An Integrated Approach to Gallicisms in Thirteenth-Century Ibero-Romance

By

Stacy L. Bryant

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

(Spanish)

at the

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

2014

Date of final oral examination: 6/6/2014

This dissertation is approved by the following members of the Final Oral Committee:
Luis Tejedo-Herrero, Associate Professor, Spanish and Portuguese
Thomas D. Cravens, Professor, French and Italian
Sandro Sessarego, Assistant Professor, Spanish and Portuguese
Pablo Ancos García, Associate Professor, Spanish and Portuguese
Diana L. Frantzen, Professor, Spanish and Portuguese

© Copyright by Stacy L. Bryant 2014

All Rights Reserved

Acknowledgments

I would like to dedicate this thesis to the memory of two important figures in the development of this project, that of my mother Barbara O'Rourke and that of Ray Harris-Northall, the advisor with whom I began this study. For different reasons, this dissertation would not have been possible without them.

I would like to express my profound gratitude to my advisor, Fernando Tejedo-Herrero, for his insightful comments, patience and optimism. His spot-on recommendations and keen eye for detail have immeasurably improved this study. I would also like to thank the members of my committee for their time and thoughtful suggestions. To Thomas Cravens for his pan-Romance acumen and pointed questions that helped me refine my ideas. To Pablo Ancos, for taking the time to offer his expertise on all things *mester de clerecía* and for his reassurance that a linguist can offer a new approach to a well-studied field of literature. To Sando Sessarego for his time and comments. To Diana Frantzen for her corrections, support and for volunteering to add my dissertation defense to her long to-do list. Special thanks go to Steven Dworkin and Steven Hess, who both offered helpful bibliographical resources.

I would like to thank my dear friends Rachel, Michelle, Jessica, JoAnn and Brett for their constant encouragement, moral support and good humor. Your friendship has been a gift since that first day of graduate school. I am also indebted to my adopted families, the Heidens--René, Fritz, Gus and Axel and the Lotticks--Nina, Adam, Kadan, Samantha and Antrim. Your generosity and confidence have been a great source of inspiration.

The good-natured support of my family has been invaluable. Even though they have never understood what could be so fascinating about Old Spanish, they have been nothing but enthusiastic about my work.

Special thanks must go to my beloved husband, Steve. I cannