensar que hubo un brote de yeísmo en las zonas de Aragón y vecinas en los últimos siglos de la Edad Media, tendencia que no llegó a consolidarse: una reacción energética la haría abortar, y como suele acaecer en tales casos se han conservado más recuerdos de la reacción exagerada que de la tendencia misma ..." 9

Arabic [ل] and [ك]

Ar. [ل] is used with taṣdīd to represent [l]; normally [ك] is only used in aljamiado manuscripts to represent intercalated vowels. Amado Alonso points out that negroes in sixteenth-century plays (e.g. Lope de Rueda's Eufemia) are yeísta 10, but that Moriscos are not. On this subject Corominas writes:

"Si los moriscos decían zebolia o caballo es porque nadie pronunciaba todavía caboya ni cabayo: de lo contrario habrían adoptado estas pronunciaciones, puesto que la [y] era fonema corriente en Árabe." 11

Contrary to the opinions expressed by Alonso, Menéndez Pidal and Corominas, Galván de Fuentes considers the dating of yeísmo to be much earlier. Quoting examples of lle padre, yorando and yamando from La historia de la Doncella Arcayona, he questions Alonso's theory that the Moriscos always distinguished correctly between [y] and [j] 12. The manuscript is probably from the seventeenth century but Galván de Fuentes considers that the examples are not indicative of Morisco innovation:
It must also be borne in mind that Morisco speech was not uniform in the Peninsula, but varied from region to region.

**Judeo-Spanish testimony**

Amado Alonso, writing on this aspect says:

"El yeismo judeoespañol no es antiguo: en ladino se ha mantenido y se mantiene la 11, lo cual indica que en la lengua hablada de los siglos XVI y XVII se practicaba la 11 todavía."

Spiegel's evidence for Judeo-Spanish yeismo seems in fact to be examples of lleismo: alya for haya, afeyarte for afeyarte, though these are possibly hypercorrections. Curiously, Spiegel does not mention examples of yeismo in the ballad Vergiles. Here there are some clearer cases: yamava, yaves, and yeba. Despite the fact that this is a fifteenth-century text, the extant version is an early eighteenth-century copy, and yeismo could be attributed to the copyist.

In general  יוד always represents י in Hebrew character, and no diacritic was used as in Ar. Consequently there is no difference in Hebrew manuscripts between Sp. 11 and ש; (v. below, however, other evidence from Aragonese documents).

**The manuscripts**

At this point we should look at our manuscripts in order to ascertain to what extent the conclusions previously reached about the nature, and dating of yeismo and lleismo coincide with our evidence. In compiling the data we shall refer to other papers in the collection numbered B. N. 5073, in particular sheets /4, /6 and /12. One of these is an inventory, and comparison will be made with Latin character Aragonese inventories from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

On the whole it will be seen that the scribes are faithful in this respect to contemporary pronunciation, but for this reason the exceptions are all the more significant. Taking each manuscript in turn it will be seen that B. N. 3319 displays a great number of instances of ell for the definite article.
From this selection it will be seen that all the examples occur before a vowel, and Galmés de Fuentes, in his section entitled "Aragonismos en el texto" of La historia de los amores de París y Viana remarks:

"Es normal el artículo ell, con la doble I palatalizada, ante vocal ... Esta forma ... era usual todavía, según Nebrija, con los femeninos: ell alma, ell aguja, etc." 19

By 'normal' we presume Galmés de Fuentes in fact means in this manuscript, since we can find no confirmation either in Vicente García de Diego or Alonso Zamora Vicente of this as a purely Aragonese form. On the contrary they both give lo and o as the usual forms20.

The manuscript also has some exceptions in this respect:

- del alcáde (231r)

- del alcáde (236v)

The problem here is to decide whether we are in fact dealing with an archaic Spanish form, or whether it is a peculiarity of Morisco speech. Certainly the majority of nouns here are masculine, whereas Nebrija only notes the form for feminine nouns.
Nevertheless this was not always the case, and we have seen how on many occasions the Muslim scribes retained archaisms long lost in Christian speech. As Corominas writes:

"Ante vocal se empleaba él con carácter bastante general en los SS. XII y XIII... en el XIV este uso está en decadencia hasta quedar relegado al lenguaje villanesco..." 21

This text is relatively early (1429) and consequently could be a reflection of a feature which was only just dying out. This is probably the case, since the scribe does distinguish carefully between these forms and the article before a consonant, even when that consonant is l. The form el lounb(a)rmi(y)ento (229v) is indicative of a definite distinction drawn by the scribe. Nevertheless, although it is most probably a fourteenth-century feature, it will be seen that it persists well into the sixteenth in other manuscripts and one must therefore ask whether it is not a kind of 11ismo which took no roots in Castilian speech habits.

As far as initial l is concerned, we find lengu(w)a (231r) (no sign here of Menéndez Pidal's Mozarabic yengia - though this of course was an Andalusian example) and also leyera (229v).

Initial CL varies in its treatment. On the one hand we find k(a)lamar and k(a)lames (230v), and on the other i yamaron (235r, 236r); (p(e)legada appears also (229v)). The retention of CL could be due to one of two factors. In the first place CL is unchanged in Aragonese; secondly it could be a cultismo. This latter reason could explain the existence side by side of two such widely differing forms of the same verb. On the other hand the contexts in which they occur do not differ greatly, and it would be hard to argue in favour of the need for distinction on the part of the author. What are we to make of the form yamaron? In the manuscript studied by Gisela Labib the form i yoraron occurs, and she makes the following comment:

"... initiales y- anstelle eines zu erwartenden 11- ist zweifellos satzphonetisch unter Einbeziehung des ihm voraufgehenden l zu erklären; nicht als Beispiel eines 1ismo." 22

It is true that in both instances where yamaron occurs it is preceded by i, and one could therefore argue that it has influenced the pronunciation of llamaron, but the possibility of its being an early
example of yeísmo should also be considered. Moreover, from the context, the likelihood of reading amaron must be rejected.

As far as internal ı is concerned, the verb salir always occurs with ḫ. On this form, Corominas writes:

"Hay variante antigua salir, corriente desde los orígenes hasta el S. XVI, y resultante por vía fonética de formas como salió, saliera, saliendo, etc. ..." 23

In this manuscript we have found

**saller** (233r)  **sallen** (243v)
**salle** (234v)

In addition we also find ci(y)ello and akelo (234v), which could be attributed to scribal error, or to some hesitation on the part of the scribe about the value of ı.

As regards yeísmo in intervocalic position we also find (239v), patayyar. The word occurs in a passage which refers to dreams, sneezing, dice and horse-racing, and it is not easy to deduce from this motley assortment what patayyar could mean! The possibilities are numerous. Bearing in mind the scribe's hesitation in this manuscript between ḫ and ḫ, we could be dealing here with one of the following:

batear, 'to bat, hit' (also O. Sp. 'to baptize')
batallar, 'to fight'
patear, 'to trample on, treat roughly'

For this last word Nebrija gives the definition:

"patear, hazer estruendo: strepo;
patear en desfavor: obstrepo" 24

From this it can be seen that if it is a question of batear or patear the scribe has used ḫ to break the hiatus. If the word is batallar then it is a case of yeísmo. Moreover, as all three are similar in meaning it is difficult to be sure which word we are dealing with. There is one pointer, however, to its being batallar and that is the vowels; but again vowels in aljamiado texts do not always correspond to Castilian orthography.
J.1 (1462)

The scribe distinguishes clearly between 11 and 1 and y. He writes lengü(w)a (4r) and also has one instance of ell in ell año (216v).

B.N.5073/7 (1482) and B.N.4908/1 (1510)

There are two examples which deserve attention here:

allegaçi(y)on (B.N.5073/7 2r, 2 times)
ellunes (B.N.4908/1, 2v)

Here we are dealing with a type of lleismo, probably because the scribe has unconsciously thought of the word as al legaçi(y)on, but has treated it as a unit, as in Arabic. In the case of ellunes the scribe has joined the article to the noun (with apparent palatalisation).

B.N.5073/6 (1478)

There is one word of interest in this paper, both for possible yeismo and lleismo. We find:

mayu(w)elo (1r, 3 times)
mayu(w)ello (1r, 2 times)

The Latin was MALLEOLUM, and it has given a number of derivations in different parts of Spain. Menéndez Pidal gives many examples in his Orígenes del Español and above. If, as seems the case from these examples, li palatalised in Aragon, then how do we explain mayu(w)elo? For this reason we have not put the y in brackets, as we cannot be sure of its value. Is it simply, as is usually the case in aljamiado manuscripts (v. Chapter XI) an intercalated anti-hiatic semi-consonant? Is it a yeismo? Is it a graphy for Latin character i, bearing in mind maiolo and mauelo found in Rioja Baja? That the s is not intercalated can be proved by looking at the Latin etymon. -LL- has never disappeared entirely, and Menéndez Pidal has no examples of mauelo or maelo. We are therefore left with one of two possibilities: yeismo or Castilian influence.

The manuscript comes from Tórtoles, and this is probably the name of a quarter of Tarazona in the province of Zaragoza. The text also refers to 'moneda korrible en el regno de Aragón' (1r), contains words like dito and one of the witnesses is from Nobayas (1r).
(Novellas in the province of Zaragoza). In this place-name we not only have proof that the text is Aragonese, but also confirmation of yeismo, as in mayu(w)elo.

B.N.5073/4 (1493) and /12 (1494)

There is no indication of exact provenance for either of these papers, but the writing is certainly similar to that of paper 13 which comes from Cunchillos, near Tarazona in the present province of Zaragoza. The interesting feature of these two inventories is a list of towels, for in the scribe’s rendering of tovalla and tovallon he alternates between \( \text{\textcircled{\text{\textordmasculine}}} \) and \( \text{\textcircled{\text{\textordmasculine}}} \), or between \( [i] \) and \( [y] \). In paper 4 we find:

- tobayon (1r, 6 times)
- tobayu(w)elas (1r)
- tobayas (1r)

and in paper 12:

- toballas (1r, 3 times)
- toballon (1r)
- tobayon (1r, v, 13 times)

It would appear that the modern Castilian form toalla is a borrowing from either Italian or Catalan:

"Es evidente ... que to(v)alla, cuya evolución no corresponde a la fonética histórica cast. ha de ser préstamo bastante tardío de otro romance, ... si realmente no entró antes de la 2ª mitad del S. XVI, se tratará de un préstamo del it. tovaglia; si es anterior sería más bien el cat. tovalla ..." [27]

We are certainly here dealing with examples prior to the second half of the sixteenth century, and therefore can safely say that these Aragonese forms are Catalan borrowings. In which case we are dealing, not with a development of \( [\text{\textordmasculine}] \) > \( [y] \) or > \( [\text{\textordmasculine}] \) (as would be the case from O. Cast. tovaja or toaja) but of a clear case of yeismo. This brings us back to Corominas’ supposition that there was a "brote de yeismo" in Aragon at the end of the medieval period. If we take both paper 4 and paper 12 together we find that 84% of the examples are with \( \text{\textcircled{\text{\textordmasculine}}} \), 16% with \( \text{\textcircled{\text{\textordmasculine}}} \). In contrast we do, however, find bermellas, filla, and muler for words from Lat. LY. Taken as a
whole though, the evidence is strongly in favour of some yeísmo.

Serrano y Sanz in a survey of Aragonese inventories of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries records many lists of household linen, but all examples of towels are with 11:

1497: tovallolas, touallas
1362: tovallones
1378: tovalletas

In Jewish documents in Latin character of the same period, 1496, in Zaragoza there is hesitation between:

toballa, tovajas, toballons, toballones

toballola

Are the examples of j in the Jewish documents the equivalents of y in the Muslim ones? It is hard to say, whether they are indicative of Castilisation or of Aragonese yeísmo, though the former is more plausible. The examples with j are however in the minority compared with those which display 11, and it would seem that one can say with reasonable safety that yeísmo is a feature limited to Morisco communities or that at least it is not represented by Spanish orthography.

T.15

The pronunciation xebolia recorded by Aldrete as typical of Morisco speech at the fall of Granada seems to have been taken as a general feature of Morisco pronunciation by Corominas (v. note 11) and Amado Alonso. In this series of doctor's notes we find gabolla (6v) and not gaboli(y)a. This illustrates the danger of considering the peculiarities of Granadan speech as indicative of Morisco speech habits elsewhere. This particular text is most probably Castilian.

B.N.5364 (1542) and T.16 (1568)

We have instances here of a feature which can hardly be called yeísmo as it in no way reflects a change in pronunciation from [l] to [y], but it does point to the occurrence of gemination as a means of resolving hiatus.

In B.N.5364 we find:
In T.16 we find:

- Juli(y)o (33v, 2 times)
- Juliyyo (33v)

In the cases in this manuscript the influence of Arabic graphies in e.g. (e.g. ḥamθ) has probably played a part.

Both manuscripts also show other unusual types of gemination, in kksaθo, qinkko etc. (v. Chapter 9). In view of this it is difficult to assess the value of yy. It would seem that both scribes are trying to strengthen the articulation of ḥamθ so that it is more than a mere intercalation, but it does not reflect any feature of Castilian pronunciation. The occurrence of juli(y)o alongside juliyyo makes any definitive statement impossible, but it is interesting to note the form صبأه (māyyoh) in a fifteenth-century Granadan text.35

The manuscript shows a few instances of the use of ell which one would not expect so late in the sixteenth century. The manuscript is from Ejea, so it could conceivably still show Aragonese features, but in the main it displays purely Castilian ones. The use of ell is by no means constant. It occurs only before Arabic words, and then not always:

- Ell aljanna (250v) el alqur'ën (252r)
- Ell annabi (251r, 252r) 1'aleya (251r, 252v)
- Ell alea (251r) ell alea (251v)

In addition we find a single instance of gemination in intervocalic position: kallor (247v).

This text displays some Aragonese features:
retention of PL: p(u)lubi(y)α (141r, 142v)
palatalisation of LY: t(e)rastalar (140v)

In addition we find the continued use of sallir:

salleron (138v)
salli(y)eron (142v)

The latter shows a 'double' palatalisation which would seem to be a scribal approximation rather than a true reflection of pronunciation, since it is extremely difficult to say.

It seems clear that in some of the late fifteenth-century manuscripts aljamiado documents reflect a movement towards yeísmo which was limited in time and place. We find no such examples in texts from neighbouring areas in Rioja and none in Castile. We also find some hesitant instances of lleísmo, which are often due to confusion over the use of the definite article, but which also occur in cases where single -l- would be expected (kallor, mayu(w)ello).

These findings go towards confirming Galmés de Fuentes' supposition that examples of lle-yeísmo in La Doncella Arcayona, reflect a phenomenon which had begun much earlier. His dating of post-1609, must now become the late fifteenth century in Aragón, for those words which develop from -LY- and -LL-; the results of initial PL-, FL-, and CL- are by no means decisive.
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CHAPTER XI

The system of vowels

Arabic vowels

The Classical Arabic system of orthography can only represent three short vowels, [a], [i], [u], by pointing the preceding consonant, e.g. ٛ [ba], with fatha, ٛ [bi], with kasra, ٛ [bu], with damma. Each can be lengthened by the addition of َٰل, َٰ, َٰا, َٰب, َٰت, and َٰ, to give [bā], [bī], and [bū] respectively. In many dialects however, the correlation of quantity is lost, and has been replaced by one of quality. In addition emphatic and velar consonants can vary the timbre of preceding or following vowels.

In present-day Moroccan Arabic the quantitative distinction has been lost except in the case of /u/ and /ü/; of the short vowels only /a/ and /u/ persist and the long vowels are /æ/, /i/ and /ü/, with allophones [ã], [ã], and [õ] respectively. As Cantineau remarks:

"Etant donné qu'il ne semble plus y avoir de phonème /a/ bref, ni de phonème /i/ bref, les phonèmes longs /ã/ et /i/ se trouvent isolés, sans partenaire bref, de sorte que leur longeur n'est plus pertinente et fait seulement partie de leur réalisation phonétique." ¹

As regards Hispano-Arabic, the situation was probably similar. In aljamiada, َٰلif plus fatha (Cl. Ar. /ā/) was always used to represent Sp. /e/, but no orthographic distinction was ever drawn between Sp. /o/ and /u/. However there is no indication that the vowels of Spanish were not accurately pronounced.

In addition, because Classical Arabic cannot tolerate two consonants with sukūn (i.e. without a vowel) or two vowels in hiatus, the scribes, basing the aljamiado system on the Classical one they had learned in the Quranic schools, intercalated vowels between two consonants and either wāw or yā between the vowels, depending on the vowels in question, e.g.

kont(a)ra
ku(w)ando
si(y)emp(e)re
Ya is also used to link the conjunction i with a following vowel, eg.

i (y)en
i (y)al

There are nevertheless some usages which are different from the above, which could be said to summarise the general rules regarding intercalation.

The manuscripts

The uses of كي

B.N.5319 (1429)

In addition to the usual intercalation of كي between two vowels, one of which is i, the scribe places sukun over a preceding r or n and immediately follows it by كي. That is, he writes ماترياس (materyas) for ماترياس (materi(y)as). It appears to be only for the diphthong ia or io following these two consonants for we find:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With Sukun</th>
<th>With Kasra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pegarya (232v)</td>
<td>Delijençi(y)a (241v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konbenyo (244r)</td>
<td>Sapi(y)os (243r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materyas (244v)</td>
<td>Akobdiçi(y)a (244r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B(e)regarya (244v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Menéndez Pidal considers that these forms are 'dudoso' where he compares muryo with muri(y)es2. We think however that these final diphthongs are given special treatment and that muri(y)es would quite naturally follow the normal pattern as it is internal. In the text studied by Gisela Labib, we find rrogarya, but compani(y)a, probably because in this last word the i is stressed. There is also an example of serbigo, so that it would seem that not all scribes limit the use of sukun before io and ia to those i's following n and r3.

J.1 (1462) wavers slightly in this respect. We have found no examples after n but the following after r:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With Sukun</th>
<th>With Kasra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kont(a)ranyo (4v)</td>
<td>Kosari(y)os (215r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rrogarya (5v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorya (5v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debiryan (215v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is interesting to note that the scribe does not appear to be
influenced by considerations of stress, since debiryan is stressed on
the ٰ, whilst kont(a)ryp and memorya, and usually rrogyra, are
stressed on the preceding syllable. In addition there is no ٰ in
leal (214v), where one would have expected the scribe to break
the hiatus.

B.N. 5073/7 (1482)

This is an Aragonese text and consequently there are some
slightly different uses of ٰ . In cases with ٰ< CT we find:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With Sukūn</th>
<th>With Kasra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fayto (1r)</td>
<td>gu(w)eyt (2r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faytas (1v, 2r)</td>
<td>gu(w)eytanta (2r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faytos (2r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the word sayer (2r) ٰ is also used. As this is an Aragonese
form, it is difficult to say whether the scribe intended to reproduce
the Aragonese ٰ or whether it is an intercalation. Hanza, ٰ ,
is also used instead of ٰ in se'ido (1v).

B.N. 4908/1 (1510)

In words ending ٰ and ٰ there is a certain amount of hesitation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With Sukūn</th>
<th>With Kasra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>memorya (1r)</td>
<td>medi(y)o (3r, 4r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medyo (1v)</td>
<td>medi(y)a (3r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rribyas (1r, 4r)</td>
<td>juni(y)o (4r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julyo (4v)</td>
<td>juli(y)o (4r)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition there are ten examples of mereyenda (1v et passim) as
opposed to five of meri(y)enda (2r et passim).

There are also some examples of the use of ٰ with sukūn
to indicate a long ی:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With Sukūn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mį (1r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dîneros (1r et passim, 23 times) one exception being dînero (4r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jǔnį (1v, 2r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dîcho (1v et passim, 16 times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dîchos (2r, 3v, 4v)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is a rare occurrence in the manuscripts we have studied, though T.13 does show a few examples of the feature.

B.N.5364 (1542)

We mentioned in the previous chapter the possibility of yeismo in these marginal notes. The examples of double ְך indicate an attempt to strengthen hiatus:

kalendariyyo (4r)
juliyyo (33v)

T.13 (1563)

There are no examples here of the rrogarya or meryenda type, but ְך is used in the verbal endings -eis, -ais:

podeys (29v)
aseñareys (30r)
bayays (30r)
tubi(y)esey (30v)

This probably came more readily to the scribe than using hamza as a bearer for kasra, in the same way as for the Aragonese scribe who wrote feyto. Hamza is so rarely used in these manuscripts, but we do find ha'unke (29v), ְך in hiatus position, as in se'ido in B.N.5073/7. Perhaps the rising stress in these two examples is the reason for their different treatment.

B.N.5223 (1577)

Again there are examples of consonant with sukun plus ְך:

injurya (250v)
sityadnas (251v)
juicyo (251v, 252v), but g(a)raçi(y)as (248v)
rrremedyal'e (252v)

When the vowel is stressed the ְך is always intercalated:

hartari(y)a (247v)

Long vowels with ְך are also found:
It would appear that in this later manuscript, and especially in J.52 there is a reduction in the use of ١ for ى, mostly in verbal endings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J.30 with ١</th>
<th>J.30 without ١</th>
<th>J.52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abeys (14or 6 times)</td>
<td>abeis (14or)</td>
<td>abeis (573r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sabeys (14or)</td>
<td></td>
<td>sabeis (573r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yarrays (141v)</td>
<td></td>
<td>yerras (574r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pekays (141v)</td>
<td></td>
<td>pekais (574r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>llegays (141v)</td>
<td></td>
<td>llegais (574r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hagais (141r)</td>
<td>hagays (573v)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neither manuscript is consistent, but this selection does show a general trend towards the production of a more accurate rendering of verbal endings. There is a similar reduction of intercalation of ١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١١٢
This feature is limited to these two manuscripts, and even
T.13 also shows an example of gu(w)ardar (28r), in contrast to
walard7on. In other manuscripts the result is usually [gw], (زود); e.g. gu(w)ardame (B.N.5319, 233r), lengu(w)a (J.1, 4r).

It would seem therefore, that for some scribes the addition of
was superfluous, either since the occlusion was already present
in the ـ, or because Sp. ـ was closer to a fricative than a real
occlusive. The development of Hispano-Arabic ـ to ـ is paralleled
in Spanish by a softening of the occlusive [g] to a fricative,
especially in intervocalic position. It could therefore be this
development that was recognised by those scribes who use ـ since
its value closely resembled that of Sp. ـ.

The case of walardon is particularly interesting. The form
gualardon was practically universal in the medieval period, but developed
to galardon by the end of the fifteenth century. The old pronunciation
is still current in Judeo-Spanish communities in Morocco and the Middle
East. The rendering walardon must come from gualardon and not galardon,
since no examples of ga are ever represented by ـ in our manuscripts.
This is further evidence of the archaic language of the sixteenth-
century Moriscos.

There is also another development in Spanish which is reflected
occasionally in the aljamiado manuscripts. It is in fact precisely the
same process as the one in Arabic. As Menéndez Pidal writes:
"La u fricativa labio-velar = [w] ... La elevación posterior de la lengua puede ser tal que su estrechez alargada llegue a convertirse en una oclusión igual a la de la [g], lo cual ocurre principalmente en la posición inicial absoluta o tras una oclusiva: huevo [gwébo], un huerto [um gwéerto] ..." 6

There are instances of this in:

B.N. 5223 (1577)

gu(w)eso (250v)

and J.30 (1597)

gu(w)estes (138v)
gu(w)eso (143r)

Cases of this kind go towards proving that the Morisco scribes paid attention to Castilian pronunciation, since although forms with g do occur in Latin character, they are the exception to the general rule.

J.30 also has one example of [g] ([ג]) for [b] ([ב]) in agu(w)elo for abu(w)elo, (138r). Menéndez Pidal remarks on this phenomenon that:

"... la confusión de oclusivas sonoras es frecuente, sea en su grado latino oclusivo ... sea en su grado romance fricativo ... Una vacilación semejante se da sobre todo en la inmediación de una vocal velar ..." 7

This is exactly the case here: [b] > [g] before a back vowel.

There is one curious use of [כ] for [ך] in J.1. That is g(a)rabi(y)a (4r, v) and el garabi (5r) for Cl. Ar. ˙c arabiyya and ˙c arabi. It is not, however, unknown as a form and it is testified by Steiger:

"Acusan cambio dentro del árabe-africano para el c inicial, ך > ג ([כ] > [ג]) los siguientes casos:

ဗ, arabija > esp., port. algarabía, port. algaravía, cat. algaravía, algarabía ..." 8

It is nevertheless unusual to find a Morisco scribe writing [כ] for [ך] in a word which must by all accounts have formed part of his cultural heritage.

Whilst realising that this is not one of the more important aspects of aljamiado writings, it is nevertheless of significance.
to note, on the one hand, the Peninsular Arabic value of ٩ being used in representing Spanish, and on the other, testimony in Arabic character of non-phonemic features which are not recorded in Spanish orthography.

Other uses of ٩

In the use of wāw, there is certainly not the variation to be found in the use of ی. In fact T.13 is the only one to show any significant differences. In this manuscript there are several instances of long vowels, rendered by ٩, and they all occur for Spanish o, never for u:

- idōlas (29r, 30r 2 times)
- nō (29r, v)
- pōb(e)res (29r)
- derrōkarse (30r)
- ēs (30v 2 times, 31r 2 times, 31v 2 times)

It is not altogether clear what the scribe intended by making certain vowels long. There is not enough consistency to suppose that he was trying to make a distinction between Sp. o and u, and it is not easy to see upon which other criteria he could base his choice. Moreover it is a feature to be found for ١ as well, which only covered one value in Spanish, unlike ٩. Possibly the scribe represented stressed vowels as long, but the few examples appear to contradict this.

Intercalated vowels

Menéndez Pidal sets out quite clearly the general usage of these:

"... en la aljama se suele acompañar de una vocal postiza o de sostén la primera consonante de un grupo inicial de sílaba o palabra ... o cuando a las dos consonantes iniciales de sílaba precede otra final de sílaba ... pero pocas veces se intercala vocal en Ydguf A cuando no concurre ninguna de estas dos circunstancias ..." 10

However, all the examples which Menéndez Pidal cites as exceptions come under the category of initial syllable group (with the possible exception of ١ن). We base this on the definition given by Vox:
However, it may be that the Moriscos divided their syllables in a different way from the usual Spanish method, since it is true to say that most variation is to be found in this category. For example, in B.N. 5319 (1429) we find:

**Initial groups**
- br: b(e)regaryas (244v)
- kl: k(a)lamar (229v, 230v)

**Internal group of three consonants**
- nbr: onb(e)re (229v et passim)
- ntr: dnt(o)ro (238v)
- str: nu(v)est(o)ro (244v)

**Internal group of two consonants**
- no intercalation
  - br: balabra (229v)
  - tr: 
  - dr: bi(y)edras (230v)
- intercalation
  - kl: jak(a)larami(y)ento (229v)

In J.1 (1462) there is variation in all internal groups:

**Internal groups of three consonants**
- no intercalation
  - npr:
  - nbr: mi(y)enbros (215v)
  - ntr:
  - str: maestrosos (213v)
- intercalation
  - skr: diskreto (216v)
  - kons(e)rendido (5v)
  - nonb(e)re (3v)
  - kont(a)raryo (4v)
  - maest(o)ros (213v)
### Internal groups of two consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no intercalation</th>
<th>intercalation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>pr:</strong></td>
<td><strong>ap(e)renden</strong> (214r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>pl:</strong></td>
<td><strong>pop(a)ladores</strong> (215v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>br:</strong> sobre (4r) kobra (216r)</td>
<td><strong>lab(a)radores</strong> (214r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>fr:</strong></td>
<td><strong>rref(e)regami(y)entos</strong> (215v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>tr:</strong> otra (4v)</td>
<td><strong>ot(o)ros</strong> (214v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dr:</strong></td>
<td><strong>lad(o)rones</strong> (215r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>kl:</strong></td>
<td><strong>d(e)k araçi(y)on</strong> (4v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>kr:</strong></td>
<td><strong>ipok(i)ritas</strong> (215r)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is not an exhaustive list, but it does show the degree of vacillation that is to be found. There is also an example of bal(a)di(y)o (214v), where ld can by no account be considered as forming part of one syllable. Perhaps there is a mistaken association here with baladí.

**B.N.5073/7 (1487)**

The scribe distinguishes between kont(a)ra (2r) and otras (1v).

**B.N.4908/1 (1510)**

This scribe has a totally different approach to intercalated vowels. The general impression is that there are very few. A closer investigation reveals that the scribe only intercalates a vowel in initial word position, and then not consistently.

### Internal groups of two or three consonants

| **br:** labro (2r) |
| **bl:** dobleros (2v) |
| **tr:** ku(w)atro (4r) |
| **dr:** Pedro (3r) |
| **npr:** kompre (1r) |
| **ntr:** entre (1r) |
| **str:** mestre (3r) |
| **nkr:** enkraibiyar (3r) |
### Initial groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>no intercalation</th>
<th>intercalation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pr:</td>
<td></td>
<td>p(a)rençip(y)aron (1v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fr:</td>
<td></td>
<td>F(a)rançiko (1r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr: tres (1v)</td>
<td></td>
<td>t(e)res (4r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trayo (2r)</td>
<td>t(a)rayo (1v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trebajaron (2v)</td>
<td>t(a)rabajaron (3v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kl:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kr: kristi(y)anos (2r)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**T.13 (1563)**

Initially in the word the vowel is always intercalated, e.g.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>br: b(a)rasas (28r)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr: g(a)rada (28r)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In internal groups of two consonants there is generally no intercalation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>no intercalation</th>
<th>intercalation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>br: sobre (31v)</td>
<td></td>
<td>p6b(e)res (29v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bl: publiko (29v)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ob(i)ligados (28v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fr: çufrençi(y)a (28r)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr: bosotros (28v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dr: pi(y)edra (29v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gl: niglijen[te]s (29v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In groups of three consonants the normal pattern is with an intercalated vowel, but there is one example of askrebido(r) (28v), alongside ask(i)ribi(y)o (32r)

**B.N.5223 (1577)**

Initial groups and internal groups of three are always separated by an intercalated vowel. In internal groups of two consonants there is some hesitation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>no intercalation</th>
<th>intercalation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pr:</td>
<td></td>
<td>rrep(e)rebolo (249r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>br: kulabras (250v)</td>
<td></td>
<td>kub(e)ren (250r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fr:</td>
<td></td>
<td>suf(e)re (249r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr: qu(w)stro (320r)</td>
<td></td>
<td>qu(w)st(o)ro (320r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr:</td>
<td></td>
<td>aleg(a)rar (248v)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
J.30 and J.52 (1597/8)

In J.30, the distinction is made quite clearly between initial groups and groups of three, which are usually divided, and internal groups of two which are on the whole left intact:

**Internal groups of two consonants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No intercalation</th>
<th>Intercalation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pr:</td>
<td>ap(e)reto (138v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>br: sobre (137v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr: nosotros (138r 4 times)</td>
<td>rret(a)raer (140v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dr: madres (139r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr: logro (140v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agrabi(y)os (141r)</td>
<td>as(a)rab(y)ao (139r)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sometimes a group of three consonants is not broken, e.g. *entre* (140r).

Before concluding this chapter, a word should be said about two other features of the aljamíado manuscripts. In the first place one must consider the value of 'alif of prolongation in Arabic words. Did the Moriscos attribute two values to this form, namely long [ä] for Arabic words and [e] for Spanish? Or was their pronunciation of Ar. ' identical with that of Sp. e? In order to determine this one should consider the influence in Peninsular Arabic of the imela, which is an inflexión of [a] > [e] > [i]. Steiger points out that not all Peninsular dialects evolve in the same way, Granadan Arabic showing more cases of [i] than the others. As far as hispano-Arabic place names are concerned, the result is nearly always [e]. From Steiger's evidence it would seem more than probable that Morisco pronunciation was influenced by imela, and that consequently the 'alif of prolongation had only one function, that of representing e whether in Spanish or in Arabic words.

Secondly, there is evidence in the manuscripts of the retention by the Moriscos of archaic forms such as *figura* (B.N.5223, 252v), *besita* (B.N.5223, 250r). As Lapesa says:

"En el transcurso del siglo XVI van desapareciendo las vacilaciones de timbre en las vocales no acentuadas. Valdés prefiere las formas modernas vanidad, ... cubrir ... a las vulgares vanedad ... cobrir; ... el extremo contrario, consistente en el empleo excesivo de i, u, no sólo dura todo el siglo XVI .. sino que algunos casos penetran en el siglo XVII."
Obviously one cannot tell whether the scribe intended [o] or [u] as both are written with damma, but the hesitation between [e]/[i] and [a]/[e] is clear. These forms will be recorded in the Glossary.

It will be seen from this survey of intercalated vowels and semi-vowels in all our manuscripts that their use was by no means universal in all positions. Moreover it would appear that for some scribes the system of syllabification of words differed from the Spanish norm. This may point to the fact that such written vowels were not pronounced but were merely orthographic conventions adhered to more strictly by some scribes than others. It certainly would seem strange that Moriscos who were Spanish speakers and who seem to have mastered many of the subtleties of pronunciation of that language, should in their own speech habits intercalate these vowels and semi-vowels of which there is no trace in the language of the surrounding Christian communities. It is also clear from Morisco writing in verse, e.g. Poema de Yúqúf that the intercalations played no part in syllable count - another indication that they were a purely orthographic phenomenon. In the same way it is not clear why some vowels are lengthened in aljama. None of these features can really bring any more light to bear on the pronunciation of fifteenth-century or sixteenth-century Castilian, but they do indicate to what extent the Moriscos were influenced by the orthographic conventions of their own Arabic script.
1. CANTINEAU, 'Réflexions', p. 251. We write /ä/, /i/, for Cantineau's /a/, /i/ for the sake of consistency with the rest of the chapter.
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CHAPTER XII

Aragonese features in the manuscripts

In his discussion of fifteenth-century Aragonese, B. Pottier writes:

"Alors que les influences des autres langues voisines de l'aragonais sont passagères, la pénétration castillane a un caractère définitif ..." ¹

In a study carried out on the language of the Aragonese inventories edited by Serrano y Sanz, B. Pottier has provided us with dates for the process of Castilianisation of certain features of Aragonese. With regard to the change from -iello to -illo he writes:

"Le changement de la terminaison ... peut .. être fixé entre les dates limites 1460 - 1480." ²

The development -it > -ch- falls within the limits 1468 - 1480. The period of transformation from -11- > -j- is extremely short: 1485 - 1490 ³.

The influence of Castilian was not felt however in the case of initial f-, which remains unaltered, probably because at the time of influence the change was only really establishing itself in Castilian ⁴.

The only manuscript which can truly be said to be Aragonese among the ones studied is B.N.5073. Some of the others show occasional instances of Aragonese, but never to the extent found in this collection.

B.N.5073/7, (1482)

Initial consonants

- f- is retained throughout, e.g.
  feýto (lr)
  ferrerí(y)a (lr)

Final consonants

- -t is retained:
  sanidat (lr)  kort (lv)
  kump(í)lidament (lv)  art (2r)
  mu(w)ert (lv)  p(e)resent (2r)
Initial groups

PL- retained:
  p(e)legar (2r)

Internal groups

CT > yt, t:
  dito (1r, v), dita (2r)
  sobredito (1r), sobreditas (2r)
  feyto (1r)
  p(e)leyte(y)o (1v)
  gu(w)eyt (2r)
  gu(w)eytanta (2r)
  dereytaje (2r)

There is one exception in the numeral ochoq(y)entos (2r), which shows Castilian influence.

Vowels

e > ie:
  p(i)ri(y)estamo (1r)

o > ue despite yod:
  gu(w)eyt (2r), gu(w)eytanta (2r)

Other features

lur (1v)
  akest (2r), akeste (1v), akesti (1v), akest (1r, v)
  seyer (2r)

The manuscripts studied in Chapters V and X show similar features:

B.N.5073/8 (1467 and 1473), from La Rioja

Initial consonants

F- is retained throughout:
  feyto (1v), filla (1r)

Final consonants

-t is retained:
  sanidat (1v)
  finkant (1r)
  akest (1v)
**Internal groups**

CT: fayto (1v), but sob(e)redixo (1r)

**Other features**

daki(y)a (1r)
bintit(e)res (1v)

B.N.5073/4 (1493) from Aragon (loose sheet written on one side only)

**Initial consonants**

F- is retained throughout:

feyto

**Internal groups**

CT > yt, t:

feyto

barbeytos

sobredito

For tobyon etc., and possible forms of yeísmo, v. Chapter X.

B.N.5073/12 (1494) Aragon

**Initial consonants**

F- retained:

fillà (2r)

**Final consonants**

-t retained:

p(i)rimerament (1r)

**Internal groups**

CT > yt:

leyto (1r, v)
est(e)reyto (1r)
dereytos (2r)

**Other features**

-iello: beli(y)ello (1r)

-LY-: muler (1r)

bormallas (1v) (v. also Chapter X)
It is not always possible to say, given the intercalation of vowels and semi-consonants in aljamiado writing whether we are in fact dealing with, for example, se(y)er or se(y)er, dereito or d(e)reito; as Galmés de Fuentes says, normally one can tell that the y is an intercalation but:

"... cuando esta -y- aparece en otros casos, tales como ... k(e)re(y)o ... se(y)a, ... que corresponden a formas de la versión castellano sin -y- ... no sabemos si la -y- en estos casos es meramente gráfica o representa un rasgo dialectal aragonés." 5

B.N. 5310 (1429)

The forms which might point to this text being Aragonese are few:

- beyer (230v), beye (242r), ku(e)aranta (242r)
- chake(y)a (230v), saber/saper (242v)
- bi(y)eños (238v)

We have no indication of provenance for this manuscript and on such slight evidence it is only possible to say that certain Aragonese features do occur.

J. 1 (1462)

This manuscript is from Segovia, and so one would not expect Aragonese forms to occur. The form t(o)-ronaron (5r) is of Catalán origin, and more frequent in Aragonese, but it is not unknown in Castile; kadaguno (214v) is recorded by Corominas as an Aragonese form but only to be found in the Poema de Yáñez. Recently Galmés de Fuentes has found another instance of this form in El libro de las batallas and comments:

"La realidad de la tendencia hacia la utilización de una consonante anti-histérica se ve confirmada en nuestros textos todavía por un ejemplo, en donde tal consonante no es una -y-, sino una -g-, como ocurre también en aragonés ..." 7

B.N. 4908/1 (1510)

Again there is no indication of provenance for this manuscript, but it seems likely that it is a much Castilianised Aragonese text. One of the people mentioned in the text is called Monkayo which could
be derived from the region of Noncayo near Agreda. The most interesting features of the manuscript are:

**Final consonants**

- **t:** bent (1r, v, 2r, 4r)
- p(imerament (1r)
- p(arotes (1r)
- (pu(w)er) (1r)

**Internal groups**

- CT: chico (2v)
- oceno (2r)

**Other features**

- **ielo/ello:**
  - lasilla (1r)
  - bigatillas (1r)

- **-ly- > j:**
  - trebabaron (2v)
  - t(a)rababaron (3r, v)
  - mujer (3r)

From this brief survey it will be seen that the text displays both Aragonese and Castilian features. It is unfortunate that there are no examples of f- or h- which would give a clear indication of the degree of Castilian influence on the scribe. Nevertheless, it does show that the influx of Castilian forms into Aragon at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth century was felt by the Muslim communities despite their traditional adherence to old forms (though the process took longer if we take Pottier's dating into account).

**T.13 (1563)**

This is not obviously an Aragonese text, but there are a few examples of possible Aragonese dialectal features:

- **deritajes (28r)** (This is dereitaje in Cantineau's text\(^2\))
- **deritaje (29v)**
- **dersytahhe (30r)**
- **afollami(y)ento (29r)** This word is derived from afollar,
"Palabra de uso general en lo antiguo, ... muy frecuente en el S. XIII y usada aún en textos aragoneses algo más tardíos (Yúçuf, A52c; Ley de Alejandro)... hoy sólo conservada en algún dialecto ..."

ad (28r); ada (28v, 29r, 30r)

As Gamís de Fuentes says:

"La preposición latina ad conserva la d final ante palabra que empiece por vocal. Este tipo de preposición es muy frecuente en toda la literatura aljamíada-morísca ... Esta preposición ... es también de uso normal en los textos antiguos aragoneses ... Ya Juan de Valdés lo reputaba como aragonésimo ..."

día(y)a (32r); aunque daquia is found in a number of Aragonese texts it is not exclusively Aragonese; Nebrija records it still.

adrear (31v);

'La variante contracta adrear tuvo gran extensión no sólo en textos orientales como el Poema de Yúçuf y el Alfarache de Martí ... sino en otros antiguos ... y clásicos (Celestina; Buscón ...)' 12

This text is interesting because the author, Muhammad Kordilero states that

'Fu(w) a enk(i)ribto el p(e)rente libro en la billa d'Exea ..." (253r)

This is clearly ajea and consequently falls well within the Aragonese area. Whereas, however, manuscripts studied from a century earlier (e.g. B. N. 5073) display many dialectalisms, this text is surprisingly free of them. There are some instances, ot(i)ri (248v, 249r, v) and setanta (252v), but even ot(i)ri is not exclusively Aragonese. The manuscript definitely shows that the process of Castilianisation of Aragonese had eradicated the majority of dialectal features even among the traditionalist Morisco communities.

J. 30 (1597)

The same can be said of this manuscript. It does show some definite Aragonese features, such as the retention of Pl. in p(u)lubia
(139r), the derivation of past participles from the preterite, e.g. *dubido* (139r), and the retention of -d- in the second person plural of verbs e.g. *dubiyese-tedes* (140v). On the whole, however, it is a Castilian text.

Before concluding this chapter consideration should also be given to the methods of rendering the Spanish language in the manuscripts. Are there any features of *aljamiado* script which are peculiar to Aragonese scribes? It is difficult to assess any differential use of initial *F-* but we have already seen that the Aragonese scribes attempted to make a more accurate distinction than in Castilian manuscripts, between /ʃ/ and /ʃ/ by using for the former and by rendering both /ʃ/ and /ʃ/ by the same letter, (e.g. B.N.5073). Likewise they retain a much clearer distinction between /ts/ and /dz/ than do the more Castilian texts. In addition fricative *j* is much less frequently used. As regards the treatment of *j* and *ch* there is no real confusion between the two. In B.N.5073/7 the question does not arise because *CT* is consistently rendered by (feyto etc.); the one exception, *ochogi(y)entos* clearly distinguished by use of *tašdid*, from forms with *j* from other sources (e.g. dereytaje). In B.N.4908/1, which is much less Aragonese, there is again a consistent use of *tašdid* to differentiate (*dicho*, *tejado*), but we do find other manuscripts which make a similar distinction.

*Q* is used only once in B.N.5073/7 and not at all in B.N.4908/1, whereas many of the others use it. B.N.5223 which is Aragonese in origin shows several instances of *Q*, but it is basically a Castilian text. Conversely, J.30 which is also of Aragonese provenance has no examples. The same is true of *b* and *p*; there is no confusion in either B.N.5073 or B.N.4908/1 but then it would appear that confusion is only to be found in the very early manuscripts (B.N.5319 and J.1).

From this it will be seen that it is by no means obvious that there is an Aragonese method of representation very different from that used in Castile; though at times a clearer distinction between phonemes is achieved, it is not, except in the case of /ʃ/ and /ʃ/, a different system.
Moreover, even manuscripts of Aragonese provenance only retain features peculiar to that dialect until the end of the fifteenth century, the period of major Castilian influence. After that it is impossible to say whether a text is specifically Aragonese. This is made all the more difficult on account of the archaic language of the scribes. Is the retention of initial $F$- to be considered indicative of Aragonese, or is it merely retained by a conservative sector of Castilian society? Similarly, there are several cases in nearly all manuscripts of vacillation of vowels, notably $e$ for $i$, and on this subject Galmés de Fuentes writes:

"En el tratamiento de las vocales átonas existe una notable vacilación entre $i$ y $e$, entre $i$ y $a$ o entre $e$ y $a$, rasgo que de un modo general suele caracterizar al dialecto aragonés frente al castellano."

This vacillation, however, is also to be found in Castilian literature of the sixteenth century (see Chapter XI), and it is not easy to determine to what extent words like, for example, *debinal* can be defined as Aragonese or simply as archaic Castilian or even a Morisco peculiarity.
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Before drawing any conclusions about the value of *aljamiado* manuscripts as evidence of sound changes in sixteenth-century Castilian, perhaps we should ask how our evidence compares with that from other sources. Basically the main ones are three: that of contemporary Spanish and foreign grammarians; Judeo-Spanish testimony; and that of Ameroindian languages. Although all three are useful sources of information on the pronunciation of Castilian, there is always a tendency among the first group to rely on the evidence of previous grammarians, and consequently their testimony can never, although often informative, be taken as a definite indication of the period when a sound change actually was taking place. Moreover, as Diego Catalán rightly points out, non-Spanish grammarians were "more concerned with a normative Spanish than spoken Spanish". So that although it can be said that a chronology of sound changes can be established through the testimonies of grammarians, it is a chronology which runs several years behind the actual changes taking place in the country as a whole.

As regards the Judeo-Spanish evidence, there are both advantages and disadvantages. Firstly, like Arabic, Hebrew is rich in sibilants, and could possibly provide proof of a fricative pronunciation of *q* and *z*. There is, however, some doubt as to the exact articulation of Hebrew sibilants in fifteenth-century Spain. In the case of *ç/l* and *ç/, there is no more certainty than in Arabic character evidence. Moreover, Jewish testimony has one serious disadvantage—the Expulsion of 1492. It can therefore in no way bring any light to bear on sixteenth-century pronunciation. As regards that of the fifteenth, Galmés de Fuentes and Spiegel differ in their conclusions. Galmés de Fuentes considers that Judeo-Spanish language was that of a tradition-bound and isolated community, whereas Spiegel considers that "Spanish Jews spoke the current popular speech of their day".

This brings us to the testimony of Ameroindian languages. In describing the affricates of Tarascan, Father Alonso de Molina wrote the following in 1571:

"Allende desto, esta lengua tiene una letra Hebrayca, que es: teade. La qual se ha de escreuir cõ t. y z. y no cõ t. y s. y hase de pronunciár t. y z."
This would further point to the disappearance or non-existence of an affricate pronunciation for Spanish q in the sixteenth century.

From this brief survey it will be seen that whilst all three sources provide certain information about the nature of fifteenth-century and sixteenth-century pronunciation, none of the evidence is complete in itself, and consequently cannot be entirely satisfactory.

How much more satisfactory is aljamiado testimony? If one looks firstly at the disadvantages of aljamiado literature as a means of determining the nature of sixteenth-century Castilian pronunciation, it will be seen that these fall basically into three categories. In the first instance one is faced with the influence of tradition upon the scribes, which led them to retain very archaic forms of language in their manuscripts. We have seen, for example, how f is still to be found in initial position, way into the sixteenth century. The Romance group b'd lingers on to the end of the century, despite the fact that contemporary accounts show that it was already moribund as a form in the first half of the century. Moreover there is no really definite sign of interdental pronunciation of ç or z, nor any indication of the development of iota as [χ].

Secondly one is obliged to ask whether, if the intercalated vowels had no value at all or at least no equivalent in Spanish, it is possible to rely to any great extent on the evidence furnished by aljamiado script as a whole. If, as seems to be the case, these vowels had no real value even in verse, one wonders, for example, if one can say with any certainty what value was attached to the use of ta’did with various consonants.

Thirdly, we cannot tell to what extent the Arabic alphabet continued to symbolise Arabic sounds for the scribes using them, or whether in fact each character had only one value, whichever language was written. As Uriel Weinreich says,

"It is a question of some theoretical interest to inquire whether, for a bilingual, the two phonemic or semantic systems in contact merge into a single system ..." 4

Weinreich's conclusion is that the two systems remain in "complementary distribution" 5. We must however remember that the Morisco communities were by no means really bilingual at this stage although they continued to use their own alphabet. It would seem that on the whole they had
their own phonemic system which was a hybrid between the Arabic and the Castilian one.

Perhaps the weakest part of the system is the vowels. We have already mentioned the problem of intercalation, but it must also be added that the scribes' inability to distinguish between o and u constitutes a serious disadvantage in the script.

If we turn now to the advantages of the system, the first one is, of course, the fact that the scribes had no orthographic preconceptions when they came to write down Spanish (preconceptions that is about Latin character orthography, for as we have seen in the phenomenon of the intercalated vowels, they were ruled to a certain extent in their script by the conventions of Classical Arabic orthography). They were therefore provided with the opportunity of reproducing Spanish phonetically within the possibilities available to them in their own script.

It is however the preconceptions which the scribes may have had about their script in relation to Arabic which prevents any representation of Spanish being wholly phonetic. The opportunity was there, but one must consider also the degree of interference from Arabic. Bloomfield discusses this point in some detail; once the idea of using an alphabet for a different language has taken root, the writer

"... may retain whatever defects the alphabet had in the first language, and he may retain letters that are necessary in the first language but superfluous in the new one, and he may fail to devise new letters for additional phonemes of the new language. On the other hand, he or his successors may be clever enough to mend these defects, either by inventing new characters or by putting superfluous characters to good use, or by semi-phonetic devices, such as using combinations of letters for a single phoneme." 6

All these features are detectable in aljamía. Firstly, ٧ and ٨ are phonemically superfluous, but phonetically useful. Secondly the scribes fail to devise any separate character for /s/ and /ʃ/. It is only in later manuscripts that a consistent distinction is drawn between /p/ and /b/. One could argue that in writing ٧ the scribes were putting a superfluous character "to good use". Finally the use of tašdíd is an example of a semi-phonetic device, though not in the
same way as medieval scribes used combinations of letters to represent \( /\alpha \), \( /\zeta \) etc. when they adapted Latin character to Spanish. 7

As Bloomfield rightly remarks,

"... written records give us only an imperfect and often distorted picture of past speech ..." 8

but it would be wrong, for this reason alone to give up the attempt to analyse the evidence. One must nevertheless bear in mind that the use of the alphabet and the deduction of phonetic data from it pose both an advantage and a disadvantage. Weinreich continues in some respects Bloomfield's thinking on the subject, though this time in purely phonemic terms, and with no attention paid to writing. He states that:

"Inasmuch as a language is a system of oppositions, a partial identification of the systems is to the bilingual a reduction of his linguistic burden and it is these natural identifications which are at the root of many forms of interference." 9

To what extent can we speak of identification in aljama? To use Weinreich's categories, we can summarise it as follows:

**Underdifferentiation**

/p/ and /\b/ sometimes

/\x/ and /\z/ sometimes

/\s/ and /\x/ and /\y/ (with slight differences in different manuscripts)

**Overdifferentiation**

[k] and [\k]

[d] and [\d]

**Reinterpretation**

/ts/ and /dz/ as /\s/ and /\z/

/d\x/ as /\x/ ?

The /p/ and /\b/ confusion is eliminated early, and would appear to have little significance in Castilian terms. The under-differentiation of /\x/ and /\z/ points to unvoicing of /\x/ as well as the possibility that unvoicing took place prior to loss of affrication. The use of only one symbol for /\x/, /\s/ and /\y/ confirms the evidence from other sources that /\x/ and /\s/ were dorsoalveolar, whilst failing to
indicate in any way the length of time /t/ remained voiced. The total lack of any symbol for /v/ could also be classed as under-differentiation, but it seems likely that the Moriscos felt there was no distinction to be made. If there had been, /v/ was available, as it was in Portuguese.

The cases of overdifferentiation provide us with adequate proof that the scribes were not only not copying from a particular Latin character manuscript, but that they paid no attention whatsoever to any writings in Latin character. The evidence provided by the coexistence in the manuscripts of ٣, ٤, ٥, ٦ and ٧ confirm that the Moriscos devised their own system for rendering Spanish, drawing distinctions which were phonemic in Arabic but not in Spanish.

The cases of reinterpretation are the most difficult to be definite about. Was the use of ٣ and ٤ felt to be an exact identification or was it in fact a reinterpretation? In other words, were fricatives used for affricates, or were both Spanish and Arabic phonemes fricative? Was it a reinterpretation in the earlier period, and an identification by, say, the middle of the sixteenth century? How do we interpret the occurrence in later manuscripts of ٤? Is the use of ٤ a device to distinguish between affricate /ts/ and fricative /t/? Does it indicate unvoicing of /t/? Does it, and this seems the least likely hypothesis, represent interdentalisation?

Similarly, one simply cannot be definite about the use of ٧ and ٢. Does ٧ constitute a reinterpretation of /dy/ as /y/? Why is it never confused, especially in the later period, with ٢?

If we draw up a chart of the aljamiado phonemic system, the following picture emerges (nasals and liquids excluded):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Interdental</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occlusive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unvoiced</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td>ç</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricative</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unvoiced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we draw up a chart of the aljamiado phonemic system, the following picture emerges (nasals and liquids excluded):
This is the general picture, and obviously for some manuscripts one would have to replace /f/ by /h/ and add /k/ or /q/ and /w/ alongside /k/ and /g/. This system constitutes a reduction of phonemes, both from an Arabic and a Castilian standpoint (lack of emphatics, non-use of /θ/, reduction of sibilants, etc.). Nevertheless it is a system which lasted for at least a century and a half with very minor modifications. It is therefore wrong to dismiss the Arabic script as inadequate. It may be so from a Castilian point of view, but it is probably fair to assume that any gross inadequacies would have been rectified by some orthographic device in the course of that century and a half, had the Moriscos really felt the need to do so.

On the other hand one must also take into account the traditional outlook of the Muslim community, and this may well be another reason for the lack of innovation in their writings. There is no real evidence of sound-change being recorded in their manuscripts earlier or even contemporary with sound changes in Castilian as a whole. Perhaps the one exception to this is the attestation of yeismo in certain of the Aragonese texts. This is not really an innovation, but it does show that the scribes were at times extremely sensitive to some differences in pronunciation, especially since this particular feature appears to have been limited at the time to certain areas of Aragón.

In the Introduction we stated that we chose manuscripts as nearly as possible at twenty year intervals with the intention of drawing up a chronology of sound-change within Morisco writings and to compare them with evidence of sound-change in Christian Spanish speech. As has been seen, however, evidence of sound-change is not progressive, (the latest manuscript, J.30, is an extremely conventional or at least archaic text) and it would be very difficult to establish any chronological table of sound-change. Any attestation of change is sporadic: the attempted distinction between /ʃ/ and /ʃ/ in B.N.5073 unwittingly demonstrates the fact that voice was being lost, but then other later manuscripts show no such confusion.

Whilst it is true to say that there can be no totally conclusive evidence drawn as regards a chronology of sound-changes in Castilian from these manuscripts, it would be wrong to give the impression that they provide a purely negative contribution to the study of fifteenth-century and sixteenth-century Spanish. Despite all the discrepancies
and approximations there does, nevertheless, emerge from these texts a considerable amount that is of value, if not for chronology, at least as confirmation of evidence from other sources for the pronunciation of Spanish and its related dialects. Moreover, the lexicon, as will be seen from the Glossary, provides a fascinating study of the archaic language of an isolated and persecuted community, and in this respect the manuscripts have a definite intrinsic value.
NOTES

1. CATALÁN, 'The phoneme /z/', p. 304

2. SPIEGEL, p. 56

3. Father ALONSO DE MOLINA, Arte de la lengua mexicana y castellana, folio 1, quoted by D. Lincoln CANFIELD, in 'Spanish ç and s in the Sixteenth Century: A Hiss and a Soft Whistle', p. 235

4. WEINREICH, p. 8

5. WEINREICH, pp. 8-9

6. BLOOMFIELD, p. 290

7. HENÉNDEZ PIDAL, Orígenes, § 4, pp. 49-52, § 8, pp. 60-63

8. BLOOMFIELD, p. 21

9. WEINREICH, p. 8
Saavedra has described this manuscript as follows:

"Códice en 4°, 244 hojas útiles, carcomido al principio y al fin, papel de dos clases. Es un comentario condónico-moral de Abu Muhammad Abdallah ibi abi Zayd. Tiene en árabe los epígrafes de los capítulos y la introducción, con su traducción interlíneal. Al fin hay una nota en árabe que señala la fecha de 832."

832 A.H. is equivalent to A.D. 1429. The manuscript is in many parts difficult to read, and the text is itself couched in language often not easy to understand. Of this manuscript we have transcribed folios 229-244. Originally we only transcribed from 238 to the end, but on account of the poor condition of the manuscript, we felt it necessary to transcribe some earlier folios as well.

1. "Sarhun fi bebin fi iccalemi wa uleqtiyad-
2. uni wa taneji wa dikru alqiraatin fi irruce'i
3. wa dikri Allahi, cubahenahu, wa alqawlnun ficcafari."
4. Sek(a)larami(y)ento en el kawso en ell aqcalem
5. i (y)en el k(alamar i (y)en ell aduce, fablar de ka-
6. bal i (y)el lonb(a)rami(y)ento del lleyer, i (y)e-
7. n ell aduce i (y)el lonb(ar)ar aqa Allah, cubahenahu,
8. i la balabra en el kamino i (y)el tornar ell a-
9. calem es debso, i (y)el kemenca ko-
10. n el es acunna p(e)legada en ella, i (y)e-
11. ll acalem ke diga ell onb(ere), "calem
12. calaykum", i diga el tornasor, "I sobre
13. bos ell acalem", o diga, "Acalemu calaykum",

1. Sarhun fi bebin: it is explained in the chapter;
2. fi iccalemi: about greeting; wa uleqtiyaluni?
3. wa taneji: whispering; wa dikru alqiraatin: mention
4. is made of transmitting salutations; fi irruce'i:
5. perhaps Ar. I*2), ruCyba, 'mindfulness'? 6.
6. aljamia the scribe does not bother to write
7. the Arabic article al when the word begins with a sun-
8. letter; en ell acalem is written as one word thus:
9. and he frequently omits ta'idid as
10. well, cf. acalem, lines 8-9, and Acalemu, line 13.
Fol. 230r

1. dizen a el, i lo ke mas p(e)lege ell açailem
2. all albbaraka ke digas en tu tornar, "I
3. sobre bos ell açailem i la bi(y)añañ ñe Allah
4. i su albbaraka"; i no digas en tu tornar,
5. "Salbo añañ Allah sobre tu", i ku(w)añño
6. da açailem uno, ñe la konpaña; pasa por
7. ellos, i (y)asi estorna uno ñ'ellos
8. i ñe açailem al kabalgaññor sobre ell a-
9. añaññor i (y)ell añaññor sobre el posado;
10. i ñar la mano es alñañana, i (y)eskibo
11. Malik ell ab(a)raçar, i di(y)olo por pasadero
12. i por cuñaynata, i (y)eskibo Malik
13. besar la mano i (y)eskibalo ke rrazonaron

5-6. The punctuation could differ to give this reading:
   ... i ku(w)añño da açailem uno ñe la konpaña, pasa
   por ellos...

8-9. The manuscript is not very clear at the beginning of
line 9; the reading is presumably añaññor, but could
possibly be añaññor, though this would be a scribal
error.
1. en ello; i no komi(y)ençan a los judi(y)os ni (y)a
2. los k(i)risti(y)anos ke te ...çalem, pu(w)es
3. ki(y)en ñe açalem sobre el ñe la ñe, pu(w)es
4. no se le pu(w)elba la kara, i (y)a ki(y)en açalem
5. sobr'el judi(y)o o el k(i)risti(y)ano, pu(w)es
6. diga sobre ti, i ki(y)en dize sobre tu
7. ell aççalem qon denibi el çin, i son las
8. bi(y)eðras, pu(w)es diseron akello,
9. i (y)el k(a)lamar es ñebño; no ent(e)res
10. en kasa ke en ella ay alguna, ñake(y)a
11. ke k(a)lames t(e)res; pu(w)es si ñan
12. licençï(y)a a ti, si no, tornate; i p(e)...
13. legaron en ir a beyer a los enfermos

2. Possibly ell precedes çalem, but the script is not clear; moreover çalem was originally written with but the dots have been crossed out.
7-8. denibi el çin: vocalisation of س (Sin) with a kasra, i.e., to say "çilem" instead of "çalem". This would change the meaning from 'peace, greeting', to 'stones'; hence the explanation i son las bi(y)eðras.
13. beyer: Aragonese beyer or be(y)er?
1. I no se aparten los menos él uno
2. lo así es la compañía ku(w)ando se-
3. san uno d'e!los i ya diseron, "No ko-
4. nbi(y)ene akello i sino por su mana-
5. mi(y)ento i lonb(a)rami(y)ento de la
6. saña, ya s'âmelanto en el bbebi a-
7. nte esto." Diso, "Maça il bno ja-
8. bal naa il bara, ficho de EÇam, obra mas
9. salbadera a el del alÇadeb de
10. Allah ke lonb(a)rara a Allah." Diso 'Omar,
11. "I lo mejor de! lonb(a)rar ada Allah qon
12. la lengu(w)a; lonb(a)rara ada Allah i su
13. manÇami(y)ento i (y)a su manÇami(y)ento

7. The meaning here is not clear; jabal could mean 'mountain' or else the reading could be jabalna 'we are created', which would give 'we are created of earth'.

1. i ells aṣuṣe ells arraṣUl, salla Allahu Calayhi
2. wa çalem, i ku(w)anfo amaneçe i (y)anojeçë
3. di, "Señor, kon ti amaneçko, i kon ti
4. anojeçëqo, i kon ti bibo, i kon ti mu(w)ero,
5. en la mañana, i (y)a ti es el tendimi(y)ento
6. en la noje, i (y)a ti es la tornaṣa"; i rraçonaron
7. kon akello, "Señor, ponme .tell mayor ẹe
8. tus si(y)erbos en tu parte", i rraç(y)on-
9. an tood bi(y)en ke lo partasen esti di(y)a,
10. i (y)en lo ke es depu(w)es ẹllo en k(a)lareda,
11. "Ke me gi(y)es kon ello a tu pi(y)ada ke la ti(y)e-
12. nças o arrezke ke llo esti(y)endas
13. o ẹaño ke lo esbi(y)es, o pekaṣo ke

3. Omitted in kon ti: $\frac{\text{2} \text{2} \text{2}}{\text{2}}$
4. Omitted in kon ti: $\frac{\text{3}}{\text{3}}$
5-6. Is the word order confused? A more logical reading would be:
   A ti es el tendimi(y)ento en la noje, i (y)a ti es
   la tornaṣa en la mañana.
10-11. Not at all clear where direct speech begins again;
   possibly after esti di(y)a.
1. la bertones, o b(í)ri(y)eta ke la rri(y)eTres
2. o eskandalo ke lo esbi(y)es o espa-
3. ci(y)a ke fagas bi(y)en kon ello, i por tu pi(y)a-
4. gaT ke tu eres sobre toma kosa pode-
5. roso, i se su aduče, calayhi içalem ".
6. Ku(w)ando el formir ponga su mano la ge-
7. reja Geyuso su masilla dereja, i la iç-
8. ki(y)er3a sobre su lliberza la içki(y)e-
9. r³a, Ğepu(w)es diga, "Señor, qon tu lonb(e)re
10. echo mi kostaáo, i kon tu lonb(e)re lo le-
11. banto, señor; si rreti(y)enes mi p(e)-
12. resona, perdonala, i si alkanças a gu(w)ar-
13. dar lo ke gu(w)ar³as kon ello los

4. eres: scribal error, the manuscript reads ares.
12-13. gu(w)ardar: could be gu(w)ardar, the manuscript is damaged at this point.
1. arrühes se los bu(w)enos de tus si-
2. (y)erbos; señor, yo desenparo mi p(e)-
3. resona a ti i (y)aku(w)esto mis ku(w)es-
4. tas a ti, i (y)enpodereyo mi ficho a ti,
5. i pu(w)elbo mi kara a ti, pabor se ti, i pe-
6. garya a ti. No ay salbami(y)ento, ni aku(w)e-
7. sto, sino a ti; demando perdon a ti, i rre-
8. bi(y)entome a ti, i k(e)reyo en tu alkiteb,
9. akel ke ñeballes, i (y)en tu arraçul,
10. akel k'enbi(y)este. Perdoname lo ke
11. aqelanto, i lo ke açageyo, i lo ke fiz
12. en polidat, i fiz en paladino. Tu eres
13. mi señor, no ay señor sino tu, señor.

1. arrühes for Cl. Ar. arrüä.
4. enpodereyo: there is really no way of deciding
whether one should read enpodereyo, with Aragonese
-y-, or enpodere(y)o.
5. se is vocalised with both fatha and kasra:
8. k(e)reyo v. note 4.
   tu is vocalised with both damma and kasra (with taṣdīd):
1. Gu(w)arłame ñe tu aldadebek ñe rrebe-
2. karas a tus si(y)erbos, i de lo ke
3. rrazonaron en ell așuçe ku(w)anño el sa-
4. r de la kasa. Señor, yo me defi(y)e-
5. nño kon ti; kerre yo ke ñe-
6. lene o ke torteye o me tor-
7. teyen i ke faga lokura o ke
8. fagan lokuras sobre mI. I rra-
9. zonaron en post(e)remeri(y)a
10. ñe kasa așala ke dīga, "Qubhena
11. Allah" t(e)renta i t(e)res beze-
12. s i dīga, "Alhamdu lillahi" t(e)renta
13. [i] t(e)res bezes i dīga, "Allahu

6-7. torteye, torteyen or torte(y)e, torte(y)en ?
12-13. The manuscript is slightly damaged on the inside at the bottom of the folios from here onwards.
1. akbar", t(e)renta i t(e)res be-
2. zes i (y)akabe las çi(y)ento
3. kon, "Le ilaha ille Allah, solo
4. no ay señor kon el en el
5. poder, a el es el poder i (y)a
6. el es la loor, i (y)es sobre
7. toda kosa poderoso". I diras
8. ku(w)anço el deportar, "La lor (sic) es
9. ada Allah, akel ke me di(y)o
10. su sabor, i sako de mi su
11. lazerya, i ēxelo en mi ku(w)er-
12. po su fu(w)erça," i di, "Aćūdo bi
13. illahi". De kafa kosa k'as mi(y)eço

3. Le ilaha ille Allah: the text reads Ile ilaha ille Allah.
8. deportar: scribal error for departar?
10. There would seem to be an omission here, for the text
   would read better thus:
   ... sako de mi ku(w)erpo su lazerya, i
   ēxelo en mi ku(w)erpo su fu(w)erça...
   On the other hand the first mi has a long i, and perhaps
   the pronoun is indicated.
12. Scribal error: bi is written ḫ.
1. i ku(w)ando te asentarás
2. en lugar, o te posarás en
3. lugar, o formirás en el, di, "De-
4. fi(y)endome qon las palabras
5. qe Allah las kunb(i)liCas qe-
6. 1 mal qe lo ke k(i)ri(y)o", i qal qefe-
7. ndimi(y)ento ke digas, "De-
8. fi(y)endome qon la kara qe Allah
9. la onrrama, kon las palabras
10. [de] Allah las kunp(i)liCas, ake-
11. [lla]s, ke no las pasan pu(w)eno
12. [ni] malo, i qon los lonp(e)res
13. [de] Allah los ferosos, tosos
1. lo ke sey t'ellos, i lo ke no se-
2. y del mal, te lo ke k(e)ri(y)o i (y)e-
3. tendi(y)o i k(i)ri(y)o i del mal
4. te lo ke deballo del ci(y)ello, i del mal
5. te lo ke puya en el, i del mal k'e-
6. stendi(y)o en la ti(y)erra i (y)e-
7. l mal te lo ke salle ci'ella, i de los
8. eskanzálos te la noje i del di(y)a,
9. i te las sobrebi(y)entas te la
10. noje i del di(y)a, sino sobrebi(y)e-
11. nta ke sobrebenga kon bi[(y)e-]
12. n", i diga en akelo ot(o)rosi ci-
13. l mal te toda besti(y)a ke, "Mi se-

2. k(e)ri(y)o: is this a scribal error for k(i)ri(y)o, influenced by the preceding ke?
1. ñor, tu eres tomañor te su
2. kabeça, ke mi señor es so-
3. bre karrera derecha", i yamaron a
4. keyen ent(e)ra en su kasa
5. ke diga, "Lo ke kerra Allah. No ay
6. fu(w)erça sino kon Allah"; i (y)es-
7. kibaron la obra en la meñkiña
8. te koser o su senb(a)lante
9. i no labe su mano en ella i no koma sino
10. de kosa lenpi(y)ana como f(e)resa
11. o su senb(a)lante i no çer-
12. ... en ella sus asi(y)erbes
13. [ni] en ella sus uñas

1. i (y)aunke la tome en su rropa; i rra-
2. cheçaron en yazer las algaripe-
3. s en las meçkiças del al-
4. bedìya ; i no konpi(y)ene ke liya
5. en el baño qon las aleyas; i no
6. es ke k(e)regka i liya el ka-
7. balgañor i (y)ella 'n kostado i (y)e-
8. ll andañor de billa a billa i (y)eskibaron
9. akello all andañor al merkañor i di-
10. seron ke akello al abrendino
11. i ki(y)en liye ell alguran si(y)ete
12. pu(w)es akello es pu(w)eno i 'll en-
13. tenCer qon el pokol leyir es

---
4. liya: Aragonese -y- or li(y)a? (v. also liya, line 6, liye, line 11, leyir, line 13).
 Fol. 236r

1. mejor; i rrazonaron k'ell annabī, ʿalayhi
2. iṣalem, no lo lei(y)a en menos
3. ūe t(e)res, i yamaron el kaminero
4. i (y)ell adelante do ke diga ku(w)ando
5. a su kabalgar, "En el lónb(e)re ūe
6. Allah; señor, ke tu eres el ko-
7. npañero en el kamo i (y)ell adel-
8. ntaño en la konpaña, i (y)en ell algo.
9. Señor, yo me sefi(y)endo qon ti
10. [de] la lazerya del kamo i de la mala
11. [jor] naka, i del mal katañor en la kon-
12. [paña] (y)en ell algo i (y)en k(i)ri(y)azon";
13. ... el kabalgañor ku(w)ando s'enpareja
1. sobre la besti(y)a; bendijo akel
2. ke nos çahuyo a nos esto, i no-
3. s a el a el (sic) amansañores i nos
4. a nost(o)ro señor somos bu(w)elto-
5. s; i (y)eskibaron el merkade-
6. yar a la ti(y)erra ñe los alcañues
7. o a la ti(y)erra ñe los negros i dixo
8. ell anabí, calayhi içalem, "El camino es
9. tajaño del alcañeb, i no konbi(y)ene
10. ke kamine, (y)e la mujer qon menos
11. de ki(y)eñes harremajo ç'ella, camino d'u-
12. n di(y)a i ñ'una noje. o mas, sino en alḥajja
13. ke'es debso espeçi(y)al, en la balabra

5-6. merkadeyar or merkade(y)ar?
1. ğe Malik, en rreku(w)a salba i si no
2. ayy kon ella ke seya ḥarremato
3. pu(w)es akello es a ella. "Ṣarḥun fī
4. bebin fī taqelaji wa dikri erraqe'i wa
5. ṭṭiyarati wa innujūmi wa lḥiṣa'i wa lwaṣmi
6. wa dikri lkilebi wa lrrifqu bi lmamlūki".
7. ṭeq(a)larami(y)ento en el kawso en e-
8. l meḏisnar i (y)el lonb(a)rami(y)en-
9. [to i (y)ej n ell eskantar i las aves i
10. [s]t(e)rellas i (y)el kast(a)rar i
11. ...ytar i (y)el lonb(a)rami(y)ento
12. [a perros i (y)el ẓar espaçi(y)o
13. [a]l si(y)erbo; i no faze fu(w)erça

3-13. Lines 7-13 are a translation of lines 3-6.
3-4. Sarḥun fī bebin: it is explained in the chapter;
4. fī taqelaji: prescribing medical treatment;
   wa dikri erraqe: calling upon the wizard (ell
   eskantar, line 9).
5. wa ṭṭiyarati: bad omen, ill luck. This is a reference
to bird omens, (the Ar. root t-t-a-r also gives tayr,
'bird'), hence the translation las aves, line 9.
   wa innujūmi: and the stars;
   wa lḥiṣa'i: and castration;
   wa lwaṣmi: tattooing. Could the missing word (line
11) be afeytar?
6. wa dikri lkilebi: mentioning dogs; (dikri for ṭikri)
   wa lrrifqu bi lmamlūki: showing compassion to
   slaves.
1. Tell eskantar Tell ocho i (y)otro i
2. Te las kartillas i (y)el medisnar
3. i bebir la meñezina, o (y)el sangar
4. i (y)el kemar, i las bentosas son
5. pu(w)enas, i (y)ell alqujul para meñezina
6. ell onb(e)re i (y)es Tell afeytami(y)ento
7. Te las mujeres; i no meñezinen kon
8. el beno, i kon la suziTa, ni kon lo ke
9. ay en ello mortezino, ni kon kosa
10. Te los ke ḫarremo Allah, tabaraka
11. taCala, i no faze fu(w)erca en el ke-
12. [ma]r i no faze fu(w)erca Tell-eska-
13. [nta]r qon l'alkiteb Te Allah i qon

5. alqujul: scribal error? ظ for ظ, and for ظ ظ ظ ظ ; the latter is not uncommon, v. qon, line 13.
6. ell onb(e)re: the text should read dell onb(e)re.
11. taCala: scribal error? تار for تار.
1. las palabras bu(w)enas, i no faze [fu(w)e-]
2. rça se las kartillas; ku(w)elgen-
3. las i (y)en ellas ell alquran i ku(w)anño
4. kaye la mortalera en la ti(y)erra, pu(w)es
5. no baya sobr'ella, i ki(y)en es en ella,
6. pu(w)es no salga fuyendo ñ'ella; i dixo
7. ell arraqúl, calayhi içalem, "En el a-
8. feytar si es pu(w)es en la mora...
9. i la mujer i (y)el kapallo", ifu(w)e so[bre]
10. el salbami(y)ento k'eskibo ...
11. ...ñ malos lónb(e)res i palazi ....
12. ...wero pu(w)eno i (y)es labar
13. ke labe el b(e)rente do...

4. kaye: Aragonese kayer or simply ka(y)er ?
11. palazi : the text is torn at this point, so that only part of the following letter is visible. It could be ب ب, or
1. ...cho su kara i sus manos i
2. sus inojos i sus kobnos,
3. i los kapos de sus bi(y)eses,
4. i de dent(o)ro de su sabana en el
5. kantaryello; depu(w)es ejelo sobre
6. el tomador ojo, i no katen de las
7. est(e)rellas sino lo ke segien
8. kon ello sobre l'alkibla i las por-
9. tes de la noje, i dese lo ke fu(w)ere
10. akello i no b(e)reyen man perro en
11. ...s kaças en la billa ni en las ka
12. ça s del albediyah, sino para a...
13. [ga] nado ke lo aonpañe en el ye[rmo]

1-6. The meaning of this passage is not clear, but it would appear to constitute a series of measures to be taken against the evil eye, el tomador ojo. 10. It is only permitted to keep dogs for hunting, for herding and for watching, (v. Shorter Encyclopaedia of Islam s.v. KALB). b(e)reyen or b(e)re(y)en? (v. also fol. 240v, line 4).
1. depu(w)es ke baya en la ...
2. s kon ello para kaça ke kaça ...
3. sustener su beña i no b...
4. por te, i no faze fu(w)erça [kas-]
5. t(a)rar el ganaño por lo ke eso ...
6. llo ñell añobar se sus kern[es]
7. i debedaron de kast(a)rar los]
8. kaballos i (y)eskibar en el af[ey-]
9. tar en la kara i no faze fu(w)er[ca]
10. kon ello en fu(w)eras d'akello i ca
11. esbaçi(y)o al si(y)erbo i no ...l ..ko-
12. st(e)reían de la obra lo ke ...
13. "Sarahun fi bebin arru'ya [wa]
14. azelab wa alcuṭeç wa allucabah

3. sostener: could this be sostener?
13. This is the beginning of a quotation which continues in fol. 239v, and is translated there, lines 3-7. Sarahun fi bebin: it is explained in the chapter; arru'ya: dream.
14. azelab: yawning; wa alcuṭeç: and sneezing; wa allucabah: and dice.
1. wa gayr ha wa ƣabaqa alhayl
2. wa gayr dālika."
3. [dek(a)la]rami(y)ento en el kawso
4. ... su(w)eños i (y)en el patayyar i
5. [(y)el] esternuño i (y)en el ju(w)ego
6. [de] caños i (y)ot(o)ro i korrer los kapallos
7. ...tirar i (y)ot(o)ro akello; diso ell arra-
8. [çel ca]layhi içalem, "Los ensu(w)eños
9. ...s el onb(e)re pu(w)eno es parte
10. ...r...nte i seys partes ñe
11. ... i ki(y)en beye de bosot(o)ro[s]";
12. ...[(y)e] skibaron en su ensu(w)eño ...
13. [ku](w)ando s'esbi(y)erta e...

1. From here till the end of the manuscript a strip of thick paper has been pasted down the right hand side of the verso of each folio, obscuring the beginning of each line.
   wa gayr: and other (things), presumably other forms of gambling, which is forbidden in Islam; ha?
2. wa gayr dālika: and so on, etc. Another scribal error: dālika for dālika,  for  . Moreover, none of the Arabic in this section (239r, line 12 to 239v, line 2) is pointed.
7. There appears to be no equivalent in the Arabic preceding for tirar, if indeed this is the complete word.
10. The first word could be t(e)renta or ku(w)arenta.
11. Aragonese beye or simply be(y)e?
1. al kostado derejo t(e)res ....
2. i diga, "Señor, yo me defi(y)en[do]
3. nel mal de lo ke biñe, ke me no ...
4. em mi (y)ad, i'n mi adunya, i ki(y)[en]...
5. taja pu(w)es, ponga su mano sobr[e la]
6. boka, i ki(y)en esternuc, pu(w)e[s]
7. diga ca, "Alabado seya Allah", i sobre ...
8. yin lo oye ke diga, "Api(y)adete a... "
9. i torne i torne ell' esternuc ...
10. "Perdone Allah a nos i (y)a bos..."
11. ...ye pos Allah i (y)adobe bu(w)est(a)ra
12. ... ad i no pasa el ju(w)ego kon lo
13. ... ni kon ell' agatrecho, i no faze

1. Possibly t(e)res bezes.
2. seya or se(y)a ?
3. Possibly esternuñador or esternuñante.
4. This could read bos or bosotros.
1. [fu(w)erça] qon los kaballois i qon los
2. ... i qon las sa(y)etas ke tiren
3. ...n qosa pongan ent(e)r'ellos
4. ... p(e)reyendan akello las u(w)el
5. ... ñeñlanta a el, i si se añelanta
6. ... sobr'el, kosa esta es la pa
7. ...bno al muçayyib, i diso Malik
8. "... ke sake ell onb(e)re añe-
9. lantami(y)ento, pu(w)es si s'adelanta
10. ...menlo i si se añelanta a el
11. ... akel k'es kon ti bene
12. ... los ñelanteros i sino
13. ... ñor ñel añelantami(y)ento

2. There is a Quranic prohibition on gambling with arrows:
   "O true believers, surely wine, and lots
   and images, and divining arrows, are an
   abomination of the work of Satan."
(Sale, The Korân, p. 112).

4. p(e)reyenden or p(e)re(y)enden?
7. muçayyib: this could continue the discussion on
   gambling, since مسـ, musib, means 'going
   straight to the butt (arrow)', and سـ and مـ
   are often confused in Hispano-Arabic.
Fol. 241r

1. i ki(y)en s'açi(y)erta en ke l...

2. en lo ke parece de las kule[bras]

3. en la billa, ke la mançen t(e)res,

4. i si fazed akello en las otra-

5. s si es pu(w)eno i no la manden ...

6. l yermo i maten lo ke pare...

7. llas i (y)eskibaron i (y)eskibaro[n]...

8. matar a los bi(y)ojos i a la pulga ...

9. fu(w)ego, i no faze fu(w)erca si ...

10. Allah ñe matar las formigas ...

11. ... en nozemi(y)ento i no pu(w)ede

12. ...las, i si no las matan es ...

13. ... a nos si es ke pu(w)eden ...

---

3. billa: the scribe originally wrote balla or even palla.
1. ... a la jenjubi(y)a i (y)eski[(ron]
2. [ma]tar las rrana(y)a i diso ill anabT
3. '... çalem; "Bendiso Allah sobre
4. ... ke Allah tira de bos la g(a)ran
5. ... julcheriy(a, i solo çani(y)a qon
6. ... te k(e)reyentes te
7. ... malo lanzado bos su (y)es
8. ... Edam i (y)Edam es de ti(y)erra,
9. [ca]layhi iççalem, en un onb(e)re
10. ... e bendíe los linajes de las ...
11. ... s saber ke no p(o)robe...
12. ... e la melijençi(y)a ka...
13. ... su çOmar sabeñ de bu...

3. Presumably Bendiso Allah is the beginning of direct speech, but because of the fragmentary condition of the text it is not easy to see where direct speech ends.
Fol. 242r

1. linajes lo ke p(e)lege su...
2. de bu(w)est(o)ros pareyente[s]
3. Malik i (y)eskibo ke alça...
4. linaje en lo ke es antes da...
5. lem i (y)el su(w)eño bu(w)eno es...
6. de ku(w)aranta i seys par...
7. sel anubuwa i ki(y)en beye en...
8. lo ke a por eskibo pu(w)es...
9. a su mano la içki(y)erda i d...
10. "...Allah defi(y)endome sel...
11. ... kon bi(y)en e as poner a los...
12. ... n no a saber el sel i no lo...
13. ... sobre el bi(y)en i (y)ello

9. içki(y)erda is written: كَشَكْيَارِذ
1. Sobre ell eskiibo i no fare fu(w)e-
2. ceraz dezir los aširres i lo ke e-
3. ... bi(y)an o de los aširres bu(w)es
4. ...Mejor i no konbi(y)ene ka monjeq
5. ...n en ella a de fazendarse 
6. ...n i (y)el mejor de los saberes
7. ... el mas ğerkano aaga Allah ġaza
8. ... el saper de su adin i sus
9. [mandami(y)]entos de lo ke mando ko
10. ... e beço por ello i k(a)lamo a el i ba...
11. ... to sobr'ello en su alkit[b]...
12. [sobre la lengu(w)a de su annabi,[ca]layhi
13. îçalem i (y)el saber en ak...

4. monjeq: could this be a reference to the tradition aimed at preventing the development of any religious orders in Islam, 'no monks in Islam'? (v. Shorter Encyclopaedia of Islam, s.v. Rahbāniya)
7. ġaza: this is probably the beginning of ġazza wa jalla, 'may he be exalted and glorified'.
13. The correct form of îçalem is îçalem, but the normal reading in this manuscript is with single.
1. ll ententer en ello i (y)a ...
2. yar por gu(w)ardallo i (y)obrar por ...
3. i (y)el saber i (y)el mejor de las
4. bras i (y)el mas cerkano de los ...
5. sapi(y)os ana Allah, i (y)el mejor e-
6. llos en ello, i lo mas e'ellos a el temor,
7. i (y)en lo ke es en el kobdiçi(y)o
8. i (y)el saber es gi(y)a a los bi(y)ene
9. ...s i (y)atirat(ur a ellos i (y)ell akostar
10. [a] kiteb de Allah i (y)alabuniya de su
11. [annabi] calayhi içalem, i segir
12. ... ra de los k(e)reyentes
13. ... r de las telañas de la me...
1. ...pañ a ke sakaron a la jente es-
2. [pa]bami(y)ento, pu(w)es en ell esa
3. ...b.çi(y)ar aś akello es el manteni-
4. mi(y)ento i (y)en segir la karrera de
5. los pasados bu(w)enos salbos
6. i (y)en ellos los gi(y)anos en separ-
7. tir lo ke separti(y)eron i (y)en sa-
8. kar lo ke kostaron ku(w)ando se ko-
9. nt(a)ristaron en los separtimi(y)e-
10. ntos i los senteçimi(y)ento[s]...
11. no sallen se la konpaha, i lo(w)a se[s]
12. Allah, akel ke nos sêlibro aša ... 
13. to ke no eramos ke sêlibras

1-2. es[pa]bâmi(y)ento: by no means a definite reading. The amount of manuscript missing at this point would seem to call for more than one extra letter; possibly es salbami(y)ento.
1. se no ke nos [él libro] Allah...
2. Abur Muhal [Abdullah ibnu Abi]
3. (y)abini(y)emos sobre lo ke pusi(y)e[se]
4. mos konbenyo de benir kon ello
5. e'nu(w)est(c)ro alkiteb, akesti
6. de lo ke se p(o)robi(w)eja kon ello si
7. kerra Allah, ki(y)en akobdiçi(y)a
8. en ab(e)rendello akesto de los
9. ... jikos, i ki(y)en a menester
10. ... a los (a)rançes i (y)en ella lo ke
11. ... e el ni la jente al saber
12. ... afirma de su k(e)reyen-
13. ..... obra por ello por sus

5. alkiteb: written الكتاب
Fol. 244v

1. ... ṭos i (y)en tayença de monjû irrabi
2. ... el saber i sus materias de las
3. acçunnas i las b(e)regaryas i los kos-
4. tunp(e)res, i yo ṭemando aça Allah ke nos
5. ab(o)robeje kon lo ke sabemos i nos
6. ayude sobre lebantarnos kon sus
7. derejos en lo ke nos manço i no ay kon-
8. fi(y)ança ni fu(w)erça sino qon Allah ell alto,
9. el marabellosos; i (y)ell așala de Allah sobre
10. Muḥammad i sobre los suyos, los bu(w)eno-
11. s i salbo salbami(y)ento ...

1. tayença de monjû irrabi, could be irrayi.
5. The text reads kon lo ka sabemos.
11. The remainder of the manuscript is in Arabic.
Manuscript J.1

Known as the Kitab segoviano or Brobiario cumni, this manuscript was written by Içe de Jebir, one of the few Morisco authors about whom a fair amount is known. He was described by Juan de Segovia as

"... el hombre, el más célebre entre todos los musulmanes del reino de Castilla, Içe Gidelli, alfaqui de Segovia." 1

It was with Juan de Segovia that Içe de Jebir worked in 1455 on the preparation of the Alcoran trilingue, and the reference to kardenales in Fol. 4r is probably to Juan de Segovia himself, as he had been a cardinal under the Anti-Pope Felix V. 2

The Kitab segoviano was written seven years later in 1462, and as well as the present manuscript in Arabic character there are four others in Latin character. One in the Real Academia de la Historia has been published by Pascual de Gayangos 3. Other manuscripts are J.30, in the Escuela de Estudios Árabes and B.N.2076 and B.N.6016 in the Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid. According to D. Cabanelas the Real Academia manuscript and B.N.2076 are not so close to the original as the other two 4.

Found in Almonacid de la Sierra, J.1. is dated at the bottom of Fol. 216v. The manuscript contains 220 folios: the first 176 are in a thin slightly untidy hand, the remainder is thicker and more decisive. There is no outstanding change in the language of the manuscript, however, and it was probably written by the same scribe, at a different time, or with a different pen. The folios chosen are from both sections: 3v-5v, 213v-217r. The first two and a half folios are blank, the last folio is in fact numbered 218, but the previous one is 216 and there is no sign of a missing folio. The manuscript is in good condition and well bound.

Reference will be made in the footnotes to Gayangos' edition of the Real Academia de la Historia manuscript.

1. D. Cabanelas, Juan de Segovia y el problema islámico, p. 145.
3. P. de Gayangos, in Memorial histórico español V, under the general title Tratados de legislación musulmana, with the sub-title 'Suma de los principales mandamientos y devedamientos de la ley y çunna', pp. 247-417.
4. D. Cabanelas, p. 149.
1. Biçmi illahi irrahmeni irrahîmi,
2. wa saddle Allâhu celayhi
3. çayidini Muḥammadin
4. ilkarim, wa celay elîhi.
5. Este es un memori(y)a de
6. los p(e)rencipales manda-
7. mi(y)entos i debeñami(y)entos
8. de nu(w)est(a)ra santa ley i çunna,
9. en el nonb(e)re de Allah un solo k(i)-
10. ri(y)ador, sin komi(y)enco ni medî(y)o
11. ni fin, ke k(i)ri(y)o el mundo de nata
12. i por su santa p(o)robiçenç(y)a e-

1. nbi(y)o sus p(o)rofetás de g(a)rañō e-
2. n g(a)rañō, depu(w)es de g(a)rañō, en fin
3. de los ku(w)ales enbi(y)o su es-
4. kojiño i bi(y)en abenturado annabī Muḥammad
5. ʒm, al bi(y)en se lo ke fu(w)eron k(iri-
6. (y)años. Dīso el onrraño
7. sabidur, mufti ilfaqī māl aljamīa
8. de los muḥlīmes de la noble i le-
9. al ḥibaād de Segobi(y)a, ke se
10. llama 'Içe de Jebir, "Kon bendītas
11. kawsas me mobi(y)eron a ent(e)ereço-
12. tar la ṣebinal g(a)rāçi(y)a ẓel alqur'en,
13. de g(a)rābi(y)a en ẓajami(y)a, sobre ke a-
14. lgunos kaɾenales me ūsi(y)eron
15. ke leyen, i (y)a mas eskondiño komo
16. no osaćo pareger, ke no sin mucha o-
17. kasi(y)on me puse a sakarlo de lengu(w)a

15: leyen or le(y)en?
16: ʒ-kasi(y)on is hyphenated in the manuscript. This is a very rare feature indeed. Here we have: ʒ-
Fol. 4v

1. castellana, akopilando akella al-
2. ta aktori\(\text{\textsuperscript{a}}\)\(\text{\textsuperscript{r}}\)\(\text{\textsuperscript{a}}\), ke to\(\text{\textsuperscript{a}}\) k(\(\text{\textsuperscript{i}}\))ri(\(\text{\textsuperscript{y}}\))atura ke
3. kosa alguna supi(\(\text{\textsuperscript{y}}\))ere se la ley, lo se-
4. be remost(a)rar a to\(\text{\textsuperscript{a}}\)s las k(\(\text{\textsuperscript{i}}\))ri-
5. turas del mundo, en lengu(w)a ke lo
6. enti(y)endan si es posible, i por
7. ibitar las infami(y)as se lo kont(a)raryo
8. pu(w)estas, p(e)lege a la imensa pi(y)aman
9. f\(\text{\textsuperscript{a}}\)rme g(a)ra\(\text{\textsuperscript{c}}\)(y)a, komo kon su ayuda, tubi-
10. (y)endo el alqur'en melante, los ke se
11. g(a)rabi(y)a fu(w)esen inorantes, a su-
12. yos i a est(a)raños; i por mayor se-
13. k(a)laraci(y)a on fare un t(e)resia\(\text{\textsuperscript{r}}\)o se
14. los artikulos ke ay en el i (y)otra
15. suma se las sentenci(y)as i fine-
16. s [di]chos kuya goberna\(\text{\textsuperscript{c}}\)(y)a on tan g(a)ran-
17. des p(i)rincibles i enumerables se-

16. [di]chos: possibly hechos, cf. Gayangos, (p. 248): ...hechos más importantes, debajo de cuya guía y gobernación...
Fol. 5r

1. ñores i jenti(y)os biben en liber-
2. tañ en las ti(y)erras te p(o)romisi(y)on
3. i kasa santa, ñonde se manti(y)ene ko-
4. n ella berñau i chustici(y)a; i porke los
5. muclices d'España kon g(a)ran sujeci(y)on
6. i g(a)randes t(e)rebatos i g(a)randes
7. fatīgas i t(a)rabachos an akacici(y)o te
8. sus rrikezzas i (y)an perdido las e-
9. sku(w)elas i (y)el garabī; i sobre su
10. k(e)reçimi(y)ento muy muchos amigo-
11. s mi(y)os te mi t(o)robaron, espeç(y)al-
12. mente me rrogaron los onrrados parti(y)o-
13. res, los ku(w)ales, kon tanta k(e)leme-
14. nci(y)a me rrogaron ke en rromange lo kisi-
15. (y)ese akopilar a nota señalada, let(a)ra
16. te nu(w)esa ley i g(i)na te akello ke to-
17. te bu(w)en muclices ñebei(y)a saber i usar. Sobre

1. ke yo no me pude eskusar se hazer
2. su rrogarya konfi(y)ando en el bi(y)en so-
3. berano ke es ayuca a los buena(s) (sic),
4. kunp(i)li(y)endo el fallecimi(y)ento ke los
5. birtuosos p(o)roposos t(a)raen sibinos
6. fines; sobre ke, me esforce i pen-
7. se se rejeir para los beniferos
8. i subzesores su brebe kunp(e)re-
9. nddo en tal kopilaç(y)on, t(a)ra(y)en-
10. do a la memorya los artikules i
11. p(e)renchipales rraçones i manza-
12. mi(y)entos, no olbiando la b(e)brebe fin
13. e este p(e)resente siglo, eke(a)lar-
14. o por kapitules como se eben
15. i como se han se kunp(i)lir se nu(w)esa ley
16. i ynuma ku(w)ando la neçesiad no se e-
17. esusa a los oyentes, ni hecho fasti(y)o ...

5. p(o)roposos: probably p(o)ropositos, cf. Fol. 216r, line 16.
1. peynadores, barberos, eskudilleros, karpenteros, y todos los otros
2. manos ganan de comer sin kar-
3. go ajeno; sirben ada Allah i gobi(y)e-
4. nimas. El g(a)rado de maestroso, kuyo
5. estado biben todos los maest(o)ro-
6. tios. ke en ley leyen en anajwi i
7. elma. a dcipulos alguna sabiduri(y)a bu-
8. (w)ena o arte o tot(i)rina o enseña-
9. mi(y)ento, segun sabe demost(a)-
10. ran sus ku(w)erpos i ganan sus a-
11. ra, en lojika i en medezina a toto-
12. los ke saben temost(a)rar
13. a
14. (w)ena o arte o tot(i)rina o enseña-
15. mi(y)ento, segun sabe demost(a)-
16. rar ganar mantenimi(y)ento i mer-

8. Gayangos: los maestros de ley i çunna (p. 415).
9. leyen or le(y)en?
1. çeü i salbaçi(y)on. El g(a)rado de
2. deçipulo: i en este estaño bibes-
3. n todos los ke ap(e)renden
4. leyes i artes kon maes-
5. t(o)ros; todo akel ke su Teçib(i)lina
6. de maest(o)ro terna p(o)robi(y)a del
7. bi(y)en soberano, kontini(u)yando
8. la birtuosa cesçi(y)a, kobra ra o-
9. narr y bi(y)en de su alma. I el estaño
10. de lab(a)rañores: se dizen billanos
11. kabañores, akarreañores, molineros,
12. lab(a)rañores o ganapanes, ke las karga-
13. s muñan a ku(w)estas de unas ti(y)en-
14. ñas a otras lo ke les manña, o bu(w)e-
15. no sea en komunal; i solñari(y)egos
16. i rrapaçes i alkilaños beones
17. i beskadores i ortelanos i to-

2. estado: the text reads estado.
7. kontini(u)yando: the text reads continujeando.
1. 2os los o(t)ros ke no an konoçiño
2. de ke biben, i se manti(y)enen usa-
3. nño korporalmente ofici(y)os pa-
4. sos i menosp(e)reçi(y)ados los
5. los (sic) ku(w)ales kontinu(y)ançó a bu(w)en fi-
6. n sin mal engaño, se manti(y)ene-
7. n i se salban ku(w)anto pu(w)eden.
8. El g(a)rado del mujeri(y)ego: su esta-
9. ño biben toña tju(w)eña, donzella, kasada,
10. bi(y)uña, si(y)erba, niña i toçtos los otro-
11. s g(a)raçtos femeniles o mujeri(y)e-
12. gos, kaçaguno segun su nobleza bi-
13. ben en g(a)raçi(y)a digna, si(y)endo
14. leal aña Allah, i a k(i)ryatura. Su esta-
15. ño bal(a)di(y)o biben toças las otras
16. personas ke de fu(w)era de akello
17. de sus nonb(a)raçtos estaçtos i

5. kontinu(y)ançó is written kontinubandó, cf. Fol.214r, line 7, note.
1. Se sus bicí(y)os abitan; i bi(y)en ansí
2. komo kosari(y)os, laπ(o)rones, rrobadores,
3. bi(y)oletaθores, i ensesores, baga-
4. munoθos, putaneros, i rrufi(y)anes, i malas
5. fenb(a)ras, i θefechiθeros, aθebinos, i
6. toθos los otros ke biben kon θos
7. fazes, ke bisten un bito i usan ot(o)ro,
8. i dizen uno i fazen ot(o)ro; t(a)raθores,
9. t(e)respasaθores, mint(o)rosos, en-
10. bidi(y)osos, malici(y)osos, sospechosos-
11. s, agoreros, b(a)lasf(e)lemi(y)aθores,
12. enb(i)ri(y)agos, konsentiθores de pe-
13. kar, los uri(y)osos o rrenzillosos, ipok(i)ri-
14. tas, erejes, enkartaθos i
15. fu(w)era se la birtuosa bica i licita, ke

1. no fazen estaño sino por sí,
2. ni son mi(y)enbros sino del qu(w)er-
3. po universal de la esperança
4. bana, konpañeros i pop(a)lañores
5. de la karçel i de la forka i dél
6. infi(y)erno, enseñan(y)os a las q(i)ri-
7. (y)aturas; sobre ke los bu(w)enos
8. se esfu(w)erçan, perkuran(y)o k(e)-
9. reçer en birtudes i los malos en rre-
10. f(e)regami(y)entos a sus biç(y)os i kono-
11. çer debiryan los pu(w)enos, ke los
12. ti(y)enpos perdiTos ku(w)ançø
13. de sus artes no usan ni kun-
14. p(e)len kon Allah las onrras i de-
15. bøos ke manñados les tí(y)ene

2-4. Gayangos: el cuerpo universal de la especie humana,
1. de așșalaes, i otros debțos
2. i açunnas i (y)enkom(y)endas ke
3. tan bi(y)en entonces en ... t(a)ra
4. ... en ello en la suma i a qu(w)enta te
5. los p(a)ladi(y)os, robașores i t(e)re-
6. spasașores; por lo ku(w)al, los unos
7. i los otros konbi(y)ene aborreçer los
8. biçi(y)os, i fazer berșadera rrepinten-
9. çi(y)a, por la ku(w)al, anșanço de kon-
10. tino kobraran la haltima fe.î.îișad
11. i g(o)lori(y)a perșurabke kon el bi(y)en
12. abenturaço p(o)rofeta Muḥammad para si(y)-
13. [e]np(e)re jamas. Sean ûașas
14. g(a)raçiy(y)as i loores al señor te-
15. 1 mundo en ke toșo u(w)elgo kun-
16. p(i)lido i akabacoro, ke los p(o)ropositos

3. en...t(a)ra: en otra ?
10. fe.i.lișad: felicidad ? haltima is presumably ultima.
1. t(a)raen debinos fines, i al su santo
2. serbic(y)i esto faga en de-
3. retami(y)[en]to ye g(o)lori(y)a ber-
4. durable, amen. Kunp(i)li(y)ose
5. este libro, ke a nombre Be-
6. braryo çunni, ke konnsI-
7. dero i kunp(i)li(y)o el onrrado
8. i Tiskreto Ika ŠedI,  
9. alfaqI i muftI mayor de
10. los moros se Kastilla, alimen
11. de los onrrados al[ima]c a de 
12. los moros se Segobi(y) a; i el
13. lo fizo i kolIji(y) o en la me-
14. čkiIa de la čIcha čIbdař,  
15. en ell año de I[Mr]il i ku(w)atroci(y)entos
16. i sesenta i dos años. Kombenga-

---

16. Kombenga-lo is explained by Gayangos in a footnote: "Es traducción literal de la frase وقعة الله usada muy frecuentemente después del nombre de un autor, que aún no ha muerto, a diferencia de esta otra رحمة الله عليه (Dios le ha perdonado) que se emplea después de nombrar a un difunto." (p. 417, note 2).
1. lo el soberano a su santo
2. serbiçi(y)o, emĩn. L'ašala
3. sobre Muḥammad el onrraño.

This folio is in fact numbered 218, though there is no sign of a folio missing.
This is part of a folder of 'papeles sueltos', which have previously been transcribed by Wilhelm Hoenerbach. The earliest one of the three we have transcribed, is /6, which is dated 1478 for Fol. 1r, and 1477 for Fol. 1v. We have only transcribed Fol. 1r, since it was particularly interesting from the point of view of possible yeidismo. It is described by Hoenerbach as:

"Rückkaufvertrag über einen Weinberg in Törtoles vom 27 Ramadan 882 H / 2. Januar 1478. Der Verkäufer (Muhammad) und der Käufer (Yüsuf) einigen sich auf eventuelle Rückgabe des Objektes." 2

As Hoenerbach also points out, the area is clearly on the Aragonese Navarrese border, as can be seen from the place names and names of the witnesses:

Törtoles (probably a quarter of Tarrazona)
Novallas (a village close by)
Morata could be connected with Morata (Jalón) 3

The folio is in poor condition, torn and blotted down the right hand side, and difficult to read at times because of a thin layer of chalk or sand (?) probably used to dry the ink.

1. W. Hoenerbach; Spanisch-Islamische Urkunden aus der Zeit der Nasriden und Moriscos, B.N. 5073/6, pp. 276-283, plates LV - LVI.
1. Alhamdu lillahi wa hadihi.
2. [Sepan] todos ku(w)anto akesta karta de g(a)raç(y)a beran, en kono bende Muḥammad
3. ... a Yūcuf Reje ʿAlī Moroto, es a saber un mayu(w)elo en el termino
4. ... na en el balle (en termino) konfu(w)erenta kon biña de ʿAlī Gu(w)arras
5. ... i kon otra biña de Yūcuf el de Llama, de la par alta, i de la ot(a)ra par
6. dell alamīn de Tortoles, ʿAbdallah el Gebar; la ku(w)al bendida (y)es a saber
7. ... de witanta su(w)eldos, bu(w)ena moneda korrible en el rregno de Aragón.
8. ... bende Muḥammad el sobreCito a Yūcuf el sobreCito kon kondigi(y)on
9. ... en ello Yūcuf el sobreCito ke tod'ora o ku(w)ando ke Muḥammad el sobreCito
10. ... los ditos fan o el o fillos suyos o ereCeres k'el dito Yūcuf
11. ... tornale el dito mayu(w)ello a el o a los suyos (y)asimesmo ke si
12. [el dito mayu]w)ello se ubi(y)ese de bender, ke se obliga Muḥammad el sobreCito

3. Hoenerbach reads: ʿAlī Morata, and connects this name with the placename Morata in the province of Almunia (Jalón), (p.232 note 1).
7. witant-a, Hoenerbach reads: okenta (p.279).
11-12. mayu(w)ello, Hoenerbach: mayu(w)elo (p.280).
13. de no tirarlla tanto por tanto a Yūqūf el sobredito, el ke
14. ... ndólo (y)asimesmo ke tod'ora o ku(w)ando ke Yūqūf el sobredito
15. ... se kerra dexasir del mayu(w)elo sobredito k'el dito Yūqūf a de rrekirir al sobre-
16. Šito Muḥammad i dar espaçi(y)o en ello; lo ku(w)al l'enpeña kon la dita karta de g(a)raçi(y)a
17. ... todas sus kondici(y)ones, las ku(w)ales atorga Yūqūf el sobredito
18. ... warto o ḥarram k'en el dito mayu(w)elo (y)abra;
19. [feyto fu] (w)e akesto, di(y)a de aljumu' a el segundo di(y)a del mes de janero
20. ... çagnera del mes de Ramadān en el año de 882
21. ... almaqīth (14)78.
22. Testemoños de lo sobrecito ÑIce el K(a)rabero, bezino morador en el lugar de Nobayas,
23. ÑIce el Kubi(y)ello, bezino morador en el lugar de Tortoles.

14. (y)asimesmo, Hoenerbach: (y)aši ši(y)a (p. 279).
16. dar espaçi(y)o, Hoenerbach: a de dar dispošisi(y)on (p. 280).
18. ... warto o ḥarram, Hoenerbach: ku(w)anto ot(a)raš k'en el (p. 280).
20. çagnera, Hoenerbach suggests: [la dezena] sagera, (p. 277)
The year 882 is written with Arabic letters, which also possess a numerical value: ٨٨٢.
21. almaqīth, 'The Messian', and therefore the Christian calendar. The year is again in Arabic letters: ٨٢٧, ٨٠, ٨٠, ٨٠, ٨٠.
22-23. bezino, Hoenerbach reads Yerno both times (p. 280).
Manuscript B.N.5073/7

This is a document from Agreda, dated 1482, establishing a joint practice between Ahmad, the veterinary surgeon and Yusuf the blacksmith.

The hand is larger and more decisive than that of B.N.5073/6, but the folios are still covered with a fine white flaky substance. There are two folios: 1r, v, and 2r are in aljamiado, 2v is in Arabic, and is an affirmation by the scribe, Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad Qalbī that he drafted the document at the request of both parties and by decree of Don Ferrandoh.

The text has been transcribed by Hoenerbach, op.cit., pp. 318-325, plates LXVII-LXX.
1. Faze testimoni(y)o sobre si mismo Ahinad AlbeYtar
2. a los testimoni(y)os de akesta karta en su
3. sanidat i(y)en su pasadero feyto kon ke ello
4. a rrçebido de Yüçuf el Ferreroh ent(a)ranbos
5. bezinos de akesta moreri(y)a de Agrița, es
6. a saber, todo o ku(w)alki(y)ere debdo ke el sobredito
7. Yüçuf le fu(w)ese tebido (sic) de dar o de pagar
8. de todo debdo k'el dito Yüçuf fu(w)ese debido a el
9. pagar de p(i)ri(y)estamo o de bendida o datiba ke fu(w)e-
10. se kont(a)ra el por ku(w)alki(y)ere kasø e rrazon o por
11. la aparçeri(y)a akella ke fu(w)e entr'ellos en la
12. obra del àsśinaύa de la ferreri(y)a komo de otras .
13. kosas akellas ke fu(w)eron konposadas ent(e)-
14. r'ellos por ti(y)enpos signados en(e)r'ellos,
15. i (y)asimesmo en l'asinaύa del albeyeti(y)a i de
16. akello abi(y)endo bi(y)en kontado todas las espe-
17. nsas ke en lá dita aparçeri(y)a fizi[y]eron del log(e)ro
18. de ti(y)enda i de fi(y)erro i de ..... de otras
19. ku(w)aleskι(y)ere ........ ent(a)ranbos

1. Proper names are not fully vowelled in this manuscript,
   Ahmd, Yüçf(v. line 4 et passim).
12. obra del àsśinaύa, Hoenerbach reads orrrada alscarýa, (p.522).
   If our reading is correct, it is tautological, since
   àssinaύa means 'work'.

Fol. lv

1. fizi(y)eron en el ti(y)enpo de lur aparçeri(y)a i (y)asi
2. kontaron bi(y)en i suso de bi(y)en i bi(y)en kunp(i)lidament siski(y)ere por el kaballo akel, ke por el
3. ment siski(y)ere por el kaballo akel, ke por el
4. p(e)leyte(y)o en la kort de los alkaldes de ake-
5. sta billa de AgrIț, i (y)en la kort del kabildo; aidan
6. kontaron por la mu(w)ert de una baka ke se diz(y)a
7. ke abi(y)e mu(w)erto en akeste billa de AgrIț sis-
8. ki(y)ere las bali(y)as de akellas komo sus esti-
9. maçi(y)ones i despensas de akellas
10. komo de otras ku(w)aleski(y)ere kosas ke an
11. se'ido feytas en akesti dito ti(y)enpo de lur
12. aparçeri(y)a ke todo bi(y)en e kunp(i)lidament atorga;
13. i kon ese el dito AhmAd Albeytar aberlo rrreezevido
14. del dito Yūçuf el Ferrero, sin g(o)roseri(y)a alguna
15. ni mal kontado; i (y)asimesmo atorga i konoce el dito
16. Yūçuf el Ferreroh kon ke el a rrreezevido del dito
17. AhmAd Albeytar todo lo ke a el fu(w)ese konbenido de todas
18. las kosas ... de aparçeri(y)a komo de
19. otros debdo[s]... ke pudi(y)e-

4. p(e)leyte(y)o: Hoenerbach reads p(e)leyte yo (p.322). Yo is out of place in a legal document, written in the third person.
16. dito: the text reads dido (scribal error).
1. sen seyer feytos en la dita art komo de
2. otras kosas despensas ke ent(e)r'ellos
3. fu(w)esen feytas fasta la p(e)resent jorrnada;
4. no finka ent(e)re los sobreditos Ahmäd i Yüçuf
5. daki(y)a la p(e)resent jorrnada finkami(y)endo de de-
6. reytaje ni allegaçi(y)on ni dubda de demandah ni rrre-
7. skolgami(y)ento de jura, por kaso de los kasos
8. ni por kausa de las kausas; i debaten ent(e)r'ellos
9. todas las portestaçi(y)ones, tanto ku(w)anto podra...
10. rretorrnar i p(e)legar tod'ora; o ku(w)ando ke se lebantara.
11. ki(y)ere d'ellos kont(a)ra su konpañero kon ku(w)alke alle-
12. gaçi(y)on de rraison del kalandari(y)o akest
13. su lebantami(y)ento o el lebantami(y)ento de ki por el se
14. lebantara o por kaso del siya baldero, sus rrazones
15. si[y]an debatidas i sus p(u)ru(w)ebas siyan dadas por mas
16. i falsas debatidas todas sus portestaçi(y)ones,
17. i (y)otras sines de akellas. Fu(w)e akest, di(y)a el arbaça
18. a gu(w)eyt del mes de seti(y)enb(e)re en el año de ocho-
19. çi(y)entos i gu(w)eytanta i si(y)ete.
20. Testimoni(y)os fu(w)eron CAlt Qastellano i Muḥammad Said.

2. kosas, Hoenerbach: tantag (p.322).
3. jorrnada, Hoenerbach: gornada (p.322), line 5 also.
6. de demandah, Hoenerbach: de mandato (p.322), but the
de is definitely repeated.
9. Hoenerbach: p(o)roteštasi(y)oneś (p.322), line 16 also,
(p.323).
12. rraison, Hoenerbach : p(e)leito (p.322).
15. mas, Hoenerbach: mentiras (p.323); impossible on
account of its length.
This is an inventory dated 14th December 1494. It is a 'particion de bienes' between Faraj el Rubio and his wife. A sixth part of the goods goes to their son-in-law. The document is damaged and browned with age and glue, especially the first folio. This document has been transcribed for the light it sheds on possible yeismo.

The manuscript has been transcribed by Hoenerbach, op. cit., pp. 252-258, plates XLVIII-L.
1. Akesta es la partición de los bienes de
2. Faraj el Rubyo kon su muler Maryam;
3. p(ienia)ument un rabo bastonado,
4. un rabesero,
5. ian una kara de almadrag b(lanka),
6. ian un debar leyto,
7. ian ot(ara) kara de almadrag b(lanka),
8. ian una kara de 'Imabada,
9. ian ot(ara) almaLada kon liston,
10. ian unas tobayos de tres baras,
11. ian ot(ara) tobalas kasas,
12. ian una belyello de bara i med(y)a,
13. ot(ara) tobalas de dos'baras,
14. ian un tobyon kotonado
15. ian ot(oro) tobyon kotonado
16. ian un rabesero kon listos be...
17. ian un belyello
18. ian un toballon listado
19. ian un tobyon est(e)rayto kon ...
20. ian un tobyon eskakeado,
21. ian un tobyon b(lanka),
22. ian un tobyon çaf(a)ranado kon ... (ntad ... n ?)
23. ian un tobyon b(lanka),

---

1. bi(y)enes: the text reads bi(y)ene.
8. 'Imabada: presumably almadrag; line 9, however, refers to (ara) almaLada,
and there is no previous reference except in line 8.

This folio is torn down the left-hand side, and consequently there is no addition, but v. fol. lv.
1. The numerical alphabet is used for figures: 

1. The first su(w)eldos is deleted.

13. kamisa: Hoenerbach reads unas ſabanas (p. 256).
14. monjil: Hoenerbach reads ſaval (p. 256).
19. albal: Hoenerbach suggests this is alphanbal, 'floor carpet', (p. 256).
1. (Suma el seyxeno, 86 f. (?)
2. suma el ku(w)arto, 129 9
3. suman los dos terç(y)os, 345 [s. =] 21 f(olorin i medi(y)o;
4. feyto fu(w)e akesto, d(T del ahad a katorze di(y)as del
   mes de dezi(y)enbre,
5. año de nu(w)ebeq(y)entos;)
6. toma el seiseno un koset kardeno, 35
7. di(y)a del ahad al katorzeno di(y)a del mes de
dez(i)y)enbre, año
8. de nu(w)ebeq(y)entos. Fu(w)e kontenta FāTIMA
   ell Arruba
9. de lo ke a ella le bini(y)a de los dereytos de su filla
   CAyga
10. de su seiseno, i tomo para ello 86, i fu(w)e kontenta
11. d'ello i le faze albara a su yerno de akello, Faraj
    el Rrubyo.
12. Testemohos de lo sobredito Ibarehim el Rruyo
13. i Aḥmad de Faḥ.
14. Suma el seiseno, 86 8
15. suma el ku(w)arto, 130
16. suman los dos terç(y)os 6 8

1-5. These lines are crossed out, either because 'un koset
   kardeno' had been omitted, or else because the addition
   is incorrect; 345 su(w)eidos, or possibly 345s. 7d.,
   (the manuscript is very unclear) do not make 21.5 florins, if
   the Aragonese florin = 16.5 sueldos. (v. Hoenerbach p.201,
   note 1); Hoenerbach reads 346s. 7d. The correct entries
   are to be found in lines 14-16. The numerical alphabet is
   used: 3, 86; 8, (f) = 80, 345; 8, (g) = 100; probably in
   error for 345; 8, as there is a dot both above and below
   the letter; 9, 129; 9, 345; 8, 21.

6. 8, 35, 86.
10. 3, 86.
14. 3, 8.
15. 3, 130.
16. 3, 8, 346s. 8d. Hoenerbach suggests 346s. 8d.
Manuscript B.N.4908/1

Neither Guillen Robles, nor Saavedra give a date for this manuscript, but it is in fact dated 916 A.H. (A.D. 1510), and is an account of expenditure incurred in the building of a house between June 3 and July 3 of that year. There is no specific indication of provenance for the manuscript but from the names of two of the men involved in building the house: Muhammad de Hariz (Ariza?) and Monkayo el Kabir (Moncayo?) one can assume that the manuscript comes from the area of the Sierra de Moncayo or the adjoining region of Jalón. The manuscript is on rough paper, folded in two, and the script is less angular than the usual magrebi hand found in other manuscripts. It is also considerably smaller but this could be due to the size of the paper used.

This document is also part of a collection of 'papeles sueltos', and is transcribed by Hoenerbach, op.cit., pp. 203-220, plates XXXI-XXXV.
Fol. 1r

1. Alhamdu lillahi wa ḥadihi.
2. Memorya sea a mi, Muça Kalber,
3. de lo ke me ku(w) esta la kasilla
4. ke konpre de Martin Albrič;
5. p(i)riterament de konpra ochenta
6. i çinko su(w)eldos;
7. item de las paretas ke labro
8. Mumin entre las dos kasas,
9. bent su(w)eldos;
10. item konpre de F(a)rangiko Pikaceo
11. para el tejado, çinko bigatillas
12. en di(y)ez su(w)eldos;
13. item la soldada del tejado dos
14. kargos de kolas, onze su(w)eldos;
15. item dos dozzenas de palos de Pero Di(y)az,
16. di(y)ez su(w)eldos i medy;
17. item seyçintas tejas,
18. un dukaço;
19. item para la pu(w)er de la kasilla i para
20. la bentana, çinko rribyas
21. i ços curri(y)agas g(a)randes
22. de a bent dîneros;

---

2. Hoenerbach: Kalabera (p. 211).
4. Hoenerbach: konp(a)re (p. 211). There are only 2 marks above ١٠، which we read as tašdīd and sukuš. If the tašdīd is fatha, how do we account for sukuš? Also Hoenerbach: Albares, but the fatha is kasra from the line above, and there is no ِ. 
7. labro: written lavro (scribal error).
10. Hoenerbach: F(a)ransisko (p. 211).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Para la misma puerta y benta</td>
<td>S. d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Dizin(w)ebi, agujas, seys dineros;</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Para la misma puerta y benta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Cinko libras de k(a)labos, dos i meño;</td>
<td>2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Una cerraj i (y)una aldaban para la puerta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Ocho su(w)eldos;</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Seys bigas para el su(w)elo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Baso a ku(w)atro su(w)eldos;</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Konpre de Muḥammad bAbdul Malik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Un sobreportal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>En tres su(w)eldos;</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>P(a)rençipi(y)aron de labrar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>La kasika dicha lunes el ter-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Cero de jūnī muwefiqan mača l-caMARATI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Lahirati min hileli šafaričemi 916;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Mastre Farrj Arrumuh dos i meño;</td>
<td>2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Muḥammad de Hariz (e)res su(w)eldos,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Ahmed abī Ḥaṣr, mogo de Ibrāhīm de Su(w)eñas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Dos su(w)eldos</td>
<td>dos 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Bent dinero: la meryenda 6d.;</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Yo i mi mogo dos su(w)eldos.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>T(a)rayo akel di el muṣuchacho de Ibrāhīm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>El dicho di(y)ez kargas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>De agu(w)a.</td>
<td>48 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Hoenerbach: pu(w)erta, (p. 212), but there is no tamīd.  
5. kon su llabe: interlinear addition.  
14-15. Corresponding to the last ten days of the lunar month şafar, in the year 916. (This is A.D. 1510).  
16. Hoenerbach: Farrāg el ɑrubī(y)o’ (p. 212).  
24. The addition is inaccurate, and should be 49s. 8d.
Fol. 2r

1. Item de Yahya el Asgar y de unos kris-
s. d.
2. sti(y)anos dozze kargas de agu(w)a; 1
3. la meri(y)enda de pan i de gindas seys dİneros; 6
4. item martes el ku(w)atreno 10
5. del mes dicho labraron los sobre-
6. dİchos i kon ellos Ju(w)an Tornero
7. ke le di dos su(w)eldos i dos dİne-
8. ros para bino; i trayo el muchacho
9. de Ibrahîm de Du(w)eños doze kargas
10. de agu(w)a; i para la meri(y)enda
11. ku(w)atro dİneros de pan
12. i dos de gindas;
13. item (sábado) el ocheno de jûni mina l'emi
14. labro Muḥammad el dicho, Ju(w)an Tornero
15. i el moço de mastre Ju(w)an Bizkaino
16. i yo i la moça; i trayo
17. el moço de Ibrahîm de Du(w)eños el jumça.
18. antes katorze kargas de agu(w)a
19. i el sábado dicho bentiseys;
20. la meri(y)enda seys dİneros,
21. bino dos dİneros.

1. Possibly Yahya el Asgar.
5. Scribal error: the text reads lo sobredîchos, Jw not
   repeated.
13. sábado is in the margin.
15. Hoenerbach: la mosa (p.214).
21. Not all the figures are entered in the manuscript.
1. Item el domingo a núebe di(y)as S. d 4o del mes dicho labro Muḥammad el mícho
2. los dobleros i los posentamos
3. el i yo; la meryenda tres
dineros;
4. item ellunes a 10 del mes dicho
5. labro Muḥammad el dicho i Gilem i Mi(y)ego
6. Martinec i yo i la moça; page
7. a Gilem dos i(y)uno, a Mi(y)ego dos
8. su(w)eldos; t(a)rayo el moço
9. de Manuel dozze kargas
10. de agu(w)a; la meryenda seys
11. dîneros i dos dîneros
12. de bino;
13. item martes a onze del mes
dicho trebajaron Muḥammad
14. San Berbet
15. i Faraj i Aḥmad i la moça i yo;
16. la meri(y)enda seys dîneros;
17. item el arba'ca a dozze del dicho mes
18. labraron Muḥammad i Aḥmad i ČAbdallah
19. el Bu(w)eno i yo i la moça,
20. i t(a)rayo el moço i fijo de Ibrahim 8 kargas
21. agu(w)a
22. i t(a)rayo el moço i fijo de Ibrahim 8 kargas
23. agu(w)a
24. 37 8

16-17. San Berbet is probably San Bernabé, whose day falls on June 11th; it is certainly curious to find a Morisco referring to the Saints' calendar, but v. also fol. 4r, lines 14-15.
22. Hoenerbach: kargaš de agu(w)a (p.214).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. moço de Manuel una karga;</td>
<td>s. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. la meryenda seys díneros;</td>
<td>d. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. item en el mesmo di(y)a dicho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. konpre de la mujer de Pedro Di(y)aç</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. una biga en ku(w)atro su(w)eldos</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. i kinze palos seys i tres;</td>
<td>6 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. item en el mesmo di(y)a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. çinko libras de k(a)labos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. d'enkrabiyar, dos su(w)eldos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. i mediy(o); i una libra de a ku(w)arenta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ocho díneros</td>
<td>3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. item el ḥamīç t(a)rabajaron Muḥammad i Aḥmad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. i ʿAbdallah el Bu(w)eno i Ju(w)an Tornero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. i Di(y)ego Martineç i la moça i yo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. el mestre tres su(w)eldos,</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. i los peones a dos su(w)eldos,</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. i la moça i yo tres su(w)eldos</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. T(a)rayo Monkayo K. sezze kargas de agu(w)a,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. mediy(a) karga de soldaça dos i ku(w)atro,</td>
<td>2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. kini(y)entas fajas, sezze díneros</td>
<td>1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. la meri(y)enda un su(w)eldo.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>32 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fol. 3v

1. Item sábado a kinze del dicho mes
2. t(a)rabajo Muḥammad i ʿAḥmad los dichos
3. i la moça i yo; la meryenda
4. ku(w)atro díneros;
5. agu(w)a dizisi(y)ete kargas
6. del moço de Ibrahîm de
7. ṫu(w)eñas;
8. item el domingo a sezze
9. del dicho mes t(a)rabajaron
10. Muḥammad i ʿAḥmad i Monkayo K.
11. i yo i la moça; la meryenda
12. seys dîneros;
13. item lunes a once del dicho
14. mes t(a)rabajaron Muḥammad
15. i ʿAḥmad el dicho; la meryenda
16. tres dîneros;
17. agu(w)a katorze kargas
18. del moço de Ibrahîm de ṫu(w)eñas

18. There is no addition.
Fol. 4r

1. item domingo a bentitres
2. d(i)yas del d(icho) mes
3. t(a) labajo Ibr(ahim) al-Makdad,
4. i su ermano y yo i la moça;
5. i (y) el d(i)y a antes t(a) rayo
6. el moço de Ibr(ahim) de Du(w)eñas
7. dozze kargas de agu(w)a,
8. la meryenda ku(w)atro dineros;
9. item lunes el p(i) rimer d(i)y a de juni(y)o
10. labro Muḥammad de Hariz i Ḥamad i la moça i yo;
11. t(a) rayo el moço de Ibr(ahim) de Du(w)eñas
12. doze kargas de agu(w)a; la meryenda
13. ku(w)atro d(í)neros;
14. item mmartes a d(os) d(i)y as de juli(y)o
   santa Isabel
15. labro Muḥammad de Hariz la bentana; konbre
16. para ella bent agujas, si(y)ete d(í)neros
17. dos libras i metti(y)o de k(a)labos d'enkrabiyar
18. kinze d(í)neros; činko rr(í)yas a mediyo
19. i t(e) res serrafizos, si(y)ete su(w)ełdos;
20. la gorronera i (y) el k(a)labo i la hoja kinze d(í)neros.

3. Hoenerbach suggests that al-Makdad is a scribal error for Makkūr, 'the aforementioned' (p. 210).
9. juni(y)o is a scribal error for juli(y)o.
14. mmartes, scribal error.
   There is Santa Isabel de Portugal whose day is July 4th; work on the house appears to have finished, however, on July 3rd.
19. t(e) res serrafizos, Hoenerbach reads: treš šezze dineroš, but if this were the case the order would be sueldos - dineros, not vice versa. (p. 216).
20. There is no addition.
1. Item mi(y)ercoles al terçero de julyo labraron
2. Muḥammad i Aḥmad los dīchos i la moça,
3. la meryenda ku(w)atro dōneros.

2. dīchos: Hoenerbach reads sobredichos (p. 216).
Manuscript B.7.5364

We have only transcribed two marginal notes from this manuscript, both records of birth, bearing the date 1542, and the date of the sacrificial feast of Pascua de Carneros. The writing is extremely faint, and from the corrections and unusual forms used one receives the impression that the writer was not an accomplished scribe, but someone who only wrote when there was an event of some importance to record. The notes appear on folios 4r and 33v.
Fol. 4r

4. Biçmi illahi irrahmeni irrahimi.
5. De kkomo naci mi fillo Muḥammad, fillo de Zzohra;
6. ke fu(w)e a çinko de juli(y)ol del año
7. de mil i kini(y)cntos i ku(w)arenta i dos,
8. digo, 1542 del kalendariyyo de Ciça;
9. de kkomo fu(w)e pasku(w)a de karneros
10. a bintidos de febrero, digo, 22, año 1545.

Fol. 33v

8. De kkomo naci(y)o mi fillo Muḥammad a çinkko de juli(y)o año 1542, digo a çinkko juli(y)o, da juliyyo a uño
9. de mil i kini(y)e- 2 Ñ 1542 ntos i dos
10. i ku(w)arenta.

33v. 9. juli(y)o is written above the line, between çinkko and da juliyyo.
33v. 10. Not a very accomplished scribe, as can be seen from the way he places the date within kini(y)entos!
Manuscript T.13

This manuscript forms part of a codex and is number 5 in Saavedra’s description of it (Saav. 87). He describes it as follows:

“La 'respuesta del mufti de Oharan' fechada a principios de Rechab de 910 (1505) y copiada a 3 de mayo de 1563 fol. 28.”

In fact, the date appears on folio 32r. This folio also contains a brief description of the quarters of the year, which seems to be in the same hand though perhaps more hurried. We have transcribed the letter in its entirety. Essentially the text is the same as that studied by J. Cantineau.

In 1502 an edict was proclaimed banishing from Castile and Granada those Moriscos who refused to accept Christianity; many wanted to stay however, and pretended outwardly to be converts:

"Comment concilier cette attitude ambiguë avec les obligations très strictes de la loi musulmane. C'était pour eux un grave cas de conscience: ils demandèrent une consultation théologique et casuistique à un docteur musulman de la ville d'Oran. C'est une traduction du texte arabe de cette consultation que nous fournîmes dans le document en question." 3

T.13 has been published in a modernised version by P. Longás 4 and in accurate transcription by L.P. Harvey. 5 Reference will be made to the latter in the footnotes of our transcription, and any significant difference with the Aix-en-Provence manuscript will also be noted.

1. Saavedra, p. 301.
2. J. Cantineau, 'Lettre du mufti d'Oran aux musulmans d'Andalousie'. This manuscript is in Aix-en-Provence, Bibliothèque de Mejanès 1223.
5. L.P. Harvey, 'Crypto-Islam in Sixteenth-century Spain'.
1. Biqmi illahi irraḥmeni irraḥīmi.
2. [Rrespu]ḥ(w)esta ke fīzo el muftī de Buhanan
3. [sob]re ci(y)ertas demandas ke fiziyeron
4. [le des]de l'Andaluçi(y)a. A nu(w)esos ermanos, los
5. [k'e]stan enkojidós sobre sū addīn, komo
6. [el] k'esta enkojido sobre las b(a)rasas e a-
7. kellos ke les a awmentado el walarTion por
8. la çufrençi(y)a de sus p(e)resonas i sus
9. fijos en su kontentaçi(y)on, los algari-
10. bos, los çerkanos de la bezindad de su
11. annabī en la g(a)rada más alta del aljanna,
12. dezidores del camino de los antepa márös
13. bu(w)enos en kawlebar la fatiga, aunke p(e)le-
14. gan las almas a las gargantas, yo demando
15. ad Allah ke os faboreqka i os ayude
16. sobre gu(w)ardar sus deritajes,

3. Harvey: a si(y)ertas (p.171); demandas is written: داعِبُ شَهِيدٌ
10. Harvey: los serkanos de la verdad (p.171), but v. also
   p.174, line 4, where the original Arabic has
   'neighbourhood'.
12. Cantineau: erederos del camino de los antepa márös Santos,
   (p.7); Harvey thinks dezidores is a corruption of
   erederos, (p.171).
13-14. Harvey: "The Quranic allusion seems to have escaped the
   translator..." (p.171,n.19, and p.174,n.33). Qur'ān
   LXXV,26, (in Sale's translation,p.562) reads,"... where a man's soul shall come up to his throat.";
   p(e)legen translates balacat in the Arabic, (Harvey,
   p.174, line 6), v. Glossary.
14. yo demando, Harvey: y demando (p.171).
16. deritajes, Cantineau: dereitajes (p.7).
1. i ke os ponga de toda angusti(y)a ... bu(w)e
2. i de salida del ke da acçalem sobre [bo-]
3. sotros. El eskrebitor desta p[re-]
4. sente es si(y)erbo de Allah, i el me[nor]
5. de los Ahmadbî de Ùbû Jumaga almag[ri-]
6. bî de la çiwad de Woharan. Seya Allah
7. kon mi i kon bosotros, kon sustileza;
8. el demandante de bu(w)eso purefikami(y)e-
9. nto en bu(w)esa algaribeza el rrogante a-
10. da Allah ke os salbe de las t(e)rebulaçi-
11. (y)ones desta bida, i os rrebiwke el
12. di(y)a del judigi(y)o kon akellos ke Allah
13. a hecho merged de los bi(y)en abentu-
14. rados; el portante sobre bosotros
15. ke seas ob(i)ligados a mantener l'addîn
16. del aliclem. Mandareys kon ello a los

5. Harvey, p.166, discusses the variants of the muftî's name. For T.13 he reads "de los Ahmadiya de (Abu) Yamaga al-Ma(?) de la siwdad de Wahran..." (p.171); but if it is Ahmadbî, this could be read Ahmad Ben (as in the Vatican ms., Harvey p.175, line 11) or perhaps Ahmad fî, cf. fi[ de in the Aix-en-Provence ms. (Cantineau p.7); almagribî is our interpretation of almag...bi but the Arabic original gives al-Hagrawî, a North African Berber tribe, (Harvey p.166 and 175 line 11).

9. Harvey: empu(w)es algaribeza (p.172)
10. Harvey: ad Allah (p.172); Cantineau: los espantoš d' esta viça (p.7).
11. Cantineau: el rrevivcamento (p.7).
1. alegarán a la munidad de bu(w)eson hijos;
2. [bi(y)] en abenturados serán los algaribos
3. [ake]los ke adobaran sus fi(y)adas ku(w)ando
4. ...ys el afollami(y)ento por las jentes e
5. [mal] ob(a)rantes ada Allah ent(e)re los niglijen-
6. [te]s, komo el bibo ent(e)re los mu(w)ertos, i sa-
7. bed ke las idolas son una fusta labrada i
8. una pi(y)edra alada k'el rreismo es el rrei-
9. smo de Allah. N3 tomo Allah de ninguno por hijo
10. i kon el no ay iwal, pu(w)es adoraciio i sufrid
11. por su serbiçi(y)o i mantenend la's sala aunqe
12. 15 hagays ahecâando i pagad l'azake aun-
13. ke sepays acher merçedes a los pü-
14. b(e)res, i haunke la deys kon ufana, porke
15. Allah no mirara a bu(w)eson figuras, mas mirara
16. el ent(i)rinsiko de bu(w)eson koraço-

1. Harvey: (lle)garan a la edad ... (p.172). The text reads
2. alidoban ...; Cantineau: loš que llegaran a la edad se
3. Harvey: adobaran suš vidaš (p.7).
4. afollami(y)ento, Cantineau: perdicion (p.7); the text
5. teads afallami(y)ento, but this is probably a scribal
6. eror, as the sense seems to be 'destruction'.
7. Harvey: los idolash (p.172)
8. alaşa: if this is correct it could mean 'a winged idol',
9. but the Arabic jamud ('inanimate',Harvey p.172,n.22),
10. comes from جامد, jamada,'to freeze'.Could alaşa therefore
11. be a scribal error for elaga, 'helada'? There is
12. no confirmation of this hypothesis in
13. Cantineau's version:
14. de ninguno, Harvey: de ningun (p.172).
15. la's sala, Harvey: l'asala (p.172).
16. lo, Harvey: lo (p.172).
17. haunke la deys, Harvey: hau'ekte la dayš (p.172).
18. ent(i)rinsiko, Harvey: al entirinsinko (p.172).
Fol. 29v

1. nes. Debío es sobre bosotros de bañaros.
2. del k'esta bor tahurar, ha'unke sepa...
3. bañaros en la mar o en el ri(y)o i sesa...
4. ys debedados de akello pu(w)es ha[zed]
5. lo de noje por el derita(je) del di(y)a i de[r̂ru(w)e-]
6. ka denbu(w)es delittache del atahur del awa; e[s]
7. debdo el attayumum, aunke no podeys sino
8. kon mazhar kon bu(w)esas manos en las
9. paredes i si no sera posible akello, pu(w)e-
10. s lo publiko del almañhab es ke se
11. derru(w)eka el debdo del aššala, i en nin-
12. gun ti(y)enpo esta tal nō pagarlo, pu(w)es
13. le falte 'l awa i la ti(y)erra sino ke sera posible
14. a bosotros el açeñar a la ti(y)erra o a una pi(y)edra
15. de la ke kon ello se da lugar para hazer atta-

2. Harvey: del k'ešta por tahora (p.172).
5. noje, Harvey: noche (p.172).
7. attayumum, Harvey: atayammum (p.172).
10. almañhab, Harvey: almadhab (p.172).
12. nō, Harvey: no (p.172).
15. de la ke; Harvey: de lo ke (p. 172).
1. a[celñar]: the text reads añar, probably a scribal error.
2. Ibna Nahhe, Harvey: Ibna Nahā (p.172). Cantineau has: Ibnu Naji (p.8), and he explains, "Il s'agit de la Risāla sur le droit mâlikite de Abaydallah ibn Abdarrahmān ibn Abī Zayd al-Qairawānī, mort vers 996. Commentée par Abū ʿQasim ʿIsa anNāji, mort en 1426. Est-ce le même que Mohammed ibn an-Nāji, auteur de Ma‘alim al-Imān? A noter qu'il a existé une traduction espagnole de cette risāla: Ribera et Asin, Manuscrits arabs et aljamiados, p.266."(note 4); ʿaw: corruption of 'aarak, expan-
4. atayyamum, Harvey: atayammum (p.172).
7. anniyo de takbirata, Harvey: anniya de takbirat (p.172).
11. Harvey: ad Allah (p.173).
12. alqīla is probably a corruption of alqībla; Cantineau: alqībla (p.8).
13. dereytahe, a scribal error; Harvey: dereytahe (p.173).
15. ap(e)remi(y)aran, Harvey: ap(e)remi(y)aron.
1. sobre beber el bino, pu(w)es beberlo eys,
2. i no kon aniya de hazer biçi(y)o; i si ós
3. kost(e)reñeren al pu(w)erko,. pu(w)es kome[rlo]
4. eys, denegantes a el kon bu(w)esos·[kora-]
5. çones, i çertefikando su ńarremami(y)e[nto;]
6. i (y)asimesmo, si os forçaran sobre tu ...
7. kosa de ńarem; i si os kasaran kon sus
8. mujeres d'ellos, pu(w)es es pasadero por-
9. ke ellos son de los del alkiteb; i si
10. ós forçaran sobre kasarse ellos qon
11. las mujeres de bosotros, pu(w)es çerte-
12. fikad su ańarreml(y)ento, i ke soys for-
13. çaosos i ke si tubi(y)eseys fu(w)erça
14. sobre akello lo permutari(y)as; i asi-
15. mesmo si ós forçaran sobre el

---

3. Harvey: koștereñeran (p.173).
5. Harvey: ńerrememiyento (p.173).
Fol. 31r

1. ...to del logro a lo ḥarem, pu(w)es aceptor de-
2. [nega]ntes kon bu(w)esos korazones en
3. ...s wwaik rareys la kabeza de bu(w)eso algo
4. [i da]reys aṣṣadaqa el rrestante i deman-
5. [da]reys perdon ada Allah por hakello; i si
6. [o]s forçaran sobre la palabra de la desq(e)re-
7. yença i si òs sera posible el de-
8. simular, pu(w)es aceptor eys, i seyan bu(w)e-
9. sos koraçones aferrados kon la kre-
10. yença, i denegantes a lo ke ablareys for-
11. çado; i si diran ke denu(w)est(e)reys a
12. Muḥammad, denu(w)est(a)rareys amando kon
13. boluntad ke direys mal del aššayṭen o
14. de Mamad el judi(y)o; i si òs diran ke Mar-
15. yam, ke fu(w)e su mujer, pu(w)es tomarays

5. Harvey: ad Allah (p.175).

11-14. The text is very corrupt here. The Arabic original (Harvey p.177 lines 7-9) and Cantineau's text are much clearer:

"Y òs diran que ġenošteiš a Moḥammad, pues elloš le llaman Maomad, ġenoštaḍ a Maomad i tomaḍ en voluntad que ġeziš mal del aššayṭen Mamad el judío, pues en los judios ay muchoš que llaman con aquel nombre." (p.9).

Cantineau also adds, "Chez les Juifs d'Espagne, les chefs de synagogue portent le nom de Ṭāy ḫ : Ma'mad, président. Cf. aussi Jewish Encyclopaedia, article Mahamad." (p.9,n.1).

14-15. Harvey: Maryam, ke fu(w)e šu mujer, pu(w)eš tomarayš... (p.175).
1. en entinci(y)on ke fu(w)e el fijo de su ce...
2. ke se kkaso kon ella en el ti(y)enpo de Be[ni]
3. Içreil, i depu(w)es se parti(y)o ant[es de]
4. f(a)rawar kon ella; dïsoy (sic) lo Așuhalî en [el ta-
5. façir del alqur'en i si ös h[a]zen [dezir ke]
6. Ççe muri(y)o en la k(u)ruç, pu(w)es tomareys
7. en boluntad ke fu(w)e por onrrarlo, i ke Allah
8. lo ensalço en lo halto de los çi(y)elos; i to-
9. do lo ke sera t(a)rabajos sobre bosotros
10. eskrebireis a sus i adreçar ö (sic)
11. ös emos si kerra Allah, i nos haremos
12. testigos a bosotros delante de Allah
13. tâ'ala ke lo ke abeyx aberdadcî-
14. do i tomaço por señor, i l'aççalem seya
15. sobre tódöös bosotros, Amen.

1. Cantineau's text is more complete: çel fijo ce ōsu
ammi (uncle) ç'elle...(p.9).
4. Așuhalî: Cantineau writes;
"Il semble qu'ici encore le texte est altéré.
Abu Qâsim ÇAbdarrahmâñ ibn ÇAbdullah aș-Șohaylî,
né à Sohail près de Malaga en 1124, mort à Marrakech
en 1185, a écrit non un tafsir mais Attarîf wâl'-iClâm...
min 'asma'i al'aClâm." (p.9 n.2).
5. Harvey: î Şi ös diran (ke digays ke)... (p.173).
10. Harvey: adreçarlo-oș-emos (p.174); sus is probably
a scribal error for nos.
13. Harvey: tu'alla (p.174).
1. Al prengipiyo de rrjab, año de nobe\[či-]
2. (y)entos i di(y)eç a ku(w)ento del alhijra,
3. esk(i)ribi(y)o a t(e)res de mayo del año
4. [de] mil i k[i]ni(y)entos i sesenta i t(e)res;
5. [a]ççalam de Allah seya sobre todos
6. los muçlimes i muçlimas, Amen.

7. Nonbram(i)yento de los ku(w)artos del año son:
8. el ku(w)arto p(i)rimero es dende beyte i ku(w)atro
9. de março, diki(y)a beyte i ku(w)atro de juní(y)o;
10. el segundo ku(w)arto es dende beyte
11. i ku(w)atro de juní(y)o, diki(y)a beyte i ku(w)atro
12. de sete(y)enb(e)re.
Manuscript T.16

This manuscript, in the Real Academia de la Historia, is bound in a small volume together with another manuscript. The whole manuscript is inserted upside down and back to front, and it measures only 9 x 14 cm. It is written very hurriedly, with many deletions, and notes scattered here and there on the page. It would seem to have been written after the journey was actually completed, as a day by day account would not have produced so many errors in the itinerary. It is dated 976 A.H. The date is entered on Fol. 15r:

nobeçiy(entes
i setenta i seys
anos a ke naçiy(o)
nu(w)est(o)ro annabi Muhammed.

However, on Fol. 24v, we find:

nobeçiy(entes i setenta
i çinco anos a ke naçiy(o)
nu(w)est(o)ro annabi Muhammed.

In this entry the scribe has crossed out from çinco to anabi inclusive, probably realising the mistake he had made in dating the Muhammedan era from the birth of Muhammad instead of the flight from Mecca. We said in the Introduction that this was probably an escape route for Morisco refugees, but in fact the order of the journey is from Italy to Spain, and it is most probably the record of a Morisco who made the journey in search of a safe route for other refugees to take. It is certainly not always the most direct route which is taken, especially in Italy. We have not been able to locate all the towns, some of which must have been very small, or else have declined in importance since the sixteenth century. The route followed is:

K(i)ricinca  Criscinza
Padua, Paduna, Padu(y)a  Padua
Biçença  Vicenza
Peskera  Peschiera
Berona  Verona
B(e)reça, B(a)rasa, B(e)rasa, B(e)resa  Brescia
Alamaña de Beneçiy(anos
Bergamo

The Venetian border with the Holy Roman Empire, the Tirol?
Milan
(Padua, Vicenza, Verona again)
Qokay
(Bergamo again)
Ews
Kalaniga, Kalloniga
(Milan again)
Biforola
Nobara
Çudara
Surrara
Kasadad de Mon Ferrad
Kasad de Mon Ferrad
Kasad de Mon Berrad
Barseel, Parseel, Barcel
Salas
Karpona, Karbonel
Ligorni(y)a, Ligorno(y)a
Salusa, Alusa
Torsa, Torrasa
Jibaw
B(a)randiga
Setoturines
Badiyya, Badi(y)a

Turin
El Rribol
Billana
Santanb(o)ros
Sakonera, Sakoneka
San Jorge, San Soraje
Susa
Chalasa
Chumun (Here they enter France)
Can Pero
Masollas
Malin Laberta

Milano
Coccaglio
Osio
Canonica
Boffalora
Novara

Casale de Mon Ferrato
Vercelli
Salasco
Carpenetto
Livorno
Saluggia
Torrazza
Chivasso
Brandizioso
Settimo Torinese
Abbazia di Stura ('abbey' can be either abbazia or badia in Italian)
Torino
Rivoli
Avigliana
Sant' Ambrogio
San Giorgio
Susa
Chalasa
Chiomonte
San Pero
Exilles
Salbertrand
Ora Same d'Oulx
Susana Cesana
Mont Jinebro Mont Genèvre
Loponte Loponti
B(i)ri(y)anson Briançon
San Martin San Martin
Biseo ?
San K(e)respin St. Crépin
San K(i)limen St. Clément
Kastel Rros Chateauroux
Anb(o)rono Embrun
Sabino Savines
Chursus Chorges
Baberra Serre
Talarte Tallard
Sawsa La Saulce
Lakilana ?
Igalaya Eygalayes
Sedderon Sédéron
Cawt Sault
(Malarasan) Malaucène?
Balasan ?
Karpint(a)ras Carpentras
Abiñon Avignon
Amusan Domazan
Domosans Sarrians
Serri(y)an Besouce
Busas Saint Cervasy
San Jerbas Marguerittes
Margalitas ?
Limas Milhaud
Millaw Lumel Viel
Lunes el Bi(y)echo Saint-Brés
San B(e)res ?
Kolomb(e)rera Montpellier
Monpelled Fabrègues
Fabriga Loupian
Lupi(y)an ?
Lauka ?
An interesting comparison can be made between this manuscript and a similar one in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, (M.S. 774 fonds arabe, folios 37v-39). This has been studied by J.N. Lincoln, 'An Itinerary for Morisco Refugees from Sixteenth-century Spain'. The route taken is somewhat different, but they both go through the Mont Genêvre pass, and to the major Italian towns (both take a round about route to avoid Milan) with the final destination Venice (the starting-point in our manuscript). The Paris manuscript is more detailed in its hints to refugees, the Madrid manuscript constituting little more than a list.
1. K(i)rj-ginga bi billa g(a)rasa
2. Paduna i Bıçenç’a i Peskera
3. i Berona i B(e)reça falda d’Alamaña de Beneç(y)anos
4. i Bergamo, i ceta e ti(y)erra esto
5. por la falda d’Alamaña i por el estado
6. de Milan, i es del rrey Felib.
7. Padua i Bıçenç’a i Berona
8. i B(e)rasa (i Peskera)
9. i Qokay i Bergamo i Ews
10. i la Kalaniga i Milan i Biforola
11. i Nobara i Ews es
12. la postrera ti(y)erra de Beneç(y)anos;
13. i la postera ti(y)erra del rrey Felip es Nobara

1. i Çudara i Surrara
2. Çudara

4r. ti(y)erra:written
8r. i leskera is deleted.
12r. la cagera is deleted and replaced by la postrera.
Memorial del camino

1. Memoria del camino
2. el primer camino de Mon
3. Berrad (Berseel)
4. i es del duque de Mantua
5. i de allí a Barseel i es ya
6. del duque de Saboya,
7. i de allí a Salas, i de allí a Karpona
8. nel i de allí a Ligorni(y)a
9. i de allí a Salusa, i de allí a Torasa.

Memoria de lo que abemos

1. Memoria de lo que abemos
2. camino fue del camino
3. por buscar otro camino, i no lo
4. fallamos a nuevo propósito.
5. primeramente Beneçi(y)a
6. bor ....

3r. i Berseel is deleted.

4v. Under line 4 is the following: قالب
5v. This line is written sideways along the outer margin.
Fol. 3r

1. Padu(y)a i Biçença i Peskera
2. i Berona i B(e)resa i Qokay i Bergamo
3. i Ews; i fasta Ews es todo
4. por ti(y)erra de Beneçi(y)anos, i todo por
5. la falda d'Alamaña.
6. I agora dent(a)ramos en ot(a)ra ti(y)erra,
7. ke es por el estado de Milan,
8. i es ti(y)erra del rrey Felip;
9. i es la p(i)rimera ti(y)erra la Kaloniga
10. i de alli a Milan, i de alli (a Nijerola)
11. a Biforola, i de alli a Nobara;
12. i aki akaba la ti(y)erra del rrey Felip,
13. i aora dent(a)ramos en otra ti(y)erra
14. ke es del duke de Mantuyya. El p(i)rimero
15. Kasadad de Mon Ferrad, i de alli a Barseel,

10. a Nijerola: is deleted, probably written mistakenly for Biforola.
1. i en Parseel akaba el
2. dukado de Dantuyya;
3. i aora dent(a)ramos en la ti(y)erra
4. rra (sic) del duke de Saboa, ke es
5. todo por la fina Italiyya;
6. i la p(i)rimera ti(y)erra del duke de Saboyya
7. es Salas, i de alli a Karbonel,
8. i de alli a Ligorrni(y)a, i de alli a Salusa,
9. i de alli a Torrasa

4. ti(y)erra is very squashed on the preceding line; the repetition is quite probably deliberate.
Fol. 5r

1. Memori(y)a del kamino:
2. p(i)rimerament Beneçi(y)a,
3. i de alli a Kasad de Mon Ferraγ,
4. i de alli a Ligorrni(y)a,
5. i de alli a Alusa,
6. i de alli a Jibaw,
7. i de alli a B(a)randiča,
8. i de alli a Setoturines,
9. i de alli a Badiyya,
10. i de alli a Turin,
11. i de alli al Rribol,
12. i de alli a Billana.

---

Fol. 5v

1. El p(i)rinçipe de Konde es kabeça
2. de los luteranos.

1v-2v. This sentence is written sideways along the folio.
1. (i de alli a Santanb(o)ros
2. i de alli a Sakonera,
3. i de alli a San Soraje
4. i de alli a Sakoneka,
5. i de alli a Susa,)
6. Santanb(o)ros
7. Sakonera,
8. San Jorge,
9. i de alli mučli
10. i de alli a Susa,
11. i de alli a Chalasa,
12. i de alli a Chumun; i es ya ti(y)erra del rrey
13. de F(a)ranči(y)a.

1-5. These lines are deleted.
Fol. 6v

1. Mese Muse Mubant:
2. este deso la meta de la jente delante
3. te i la otra metad de çaga i tomo el
4. en medi(y)o a los itali(y)anos. Mato
dos mil d'ellos.
6. Son serton del billas
7. Çan Pero.

2. meta: error for metad
7. Çan: originally written with a ل but the dots have been deleted.
Fol. 7r

1. I de alli Esiollas e p(i)rimera ti(y)erra
2. del Dalfines, i diçese Dalfines
3. por el p(i)rimor ficho ke ti(y)ene el rre-
4. y de F(a)ranç(y)a;
5. i de alli Masu Laberta,
6. i de alli a Crs
7. Susana
8. Mont Jinebro
9. Loponte
10. B(i)ri(y)anson
11. San Martin
12. i de alli a Biseo
13. i de alli a San K(e)respin
Fol. 8r

1. i de alli a San K(i)limen
2. Kastel Rros
3. Anb(o)rono
4. Sabino
5. Chursus
6. Babserra
7. Talarte
8. Sawsa
9. i de alli Lakilana
10.
11. Baw ti(y)erra
12. Igalaya

10. La Tawsi?
Fol. 9r
1. Sedderon
2. Çawt
3. (Malarasan)
4. Balasan
5. Karpint(a)ras
6. Abiñon
7. Amusan
8. Domosans
9. Serri(y)án
10. Busas
11. San Jerbas
12. Margalitas
13. Limas

3. Malarasan is deleted
Fol. 10r

1. Millaw
2. al pu(w)ente
3. Lunes el Bi(y)echo
4. San B(e)res
5. Kolonb(e)rera
6. Monpelled
7. Fabriga
8. Lupi(y)an
9. al ostal de Lauka
10. i de alli a San Niyli
11. San Tibeli
12. Bisi(y)as
1. (Narbona)
2. Karkasona
3. Limes
4. Dises
5. i de alli al Bulu
6. i de alli a Pertus
7. Chunkera
8. Figeras
9. Jirona
10. i de alli a Astel Rrik
11. San Saloni

1. Narbona is deleted.
 Fol. 12r
1. Linas
2. La Rroka
3. (Bollu)
4. Molled

 Fol. 14r
1. El puerto de Jedda
2. El puerto de los
3. El puerto de Benas

12r, 3. Bollu is deleted.
1. Me memori(y)a (sic) del kamino ke abemos
2. andado por buskar el mechor kamino
3. para por donde fu(w)esemos mejor i mas
4. a p(a)lazer, i mas seguros kon poder de ake
5. akel (sic) ke pu(w)ede toda kosa, komo señor
6. poderoso de g(a)ran potestad i poderoso ke es.
7. B(i)rj-iuerameriue Beneçi(y)a
8. i de alli a Padu(y)a
9. Biçenza
10. Peskera
11. Berona
12. B(e)rasa
13. Qokay
14. Bergamo
15. Ews
16. (i de alli a ) i hasta Ews es todo por ti(y)erra

16. i de alli a is deleted.
1. de de (sic) Beneficianos, i esta todo por
2. la falda d'Alamaña la elta (sic), tierra de mucha
   p(o)ro-
3. bisi(y)on i abundante de toda kosa,
4. i muy farta i basta de toda kosa;
5. i depu(w)es dent(a)ramos en otra ti(y)erra,
6. ke es po: el estado de Milan, i es
7. ti(y)erra del rrey Felip,
8. i es la p(i)rimera. ti(y)erra la Kaloniga,
9. i de alli a Milan,
10. Biforola
11. Nétara,
12. i alli se akaba la ti(y)erra del rrey Felip;
13. i depu(w)es dent(a)ramos en otra ti(y)erra
14. ke es del duke de Mantu(y)a i esta esta
15. ti(y)erra en lo mechor de la Itali(y)a, ti(y)erra
   muy bon-
16. dosa de p(o)robisi(y)on.

---

16. bondadosa: d.de.s. sa is spread right across the page,
   and the fatha is missing entirely.
1. i es del p(i)rimer lugar Barçel
2. i de alli a Salas
3. Karbonel
4. Ligorrni(y)a;
5. i aki se akabe la ti(y)erra del duke de
7. I agora dent(a)ramos a la ti(y)erra del duke
8. de Saboya, i el p(i)rimer lugar del duke
9. de Saboya es a Salusa,
10. i de alli a Torasa,
11. i de alli a Jibaw,
12. i de alli a B(a)randiça,
13. i de alli a Setoturines,
14. i de alli a Badi(y)a,
15. i de alli a Turin.
Fol. 24r
1. I esta ti(y)erra del duke de Saboya
2. esta parte d'ella dent(o)ro en
3. la Itali(y)a i la otra parte todo es
4. Pi(y)amonte i es ti(y)erra muy bondosa
5. de toda p(o)robisi(y)on, ke se pu(w)eda deman-
6. dar de ku(w)alki(y)era naturaleza de p(o)ro-
7. bisi(y)on i de toda kosa konbenible para
8. el sostentami(y)ento de la persona.

Fol. 24v
1. Yo tome ñanse su(w)el
2. i al pu(w)erto de los
3. del Bulu
4. i de alli Archilles

Fol. 24v.: These lines are merely scribblings over the page.

Although we have not analysed this manuscript in detail, except insofar as it shows unvoicing of \( \text{\textipa{\textit{i}}} \), it is nevertheless interesting to note some of its salient features. Firstly, there are relatively few intercalations, e.g. otro, postrero. In addition the scribe makes little use of fricative \( \text{\textipa{f}} \), \( \text{\textipa{\textit{z}}} \), while using both \( \text{\textipa{q}} \), \( \text{\textipa{\textit{q}}} \), and \( \text{\textipa{k}} \), \( \text{\textipa{\textit{k}}} \), and occasionally confusing \( \text{\textipa{p}} \), \( \text{\textipa{b}} \), and \( \text{\textipa{\textit{b}}} \).
Saavedra describes this manuscript as a "magnífico códice encuadernado a la europea". It is a morisco devotionary, written by Muhammad Cordilero for Mustafir Waharan, 7 Jumed II, 985 A.H. (22 August 1577). The pagination of the manuscript is curious. There is a detailed index at the beginning with folios numbered as far as 322. The folios are numbered in sequence up to 250, after which there are only five more: 251, where a new section begins on prayers for the dead, 252 (unmarked) then two folios loose with the inner pages taken up by two elaborate designs, and marked 320, 321: 320r appears to be a continuation of 252. 321v is blank and is followed by a folio which contains the date of the manuscript. This is unmarked and we have numbered it 253 but it could possibly be 322, the last number given in the index. Although the decorated folios are loose, there is in fact no indication of others missing. The folios we have transcribed are as follows: 247v-253r, including the mysterious 320r, which is in fact only a few lines.

1. "I bibiras rreposaño i no perñeras tu justići(y)a, ye hijo
2. te Edam. La mu(w)erte es kamino i todos lo an s(e
3. kaminar. La mu(w)erte es pu(w)erta i todos an s(e pasar
4. por ella. La mu(w)erte es amarga i todos l'an s(e
gustar,
5. ye hijo s(e Edam. No te rreposes en este mundo
6. ke no as s(e morar en el; si(y)enp(e)re t(a)rabaja para
7. el ot(o)ro mundo, ke mañana seras en el, ye hijo s(e
Edam.
8. ¿Komo te ag(a)rada este mundo kon kallor i f(i)ri(y)o
i t(a)ra-
9. bajo i hanb(e)re i señ i pobrezza, ye hijo s(e Edam?
10. ¿Komo olbidas el ot(o)ro mundo, k'es s(e p(a)lazzer i
rrikeza,
11. i hu(w)elgo durable i biça sin fin, ye hijo de Edam?
12. Si fu(w)ese tu algo el mundo no te hartari(y)a, i
hartar-
13. te a, o b(a)raçaña s(e ti(y)erra, ye hijo s(e Edam.
14. Si bibi(y)eses mil años, no te hartari(y)as, i al fin
abri(y)as
15. s(e morir, i qu(w)ando bini(y)ese la mu(w)erte no la
kerri(y)as ber,
16. ye hijo s(e Edam. Haz bi(y)en, k'es la llabe s(èl
17. aljanna, i warnate s(e hazzer mal, k'es la llabe s(e
jahannam,
18. ye hijo s(e Edam. Todo lo ke añefikaras

10. rrikeza is written ﴾َرِكِيْزَأ﴿, arrikeza, which shows
that ﴾َرِكْي﴾ had become a traditional graphy, even in
Romance words; v. Harvey, Literary Culture, Appendix,
p.25.
1. se a de kaer i todo lo ke lebantaras se a de Terribar, i todo
2. lo ke ti(y)enes se a de perder sino el bi(y)en ke haras,
3. ye hijo de Edam. Abre tus ojos i para mi(y)ent(e)res
4. ke tu karrne es para el t(a)rabajar, i tu kara para las
5. berwenças, i tu alma para la pena, si olbiças al
   k(i)ri(y)añor,
6. i tu algo para tus erederos i la ku(w)enta d'ella para ti,
7. i el p(o)robecho para ellos i la rrepintenci(y)a para ti,
   porke
8. no te skonpañara en tu fu(w)esa sino tu obra, ye hijo de
   Edam.
9. Si mala konpañi(y)a llebaras, mala konpañi(y)a terrnas,
10. ye hijo de Edam. Ku(w)entate antes ke te
11. espi(y)ertes i llora tus pekaños antes ke te ke-
12. men en jahannam, ye hijo de Edam. Aborrege el mundo
13. i aborre ke ell algo i salbart'as del fu(w)ego de jahannam,
14. ye hijo de Edam. Nonb(a)rame en la ti(y)erra i nonb(a)rat'e,
15. i seras nonb(a)rado en el ci(y)elo. No me olbiças, ke si me
16. olbiças, tu bi(y)en olbiçaras, ye hijo de Edam.
17. Nonb(a)rame mucho en bi(y)en i seras mi bezino en mi kasa,
18. ye hijo de Edam. Kunp(e)le mis mandami(y)entos
Fol. 248v

1. i apartate de lo ḥarem, i kontentate kon lo ke te doy, 
2. i sey akontentante a la mu(w)erte, i seran mis g(a)raçi(y)as 
3. kontigo, ye hijo de Edam. Ki(y)en pekara rreyendo, 
4. ponerlo e en el fu(w)ego llorando, i ki(y)en me serbira llorando, 
5. ponerlo e en el aljanna rreyendo, ye hijo de Edam. 
6. Pi(y)ensa en mi serbiçi(y)o, i yo pensare en tu arrizke 
7. i walarジョン, ye hijo de Edam. ¿Komo ki(y)eres 
8. segar lo ke no senb(a)raste, i gozar de lo ke no ganaste, 
9. i tomar pago de lo ke no hiziste, ye hijo de Edam? 
10. Ki(y)en sabe ke naçi(y)o para morir, ¿komo se pu(w)ede aleg(a)rar 
11. para bebir? I ki(y)en sabe ke a de morir, ¿komo pu(w)ede llorar 
12. al ke mu(w)ere? I ki(y)en sabe ke kosa es la fu(w)esa, 
13. ¿komo se pu(w)ede aleg(a)rar? I ki(y)en sabe k'es jahannam 
14. ¿komo se pu(w)ede rreir? I ki(y)en sabe ke lo an de komer 
15. los gusanos, ¿komo pu(w)ede engordar? I ki(y)en sabe 
16. ke su algo a de ḥexar a ot(i)ri, ¿komo pu(w)ede t(a)rabajar? 
17. I el ke sabe ke no haran bi(y)en por su alma, ¿komo 
18. dexa lo suyo sin hazzer bi(y)en por ella? I si tu no hazzes
Fol. 249r

1. por tu alma, ¿como hara ot(i)ri por ella, ye hijo de Edam?
2. De la ti(y)erra te hizze i a la ti(y)erra te tornare, i d'ella te sakare bestito
3. kon tu obra, ye hijo de Edam. Suf(e)re la sober-
4. berbi(y)a (sic), i suf(e)re la sinrrazon i suf(e)re mi serbiçi(y)o i abras
5. mi walarton, ye hijo de Edam. Ku(w)ando ki(y)ero
6. bi(y)en a mi si(y)erbo, rrep(e)rebolo, i enbi(y)ole te sus pekađos
7. i maliçyas, ye hijo de Edam. A ti es el obrar,
8. i a mi es las esk(i)ribturas te mis almalakes onrratos,
9. k'esk(i)riben bu(w)esas obras; i a mi es el walarton,
10. ye hijo de Edam. A ti es el rrogar i a mi es
11. el oirte; i a ti es el demandar i a mi es el dar; i rru(w)ega
12. a tu señor, k'es f(a)ranko i derechero i taptiboso i oidor
13. i pertsonator." I diixo, "Rrogadme, i rresponderos e,
14. ye hijo de Edam. A ti es el t(a)rabajar i a mi es
15. el walarton sin ku(w)enta, ye hijo de Edam.
16. Si te rrepentiras, pertsonart'e, i si me ag(a)rateçeras,
17. part'e, ye hijo de Edam. A ti es el rrepenti-
18. mi(y)ento, i a mi es el rreçebir la rrepintenç(y)a,
1. Ke yo soy señor del arrapintiénte i no perdoné el pekaço.
3. Pekas; ¿por ke no te api(ado) das del ke yerra, ye hijo.
4. ¿De Elam? Yo no me ensoberbécen sobre ti; ¿por ke
5. 'tensoberbécés sobre ot(i)ri? Yo no m'ensaño ni te maldigo;
6. ¿por ke maldizzes i t'ensañás sobre ot(i)ri, ye hijo
7. ¿De Elam? Pu(ades) ke no menwa lo halel, ¿para ke
8. ki(y)eres lo harem, ye hijo de Elam? ¿Por ke te
9. ensañás qu(ando) no te doy lo ki(y)eres i yo no m'ensaño.
10. qu(ando) no me sirbes? Te soy para ke te rripi(y)entas,
11. ye hijo de Elam. Yo hizze las kosas para tu
12. sirbi(y)o, i hizze a ti para el mi(y)o; pu(w)es sirbime
13. en bi(y)en i no fi(y)es sino te mi, porque no te pu(w)ede
14. salbar sino yo, ye hijo de Elam. T(a)rabaja para mi,
15. i pespu(w)es sera la gananci(y)a g(a)rande para ti, porque
16. por una alhaçana t'eski(y)ibo ti(y)ez, i por un pekaço
17. no t'eski(y)ibo sino uno, i aun t'espero si te rrepens-
18. tiras, ye hijo de Elam. Yo no ki(y)ero sino mi derecho
1. ¿por ke ki(y)eres mas del derecho d'el, ye hijo de Edam?
2. Naçiste desnudo, i yo te besti; naçiste pobre, i dite
3. algos; naçiste chiko, i hizzete g(a)rande; naçiste ci(y)ego,
4. i alunb(e)rete; pu(w)es sey a mi komo soy a ti,
5. ye hijo de Edam. Pekas, i dite hogar; olbitasme i
dexasme,
6. i no te ñesmanpare, i baste i apartaste de mi, i espero
ke te
7. tornes a mi, ye hijo de Edam. Ap(e)lega a los tuyos,
8. i haz bi(y)en a los werfanos i mesterosos, i besita los
9. enfermos, i enpara a los algaribos, i no tornnes a los
10. ñantes, i onrra a los alfaqi(y)es, ke yo no te ñenudare
11. a ti, ye hijo de Edam. Sey f(a)ranko, ke la f(a)ran-
12. kezza es un arbol ke kub(e)ren sus rramos
13. a los del aljanna, i no seas eskaso, ke la eskasezza
14. es un arbol en chahannam k'ençendera a todo eskaso,
15. ye hijo de Edam. No seas hablator, porke todo
16. hablator es denostato, i no seas mint(o)roso, ke la
17. mentira gi(y)a a las maldaztes, i las maldaztes gi(y)an
18. al fu(w)ego. Sey berañero, porke la berañ gi(y)a

12. References to the tree of Paradise are to be found in
'El otro mundo en la literatura aljamiado morisca',
by M. Manzanares de Cirre, pp. 602,607.
Fol. 250v

1. a la onrra i es mas fu(w)ertę k'el gu(w)eso; i la onrra gi(y)a
2. all aljanna, ye hijo Ḟe Eṯam. Si no personas a ki(y)en
3. te yerra, ¿komo ki(y)eres ke te perṪone a ti? I Ḟa pasaña
4. Ḟe ki(y)en te injurya, i no maldigas a sin rrazzon; ke
5. sobre ti torrnara la maldicį(y)on; i no maldigas kon rrazzon
6. ke pi(y)erći es el walarći, ye hijo Ḟe Eṯam.
7. No p(a)ratikes kon los malos, ke en ellos hallaras mala
8. p(a)ratika; p(a)ratika kon los bu(w)enos, i seras kontaño
9. Ḟ'ellos, ye hijo Ḟe Eṯam. Ḟa lo tuyo a ki(y)en te
10. bi(y)eda lo suyo, i haz bi(y)en a ki(y)en te hazze mal,
i no hagas
11. mal a nađi. Ap(e)lega a ki(y)en se te aparta, i habla a ki(y)en
12. no te habla, i di bi(y)en Ḟe ki(y)en dizze mal de ti, ke si
13. tal hazzes komo el, tal eres tu komo el;
14. ke ki(y)en no hazze mas ke ot(o)ro no bale mas ke ot(o)ro;
15. i haz bi(y)en a las jentes, i warคำถาม Ḟ'ellas komo
16. Ḟe biripas i Ḟe kulebras, ye hijo Ḟe Eṯam.
17. PerṪonaos, i perṪonaros e; amaos, i amaros e; ap(e)le-
18. gaos, i ap(e)legaros e; i sokorreos, i sokorreros e.
Fol. 251r

1. I no 'ma-lyces ent(e)re bosot(o)ros ni enk(i)lines
2. el mal, sino tornarse a mi saña sobre bosot-
3. t(o)ros. Aberr berwença los chikos
4. a los g(a)randes i api(y)añar los g(a)randes
5. a los chikos; i kunp(i)lir los pesos
6. i mesuras. Hazzeñ bi(y)en a bu(w)est(a)ras mujeres,
7. no menoskabes a las jentes sus kosas,
8. i sereis bi(y)en abenturados en este mundo
9. i en el ot(o)ro." Aki hazzen fin wa alhamdu lillahi, rabb al c elamīn.

11. Lo ke bino en l'aleya ṭel alkurṣī ṣe su
12. walarṭon. Fu(w)e rrekonto por ell annabi Muḥammad,
13. šalla Allahu ẓalayhi wa ẓallam, k'el dīxu, "Qu(w)ando
14. leira el k(e)reyente ell alea ṭel alkurṣī,
15. i harra ṭonaç(y)on ẓe su walarṭon ẓ'ella a los mu(w)ertos,
16. porrna Allah, noble es i onrrato, en kasta fu(w)esa
17. ẓe sali(y)ente i poni(y)ente qu(w)arenta k(a)lareṭaṭes

9. No vocalisation of Arabic.
13. No vocalisation of Arabic.
14. Scribal error: alea for aleya, written یلا
1. i ensanchara sobr'ellos sus sityaras (sobra)
2. i De Allah al lecidor walaqdon se setenta annabies,
3. i enxalça Allah a el por kađa mu(w)erto çi(y)en
4. g(a)razas; i esk(i)ribe Allah por kađa mu(w)erto
5. ñi(y)ez alhaçanas, i halcqa Allah a el por kađa
6. alharfe un almolake ke ataqbiñen por el
7. hasta el di(y)a ñel juiçyo; i sabi ke
8. en kađa alharfe ñesta aleya ay mil
9. alhaçanas e mil bendici(y)ones, i mil
10. arrahmas, wa alhamdu lillahi rabb alcelamin."
11. Rrequ(w)entase ke ñixo ell annabí Muhammad, ñalla .
12. Allahu Calayhi wa callam, "Ki(y)en leira ell aleya ñel
13. alkurçi, k'ës: 'wa ilahukumu', k'ës
14. hasta ño ñizze: 'ñelidín', no cesara ñe ser ñe Allah
15. warçado en akella noche ke la leira hasta
16. la mañana, i no se le açerkara ell aššayten."
17. I ñixo mas, "Ki(y)en leira: 'taberaka allañí
18. biyadihi ilmulku' perkurara por el en su

1. sobra is deleted.
10. Ño vocalisation of Arabic.
1. fa(w)esa"; mas dixo ell annabī Muḥammad, ṣalla
2. Allahu ʿalayhi wa ʿallam, "Esp(i)rib(y)o Allah el alqur’ en
3. antes ke formase los ẓi(y)elos i las ti(y)erras
4. ẓi(y)ez mil años, i puso en el 'lillahi me fi
5. fī ilerdi", hasta el kabo del açūra ẓe alam
6. ʿalika", i dixo, "No se leira en kasa ninguna
7. ke no huyga el aḥṣayṭen ẓella, i ot(a)ras muchas
8. i·bu(w)enas p(o)ropiadaes ke Allah puso en ellas."
9. Fa(w)e rrekontaño por el annabī Muḥammad, ṣalla
10. wa ʿallam, ke dixo, "La noche ke subi a los ẓi(y)elos
11. biṭ luḥaš rrekolgados ṣel alcarrī, i lei en el
12. uno ẓ'ellos, i ḍezzi(y)a ke la llabe ṣel alqur' en,
13. k'es la ẓūra del alḥamdu, i en ot(o)yro lūh
14. estaba esk(i)ribto todo el alqur' en. I dīxi yo,
15. 'La ora, señor, onrra kon estas ṭos tablas a mi
16. alumma.' Dīxo Allah taʃela, 'Ye Muḥammad, yo te onrrro
17. kon ellas a ti i a tu alumma.' I yo pense de ṭemandar
18. ¿ke walarṣon ti(y)ene ki(y)en le el açūra ẓe alḥamdu?

13-14. This is a reference to the lauḥ mahfūz. "The word lauḥ means a plank, as in Qur’an 54:13, and also a tablet for writing, and mahfūz occurs but once in the Holy Qur’an and there it is mentioned in connection with the guarding of the Qur’an itself: 'Nay! it is a glorious Qur’an in a guarded tablet'.", Muhammad Ali, The Religion of Islam, (p.328).
1. pero no me fu(w)e mandaño; mas tan bi(y)en abenturaño sera
2. ki(y)en la leira. I mire depu(w)es en los luñes
3. ot(a)ra bez i biñ t(e)res luzzes en t(e)res partes
4. i ñise, 'Ya señor, ¿ke son estas k(a)lareðades?'.
5. Díxo Allah, 'Ye Muñammad, es el lugar ñel açúra ñe ya çin,
6. i el ot(o)ro el lugar ñel aleya ñel alkurçí, i el terçero
7. el lugar de quñ huwa Allah añadu'. I Díxi, 'Señorr, (sic)
8. onrra kon ellas a mi alumma'. Díxo, 'Yo te onerro a tu alumma.'
9. Despu(w)es Díxi, 'Señor, ¿ke walarñon ti(y)ene ki(y)en leira
10. l'aleya ñel alkurçí?'. Díxo Allah, 'Es la fegura ñe mi
11. señori(y)o; ki(y)en la leira una bez, mirare a el setanta
12. bezzes, i rremetyal'e setanta menesteres.' Despu(w)es
13. Díxi, 'Señor, ¿ke walarñon ti(y)ene ki(y)en lee el açúra
14. de ya çin?. Díxo, 'Ye Muñammad, es el qoraçón ñel alqur'en, i son
15. ochenta aleyas; ki(y)en la leira kañña ñi(y)a una bez abra de mi
16. ochenta pi(y)añades, beinte en este mundo, i beinte en la ora de su
17. mu(w)erte, i beinte en su fu(w)esa, i beinte el di(y)a ñel jüigyo.' I Díxi,
18. 'Ye señor, ¿ke walarñon abra ki(y)en leira quñ huwa Allah añadu?'. Díxo, 'Ye Muñammad,

4. ya: scribal error for ye.
10. Fegura: "'Face' is the term which in the Koran corresponds to persona or 'being'". (Gibb, Mohammodanism, p.37).
Fol. 320r

1. sera en mi ospeñaje i son (ochenta aleyas)
2. qu(w)atro aleyas; ki(y)en la leira kada di(y)a unawbez
3. darl'e los qu(w)at(o)ro rri(y)os nonb(a)raños en mi
4. alqur'en del aljanna".

1. ochenta aleyas is deleted.
1. Bigmi illahi irrahmeni irrahimi wa salla Allahu 'ala Muhammadin ilkarimi wa 'ala elihi.
2. Fu(w)e esk(i)ribto el p(e)rcende libro en la billa 'Exea por manos del menor
3. si(y)erbo de Allah ta'c ela i mas necesitaño i menesteroso del
4. perdon i pi(y)a'ana de su señor, Muhammad Korfilero, hijo
5. de 'Abdul 'Aziz Korfilero para Mustafir Waharan,
6. hijo de Barahen Waharan, i para ki(y)en kerra Allah despu(w)es
7. 'el. Akabose kon ayuda de Allah, i kon su g(a)raçi(y)a
8. alhamciq a si(y)ete de la luna de jumed azzeni 'el año
9. de nobeci(y)entos i ochenta i cinko 'el alhijra 'el
10. eskojido i bi(y)en abenturaciño annabi Muhammad, salla Allahu
11. 'alayhi wa callal, konkoringante kon el binticoseno de
12. agosto 'el año de mil i kini(y)entos i seta[nta] i si(y)ete
13. al konto de C'Içe, 'alayhi icçalem. Señor Allah,
   apï(y)a'na i per-
14. ñona al ke a esk(i)ribto este libro i a ki(y)en lo a hecho
15. esk(e)rebir i a ki(y)en leira en el, i lo eskuchara i obrara
16. kon lo ke ay en el, i a todes los muçlimes i muçlimas
17. jerenalmente, bi raçmatêhî amîn, ye rabb al'elamîn,
18. wa salla Allahu 'ala Muhammadin ilkarîmi wa 'ala elihi wa sahîha wa çalam taçliman.

18. No vocalisation of Arabic.
Manuscript J.30

This is another manuscript found at Almonacid de la Sierra. It is entitled El alkiteb del rogar por agua. It contains 143 written folios and 6 blank ones. The date 1597, is on the last folio. The manuscript is in very poor condition, as will be seen from the extract we have chosen for transcription. Many of the lacunae have been completed however from the copy of the manuscript J.52, dated a year later, and which is in much better condition. Variations will be indicated in the footnotes. The folios chosen for transcription are 137-143. Folios 132v - 143 have been published in a modernised version by Longás.¹

¹ Longás, op.cit., pp. 125-132.
1. ... ke ella i sobr'ella abi(y)a rropas
2. ce seçña i sobre su kabeça una korona
3. ce oro; i abi(y)a kon ella una konpñaña ce gonze-
4. llas (y)en meði(y)o del alquba abi(y)a una
5. pelrra rrelunb(a)rante, ke su k(a)laror kuñaba
6. arra por las bistas; (y)ella miraba a toða
7. ki(y)en la miraba, ke no la miraba ninguna ke
8. no pareç(y)a sino ke teni(y)a ella pu(w)estos
9. en el sus ojos; i pareç(y)oseles
10. a ellos ke ella estaba biba, i marabijose
11. Dewüd de ella kon g(a)rande marabilla;
12. Sepu(w)es ðisole, " Aqṣalemu ʿalayki,
13. ye donzella", i ðisole un bi(y)ejo ke
14. abi(y)a kon el, "Ye Dewüd, sepas ke
15. ella es mu(w)erta". I delante de ella abi(y)a
16. [un] allûh de oro, (y)abi(y)a esk(i)rito en a-

13. J.52: un bi(y)echo (571v).
1. kel allūh lo sigi(y)ente, "Yo [soy Furwata],
2. fija de Sīqṭ, i su agu(w)elo fu(w)e Ėd,
3. el antigo rrey se sali(y)ente i se poni(y)ente, i yo enseñoree lo ke ellos en-
4. te, i yo enseñoree lo ke ellos en-
5. senorearon, i mande lo ke ellos manda-
6. ron i fu(w)emos en los alqasares en
7. seguridad (y)en ellos fu(w)emos kon bi-
8. ci(y)os i kon abundançi(y)as faboregi-
9. dos, hasta ke se asento kon nosotros
10. el juzgo sel señor se todas las ko-
11. sas, i continuaron sobre nosotros
12. si(y)ete años kon nozi(y)entes,
13. ke no seballo sobre nosotros [el]
14. ci(y)elo gota se agu(w)a, i nos komimos
15. lo ke era kon nosotros de los ga[nados]
16. i se los (sic) besti(y)as i los mortezino[s]

6. J.52: alkaçeres (571v); is the correct Arabic
form, but and had the same value in Hispano-
Arabic.
16. J.52: las besti(y)as i las mortezinas (571v).
Fol. 138v

1. [ke echaban] en los femarales, hasta
2. ke se akabaron. Pu(w)es ku(w)ando bimos
3. ke se ap(e)reto el fecho sobre nosotros,
4. çerremos nu(w)est(a)ra çibdad i çerren-
5. k(i)limos nu(w)est(a)ras personas al juz-
6. go del señor de todas las kosas.
7. Pu(w)es ku(w)ando fu(w)e otro ñi(y)a, beos
8. ke salleron las gu(w)estes i las muje-
9. res i las ñonzellas i los ñurros i los
10. kabtibos i se pusi(y)eron tocos fe-
11. lante' ñe mi alqaşar, a la pu(w)erta, i ñeman-
12. [da]ron sokorro ada Allah taçela, i g(i)ritaron
13. [todo]s a una boz, kon g(a)randes g(i)ritos,
14. 'Ye, nu(w)est(o)ro señor, i nu(w)est(o)ro p(e)re-
15. [kura]Tor, tu eres akel ke no juzgas
16. [a d]e sin rrazon ni hazes ñe sin jus-

4. J.52: çi(y)udad (572r).
5. J.52: derrenk(i)limos nu(w)est(a)ras personas (572r).
6. J.52: al juzgo de Allah, el señor ... (572r).
8. J.52: sali(y)eron (572r).
1. tići(y)a. Tu no eres el ke kos-
2. t(i)ríños a la persona a ke haga más
3. de lo ke pu(w)ese; pu(w)es ¿komo hazes
4. ag(a)rabi(y)o a estos pekañores ke
5. as ñctubido de ellos la p(u)luñia si(y)ete
6. años? Pu(w)es katalos aki, paraños
7. ñelante de ti, koñiçi(y)ando lo ke es
8. en tu poder. Ye nu(w)est(o)ro señor,
9. ¿ a ku(w)anto los niños pekeños? pu(w)es
10. ellos biben de lo ke tetan de los pe-
11. chos de sus mañres; i los biejos
12. de g(a)rande ti(y)enpo, pu(w)es katalos
13. aki ke komeñ las mortezinas;
14. i los jobenes i los de medi(y)a euñaj
15. pu(w)es ellos an huñño a los montes i
16. (y)a los ñesi(y)ertos a pasar torme-

5. J. 52: p(u)luñi(y)a (572r).
1. [nta] de la mu(w)er[te] del juzgo i komen
2. las yerbas i las naçençi(y)as de la
3. ti(y)erra i paçen las yerbas komo paçen
4. los animales. Pu(w)es, ye nu(w)est(o)ro se-
5. ñor, ¿por bentura ke se a akabañ lo ke
6. es en tu poder, o an feneçido tus t(a)ra-
7. soros, o te a kitaço alguno ñe tus rre-
8. ismos o se a muñado tu alçar? Pu(w)es
9. ku(w)ando akello, beos ke bino una boz
10. ñe parte ñe Allah taçela, i les g(i)rito
11. ñizi(y)endoles, 'No se an akabañ mis
12. [t(a)ra]soros, ni me a kitaço ninguno ñe mi rre-
13. [is]mo, ni se a muñado mi alçar? antes
14. [yo] soy Allah, akel ke no ay señor
15. sino yo, ke e baleqado toças las
16. [koa]s, i yo soy feneçedor d'ellas

1. J. 52: huyendo de la mu(w)erte (572v).
1. kon la mu(w)erte; ye bedado] 1[a] de sin rrazón
2. de mi poderi(y)o ke no hago ag(a)rabi(y)o a ninguno,
3. (pero bosotros) (y)e beñado a mi persona
4. el fazer ag(a)rabi(y)o, pero yo e pú(w)esto
5. entre bosotros debeñami(y)entos
6. (y)abeys desobedeciido mi mandami(y)e-
7. nto, (y)abeys reynando en mi reisimo,
8. (y)abeys kabalgañdo en las malbestade-
9. s, (y)abeis bibido en el mundo, (y)os a-
10. beys eng(a)randegigo kon los algos,
11. (y)abeys fundado en el mundo, (y)abeys
12. olbidañdo la otra biñda. No sabeys ke yo e-
13. nbi(y)e a bosotros mi annabi i mi mensajerá
14. por ke no aya a bosotros sobre mi
15. diskulpa ni achaki(y)a el di(y)a del juiçi(y)o],
16. i lo desobeditistes i lo lanças[tes]

3. (pero bosotros) is deleted.
7. J.52:(y)abeis (573r).
1. [fu(w)era del] b[ul](w)e[st(o)ros] rreynos i be-
2. de sobre bosotros ti(y)ez espeçi(y)al-
3. mañes: la p(i)rimora, ke os ñetubi(y)es-
4. ñes del t(e)restallar, (y)es rret(a)raer
5. las tachas a las jentes, (y)el hablar mal de
6. otro en absenç(y)ia; la segunda, ell es-
7. mindar; la terçera, la enbidi(y)ia; la ku(w)at-
8. reña, ke no matasañes persona; la çin-
9. kena, ke no fizi(y)esetes azine; la se-
10. yseña, ke no bebi(y)esetes bino;
11. la setena, ke no fizi(y)esetes ñe
12. [sin] razôn a ninguno; la oçena, ke no ko-
13. [mi(y)el]esetes el logro; la nobena ke no ñe-
14. [sìk(e)re(y)esetes; la ñezena ke no
15. [minti(y)esetes i ñesobeseçistes
16. [mis man]dami(y)ientos, i ñesmintis-

5. J.52: las tajas (573r).
6. J.52: desmindar (573v); ell esmindar could also be
   read as el lesmindar, v. Glossary.
7. J.52: enpidi(y)a (573v).
11-12. J.52: no fizi(y)esedes sinrazon (573v).
Fol. 141r

1. tes mi [mensajero, i por kawsa de abe-]
2. ros at(e)rebiño sobre akes[tas] di(y)e-
3. z especi(y)aaldas (y)aber[oc]s ke-
4. brantado, e metuibo sé bosotros la p(u)lu-
5. bi(y)a; mas enpero yo ségo a bosotros
6. ke e debajo sé mi persona la sé sin
7. rrazon, (y)asimesmo la beše sé bosotros;
8. pu(w)es no hagais sé sin rrazon, ni agra-
9. bi(y)os, ye si(y)erbos, ke tosos bo-
10. sotros soys errados, sino ki(y)e-
11. n yo' lo gi(y)o; pu(w)es sémandaðme gi(y)a,
12. i gi(y)arios e, ye si(y)erbos. Todos
13. soys hanb(i)ri(y)entos sino ki(y)e[n]
14. yo le ñoy sé komer; pu(w)es sé[mandad-
15. me ke os sé sé komer, i p(o)robe[ndar-
16. os e, ye si(y)erbos. Todos [bosotros]

1. [soys desnudos, sino ki(y)en] yo lo bi-
2. [to, pu(w)e]s demandaðme a ke os bista
3. i bes[t]iros e, ye mis si(y)erbos. Bo-
4. sotros yerrays de noche i de ñi(y)a,
5. i pekays, i yo perðono a bosotros toño-
6. s los pekaðos; pu(w)es demandaðme
7. perðon i perðonaros e, ye mis si(y)e-
8. rbos. Posotros no llegays a mi nozim(y)e-
9. nto, ¿para ke me nozays? Ni llegays
10. a mi ap(o)robechami(y)ento, ¿para ke me ap(o)ro-
11. bechays, ye mis si(y)erbos? Si [los
12. p(i)ri]meros de bosotros i los pos-
13. [t(e)re]ros i las personas de bosotros
14. [i los] aljinnes fu(w)esen todos ajun-
15. [tados] en una ti(y)erra i todos me ñeman-
16. [dasen i] me ñemandase kaña uno d'ellos

4. J.52: yerrais (574r).
5. J.52: pekaïs (574r).
8. J.52: llegais (574r).
10. J.52: ap(o)robeiami(y)ento (574r).
1. lo ke me [demandasen todos dari(y)s]
2. a kaña u[no] d'e[l]los su d[e]manda i no m[on]gu(w)a-
3. ri(y)a akello ninguna kosa de [lo kē e]s
4. en mi po'der, ye mis si(y)erbos.
5. Pu(w)est(a)ras obras, yo las esk(i)ribo
6. a bosotros, i ṭepu(w)es os ṭare gu(w)alar-
7. ṭon por ellas. Pu(w)es ki(y)en hallara ke
8. abra obraço bu(w)enas obras, pu(w)es
9. ṭe las loores ada Allah por ello; i si
10. hallara ke abra obraço otro fu(w)eras
11. ṭe akello, pu(w)es no rri(y)ebte sino
12. a su persona.' Pu(w)es ku(w)an[do]
13. akello, açoobaron las jentes su[s]
14. intinci(y)ones, lu(w)ego en akella [ora]
15. (y)arrepinti(y)eronse ṭe toðos [sus]
16. pekaños i ṭi(y)eron ada Allah

1. [fe (y)omenache ke ellos no keb(a)rantari(y)an ja] mas
2. [ninguna de las di(y)ez egbe[çi](y)alδα-
3. de[œ. E]nbio Allah sobr'ellos la p(u)lubi(y)a
4. lu(w)ego en akella ora, i naçi(y)eron las
5. yerbas i las pastores i salli(y)eron
6. las ortalizas i las berðuras δe
7. la ti(y)erra, i bibi(y)eron δe las yerbas
8. i δe las naçenci(y)as lo ke kiso Allah
9. hata ke se akabo mi p(a)lazo i mori δe han-
10. b(e)re. Depu(w)es mande ke pusi(y)esen
11. akeste allüñ δelante δe mi para ke
12. [fu(w)e]se p(e)reikaci(y)on i esenp(o)lo
13. [a las] jentes. Depu(w)es bine a este
14. [alqa]ñar, i pusi(y)eronme komo me beys
15. [por don]de la ti(y)erra es mi kama, i las pi(y)e-
16. [dras] son mi kabezera i se komen

2. J.52: las di(y)ez kosas espeçi(y)aladas (574v).
1. los gu[sanos la sustanci(y)a de mis]
2. gu(w)eso[s. Pu(w)es ki(y)en bea a mi
3. p(o)ro] kure ke no lo engañe el m[undo asi kome]
4. me engaño a mi." Salbe Al[lah nu(w)est(o)ros]
5. kora[cones i nu(w)est(o)ros higado]
6. del mal de la hamb(e)re i salbenos Allah
7. de la estiriçi(y)a i de la seka i del albale
8. por su pi(y)adad, emIn, emIn, ye rabba
9. alcelamIn. Akabose de esk(e)rebir]
10. i de sakar de carabi en rromançe el alkite-
11. b del rogar por agu(w)a, kon las lores
12. ada Allah i la bu(w)ena de su ayuda; (y)ak[elle]
13. fu(w)e di(y)a de alhamiç a ku(w)atro
14. de P alqiçdat, konkordante a ...
15. del mes de jüni(y)o del año de m[i]l i
16. ki[ni(y)entos i nobenta i si(y)et[e.]

7. estiriçi(y)a, possibly est(i)rici(y)a.
10. J.52: el alkiteb de las rrogaryas del rogar por agu(w)a kon las lores ada Allah (575v). The text finishes here.
16. The following folio is so damaged, that it is impossible to piece together, and there is no equivalent in J.52.
GLOSSARY

In compiling this glossary we have included all Spanish words of interest, and all Arabic words, as well as words of Arabic origin. Often Arabic words have been hispanised by the Moriscos, and it would therefore be difficult to separate Spanish and Arabic vocabulary into two separate lists. Where an Arabic word appears prefixed by the article, al, in the text, it is listed under al; the same procedure has been adopted with words with an agglutinated article, e.g. annabi, which will be found thus, and not under nabī.

A word should be said about the hispanised Arabic words. This is a phenomenon discussed in general terms by L. Bloomfield. He quotes examples of American immigrant German, where German prefixes and suffixes are added to English words, e.g.

"ich hoffe, Sie werden's enoyen ... ich hab' einen kalt gecatched ..." ¹

Weinreich classifies these hybrid words further, firstly those in which the stem is transferred and a derivative affix reproduced, as in fils-ig, 'filthy', and nip-ig, 'sheepish', and secondly in which the stem is indigenous and the affix is transferred, e.g. Futter-age, 'forage', "a nonce word formed, by popular etymology, after French four-age." ²

It is this latter type which is found in aljamiado, Spanish affixes being transferred to Arabic stems, e.g. harremami(y)ento from harēm. The reverse process is not found, though unusual affixes occur such as dek(a)laram(y)ento where one would expect dek(a)larağ(y)on.

Where appropriate reference has been made to occurrences of the same or similar words in other aljamiado texts and in dictionaries. The abbreviations to these are as follows:

**Dictionaries**

Alonso = M. Alonso, Enciclopedia del idioma: diccionario histórico y moderno de la lengua española

Borao = J. Borao y Clemente, Diccionario de voces aragonesas

---

1. Bloomfield, Language, p. 462
2. Weinreich, Languages in Contact, p. 52
Breve DCELC = J. Corominas, Breve diccionario crítico etimológico de la lengua castellana

DCELC = J. Corominas, Diccionario crítico etimológico de la lengua castellana

Aljamiado texts

Cantineau = J. Cantineau, 'Lettre du moufti d'Oran aux musulmans d'Andalousie'

G. de F. = A. Galán Fernández, El libro de las batallas, II

Gayangos = P. de Gayangos, 'Closario de las palabras aljamiadas y otras que se hallan en dos tratados y en algunos libros de moriscos', Memorial histórico español, V, pp. 427-449

Harvey = L.P. Harvey, 'Un manuscrito aljamiado en la biblioteca de la Universidad de Cambridge'.

Harvey 'Cambridge MS' = L.P. Harvey, 'Crypto-Islam in Sixteenth-century Spain'

Harvey 'Crypto-Islam' = L.P. Harvey, 'The Arabic Dialect of Valencia in 1595'

Klenk = U. Klenk, 'La leyenda de Yūqūf: ein Aljamiadotext, Einleitung, Text, Glossar'

Kontzi = R. Kontzi, Aljamiado Texte: Ausgabe mit einer Einleitung und Glossar, I

Lincoln = J.N. Lincoln, 'Aljamiado Prophecies'

Nykl = R. Nykl, 'A Compendium of Aljamiado Literature: Libro del rekontamiento del rrey Alisandere'

Saa. = E. Saavedra, Discurso sobre la literatura aljamiada, Apéndice II, 'Closario de las palabras árabes aljamiadas o poco conocidas que se encuentran en el discurso y en el apéndice anterior'

Sánchez = J.A. Sánchez Pérez, Partición de herencias entre los musulmanes del rito mālüqīf

Yūqūf = R. Menéndez Pidal, Poema de Yūqūf: materiales para su estudio
Other references

Steiger = A. Steiger, Contribución a la fonética del hispano-arabe y de los arabismos en el ibero-románico y el siciliano

Sale = G. Sale, The Korán

Occasional references will be given in the footnotes. (For full bibliographical details, v. Bibliography.) The references to Klenk, Kontzi, Sykl, Yúquf, and Galmés de Fuentes are to the glossaries and notes only, not to individual folio references. It must be borne in mind that in the early glossaries such as those of Gayangos and Saavedra the method of transcription often differs from that used today. e.g. ç is used instead of k, ö is used in many Arabic words instead of u, ch is used for j, etc. Similarly the German method of transcription, i.e. Klenk and Kontzi, uses g for j, s for ç and ñ for s.

Where the variants for one entry in these glossaries are numerous, this is especially the case of Kontzi's glossary, we have selected a representative number of them only. Also for the sake of brevity page references will be given thus:
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Words are grouped as far as possible according to derivation and meaning. A cross-reference will refer, where this applies, to the first word in a group. Verbs are given in the first instance in the infinitive, with other forms listed beneath, but not individually translated. A form in square brackets (mostly infinitives) does not actually occur in the text, but is merely a convenient heading. Verbs in cross-references however will be in the form they occur in the texts. Square brackets within a word indicate hypothetical additions. Nouns and adjectives and past participles are entered in the masculine singular except where the plural or feminine shows any unusual features.

Spanish alphabetical order has been followed, and Arabic h and h are grouped with h; dots not count in the order. Lists of variant forms found in other glossaries are not underlined because of the number of diacritics which need to be added; in direct quotations and prose, where the sense would be unclear, they are underlined however.
a sin v. sin

[abénir]
abini(y)emos (B.N.5319, 244r)

to agree upon
DCEL s.v. VENIR; Nykl 587; Klenk 99

to have, to receive

[aber]
abra (B.N.5223,252v)

[aber berwença]
abed berwença (B.N.5223,251r)

[aber temor]
atemor (B.N.5319, 243r)

to be respectful

to be afraid

to believe, to hold to be true
Nykl 587; Klenk 99; Kontzi100: a calque on Ar. ٥٥٥٥ gaddaqa, 188; G. de F. Ili 'bacer verdadera', 'hacer valedera alguna cosa'

abini(y)emos v. abenir

[abitar]
abitan (J.1, 215r)

to live

[ablar]
ablareys (T.13,31r)

to speak

to learn

[ab(e)rendier]
ab(e)rendello (B.N.5319, 244r)

abrendino (B.N.5319, 235v)

ap(o)robechami(y)ento

ab(o)robeje v.

acadrécho (B.N.5319, 240r)

chess
DCEL s.v. AJEDREZ; Steiger 194; O.Sp. axidriche, acedrix

[açageyar]
acageyo (B.N.5319, 232v)

to hold back, to fail
Nykl 587: 'to draw back', 'to postpone'; Kontzi 228; 'aufschieben', 'unterlassen (Gebete)';
cagero (B.N. 5073/6, 1r)

aacalem (B.N. 5319, 229v; T. 13, 31v)

aacalem (T. 13 32v)
aacalem (B.N. 5319, 229v, 230r, v)

[accalemi (B.N. 5319, 229v)

calem (B.N. 5319, 230v)

acalemu calaykum (B.N. 5319, 229v)

acalemu calayki (J. 30, 137v)

calem calaykum (B.N. 5319, 229v)

calayhi icalem (B.N. 5319, 232r, 236r, v, 238r, 239v, 242v, 243r; T. 13, 30r)

calayhi icalem (B.N. 5319, 241v; B.N. 5223, 253r)

[decir ell accalem]

dize ell accalem (B.N. 5319, 230v)

[p(e)legar ell accalem]

[p(e)lege ell accalem (B.N. 5319, 230r)

tornar ell accalem (B.N. 5319, 229v)

sobre bos ell accalem (B.N. 5319, 229v)

[decir ell accalem]

dize ell accalem (B.N. 5319, 230v)

[p(e)legar ell accalem]

[p(e)lege ell accalem (B.N. 5319, 230r)

tornar ell accalem (B.N. 5319, 229v)

last

Nykl 594; Kontzi 326; G. de F. 171

peace, greeting

Gayanpos 427: açalem, azalim; saa. 321: açalem;

Nykl 587: aç-çalâm; Kontzi 228: asalâm, assalâm etc.

peace be with you (masc.)

peace be with you (fem.)

peace be with you (masc.)

peace be with him (used after references to Muhammad)

Saa. 322: aley çalem, alehîçalem, alehîçalem,

'formula que se aplica a los profetas anteriores a Mhoma' (not so in our mss.)

peace be upon you

to give a greeting

to give a greeting

to give a greeting

Klenk 126: 'den Gross erwidern'
açañar (T.13, 29v)
açañando (T.13, 29r)
açañareys (T.13, 30r)

acer v. hazer
dogma, article of faith, the acknowledged practice of Mohammad

acunna (B.N.5319, 244v)
acunna (B.N.5319, 229v; J.1, 216r)
cunna (J.1, 3v, 5r, v)

acunna p(e)legada (B.N.5319, 229v)
Bebraryo cunni (J.1, 216v)

[acçūra] صور
acçūra de alam dalika (B.N.5223, 252r)
acçūra de alçamdu (B.N.5223, 252r)
cûra del alçamdu (B.N.5223, 252r)
acûra de ya çin (B.N.5223, 252v)

second chapter of the Qur'an
first chapter of the Qur'an which begins with the words "al Îamdu lîllah"

chapter 36 of the Qur'an
Sale 430, n.1: "The meaning of these letters is unknown... some however, from a tradition of Ibn Abbas, pretend they stand for Ya însân, i.e., 0 man. This chapter, it is said, had several other titles given it by Mohammad himself, and particularly that of The Heart of the Korân. The Mohammedans read it to dying persons in their last agony." (v. fol. 252v, line 14)
305.

 accusation, complaint

DCELC s.v. ACHACAR:
"arag. bilb., 'pretexto, causa'... 'acusación',
del. ár. sakfiya 'acusación'..."

to

Yüçuf 85; Kontzi 190,
disagrees with Menéndez Pidal's opinion that ada is a scribal error, but, v.
G. de F. 62-3. Both forms (with the exception of
B. N. 5319 243v) occur only before Allah. DCELC s.v. A:
"J. de Valdés ... To desaprueba como dialectal
de Aragón."

law, religion
Gayangos 428: adìn, addin,
addim; Saa. 321: addìn;
Nykl 588: ad-dìn; Kontzi 191:
addìn, adìn, adîn; G. de F.
117: addîn, a'ddin

soothsayer
DCELC s.v. DIOS:"...divino
'tadivinador' (Nebr.)... pero lo común ... es que
por inflijo de adivinar se
dijera adivino [adebinô, Bercaio, S.Dom., 162 ...];
Nykl 588: adebinô; Kontzi 193
to build, to construct

leader, captain
Gayangos 428: 'comisionado',
'encargado', 'apoderado'

error?
to go too far, to err
(cf. açageyar)
to err

port. "adiantado".
se adelanta (B.N. 5319, 240v)
s'adelanto (B.N. 5319, 231r) [adelantarse]
s'adelanta (B.N. 5319, 240v)
adís v. addín
doobar (B.N. 5319, 239r)
doobar (J. 30, 142r)
doobe (B.N. 5319, 240r) [doobar]
doobaran (T. 13, 29r)

dreçar (T. 13, 31v)

adúc (B.N. 5319, 229v)

adún (B.N. 5319, 240r)

aferrerrar

aferrado (T. 13, 31r)

afeytami(y)ento (B.N. 5319, 237v)

afollami(y)ento (T. 13, 29r)

Gayangos 428: 'adelantar', 'comisionar', 'dar encargo'; Nykl 588: 'to bring forward', 'to cause', 'to earn'

to prepare

to arrange?

Nykl 588: 'to bring into order', 'to adjust', 'to arrange', 'to rule'

to prepare, arrange

DCELC s.v. ADEREZAR;
G. de F. 117, 118

call

prayer

Gayangos 428; Saa. 321; Kontzi 192: addúca, addúca, adduca, etc.; G. de F. 117: a'dduca (= prayer in these references)

world

Gayangos 428; Saa. 321; Nykl 588: ad-dunya, a-dunya; Kontzi 192: addunya, addunya, aduña etc.; G. de F. 117

to grasp firmly

DCELC s.v. HIERRO: "...frecuente desde el S.XIV, casi siempre con significado náutico ..."; G. de F. 119

cosmetics

Nykl 588: afeytamento, 'adornments'; Kontzi 195: afeytamenteĩ, 'Schmuckstücke'

destruction

Nykl 589: 'destruction, damage'; afollar, Gayangos 429: 'impedir, ... anular'; Yuçuf 89-90; Klenk 100: 'Schaden anrichten'; Kontzi 196.
agora (T. 16, 23r)

agu(e)lo (J. 30, 138r)

aguja (B. N. 4908/1, 1v, 4r)

ahad (B. N. 5073/12, 2r)

ajaran(y)ento v. harem

aidan (B. N. 5073/12, 1r, v; /7, 1v)

ajami(y)a (J. 1, 4r)

[akaeçer]

akaeçido (J. 1, 5r)

akelo (B. N. 5319, 234v)

akest (B. N. 5073/7, 2r)

akesti (B. N. 5319, 244r)

akesto (B. N. 5319, 244r; B. N. 5073/12, 2r)

akest (B. N. 5073/12, 1r)

akest (B. N. 5073/7, 1v; J. 30, 142v)

akest (B. N. 5073/7, 1v)

akest (B. N. 5073/7, 1r, v)

[kobdiçi(y)ar]

akobdiçi(y)a (B. N. 5319, 244r)

kobdiçi(y)o (B. N. 5319, 243r)

[akonpanar]

akonpanara (B. N. 5223, 248r)

now
grandfather

Alonso: S. XIV al XVIII;
Kontzi 196; G. de F. 119

iron pin, peg

first (day), i.e. Sunday

Gayangos 432: alhad;
G. de F. 128

item, also

foreign, i.e. Spanish

Ar. 'ajami, 'ağamī
Saa. 323: aljamfa; Kontzi 205:
alğami, 'ağamī

to fall from, to lose

Klennk 100; aka'eser en la
yi(y)erra, 'der Sünde verfallen'

that

dem. pron.

dem. pron. masc.

dem. pron. fem.

dem. adj. masc.

dem. adj. fem.

Arag.
to covet

greed, desire

Nykł 602; Kontzi 287-8:
kobdiçi(y)a, kobdiçi(y)ar:
G. de F. 230, kobdiçi(y)a, etc.
to accompany
akontentante (B.N.5223, 248v)

kontentaçi(y)on (T.13, 28r)

akopilar (J.1, 5r)
akopilando (J.1, 4v)

kopilaçi(y)on (J.1, 5v)

aktoriad (J.1, 4v)

aku(w)esto (B.N.5319, 232v)

alabuniya (B.N.5319, 243r)

alcadeb (B.N.5319, 236v)

alcadue (B.N.5319, 236v)

alamin (B.N.5073/6, 1r)

alcar (J.30, 139v)
alcarhi (B.N.5223, 252r)

calayhi içalem v. acçaalem
calayhi iççalem v. acçaalem
calayhi wa çallam v. acçaalem

albale (J.30, 143r)

contented

DCELC s.v. CONTENTO;
Alonso: s. XVI "U. hoy an Aragón." Klenk 100: acententar
contentment

G. de F. 121: akontentaçi(y)on;
Harvey 'Crypto-Islam' 171, n.17: a calque of مرض

to compile

DCELC s.v. RECOPIlar: (1st doc. 1573, but not akopilar), copilar in Santillana; Kontzi 198; Harvey, 'Cambridge MS' 64

compilation

Harvey 'Cambridge MS' 67-68

authority

shelter

G. de F. 121

? perhaps connected with Ar. ِلا ب = beginning

punishment, torture

Gayangos 429; Saa. 321;
Kontzi 191; G. de F. 122

enemy, foe

inspector of weights and measures

the throne (of Allah)

Gayangos 429; Saa. 321;
Nykl 589; Kontzi 199

temptation, misfortune

Gayangos 429; Saa. 321;
Nykl 588: 'evil torment';
Kontzi 201; G. de F. 125:
'enfermedad', 'calamidad'
albara (B.N. 5073/12, 2r) receipt for payment

albaraka (B.N. 5319, 230r)
blessing, happiness

albediya (B.N. 5319, 235v) countryside?
albediyah (B.N. 5319, 238v) Al. بَدِيْهَة.
albediya (B.N. 5319, 235v; B.N. 5223, 251v, 252v, 320r) verse of the Qur'an

aldaban (B.N. 4908/1, 1v) Muslim lawyer or man of religion, Ar. ﻥَـٰذَر

alea v. aleya verse 236 of Chapter II of the Qur'an

aleya (B.N. 5319, 235v; B.N. 5223, 251v, 252v, 320r) Gayangos 430; Saa. 322; Nykl 590; Kontzi 212

aleya (B.N. 5223, 251r) Kontzi 203: alfaqi, alfaqi

alaya (B.N. 5223, 251r) Muslim lawyer or man of religion, Ar. ﻥَـٰذَر

aleya del alkurči (B.N. 5223, 251r, v, 252v) verse 236 of Chapter II of the Qur'an, the verse of The Chair

alfaqi (J. 1, 4r, 216v) Gayangos 430; Saa. 322; Nykl 590; Kontzi 212

alfaqi(y)es (pl.) (B.N. 5223, 250r) Kontzi 203: alfaqi, alfaqi

algaribo (T. 13, 28r, 29r) sinner

algaripes (pl.) (B.N. 5319, 235v) foreigners, strangers
algaribeza (T. 13, 28v) disgrace

1 J. K. Walsh, 'ነ-ër-q y g-ër-b en el léxico peninsular', "La primera documentación (de algarivo) es del Libro de Alexandre, c. 1519, B.A.E., LVII, p. 194a .. También en Rímado de Palacio, ... Cancionero de Baena. Todas estas documentaciones encierran el sentido de 'desgraciado, negativo, malo, negro' que caracterizan ciertos derivados de esta raíz árabe." (pp. 273-4). There is also the possibility of an association with grave. N.B. B.N. 5319 is dated 1429, so algaripes is an early dating.
algó (1) (B. N. 5319, 236r; B. N. 5223, 247v, 248r)
  algos (B. N. 5223, 250r; J. 30, 140r)
  algo (2) (T. 13, 31r)

albaçana (B. N. 5319, 230r; B. N. 5223, 249v, 251v)
  حَمْسَة

alhajja (S. N. 5319, 236v)
  لَمْحَة

alhámdu lillahi (B. N. 5319, 233r)
  أَلْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ وَحْدَهُ

alhámłč (B. N. 5223, 253r; J. 30, 143r)
  أَلْحَمْلَى (B. N. 4908/1, 1r)

alhárfce (B. N. 5223, 251v)
  كَرْف

alhijra (T. 13, 32r; B. N. 5223, 253r)
  هَجر

possessions
  Alonso, s. v. ALGO 3: S. XIII
  "En esta acep. 3ª se usó m. en pl. hasta el S. XIV";
  Klenk 101; Kontzi 204;
  G. de F. 128

money
  Sanchez, 7, n. 26: "La palabra algo se refiere al capital
  objeto de la partición de herencia." In this case, simply capital;
  (v. also kabeza); Alonso, s. v. ALGO 2:S. XII-XX.

good deed, worthy action
  Gayangos 423; Kontzi 207;
  albaçana, alhásana

pilgrimage to Mecca
  Gayangos 432: alhache
  Saa. 322: alhach; Kontzi 197:
  alhāge, alhā(k)e, alhā(k)ē

Allah be praised
  Gayangos 432; Saa. 322;
  Kontzi 207

fifth (day), i.e. Thursday
  Gayangos 432; Saa. 322;
  Kontzi 207: alhámis, alhámis;
  G. de F. 129: alhamic

letter
  Gayangos 432; Kontzi 207:
  alhárfe, alhárfe, alhárfe

the flight from Mecca; the
  start of the Muslim calendar,
  A.D. 622
  Gayangos 433: alhijra, alhixra,
  alhichra; Saa. 322: alhichra;
  Kontzi 206: alhiğra,
  alhiğ(a)ra, alhiğrata
Islam
Gayangos 433; Kontzi 211:
alisallām, alislām,
alis(a)lām; G. de F. 131

rites of the pilgrimage to Mecca
Gayangos 433: 'Intención de visitar los lugares sagrados, y la entrada en ellos con reconocimiento'; Kontzi 209:
alhijam, alihram, alihram etc.
imam, religious leader
Gayangos 433; Saa. 323;
Kontzi 210; G. de F. 132

Ar. الْجَمَاعَةٌ , community of Muslims; جَامِعٌ principal mosque
Gayangos 430; Saa. 322;
Kontzi 204-5: algama, alga'ama

heaven
Gayangos 430; Saa. 322; Nykl 590; Kontzi 205: algama, algamna(h); G. de F. 133.

notoriety?
Gayangos 430; Saa. 324; Nykl 590; Kontzi 205: algineš, algineš, alginne(§), alginni;
G. de F. 133

spirits, angels
Gayangos 430, 435: Saa. 324;
Nykl 590; Kontzi 205: algineš, algineš, alginne(§), alginni;
G. de F. 133

Friday
Gayangos 430; Saa. 322;
Kontzi 205: algumua, algumua,
algumu(§)a, algumua, gumu'a;
G. de F. 133
to reach
alkiba (B.N.5319, 238v)
the part of the mosque which points towards Mecca, and to which Muslims turn during their prayers.
Ar. مكة, qibla
Gayangos 446; Nykl 590; Kontzi 211-12: alkiba, alqibla etc.; G. de F. 135: alqibla
alqiba?
book
Gayangos 435; Saa. 323; Nykl 590; Kontzi 212: alkitiib(i), alkitiib, alqitiib
almadhab (T.13, 29v)
Islamic school of law, religion, belief
almadrak (B. N. 5073/12, 1r)
almadraq (B. N. 5073/12, 1r)
mattress for the bed, or for sitting on the floor
almag [ri]bi (T.13, 28v)
pillow, cushion
almahada (B.N.5073/12, 1r)
almahada (B.N.5073/12, 1r)
North African
almalake (B.N.5223, 249r, 251v)
angel
Saa. 323; Yûçuf 89; Kontzi 213-14: almalak, almalaqe, etc.; G. de F. 137
castle, palace
Nykl 591; Kontzi 215; G. de F. 134
dome, cupola
Gayangos 430; Kontzi 212; G. de F. 135
alqujul (B.N. 5319, 237v)

alquran (B.N. 5319, 235v, 238r)

alqu'ren (J. 1, 4r, v; T. 13, 31v; B.N. 5223, 252r, 252v, 320r)

alumma (B.N. 5223, 252r, v)

[alumb(a)rar]

alumb(e)rete (B.N. 5223, 250r)

Allahu akbar (B.N. 5319, 233r - v)

allegaci(y)on (B.N. 5073/7, 2r)

alūk (J. 30, 137v, 138r, 142v)

lūh (B.N. 5223, 252r)

lūh (B.N. 5223, 252r, v)

[amanečer]

amanečko (B.·. 5319, 231v)

anabi v. annabi

antimony
Ar. كَبْلُ حُيْبْلُ hisp. Ar. كَبْلُ حُيْبْلُ for كُبْلُ حُيْبْلُ for حُيْبْلُ ; Kontzi 212: alkoh(a)lar, alqoh(a)lar

the Qur'an
Gayangos 439

people, especially the Muslim community
Gayangos 434; Nykl 590; Kontzi 216: alumma, alunma; G. de F. 140
to give light

Allah is most great

allegation
Hoenerbach 324: 'Beweisführung'

written tablet
 Gayangos 434; Saas. 326: luh mahfut; Nykl 604: luh
to wake up

Kontzi 218

1. The long-standing discussion on the Romance or Arabic origin of the personal use of this verb, and also of anochezco is well summarised and further continued in Eugenio Coseriu's 'Arabismos o romanismos?', pp. 4-15, (1961). Coseriu favours a Romance origin for the construction, in view of its existence in Roumanian. Americo Castro, 'Sobre 'yo amanezco' y 'yo anochezco' ', (1966), disagrees, and reiterates the importance of Arabic influence.
anajwi (J. 1, 213v)

aniya v. anniyo

annabî (B. N. 5319, 236r, 242v; J. 1, 4r; T. 13, 28r, 30r; B. N. 5223, 251r, v, 252r, 253r; J. 30, 140r)

anniyâ (B. N. 5319, 236v, 241v)

anniyo (T. 13, 30r)

aniya (T. 13, 30v)

[anoječer]

anojeçço (B. N. 5319, 231v)

ansî (J. 1, 215r)

antigo (J. 30, 138r)

anubuwa (B. N. 5319, 242r)

grammar, syntax

Ar. تَجَعُّ، anajwi, ( for ٍ )

prophet, Muḥammad

(prophets)

intention

Ar. نِيْأَ، anniya

Gayangos 435; Saa. 325: enía
to go to sleep, to spend the night (see footnote on p. 313)

Kontzi 221

so, thus

G. de F. 146

ancient

Alonso: s. XIII al XVII; Kontzi 222; G. de F. 146

prophethood, the gift of prophecy


to come upon, to rush upon
Gayangos 436: 'chocar uno contra otro'; Nykl 591: 'to attack'

cauising to benefit, prosper

Nykl 592: ap(o)robechar, 'to cause to prosper', a calque on الأنَعَث، anafá'a
to take advantage of

to cause to prosper

DCELC s.v. PROVECHO: "... provechar, variante medieval minoritaria, SS. XIII-XV... "; Nykl 607: p(o)robytar

Arabic language

The forms with g could simply
be a case of using ḥ for
or else be based on
Ar. حارثة garbiyya, western,
i.e. North African Arabic;
(v. algaribo)
Saa. 322: algarabía;
G. de F. 149: arabi

fourth (day), i.e. Thursday
Gayangos 429

scribal error for allâ?

the Messenger Muḥammed
(v. annabi and arrireza)
Saa. 323; Kontzi 317: rasulu, rrasül, etc.; G. de F. 149

mercy, compassion
Gayangos 436; Nykl 592;
G. de F. 149

message
Saa. 327; Kontzi 320: risāla;
risāla; rišāla; rrisāla

food, sustenance
Gayangos 436: arrizque; Saa. 324; Nykl 592: ar-rizqi, ar-rrizke, etc.; Kontzi 225-6: 13 variants; G. de F. 151

[ap(o)robechar]
ap(o)robechaya (J.30, 141v)

[ab(o)robejar]
ab(o)robeje (B.N.5319, 244v)

[p(o)robejar]
p(o)robi(w)ej (B.N.5319, 244r)

arabi (J.30, 143r)

garabi (J.1, 5r)
garabi(y)a (J.1, 4r, v)

arba( a (B.N.5073/7, 2r; B.N.4908/1, 2v)

arra (J.30, 137v)

arraṣūl (B.N.5319, 231v, 232v, 238r)

arrahma (B.N.5223, 251v)

arrapinti(y)ente v. rrepentimi(y)ento
arrapinti(y)eronse v. rrepentimi(y)ento
arrezke v. arrizke

arricela (T.13, 30r)

arrizke (B.N.5223, 248v)

arrezke (B.N.5319, 231v)
arruh (B.N.5319, 232v)

Arrumuh (B.N.4908/1, 1v)

art (B.N.5073/7, 2r)

artikules (pl.) (J.1, 5v)

aşala v. aşala
aşıcr v. aşıcr

[asentar kon]

asento (J.30, 138r)

[asentararse]

te asentaras (B.N.5319, 234r)

asidaq (B.N.5073/12, 1v)

asi(y)erbes (B.N.5319, 235r)

asimesmo (B.N.5073/6, 1r; B.N.5073/7, 1r, T.13, 30v; J.30, 141r)

aşinaça v. aşinaça

aşıcr (B.N.5319, 242v)

aşıcr (B.N.5319, 242v)

asədaqa (T.13, 31r)

assala (T.13, 29r, v, 30r; J.1, 216r)

assala (B.N.5319, 233r, 244v; J.1, 217r)

soul, spirit

Saa. 324; Kontzi 227; G. de F. 151

proper name, the repairer?

Ar. , ra'ama, to repair

skill, Arag.

articles (pl. in -es)

to sit (in judgement)

Nykl 592: to besiege

to sit down

dowry

Gayangos 427; Saa. 321; Kontzi 229-30: aşidake, aşidaq, etc.

hair?

and, and also

poetry, verse

alms, donation

Gayangos 427; Saa. 321; Kontzi 227: asadaka, aşadaqa, etc.; G. de F. 151: aşadaqa

any one of the five obligatory Muslim prayers

Saa. 324; Nykl 592; Kontzi 200: aşala, asala, aşalla, etc.; G. de F. 154
Satan
Gayangos 437; Saa. 324; Nykl 592; Kontzi 232; G. de F. 155

work?
Ar. كتبا " sina'a, craft, industry

to praise God, from
Ar. كتبا, taβbih, praise of the Lord

Kontzi 79, for hispanised
Arabic verbs; Gayangos 448:
taβbiha, taβbihar; Saa. 324:
taβbiha, 327 taβbihar;
Klenk 130; Kontzi 236:
taβbiha, attaβbiha;
G. de F. 156

ritual ablution
Gayangos 447: tahara; Saa. 324;
Kontzi 235: atahur, atahur, atahur, etc.

to carry out atahur
Kontzi 79, for hispanised
Arabic verbs; Gayangos 447:
taharase, tahorarse;
Kontzi 235: taγgarar, taγgarar, tāhara, tahrara, etc.; G. de F. 276:
taharase

attractive?

to grant
Cat. atorgar, O. Arab. aitorgar
Nykł 593; Kontzi 237;
G. de F. 157

rubbing with powder, sand or earth, as a substitute for wado, washing of the hands, when water is not available
Gayangos 437; Kontzi 237

I take refuge with God
although
awa (T.13, 29v)

[awmentar]

awmentado (T.13, 28r)

azake (T.13, 29r)

azine (J.30, 140v)

water

Nykl 593: awa, awwa, agu(ww)a; Kontzi 238; G. de F. 153

to increase

Poor-rates tithe

Gayangos 437: azaque, azaqui; Saa. 324; Kontzi 239: azaka, azakā

adultery, fornication

Gayangos 435; Saa. 324; G. de F. 159

B.

balabra (B.N.5319, 229v)

baldero (B.N.5073/7, 2r)

bal(a)di(y)o (J.1, 214v)

cal(a)di(y)o (J.1, 216r)

bali(y)a (B.N.5073/7, 1v)

boso (B.N.4908/1, 1v)

paso (J.1, 214v)

bastonado (B.N.5073/12, 1r)

bbebi (B.N.5319, 231r)

bebir (1) (B.N.5319, 237v)

bebí(y)esedas (J.30, 140v)

bebir (2) (B.N.5223, 248v)

bebraryo (J.1, 216v)

v. also açcunna

beli(y)ello (B.N.5073/12, 1r)

word

Nykl 593: 'vain', 'evil'

worthless, vain

Nykl 593: balderi(y)a, 'evil deed'. There is a possible confusion with baladf.

value?

ground, lower (floor)

low, humble

rolled (of cloth)

chapter?

from Ar. باب, bab

to drink

Arag. retention of -d-

to live

compendium

small veil

Arag.
[bendecir]
bendijo (B.N.5319, 236v)
bendiso (B.N.5319, 241v)

Be[ni] içreil (T.13, 31v)

beno (B.N.5319, 237v)
bent (B.N.4908/1, 1r, 1v, 4r)
bentiseys (B.N.4908/1, 2r)
bentitres (B.N.4908/1, 4r)
beyte (T.13, 32r)

bintidos (B.N.5364, 4r)
bintidobseno (B.N.5223, 253r)

bentosa (B.N.5319, 237v)
beon (J.1, 214r)

[ber]
bić (B.N.5223, 252r, v)

[berdonar]
berdones (B.N.5319, 232r)
berdurable (J.1, 216v)
berga (B.N.5073/12, 1v)
bermella (B.N.5073/12, 1v)

berwença (B.N.5223, 248r, 251r)
v. also aber

[besitar]
besita (B.N.5223, 250r)

baskador (J.1, 214r)
beyer (B.N.5319, 230v)
beye (B.N.5319, 239v, 242r)

to bless
the Children of Israel
Saa. 324: Beni İçreil
poison?
twenty, Arag.
G. de F. 165: vente
twenty-six
twenty-three
twenty
Klenk 104; G. de F. 167: veyte
twenty-two
twenty-second
Yúquf 150: vinte, vintiocho;
Kontzi 244: binte, hinti i
t(e)rešeno
cupping-glass
labourer
to see
to pardon, to forgive
lasting
border, edge
red, ruby
Arag.
respect
Nykl 593
to visit
fisherman
to see
beys (pl. (B.N.5223, 252v)

by rahmatih amin ya rabb al[-c elamín (B.N.5223, 253r)

by (y)adad v. pi (y)adad

bici(y)o (J.1, 215r, v, 216r; J.30, 138r)

bici(y)l (J.1, 253r, 254r)

by(ad)h (B.N.5223, 250v)

bintidos v. bent

bintidoseno v. bent

by(y)ojo (B.N.5319, 241r)

by(y)oletador (J.1, 215r)

biripa (B.N.5223, 250v)

bito (J.1, 215r)

b(a)lasf(e)lemi(y)ador (J.1, 215r)

[b(a)raçar]

b(a)raçado (B.N.5223, 247v)

b(e)magya v. [pegar]

b(e)renga (B.N.5319, 238r)

b(e)reyendam v. [p(e)reyender]

b(1)ri(y)eta (B.N.5319, 232r)

bu(v)erta (B.N.4908/1, 1v)

by his grace, Amen, oh Lord of the world

pleasure

Nykl 594: 'delight'; Kontzi 244

in the name of Allah, the all merciful, the compassionate

old

foot

Arag.

stone

small beam

louse

rapist, seducer

viper?

possibly b(i)ripa, metathesis of bipra

habit, clothing

scribal error?

blasphemer

to embrace?

garment?

error?

black mark?

doors
bu(w)es (B. N. 5319, 242v)

bu(w)eso (T. 13, 28v, 29r, v, 30r, v, 31r; B. N. 5223, 249r)

caf(a)ranado (B. N. 5073/12, 1r)

cagero v. açageyar

cahuyo (B. N. 5319, 236v)

calem v. aççalem

calem C alaykum v. aççalem

[çani(y)ar]

çani(y)a (B. N. 5319, 241v)

çençi(y)a (J. 1, 214r)

[çertefikar]

certefikad (T. 13, 30v)

certefikando (T. 13, 30v)

gibdağ (J. 1, 4r, 216v; J. 30, 138v)

ciwdad (T. 13, 28v)

cici(y)entos v. seyçinos
ci(y)ello (B. N. 5317, 234v)

cinkeno (J. 30, 145v)

cinkko (B. N. 5364, 33v)

ciwdad v. cibdağ

cubhena Allah (B. N. 5319, 233r)

cubhennahu (B. N. 5319, 229v)

sambahan Allah, cibadağ

cufrenci(y)a (T. 13, 28r)

çunna v. aççunna

then

your

G. de F. 17C

saffron-coloured

? to make amends?

Gayangos 447: senear

science

Nykl 594: çençi(y)a, sençi(y)a

to affirm, to state

Alonso: s. XIV al XX;
Nykl 594; Klenk 123;
Kontzi 327; G. de F. 173.
town, city

G. de F. 173: Gibdat;
174: ciwdad

sky

fifth

five

praised, glorified, be Allah

praised be he

Gayangos 439: cubhannahu

suffering

Nykl 594; Kontzi 328;
G. de F. 175
çüra v. aççüra
curri(y)aga (B.N.4908/1, 1r)

strap, rope

Ch.

chahannam v. jahannam

justice

D.

daki(y)a (B.N.5073/7, 2r)
dake(y)a ke (B.N.5319, 230v)
diki(y)a (T.13, 32r)
v. also dende

[dar pasada]
da pasada (B.N.5223, 250v)

datiba (B.N.5073/7, 1r)
de fu(w)era de v. fu(w)eras de
de sin v. sin

[deballar] (1)
deballo (B.N.5319, 234v)
deballes (B.N.5319, 232v)
[deballar] (2)
deballo (J.10, 138r)

to forgive

Kontzi 245-6;
G. de F. 176 (all daki(y)a)

to send down from Heaven,
to reveal

Calque on Ar.  작품 ,

G. de F. 177

to fall

Debuilalz (1)
deban leyto (B.N. 5073/12, 1r, v)

debo (B.N. 5319, 229v, 230v, 236v)
dabdo (J. 1, 215v, 216r)
daedo (B. N. 5073/7, 1r, 1v; T. 13, 29v)
dewitho (T. 13, 30r)

debedami(y)ento (J. 1, 3v; J. 30, 140r)
[pdebedar]
dedebamon (B. N. 5319, 239r)
dedebado (J. 30, 141r)
[debedar]
dedebado (T. 13, 29v)

debi] or [deber]?
debiryan (J. 1, 215v)

debival (J. 1, 4r)
debino (J. 1, 216v)

debiryan v. [deber]
decib(i)lina (J. 1, 214r)
decipulo (J. 1, 213v, 214r)

defechizero (J. 1, 215r)

defendimi(y)ento (B. N. 5319, 234r)
dekaraço (T. 13, 30r)
dek(a)larami(y)ento (B. N. 5319, 229v, 237r, 239v)
delierci(y)a (B. N. 5319, 241v)
delittache (T. 13, 29v)

demandah (B. N. 5073/7, 2r)
demandante (T. 13, 28v)

divan bed, Arag.
duty, debt
G. de F. 177

prohibition
to forbid
Sykl 595; Klenk 105;
Kontzi 248
to have to
divine, holy
DCILC s.v. DIOS: "...
divinal Nebr.; APal..."
discipline
disciple
Kontzi 249: 'Jünger'
magician, sorcerer
DCILC s.v. HACER: deshechizar (no date or provenance)
defence
opposite? in sight of?
statement, explanation
diligence
power, effectiveness
Kontzi 250: delitaçe, 'Kraft', 'Wirkung', 'Vermögen'
demand, request
person who requests
G. de F. 178
denbu(w)es v. depu(w)es

dende (T.13, 32r)

denegante (T.13, 30v, 31r)

denibi el çin (B.N.5319, 230v)

[denostar]
denu(w)est(a)reys (T.13, 31r)
[denost(a)rar]
denu(w)est(a)areys (T.13, 31r)

[dent(a)rar]
dent(a)ramos (T.16, 3r)

[denuđar]
denuđare (B.N.5223, 250r)

denu(w)est(e)reys v. [denostar]
denu(w)est(a)areys v. [denostar]

departimi(y)ento (B.N.5319, 243v)
departir (B.N.5319, 243v)
departi(y)eron (B.N.5319, 243v)

deportar (B.N.5319, 233v)

depu(w)es (B.N.5319, 231v, 239r; J.1, 4r; T.13, 31v; B.N.5223, 252v; J.30, 142v)
depu(w)es (J.30, 137v, 142v)
denbu(w)es (T.13, 29v)

deraytahe v. deraytaje

derfejo (B.N.5319, 232r)
derfejo (B.N.5319, 232r, 240r)
derfejo (B.N.5319, 244v)

from, in the expression: dende ... diki(y)a, (v. daki(y)a)

Kontzi 250

denying

vocalisation of sin with a kasra

to insult

G. de F. 179: denost(a)rar

to enter

Syk1 595; Kontzi 251; G. de F. 179

to denude (to abandon?)

Kontzi 251: denudado, 'entblösst', 'beraubt'

explanation

to explain

LCEL s.v. PARTE: departimiento
to depart

after (despu(w)es only occurs in B.N.5223, 249v, 252v)

Kontzi 250-1: denpu(w)eš, depu(w)eš; G. de F. 179

right, (adj.)

right, (adj.)

right, law, (noun)
deraytaje (B.N. 5073/7, 2r)  
entitlement

deraytahhe (T. 13, 30r)  
entitlement

deretami(yen)to (J. 1, 216v)  
right, authority

deritaje (T. 13, 28r, 29v)  
entitlement

dereyto (B.N. 5073/12, 2r)  
due

[derrenk(i)lir]  
to submit, to yield

derrenk(i)limos (J. 30, 138v)  

[derrokar]  
to abrogate

defru(w)eka (T. 13, 29v)  
to be abrogated

[derrokarase]  
Klenk 106: 'herabfallen';


derrokarse ha (T. 13, 30r)  
to leave

se derru(w)eka (T. 13, 29v)  

[desar]  
to abandon

desan (B.N. 5319, 231r)  
DCELG s.v. PARAR: "...

dese (B.N. 5319, 238v)  
[emparar, Cid, forma que también

dexar (B.N. 5223, 248v)  
se halla en Berceo: ...]";

[dexar]  
Nyk\l  596: 'to abandon', 'to

dexa (B.N. 5223, 248v)  
leave without protection'

dexasme (B.N. 5223, 250r)  
to abandon

[desenparar]  


desenparo (B.N. 5319, 232v)  

[desmanparar]  


desmanpare (B.N. 5223, 250r)  

---Tma not so. The reading is clearly desenparado,

Fol. 2v, line 4, in Menéndez Pidal's edition.

---

1. Corominas, DCELG s.v. PARAR, gives desmanparar as appearing in

Ydcut, verse 16: This is not so. The reading is clearly desenparado,
desimular (T.13, 31r)

to dissimulate
Kontzi 253: desimular

disbelieve
to disbelieve
G. de F. 181

disbelief
G. de F. 181: desk(e)re(y)ença, desk(e)re(y)ençi(y)a, (but v. also p. 36)
to slide, to fall
DCELL a.v. DELIZNARSE: deslenar, n.1400, G. de Vinuessa; ..

expenditure
to hold back
Aragonese use of past participle formed on the preterite
Arag. retention of -d-
to dispose of?
beneath
preacher of the way of God?
But v. Harvey, 'Crypto-Islam' 171, n.18: "Probably a corruption for erederog."

December
to say
(v. also Chapters V and VI)

desk(e)re(y)ença (J.30, 140v)

desk(e)re(y)ença v. [desk(e)re(y)ença]

desq(e)reyença (T.13, 31r)

despensas (pl.) (B.N.5073/7, lv)

despensas v. [desenparar]

desmanpare [desenparar]

desq(e)reyençan (B.N.5319, 233r)

desq(e)reyençan v. [desk(e)re(y)ença]

[detener]

detubicio (J.30, 139r, 141r)

detubicio(y)esedas (J.30, 140v)

dexar, dexta, dextasme v. [desar]

dexesir (B.N.5073/6, 1r)

deyuso (B.N.5319, 232r)

dezidor del kamino (T.13, 28r)

dezid(y)enb(e)re (B.N.5073/12, 2r)

dezir
B.N.5319:

dezir (242v)
dize (230v)
dizen (230r)
diso (231r et passim)
dixo (236v, 238r)
diseron (235v, 231r, 235v)
J. 1:
se dizen (214r)
dizen (215r)
di(y)eron (4r)
diso (4r)

B. N. 5073/7:
se disi(y)a (1v)
dito (1r, v, 2r)

B. N. 5073/6:
dito, dito (1r)

T. 13:
diso, diso (30r)
di(y)on (31v)

B. N. 5223:
dizze (250v)
dizze (251v)
dezzi(y)a (252r)
dise (252v)
dixi (252r, v)
dixo (249r, 251v, 252r, v)
dixo (251r)

J. 30:
disole (137v)
disole (137v)
di(y)endo (139v)

diki(y)a v. daki(y)a
dinero (B. N. 4908/1, 4r)

Old Aragonese coin,
12 dineros = 1 sueldo
dinero (B. N. 4908/1, 1r et passim)
dise, diso, di(y)eron, dito, dixi, dixo
dize, dizen and variants
v. dezir
dizinu(w)ebe (B. N. 4908/1, 1v)
dizisi(y)ete (B. N. 4908/1, 3v)

This is a late usage (1577),
where
nineteen, Arag.
seventeen, Arag.

G. de F. 183: dezisi(y)ete,
digizi(y)ete, 184:
dizisi(y)ete

G. de F. 184

where
doblero (B.N.4908/1, 2v)

dot(i)rina (J.1, 213v)
doze (B.N.4908/1, 2r, v, 4r)
doze (B.N.4908/1, 2v)
dozzena (B.N.4908/1, 1r)

alqidad (J.3v, 143r)
d’ulquidat

dubda (B.5073/7, 2r)

dukado (B.N.4908/1, 1r)

ducat, Old Aragonese coin

1 dukado = 22 sueldos

beam

Foenerbach 218: ‘Balken’
doctrine
twelve
dozen
eleventh month of the Islamic calendar
Gayangos 440: dulquidat
doubt
G. de F. 184
duropa (B. N. 5073/1, 2v)

duropa (B. N. 5073/1, 2v)

duropa (B. N. 5073/1, 2v)

duropa (B. N. 5073/1, 2v)

duropa (B. N. 5073/1, 2v)

F

c[ebei][ci(y)]al[aad] v. especi(y)al[aad]

cEd (J.3v, 133r)

Edam (B.N.5319, 231r, 241v; B.N.5223, 247v et passim)

[ejar]
ejelo (B.N.5319, 238v)

e11 (B.N.5319, 229v et passim; J.1, 216v; B.N.5073/12, 2r; B.N.5223, 251r et passim)

en fu(w)eras de v. fu(w)eras de
[enbi(y)ar]
enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

enbi(y)este (B.N.5319, 232v)

In the Qur’an, a tribe and also a king, Ad; Sale 147: “Ad was an ancient and potent tribe of Arabs... and zealous idolaters ... They chiefly worshipped four deities ... the first [Sābi’ā] supplying them with rain ...” See also P. Bell, Introduction to the Qur’an, pp. 127-8, 131-3.

Adam
Gayangos 440; Saa. 325
to throw
the
G. de F. 186
to send
drunkard
G. de F. 187: enbi(y)ar
[enkartar]
enkartado (J.1, 215r)

[en(k)linar]
en(k)lines (B.N.5223, 251r)

[enkojier]
enkojido (T.13, 28r)
enkojido (T.13, 28r)
enkrabiyar (B.N.4908/1, 3r, 4r)

[enparar]
enpara (B.N.5223, 250r)

[enparejarse]
s'enpareja (B.N.5319, 236v)
enpero (J.30, 141r)

[enpoðereyar]
enpoðerey o (B.N.5319, 232v)

[ensalgar]
ensalço (T.13, 31v)
[enxalgar]
enxalça (B.N.5223, 251v)

[ensañarse]
m'ensaño (B.N.5223, 249v)
t'ensañas (B.N.5223, 249v)
ensemp(o)lo (J.1, 215v)
esenp(o)lo (J.30, 142v)

to condemn

to cause (harm)?
en(k)linar al mal; or should it be en(k)linar al mal, i.e. to turn to evil ways?
to grasp hold of
to drive in nails
Alonso: encalvijar s.XVII al XX; Kontzi 258: enk(a)labigar
to aid, to succour (cf. desenparar)
Nykl 597; Kontzi 259; G. de F. 189: enpara
to mount?
but, however
Nykl 597: 'therefore'; G. de F. 190
to have power over
Klenk 108, Kontzi 259
to exalt, to raise up
DCELC s.v. ENSALZAR, "1a dec.: enxalgar... (2a mitad del S.XIV), ... ensalgar ... (2a mitad del S.XIV)."
Nykl 597: enxalgaršë; G. de F. 192: enxalçado
to be angry
for the use of sobre, v. Kontzi pp. 97-8; G. de F. 190

example
to dominate
Klenk 108; Kontzi 260;
G. de F. 191

arsenist?

DCELC s.v. ENCENDER: "... enceso INCENSUS (BerCEO, S.MILL., 215) ..."

to understand
intention
Kontzi 262: entinsi(y)on;
283: intinsi(y)on

both
to interpret
possibly: enter(e)petar;
Gayangos 440: entrepetado.¹

depths
Kontzi 262; G. de F. 192

innumerable

heir
heretic
brother

to divert
Nyk1 597; Kontzi 262-3

to enchant, to bewitch
Alonso: s.XIV;
Saa. 325: escanto

¹. L.P. Harvey, 'A Morisco Manuscript in the Godolphin Collection, at
Wadham College, Oxford', p. 463: ynterPetrar. This is a Latin character
manuscript, so perhaps enter(e)petar is more correct than ent(e)repetar.
eskasezze (B.N.5223, 250r)
eskaso (B.N.5223, 250r)

eskibar

eskibalo (B.N.5319, 230r)
eskibo (B.N.5319, 230r, 242r)
eskibaron (B.N.5319, 235r, v, 236v, 239r, v, 241r)
eskibaron (B.N.5319, 241v)
eskibo (1) (B.N.5319, 242r)
eskibo (2) (B.N.5319, 242v)

eskribidor (T.13, 28v)
esk(e)re[bir] (J.30, 143r)
esk(e)rebir (B.N.5223, 253r)
eskrebireis (T.13, 31v)
esk(i)ribo (B.N.5223, 252r, 253r)
esk(i)ributas (pl.) (B.N.5223, 249r)
eskudillero (J.1, 213v)
esmindar (J.30, 140v)

meanness
mean

DCELC s.v. ESCASO:
"Escasez [1626...], antes escaseza ...";
Kontzi 263: eškašeza
to regard as to be avoided

Nykl 597: 'to dislike', 'to shun'
evil, ugly (adj.)

Nykl 597: eškibo;
Klank 109: 'entsetzlich', 'schlecht'
evill? evil person? (noun)

writer, scribe
to write

scripture

DCELC s.v. ESCRIBIR:
escrividor (Bercero);
Kontzi 264: ešk(e)rebir;
G. de F. ešk(e)rebir
kitchen-boy?
to lie
(J.52, 573v: desmindar)

Kontzi 265: ešmentir;
254: dešmentimi(y)ento;
294-5: probably lešminde, lešmindero; Klank 110:
ešmentir; G. de F. 195: esmentir
(cf. [mentir])
grace, kindness
mercy, compassion; dar
espaqi(y)o is a translation of 'show compassion'.
DCELC s.v. ESPACIO: "... en la Edad Media ... predominan las [acs.] secundarias 'sosiego', 'consuelo' ...

self-restraint, prohibition
Ar. ج م means 'to attribute anything exclusively to';
several words from the same root mean 'special' 'particularity' etc.; the root also gives the word ت ا , 'self-restraint', 'property (of a medicine)';
therefore espaqi(y)aldad could well be a calque meaning 'restraint' or 'prohibition'. For other calques on the same verb, v. Kontzi 101.

to wake up
Kontzi 266: espertar(vé);
G. de F. 197: espertar

to extend, to spread
to sneeze
DCELC s.v. ESTORNUDAR:
"... La variante primitiva estornudar ... figura también en Alfonso de Valdés († 1541) ... "
Kontzi 267: estornudar

this
G. de F. 197: "Terminación característica del dialecto aragonés antiguo, así como del riojano, común al dialecto leonés ..."

jaundice
DCELC s.v. ICTÉRICO:
"1º doc.: iterico, .. Nebr."
est(a)raño (J.1, 4v)
est(e)reyto (B.N.5073/12, 1r)

F.
fablar (B.N.5319, 229v)
faga, fagas, fagan v. hazer
falleçimi(y)ento (J.1, 5v)
fare, fares v. hazer
fasta (B.N.5073/7, 2r)
fasti(y)o (J.1, 5v)
fazendarse (B.N.5319, 242v)
[fazer fu(w)erça] (B.N.5319, 237r, v, 238r, 239r)
(for forms of fazer v. hazer)
fecho (J.30, 138v)
fegura (B.N.5223, 252v)
femaral (J.30, 138v)

stranger
narrow
to speak
Kontzi 268: fabular, faular, fa(w)ular
fulfilling of a promise
Calque on Ar. w-f-a وَضَيْ, which gives both wafiq, 'fulfilling a promise', and wafat, 'death'
up till
repugnant (adj.)
? possibly defazendarse
Nykł 588: afazendarše, 'to be preoccupied, worried'; Kontzi 258: enfazendar, 'beschäftigen', 'Sorge bereiten'
to misuse?
event?
Nykł 599: 'thing', 'condition', 'state'; Kontzi 269: 'Geschehnis', 'Angelegenheit'
(v. also hazer)
being
Nykł 599: 'image (idol), picture'; Kontzi 269; G. de F. 200
dung-heap
Borao 231: femeral;
Gayangos 441: fiemo;
Kontzi 269: femaralleš
fenb(a)ra (J.1, 215r)

feneñedor (J.30, 139v)

fermoso (B.N.5319, 234r)

Ferrero (B.N.5073/7, 1v)
Ferreroh (B.N.5073/7, 1r, v)

feyto (B.N.5073/7,1r)

fi(y)ada (T.13, 29r)

ficho v. fijo
fi(y)erro (B.N.5073/7, 1r)

fijo (B.N.4908/1, 2v; T.13, 28r, 31v)
  fija (J.30, 138r)
  ficho (B.N.5319, 231r, 232v; T.16, 7r)
  fillo (B.N.5364, 4r, 33v)
  filla (B.N.5073/12, 2r)

finkami(y)endo de deréytaje (B.N.5073/7, 2r)
  [finkar]
  finka (B.N.5073/7, 2r)

fiz, fizo, fizi(y)eron and variants v.
forka (J.1, 215v)

formiga (B.N.5319, 241r)
  [forçar]
  forsaran (T.13, 30v)

woman
Kontzi 269: fenbra, fenb(a)ra
taker away of life
G. de F. 84-5, for occurrence of phrases in 'ser + -dor' in aljámía

beautiful
G. de F. 200

blacksmith (proper name)

deed
(v. also hazer)
G. de F. 201
?

Harvey 'Crypto-Islam', 171, suggests a corruption of bidas.

iron

son

daughter

son

daughter

G. de F. 201: ficho;
202: fillo, filla

remaining legal business?

to remain
Nykl 599: 'to remain', 'fix', 'drive into'

hazer
gallows
G. de F. 203

ant

to force, to oblige
(the normal spelling is forçar)
f(a)rankezza (B.N.5223, 250r)

f(a)ranko (B.N.5223, 249r, 250r)

f(a)rawar (T.13, 31v)

generosity

Harvey 'Valencia' 89:

ifranqizza
generous
to have sexual relations

Cantineau 9: dentrar;
Kontzi 90 confirms that
dentrar is a calque on
Ar. جَّرَّ ، 'to enter',
and 'to have sexual relations'.
Perhaps f(a)rawar is also a
calque.
outside, except

DCELC s.v. FUERA,"... fueras
h.950 ... fuera tiende a
generalizarse desde el
S. XIII..."
grate

DCELC s.v. FOSA;
Alonso: s. XIII al XVII;
G. de F. 205
to flee
to flee
G. de F. 205: fuyga
to establish oneself?

wood

Borao 244; Saa. 325;
Nyk1 599; Kontzi 273

Borao 241: "cárcel en que
entra el gorrón o eje de
las puertas de calle,
construídas con este giro
y no con bisagras".

fu(w)eras de (J.30, 142r)
de fu(w)era de (J.1, 214v)
en fu(w)eras de (B.N.5319, 239r)

fu(w)esa (B.N.5223, 248r, v, 251r, 252r, v)

[fuir]
fuyendo (B.N.5319, 238r)
[huir]
huyga (B.N.5223, 252r)

[fundar]
fundado (J.30, 140r)

fusta (T.13, 29r)

fuyendo v. fuir

G.

garabí v. carabí
garabí(y)a v. carabí
gorrionera (B.N.4908/1, 4r)
gu(w)alardon (J.30, 142r)
reward
G. de F. 207: gu(w)alardon

walardon (T.13, 28r; B.N.5223, 248v, 249r, 250v, 251r, v, 252r)
reward
G. de F. 208

gu(w)eso (B.N.5223, 250v; J.30, 143r)

hanb(i)re (B.N.5223, 247v; J.30, 142v, 143r)
hunger

hamb(i)ri(y)ento (J.30, 141r)
hungry

harem (T.13, 30v; B.N.5223, 248v, 249v)
what is forbidden, opposite of ḥareel

[ḥarremar]

[ḥarram (B.N.5073/6, 1r)
to prohibit
Kontzi 79, for hispanised Arabic verbs
a lo ḥarem (T.13, 31r) unlawfully
ṣahrāmi(y)ento (T.13, 30v) prohibition
ḥarremāmi(y)ento [onto] (T.13, 30v)

Gayangos 442: haram;
Saa. 325: haram; Nykl 599:
ḥarremar; Kontzi 279-80:
ḥaram, ḥarām etc., ḥarramar;
G. de F. 211: ḥaram

perature

harram, ḥarremo, ḥarremado, ḥarremāmi(y)ento], v. ḥarem

hata ke (J.30, 138r, 142v)

until

Ar. 4ata ( for  Cush)

Gayangos 442; Kontzi 278:
G. de F. 211

haunke, hau'nke v. aunqe
to do, to make

hazer

B.N.5319:

faze (237r, v; 238r, 239r et passim)
fazen (241r)
fagas (232r)
faga (233r)
fagan (233r)
fiz (232v)
fare (242v)

J.1:
fazer (216r)
hazer (5v)
fazes (215r)
fazen (215r, v)
faga (216v)
fizo (216v)
fare (4v)

B.N.5073/7:
faze (1r)
fizī(y)eron (1v)
feyto (1v, 2r)
I.13:

açer (29r, 31r)
hazer (29v, 30v)
haz (30r)
fišo (28r)
fiš(y)eron (28r)
fares (30r)

B.N.5223:

hazzer (247v, 248v)
hazzes (248v, 250v)
hazze (250v)
hazzen (251r)
haz (250v)
haz (247v, 250r, v)
hazzed (251r)
hizze (249r, v, 250r)
hiziste (248v)
harra (251r)

J.30:

fazer (140r)
hazes (138v, 139r)
fiš(y)esešes (140v)

v. also [fazer fu(w)erça], fecho and feyto

helidūn (B.N.5223, 251v) immortal
hez, hiziste, hizze v. hazer

hu(w)elgo (B.N.5223, 247v) enjoyment, pleasure
u(w)elgo (J.1, 216r)

hursto (J.30, 138v) free man
Ar. ُهُرُر , ḥurr
G. de F. 215

huyga v. [fuir]
I.

ibitar (J.1, 4v)

to avoid

DCELC s.v. EVITAR:
"La doc.: 1490, Celestina ...
("... evitar ...") ...
This is an early dating.

iççalem v. aççalem

Cige (T.13, 31v)

idola (T.13, 29r, 30r)

imensa (J.1, 4v)

inojo (B.N.5319, 238v)

inorante (J.1, 4v)

intinci(y)on v. entinci(y)on

ipok(i)rita (J.1, 215r)

iwal (T.13, 29r)

Jesus

Gayangos 437: Ayçe;
Saa. 326: Ice, Hice

idol

immense

knee

ignorant

Kontzi 282

hypocrite

equal

Nyk1 600: iwalado;
Klenk 112: iwalar;
Kontzi 282: iwalar(ë)

J.

jahannam (B.N.5223, 247v, 248r, v)

chahannam (B.N.5223, 250r)

Hell

Gayangos 439, 443;
Kontzi 276: žahannam,
žahhanam, Žehannam, etc.;
G. de F. 221: žahannam

janero (B.N.5073/6, 1r)

January
jenzabu(y)u (B.N.5319, 241v)

C stał, centipede

jantzi(y)o (J.1, 5r)

people

generally, in general

Nykl 594 çanjupi(y)ašt;
580 Çunjubi(y)ašt

jermalmente (B.N.5223, 253r)

day

Nykl 600: jermenal, 'chief'

jornada (B.N.5073/7, 2r)

judgment

G. de F. 222

juzigo (B. A. 5223, 251v, 252v)

July

juzgo (J.30, 138v, 139v)

kabal (de) (B.N.5319, 229v)

politely

kabeza (T.13, 31r)

principal, capital

Ar. رأيس, ra'is, can mean both 'head' and 'capital'; possibly a calque.

jumca v. aljumuc-a

jumed azzen (B.N.5223, 253r)

sixth month of the Islamic calendar

jum (B.N.4908/1, lv, 2r)

June

juzgo v. judici(y)o

K.

1. There are several occurrences of the word in varying forms: Ŷinįbasa in the Vocabulista, Ŷinįbansa in the Anónimo Sevillano, gubcipicha, pl. gubcipechit in Pedro de Alcalá. For full details see D.A. Griffin, Los mozárabismos del "Vocabulista" atribuido a Ramón Martí, pp. 49-50, 231-2; Steiger, p. 188; F. Simonet: Glosario de voces ibéricas y latinas usadas entre los mozárabes s.v. CHENTUPEDES; R. Dozy: Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes s.v. جنجباسة, and DCELC s.v. CIENTO.
kabtibo (J. 30, 138v)

[kaçar]
kaça (B. N. 5319, 239r)
kaďaguno (J. 1, 214v)

kalandari(y)o v. kalandariyyo
kalderu(w)elo (B. N. 5073/12, 1v)
kalendariyyo (B. N. 5364, 4r)
kalandari(y)o (B. N. 5073/7, 2r)
kallor (B. N. 5223, 247v)
kaminero (B. N. 5319, 236r)

kantaryello (B. N. 5319, 238v)
kapallo (B. N. 5319, 238r, 239v)
kapitules (pl.) (J. 1, 5v)
kapo (B. N. 5319, 238v)
karme (B. N. 5223, 248r)
kartilla (B. N. 5319, 237v, 238r)

kasa (B. N. 5073/12, 1r)
kasa santa (J. 1, 5r)

kasilla (B. N. 4908/1, 1r)
kataďbr (mal) (B. N. 5319, 236r)
katorze (B. N. 5073/12, 2r)
katorzeno (B. N. 5073/12, 2r)
captive
Nykl 601: kabtibo;
Kontzi 286-7: kabtibo, qahtibo, qatibo, qahtibo; G. de F. 227: kativo, gativo
to hunt?
each one
Yüçuf 67; Kontzi 238;
G. de F. 223
pot, kettle
calendar
heat
literally 'pedestrian',
'walker', but possibly here
means 'person who follows
in the Way of the Prophet'?
small jar?
horse
chapters (pl. in -es, cf.
artikules)
toe
flesh, body
usual meaning: 'liturgical
calendar’. Here possibly
a calque on Ar. ﷲ ﷴ ﷺ ﷸ ﷹ ﷼ hirz,
amulet'.
household (adj. fem.)
Jerusalem
Ar. ﷱ ﷺ ﷲ ﷸ ﷺ ﷸ ba’it almaqdis
= holy house, Jerusalem.
small house
person who casts the evil eye?
fourteen
fourteenth
Kontzi 287: katorzeno
kawlebar (T.13, 28r)
kawso (B. N. 5319, 229v, 239v)
k’el (B. N. 5223, 251r)
k’es (B. N. 5223, 247v, 251v, 252r)
keyen (B. N. 5319, 235r)

[kkasarse]
se kkaso (T.13, 31v)
kkomo (B. N. 5364, 4r, 33v)

k(a)lamar (B. N. 5319, 229v)
  k(a)lamo (B. N. 5319, 242v)
  k(a)lames (B. N. 5319, 230v)

k(a)laredad (B. N. 5319, 231v)
  k(a)larepad (B. N. 5223, 251r, 252v)

kobdiçi(y)o v. [akobdiçi(y)ar]
kobjo (B. N. 5319, 238v)

kola (B. N. 4908/1, 1r)

kolijji(y)o (J. 1, 216v)

[komer]
  ko[mi(y)e]sësës (J. 30, 140v)

[konbenir]
  konbenyo (B. N. 5319, 244r)

to suffer, to bear
DCELC s.v. CABLEYVA;
Gayangos 438: caulebar;
Kontzi 285: kaplear,
ka(w)ulebarše, ka(w)ulebarše, kawlebar

chapter, article?
kawso appears to translate
Ar. لـ، bāb, = chapter, but there is no obvious calque. Perhaps 'discussion'.
G. de F. 228: 'litigio'

abbreviation of ke el
abbreviation of ke es
who
to marry

how
to call, to call out (Arag. cl)
G. de F. 230

brightness, clarity
Klenk 113: k(a)laredad,
k(a)laredat, k(e)leredad;
G. de F. 230

elbow
Nyk1 602: kobdo; Kontzi 288:
kobdo; G. de F. 230: kobdo

mortar
DCELC s.v. COLA II

he collated?
infinite: kolijji(y)ar or kolijjir?
to indulge in, to practise
Arag. retention of -d-
to be suitable
[konpenir]

konpi(y)ene (B.N.5319, 235v)

konbre v. [konprar]

konfu(w)erenta kon (B.N.5073/6, 1r)

konpaña (dar 1a) (B.N.5319, 230r)
  konpaña (B.N.5319, 231r)
  (B.N.5319, 236r)

konpañero (B.N.5319, 236r; J.1, 215v)

konpañ(y)a (B.N.5223, 248r)

[konprar]

konpre (B.N.4908/1, 1r, v, 3r)
  [konbrar]
  konbre (B.N.4908/1, 4r)
  konpra (B.N.4908/1, 1r)

komp(a)rendido (J.1, 5v)

[kontarse]
  ku(w)entate (B.N.5223, 248r)

kontentaçi(y)on v. akontentante

kontino (de) (J.1, 216r)

konto de C'Içe (B.N.5223, 253r)

kont(a)raryo (J.1, 4v)

[kont(a)rastarse]
  se kont(a)rastaron (B.N.5319, 243v)

kopilaçi(y)on v. akopilar

korrible (B.N.5073/6, 1r)

kort (B.N.5073/7, 1v)

next to, bordering on (fem.)
to give a greeting
greeting? friendship?company, group
G. de F. 232
companion
company
to buy
purchase
compendium? summary?
to account for oneself, for one's behaviour
continuously
G. de F. 233
Christian calendar
Nykl 603: konto; Kontzi: konto; G. de F. 233: konto
opposite
to oppose one another
Nykl 603: 'to oppose'
current
Borao 199: "... corriente; se aplica a la moneda..."
court, capital
Arag.
kosari(y)o (J.1, 215v)
koset (B.N.5073/12, 1v)

[kostreñir]
kostreñan (B.N.5319, 239r)
kost(e)reñeren (T.13, 30v)
kost(i)riñes (J.30, 139r)
kostump(e)re (B.N.5319, 244v)
kreyenca (T.13, 31r)
k(i)ri(y)azon (B.N.5319, 236r)
ku(w)aranta (B.N.5319, 242r)
ku(w)atreno (B.N.4908/1, 2r; J.30, 140v)
qu(w)at(o)ro (B.N.5223, 320r)
ku(w)estas (pl.) (B.N.5319, 232v)
[kuiñar]
kuñaba (J.30, 137v)
kumb(i)ño v. kump(i)lidament
kump(i)lidament (B.N.5073/7, 1v)
kump(i)lír (J.1, 5v)
kump(e)le (B.N.5223, 248r)
kump(i)lír (B.N.5223, 251r)
corsair
sewn garment
Hoenerbach 258: 'genähites Kleid'.
to constrain, to compel
NykI 603; G. de F. 235:
kost(i)riñimi(y)ento

tradition (of Islam), (masc.)
Borao 200, frequently masculine in Aragonese

belief
Kontzi 291: k(e)reyensa,
k(e)re(y)ensi(y)a;
k(i)ri(y)ensi(y)a;
G. de F. 235: k(e)re(y)enza

family, household
Klenk 114: 'Familie'

forty, Arag.
fourth
four

shoulders, back
G. de F. 237
to shine?
to fulfil

fully, duly

1. On the loss of N in the Latin prefix KON-, v. Consuelo López Morillas, 'Aljamiado AKOŠEGIR and its Old Provençal counterparts'. This example, kostreñir, appears to be the only instance in these manuscripts, although C. López Morillas has found several more in other aljamiado texts.
kump(i)li(y)o (J.1, 216v)
kump(i)li(y)ose (J.1, 216v)
kump(i)lido (J.1, 216r)
kump(i)li(y)endo (J.1, 5v)
kump(i)lido (B.N.5319, 234r)
kumb(i)lido (B.N.5319, 234r)

perfect, excellent

C. de P. 237: kump(i)lida-s

L.

la ora v. ora

lazerya (B.N.5319, 233v, 236r)

misery, poverty

there is no God but Allah

Saa. 326; G. de P. 239

le ilahe ille Allah (B.N.5319, 233v)

there is no God but Allah

Saa. 326; G. de P. 239

lebantâmi(y)ento (B.N.5073/7, 2r)

closure of accounts

Borao 255: 'ajuste y finiquito de cuentas'

leîdor v. leyer

lenpi(y)ans (B.N.5319, 235r)
[leyer]

clean
to read

Kontzi 294: 1eir, 1leir;
G. de P. 240: liyas, liy6
etc.

leîyer (B.N.5319, 229v)

to send a greeting.

This is a calque on Ar. ِحَلَّ ،
to read, from which is derived
the expression
َحَلَّ رَحْمَةَ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامَ
qirsâta  גלָלְיוּ הַזָּלָם ,
'to transmit salutation to
someone'.

reader

Kontzi 294

milk-can? or bed-linen?

what there is in the heavens
and on earth is Allah's
lonb(a)rami(y)ento (B.N.5319, 229v, 231r, 237r)
lonb(a)rar (B.N.5319, 229v, 231r)
lonb(a)rara (B.N.5319, 231r)
lonb(e)re (B.N.5319, 232r, 236r, 238r)
lonp(e)re (B.N.5319, 234r)

loob (B.N.5319, 233v)
lor (B.N.5319, 233v)
loores (pl.) (J.1, 216r; J.30, 142r, 143r)

lūh, luh v. allūh
lur (B.N.5073/7, 1v)

luzzes (pl.) (B.N.5223, 252v)
leyer v. leyer
liberza (B.N.5319, 232r)

lllo (B.N.5319, 231v)

malbestad (J.30, 140r)

maldezzir
maldezzir (B.N.5223, 249v)

Malik (B.N.5319, 237r)

Hamad el judi(y)o (T.13, 31r)
calling by name
to name
name
name
Nykl 604: lonb(a)rar, lonb(a)rami(y)ento, reputation, glory:
Kontzi 295: lonb(a)rami(y)ento, Rhum'; 296: lonb(a)rar,
lonb(e)re, lonbre, lonbrre
praise
(J.52, 575v: lores)
their, Arag.
Kontzi 296
lights
left? possibly derived from Lat. LAEVS
it
evil, evil ways
DCELC, s.v. MALVADO
to curse
Malik ibn Anas, one of the great jurists who codified
Islamic law, founder of the Malikite School, (d. A.H. 179,
A.D. 795).
head of Sephardi communities in Spain (v. Cantineau 7)
marabellosa (B.N.5319, 244v)
[marabijarse]
marabiose (J.30, 137v)
Maryam (T.13, 31r)
masilla (B.N.5319, 232r)
mestre (B.N.4908/1, 2r)
mestre (B.N.4908/1, 3r)

[matar]
mataseñes (J.30, 140v)
materya (B.N.5319, 244v)
mayu(w)elo (B.N.5073/6, 1r)
mayu(w)ello (B.N.5073/6, 1r)

mazhar (T.13, 29v)

meckida (B.N.5319, 235r, v; J.1, 216v)
machor (T.16, 21r, 22r)
medesina (B.N.5319, 237v; J.1, 213v)

[medesinar]
medesinen (B.N.5319, 237v)
medisnar (B.N.5319, 237v)
medisnar (B.N.5319, 237v)
medy (B.N.4908/1, 1r)
medyo (B.N.4908/1, 1v)

marvellous
to marvel, to wonder

Mary

cheek

Kontzi 299: maši(y)ello, maši(y)elo; G. de F. 245
master craftsman
to kill
Arag. retention of -d-
matter

young; vineyard

DGCLC s.v., MAÑELO:
"Mayuelo significa 'albaricoque' en Alosno, Selayva ... ¿forma
mozarabe con disimilación
de 11 en y?"
to rub

Ar. مصا, mačaha

Gayangos 444; Saa. 326;
Nykl 604; Kontzi 213:
almañisar, masjar;
G. de F. 243: mañjar
mosque

Lincoln 635; Klenk 117;
Kontzi 301: mekida, meşkida;
G. de F. 136: almeñkida;
246: meşkida

better

medicine

Kontzi 299: medesina
to prescribe, to administer

medicine
to prescribe, to administer

half
memorya (J.1, 5v; B.N.4908/1, 1r)

[mentir]

[menti]ykseses (J.30, 140v)

mint(o)roso (J.1, 215r; B.N.5223, 250r)

[menwar]

menwa (B.N.5223, 245v)

markadeyar (B.N.5319, 236v)

meryenda (B.N.4908/1, 1v, 2v, 3r, v, 4r, v)

mesmo (B.N.4908/1, 1v, 3r)

mesteroso (B.N.5223, 250r)

mestre v. mastre

mi(y)enbro (J.1, 215v)

minti(y)kseses v. [mentir]

mint(o)roso v. [mentir]

umartes (B.N.4908/1, 4r)

monjeç (B.N.5319, 242v)

monjil (B.N.5073/12, 1v)

mortalera (B.N.5319, 238r)

mortezena (J.30, 139r)

mortezeno (B.N.5319, 237v)

(J.30, 138r)

memory
to lie

Arag. retention of -d-
deceitful

Klenk 118; Kontzi 302:
mintiroso, mintroso;
G. de F. 246: ment(o)roso,
248: mintiroso;
(cf. esmindar)
to lessen, to diminish

to trade

snack

same

G. de F. 247

needy person

member

Tuesday (scribal error)

monks?

long robe

DCELC s.v. MONJE,
"vestidura de monge", Hebr.

plague

Lincoln 639 1

carcase
dead
carcass

DCELC s.v. Mortezena;
Kontzi 303; mortezina,
mortezena

1. See also G. Tilander, 'Fueros aragoneses desconocidos, promulgados a consecuencia de la gran peste de 1348', p. 138: mortallera.
muçayyib (B.N.5319, 240v)

muçlim (J.1, 4r)
  muçlim (J.1, 5r)
  muçlimes,-as (pl.)
  (T.13, 32r; B.N.5223, 253r)

muçuchacho (B.N.4908/1, 1v)
  (or moçochacho)

mu(w)ert (B.N.5073/7, 1v)

mujeri(y)ego (J.1, 214v)

muler (B.N.5073/12, 1r)

munidad (T.13, 29r)

N.

naçançi(y)a (J.30, 139v, 142v)

nadi (B.N.5223, 250v)

niglijen[te] (T.13, 29r)

noje (B.N.5319, 231v, 234v, 236v, 238v; T.13, 29v)

[nomb(a)rar]
  nomb(a)rare (B.N.5223, 248r)
  nomb(a)rarte (B.N.5223, 248r)
  nomb(a)rado (B.N.5223, 248r)
  nomb(a)raro (J.1, 214v; B.N.5223, 320r)
  nomb(a)re (J.1, 3v)

nost(o)ro (B.N.5319, 236v)
  nu(w)eso (J.1, 5r, v; T.13, 28r; T.16, 2v)

1. Yakov Malkiel in 'Old Spanish NADI(E), OTRI(E)', dates the final disappearance of the old form nadi by 1550, pp. 208, 229. The same is true of otri. This is therefore a late dating (1577).
nozays (J. 30, 141v) to harm, to cause distress
nozemi(y)ento (B.N.5319, 241r) harm
nozimi(y)ento (J. 30, 141v) harm?
nozientes (pl.) (J. 30, 138r) hardship?

DCELC s. v. NUCIR: (not in Nebrija or classical writers, and not understood by 1587). This is therefore a late dating.

Nykl 605: nozimi(y)ento, nozimi(y)ento, 'harm'; nozir, 'to cause distress'; nozi(y)ento, 'fierce', 'destructive'; Kontzi 305: nozer, nozir; G. de F. 252: nozer, nozemi(y)ento

nu(w)ebeci(y)entos (B.N.5073/12, 2r) nine hundred
nu(w)eso v. nost(o)ro

ochano v. [ocho](2)
ocho (1) (B.N.5319, 237v)

[ocho] (2)
gu(w)eyt (B.N.5073/7, 2r) eight, Arag.
gu(w)eytanta (B.N.5073/7, 2r) eighty (ochenta in B.N.4908/1, 1r; and B.N.5223, 252v)
witanta (B.N.5073/6, 1r) eighty
ocheno (B.N.4908/1, 2r; J.30, 140v) eighth

oidor (B.N.5223, 249r) listener

okasi(y)on (J.1, 4r) trouble, difficulty

DCELC s. v. CAER: 'accidente improvisto', 'daño grave'.

[omenache] (J.30, 142v, = J.52, 574v)

omb(e)re (B.N.5319, 229v, 237v, 239v, 240v, 241v)

onrra (J.1, 214r, 215v; B.N.5223, 250v)
onrar (T.13, 31v)
onro (B.N.5223, 252v)
onrra (B.N.5223, 250r, 252r, v)
onrrado (J.1, 216v)
onrrado (B.N.5319, 234r; J.1, 4r, 5r; B.N.5223, 251r)

ora (T.13, 30r; B.N.5223, 252v; J.30, 142r, v)
la ora (B.N.5223, 252r)

ortaliza (J.30, 142v)
ortelano (J.1, 214r)
ospedaje (B.N.5223, 320r)
ot(i)ri (B.N.5223, 248v, 249r, v)

ton(0)rosi (B.N.5319, 234v)

or (J.30, 142v)

oma (J.30, 142v)

olm (J.30, 142v)

ora (T.13, 30r; B.N.5223, 252v; J.30, 142r, v)

[parar mi(y)ent(e)res]
para mi(y)ent(e)res (B.N.5223, 248r)

homage
Kontzi 306: omenaγe;
G. de F. 253: omenache

man

honour
to honour

time, hour
then, so
Klenk 118; Kontzi 293

vegetable
gardener
care, shelter?
others
(v. note: to nadi)

also
to graze, to eat (here applied to humans)
clear, open, manifest
Gayangos 445; Klenk 119;
Kontzi 307: paladino;
G. de F. 254

parar mientes;

Nykl 606
paretes (pl.) (B.N.4908/1, 1r)

pareyente (B.N.5319, 242r)

partidor (J.1, 5r)

pasku(u)de karneros (B.N.5364, 4r)

paso v. bas:
pastores (pl.) (J.30, 142v)
patayyar (B.N.5319, 239v)

[pegar]
pegaryaa (B.1.5319, 232v)
Jesusregarya (B.N.5319, 244v)
pelrra (J.3v, 137v)

[perkurar]
perkurara (B.N.5223, 251v)
perkurando (J.1, 215v)

[permutar]
permutari(y)as (T.13, 30v)
pi(y)adad (J.30, 143r)
pi(y)adad (B.N.5319, 231v, 232r; J.1, 4v; B.N.5223, 252v, 253r)
bi(y)adad (B.N.5319, 230r)
p(a)lazzer (B.N.5223, 247v)
p(e)legar (1) (B.N.55473/7, 2r)

[p(e)legar] (2)
p(e)legaron (B.N.5319, 230v)

walls, Arag.; sing. paret or parete?
G. de F. 255: parete(s)
relation
religious leader?
Muslim sacrificial feast: غَيْدِ الْاضْحَـى, QId al'adha
pasture-land?
to do battle? (batallar)
to trample on? (patear)
to baptize? (O.Sp. batear)
to pray?
prayer
pearl
DCELE s.v. PELRA: "... la forma alterada pelra en inventario arag. de 1497...";
Nykl 606; Kontzi 310;
G. de F. 256
to try
Klenk 120; G. de F. 257
to change, to alter

pity, compassion
Klenk 120: pi(y)adad, bi(y)adad;
G. de F. 257: pi(y)adad

pleasure
to conclude, Arag.
Borao 289
to decide
[p(e)legar] (3)
  p(e)lege (J.1, 4v)

[p(e)legar] (4)
  p(e)legan (T.13, 28r)

v. also aççalem and aççunna

[ap(e)legar]
  ap(e)lega (B.N.5223, 250v)
  ap(e)legaos (B.N.5223, 250v)
  ap(e)legaro (B.N.5223, 250v)

  p(e)leyte(y)o (B.N.5073/7, 1v)
  p(u)lubia (J.30, 139r)
    p(u)lubi(y)a (J.30, 141r, 142v)

  pobrezza (B.N.5223, 247v)

[polber]
  pu(w)elbo (B.N.5319, 232v)
  pu(w)elba (B.N.5319, 230v)

  polidaf (B.N.5319, 232v)

[poner]
  porma (B.N.5223, 251r)
  pop(a)lador (J.1, 215v)
  porposito (T.16, 2v)

  porma v. [poner]

  portante (T.13, 28v)
  portes (pl.) (B.N.5319, 238v)

  portestaci(y)on (B.N.5073/7, 2r)

  pos (B.N.5319, 240r)
    posotros (J.30, 141v)
    pu(w)est(a)ra (J.30, 142r)

  to please
  to reach
  possibly a calque of Ar. , balaga, 'to reach'
  G. de F. 258: 'llegar', 'allegar', 'convocar'

  to come together, to help
  plea, pleading (legal)
  rain, Arag.
  Kontzi 313: p(u)lubi(y)a, p(u)lubya; G. de F. 259: p(u)lubia
  poverty
  to turn
  secrecy
  to put
  G. de F. 259: pormé
  inhabitant
  intention
  matter, problem?
  gates
  sing. port or porte?
  protest, claim
  you
  your (fem.)
[presentar]

presentsamos (B.N. 4908/1, 2v)
post(e)renmeri(y)a (B.N. 5319, 233r)

[p(a)ratika (B.N. 5223, 250v)
[p(a)ratikar]

p(a)ratika (B.N. 5223, 250v)
p(a)ratikes (B.N. 5223, 250v)

p(e)reikaci(y)on (J. 30, 142v)

[p(e)rençipal (J. 1, 3v)

[p(a)rençipi(y)ar]

p(a)rençipi(y)aron (B.N. 4908/1, 1v)
p(i)rençibe (J. 1, 4v)

p(e)resent (B.N. 5073/7, 2r)

p(e)resona (B.N. 5319, 232r, v; T. 13, 28r)

[p(e)reyender]

p(e)reyendan (B.N. 5319, 240v)
[b(e)reyender]

b(e)reyendan (B.N. 5319, 238v)

p(i)ri(y)estan (B.N. 5073/7, 1r)

p(i)rimera (B.N. 5073/12, 1r; B.N. 4908/1, 1r)

p(i)rinçibe v. p(e)rençipal

[p(o)robe[ndar]]

p(o)robe[ndar]os e (J. 30, 141r)

p(o)robi(w)aja v. ap(o)robechami(y)ento

p(o)robi(y)o (J. 1, 214r)

p(o)romisi(y)on, ti(y)erras de (J. 1, 5r)

to lay down, to place

latter part of dealings
to have dealings with Klenk 120
teaching, lesson Sánchez 147: preicando chief, principle to begin

prince
Lincoln 638: prencipio; Kontzi 314: p(u)rensip(y)ar this (day), Arag.
G. de F. 260
to take?
G. de F. 260: prender to take

loan, Arag.
firstly, Arag.

promised land

person
Nyk1 607; Klank 314; Kontzi 121; G. de F. 260

(354.)
property, attribute

purpose (error for p(o)roposito?)

door

purification
to ascend, Arag.
Gayangos 446; Nykl 607; Kontzi 315; G. de F. 261

on (B.N.5319, 230v, 231r et passim; T.13, 30v)

qoraçon (B.N.5223, 252v)

qosa (B.N.5319, 240v)

q(i)ri(y)atura (J.1, 215v)

qu(w)ando (B.N.5223, 247v, 249v, 251r)

qu(w)arenta v. ku(w)aranta
qu(w)at(o)ro v. ku(w)aranta
qu(w)atro v. ku(w)aranta
qu(w)enta (J.1, 216r)
qu(w)erpo (J.1, 215v)

the first words of Chapter 112 of the Qur'an, "Say, 'He is God, the only one'.".
Gayangos 439; Saa. 325; G. de F. 237
rragel (B.N.5073/12, 1r)

[rraç(y)onar]
rraç(y)onan (B.N.5319, 231v)
[rraçonar]
rraçonaron (B.N.5319, 231v)
[rrazonar]
rrazonaron (B.N.5319, 230r, 233r, 236r)

[rracheçar]
rracheçaron (B.N.5319, 235v)

rrajab (T.13, 32r)

rrazonaron v. [rraç(y)onar]

[rrebibkar]
rrebibkaras (B.N.5319, 233r)
[rrebiwickar]
rrebiwke (T.13, 28v)

rrbi(y)entome v. rrepentimi(y)ento
rrbiwick v. [rrebibkar]

[rrebtar]
rri(y)ebte (J.30, 142r)

[rredrar]
rri(y)edref (B.N.5319, 232r)

rref(e)regami(y)ento (J.1, 215v)

small shiny silk cloth, or possibly Arras tapestry
DCELC s.v. RAER
to reason

to reject, to refuse
seventh month of the Islamic calendar
Gayangos 446; Saa. 327; Kontzi 321

to revive
Gayangos 446; Nykl 608; Kontzi 318: rehibkar, rrebirkar etc.; G. de F. 264: rrebibkado(s)
to blame
Klenk 123: rribtar; Kontzi 322: rrebtar, rribtar, rruitar; G. de F. 264: rrebtar
to withdraw, to take back
Alonso: s. VIII v XIV; Nykl 608; Kontzi 318: redrar; G. de F. 265: rredrado
reprobation, upbraiding, criticism
Gayangos 441: esfregar, 'fregar', 'restregar'; Kontzi 263: esfregar; G. de F. 265: rref(e)rega
regno (B.N. 5073/6, 1r)
rreismo (T. 13, 29r; J. 30, 139v, 140r)

regir (J. 1, 5v)
rrekir (B.N. 5073/6, 1r)
[rrekolgar]
rrekolgado (B.N. 5223, 252r)

[rrekontar]
rrekontado (B.N. 5223, 251r)
[rrequentarse]
rrequ(w)entase (B.N. 5223, 251v)

rreku(w)a (B.N. 5319, 237r)

rrelumb(a)rante (J. 30, 137v)

[rremeñyar]
rremeñyal'e (B.N. 5223, 252v)
rrenzilloso (J. 1, 215r)
rrepentimi(y)ento (B.N. 5223, 249r)

rrepintenci(y)a (J. 1, 216r; (B.N. 5223, 248r, 249r)

[rrepintirse]
te rripi(y)entas (B.N. 5223, 249v)
te rrepentiras (B.N. 5223, 249r)

[rrebentirse]
rrebi(y)entome (B.N. 5319, 232v)
[arrepentirse]
arrepinti(y)eronse (J. 30, 142r)

arrapinti(y)ente (B.N. 5223, 249v)

kingship
Gayangos 446: 'la condición y oficio de Rey, la dignidad real'; Nykl 608: rriismo, rreismo, riismo; Klenk 122; Kontzi 322; G. de F. 265
to direct, to co-ordinate
Hoenerbach 281: 'erwerben'; Klenk 122: 'verlangen', 'bitten'
to hang
caravan, procession
DC-LC s.v. CUA; Klenk 122: rreku(w)a, rrauku(w)a
shining
Kontzi 323
to assist
quarrelsome
repentance
repentance
to repent
G. de F. 267: rrepentirse
penitent (noun)
[repet(e)rebar]  
repet(e)rebo (B.N.5223, 249v)  
to rebuke

requ(w)entase v. [rekontar]  
postponement of oath

reskolgami(y)ento de jura  
(B.N.5073/7, 2r)  
Hoenerbach 324; 'schwebendes 
Zidverfahren'; sykl 608:  
'let fall down', 'to let slide down';  
G. de F. 267: reskolgado

rettornar (B.N.5073/7, 2r)  
to return?

rett(a)raer (J.30, 140v)  
to criticize

ribiya (B.N.4905/1, 1r, 4r)  
board, plank

[rebetar]  
[Rreðrar]  
wealth

saber  
to know

saper (B.N.5319, 242v)  
wise man, learned man

sey (B.N.5319, 234v)(v. also seyer)  
wise man, learned man

sabi (B.N.5223, 251v)  
G. de F. 270: sabidor

sabidor (J.1, 4r)  
sapi(y)o (B.N.5319, 243r)  

S.
sabor (B.N.5319)
salbami(y)ento (B.N.5319, 232v, 238r, 244v)
salbo (B.N.5319, 243v)
sali(y)ente (B.N.5223, 251r; J.30, 138r)

šalla Allahu ġalayhi wa şalām (B.N.5319, 231v)
šalla Allahu ġalayhi wa şallām (B.N.5223, 251v, 252r)
šc m (J.1, 4r)

saller (B.N.5319, 233r)
salle (B.N.5319, 234v)
sallen (B.N.5319, 243v)
salleron (J.30, 138v)
sallī(y)eron (J.30, 142v)
sallida (T.13, 28v)

sangar (B.N.5319, 237v)
sanidat (B.N.5073/7, 1r)
saper v. saber
sapi(y)o v. saber

sartan (B.N.5073/12, 1v)
šaw (T.13, 30r)

seido v. seyer
seiseno v. seyçintos
seixeno v. seyçintos

seka (J.30, 143r)

sennb(a)lante (B.N.5319, 235v)

knowledge?
salvation
grace?
the East

May God save him and grant him peace! (used only after reference to Muhammad).
Saa. 324; G. de F. 270

abbreviation of the above expression
to go out, Arag.

Kontzi 330: šalir, šallir; G. de F. 271: sallir

outlet, escape
Kontzi 330
to bleed
soundness of mind

frying-pan

explanation
corruption of Ar. شرخ, šarb
to sow

sawn wood
Alonso s.v. Serradizo 2: "Dic. de la madera serradiza, la de sierra, la que resulta de subdividir con la sierra la enteriza."

seventy
setanta (B.N. 5223, 252v)
setano (J.30, 140v)

seventh
seti(y)enb(e)re (B.N. 5073/7, 2r)

September
seγῑntos (B.N. 4908/1, 1r)

six hundred
γῑγῑentos (B.N. 5073/12, 1v)

sixth part
seiseno (B.N. 5073/12, 2r)
seixeno (B.N. 5073/12, 1v, 2r)
seyxeno (B.N. 5073/12, 2r)
seyreno (J.30, 140v)

sixteen
sezze (B.N. 4908/1, 3r, v)

sixty
sisanta (B.N. 5073/12, 1v)

to be
seyer (B.N. 5073/7, 2r)

seya (B.N. 5319, 248v, 250r)

(v. also saber)
seya (B.N. 5319, 248v, T.13, 28v, 30r, 31v, 32r)
seyan (T.13, 31r)
aiya (B.N. 5073/7, 2r)
siyan (B.N. 5073/7, 2r)
seido (B.N. 5073/7, 1v)

always
si(y)enp(e)re (J.1, 216r; B.N. 5223, 247v)

to indicate, to agree upon?

[signar]

signado (B.N. 5073/7, 1r)

[sin]

without
a sin (B.N. 5223, 250v)

without
de sin (J.30, 138v, 140v, 141v; J.52, 573r)

Yücef pp. 85-6

without, Arag.

Nykl 609; Klenk 124; Kontzi 334;
G. de F. 274: sines

sines de (B.N. 5073/7, 2r)
sinrəzon (B.N. 5223, 249r)
sisanta v. seyçintos
siski(y)ere (B.N. 5073/7, 1v)
sityada (B.N. 5223, 251v)
ṣc m v. salla Allahu ẓalayhi wa ẓaʿlem
sobredito (B.N. 5073/7, 1r; B.N. 5073/7, 1r, 2r)
sobreportal (B.N. 4908/1, 1v)
soldaḍa (B.N. 400/1, 1r)
soldari(y)ego (J.1, 214r)
subzesor (J.1, 5v)
su(w)eldo (B.N. 5073/6, 1r; B.N. 5073/12, 1v; P. i. 4908/1, 1r, 2r, v, 3r, 4r)
sujiçi(y)on (J.1, 5r)
suso de (B.N. 5073/7, 1v)
suwstileza (T.13, 28v)
suzetener (B.N. 531r, 239r)
suzidaḍ (B.N. 531r, 237v)
T.
taçala v. taçela
tabaraka taçala (3...5319, 237v)

ٌتَآَرَكَرَكْ تَعَلَّ
tabaraka alladī biyadihi ilmuiku (B.N. 5223, 251v)

ٌتَآَرَكَرَكْ ذَٰٔلِكَ الَّذِي يَبْرَعُ ٱلْمُلْكُ
tacha (J.30, 140v)

taçela (B.N. 5223, 252r, 253r;
J. 30, 138v, 139v)
taçala (T.13, 31v)

injustice
whosoever
above-mentioned
lintal
soldierly, military
successor
old Aragonesè coin, 1 sueldo = 12 dineros
subjection
Breve_BoeLC: 1ª doc. 1438
more than, very
subtlety
to sustain?
dirt
blessed and exalted be he
Ar. تَعَالَ تَعَالَ تَعَالَ ta ẓalā
blessed be he who has in his hands the whole world
Ar. تَآَرَكَرَكْ tabaraka
Both expressions are used after reference to Allah.
error, moral blemish
(J.52, 573r: taja)
Nykl 610; G. de F. 276
exalted be he
Used after reference to Allah.
interpretation, commentary on the Qur'an
Ar. تفسير, tafsîr
Gayangos 447: tafsîr;
Saa. 327: tafçira
repetition of the formula
الله أكبر, Allah akbar, God is the most great.

[ta]fâcîr (T. 13, 31v)
tahurâr v. atahur
tabhirâta (T. 13, 30r)

tayenda de monjū irrabi (B.N.5319, 244v)
telaña (B.N.5319, 243v)
temor v. [aber]
tendîmi(y)ento (B.N.5319, 231v)
[tener]
terna (J.1, 214r)
ternas (B.N.5223, 248r)
tubi(y)endo (J.1, 4v)
teolji(y)a (J.1, 213v)
terna, termas v. [tener]
ti(y)enpo (J.30, 139r)
toballa (B.N.5073/12, 1r)
toballon (B.N.5073/12, 1r)
tobayon (B.N.5073/12, 1r, v)
tod'ora (B.N.5073/7, 2r; B.N.5073/6, 1r)
tomadôr d' ojo (B.N.5319, 238v)
tornaña (B.N.5319, 231v)

lying down
to have

theology

Arag.

1. P. Arnal Cavero, Vocabulario del alto aragonés: de Alquezar y pueblos próximos, p. 29, 'pañol de cocina; paño de mancos; toalla burda'.

1. Nyil 611: 'always, each time'; G. de F. 278: tod-ora, toda ora

2. Klenk 125: tomar de ojo, 'ausspionieren'

3. Alonso s.v. TORNAR 5: 'volver en sí, recobrar el sentido'. (Alonso dates this as 13th-14th century)
tornador (B.N. 5319, 229v)
tornar (B.N. 5319, 230r)
[tonarse] (1)
tornate (B.N. 5319, 230v)
[tonarse] (2)
tornar (B.N. 5319, 231r)
tornar (B.N. 5319, 232v)
(tornarse) (1)
tornate (B.N. 5319, 230v)
[tonarse] (2)
tornar (B.N. 5223, 250v)
[tonarse] (3)
tornara (B.N. 5223, 251v)
[tonarse]
tornarse a (B.N. 5223, 251v)
(for tornar v. also acçalem)

[torteyer]
torteye (B.N. 5319, 233v)
torteyen (B.N. 5319, 233r)
t(a)rabacho (J. 1, 5r)
[trebajar]
trehabajaron (B.N. 4908/1, 2v)
t(a)rabaso (B.N. 5073/12, 1r, 1v)
t(a)rasoro (J. 30, 139v)
[t(a)rayar]
t(a)rayo (B.N. 4908/1, 1v, 2v, 3r, 4r)
rayo (B.N. 4908/1, 2r)
trehabajaron v. t(a)rabacho
t(e)rebato (J. 1, 5r)

person who replies
to reply
to turn away, to go back
to return, to come back
to return, to send back
to send away, to dismiss
to turn (upon)
to turn (upon)
to do wrong
Yuduf 94
trouble, labour
to work
Nykl 610: t(a)rabacho, t(a)rabasso; Kontzi 339:
t(e)rebacho, t(e)rebajar, etc.;
G. de F. 280: t(e)rebajo
pillow, bolster
DCLC, s.v. VEJTER
treasure
Nykl 610; Kontzi 339
to bring, to carry
G. de F. 280: t(a)rayar

1. Arnal Codera: trebatir, 'perderse, confundirse una cosa'.

---

353.
t(е)rәbulәgi(y)on (T.13, 28v)

trissьiо (J.1, 4v)

нasesаdоr (J.1, 215r, 216r)

t(е)restiislar (J.30, 140v)

t(s)robar]
t(s)robaron (J.1, 5r)

tubi(y)endo v. [tener]

u(ω)elgo v. hu(ω)elgo

ufаna (T.13, 29r)

uri(y)oso (J.1, 215r)

cuyaynata (B.N.5319, 230r)

wa аlhamdu lillahi rabb alcәlamәn (B.N.5223, 251r, v)

الحمد لل‎ہٰ ً رәب ً العالمین

wa ilahukumu (B.N.5223, 251v)

و الهكِم ً و
wa salla Allahu ʿala Muḥammadin ilkarīmi wa ʿala elihi wa saḥba (?) wa ʿalam tasliʿīman (B.N. 5223, 253r)
وفق الله عليه و سلم تشليماً
wa salla Allahu ʿala elihi ʿayyidinī Muḥammadin ilkarīm, wa ʿala elihi (J. 1, 3v)
وفق الله عليه سيدنا سلم الكرم و علي الأم
walarḍon v. gu(v)alarḍon

[wārḍar]
wardādo (B.N. 5223, 251v)

[wārḍarse de]
wardāte (B.N. 5223, 247v, 250v)

[wāwarḍar]
wāwarḍareys (1.13, 31r)
werfan (B.N. 5223, 250r)

[wāwāvarḍareys v. [wārḍar]

[yamar]
yamaron (B.N. 5319, 235r, 236r)
yazer (B.N. 5319, 235v)
ye (B.N. 5223, 247v et passim; J. 30, 137v, 139r)

ye rabba aṭelamin (J. 30, 143r)
بارب العالمين
yerba (J. 30, 139v)

[yerra]
yerra (B.N. 5223, 249v, 250v)
yerrays (J. 30, 141v)

Muḥammad the noble, and his family, may Allah save them and grant them good health and peace.

Allah bless him, our noble leader, and his family to protect
to avoid, to protect oneself
to retain, to keep
orphan
to call
to lie down
oh!
Ar. يَا, ya, always used in the vocative
oh lord of the worlds!
grass
to err
Gayangos 449; ḳ‘ul 611; Kontzi 342; G. de F. 291; yerror
1. Periodical Abbreviations and Places of Publication

A
Arabica, Leiden

AFA
Archivo de filología aragonesa, Zaragoza

ALAn
Al-Andalus, Madrid, Granada

ALUM
Anuario de Letras de la Universidad de México, México

AO
Archivum, Oviedo

Archiv
Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen (und Literaturen), Braunschweig, Berlin

BF
Boletín de filología, Lisboa

BH
Bulletin hispanique, Bordeaux

BICC
Boletín del Instituto Caro y Cuervo, (Thesaurus), Bogotá

FM
Filología moderna, Madrid

GR
Geographical Review, New York

H
Hispania, Tallahassee

HR
Hispanic Review, Philadelphia

JA
Journal Asiatique, Paris

JAOS
Journal of the American Oriental Society, Boston

Lang.
Language, Baltimore

MLR
Modern Language Review, Cambridge

MO
Le Monde oriental, Uppsala

N
Neophilologus, Gröningen

NRFH
Nueva revista de filología hispánica, México

PMLA
Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, New York

RFE
Revista de filología española, Madrid

RFH
Revista de filología hispánica, Buenos Aires

RH
Revue hispanique, Paris

RI
Revista iberoamericana, Iowa City
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIEIM</td>
<td>Revista española del Instituto de Estudios Islámicos de Madrid, Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIO</td>
<td>Revue internationale d'onomastique, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLiK</td>
<td>Revue de linguistique romane, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPh</td>
<td>Romance Philology, Berkeley, Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sefarad, Madrid, Barcelona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>Studia Neophilologica, Uppsala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td>Vox Romanica, Zürich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Word, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Wörter und Sachen, Heidelberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZRPh</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, Halle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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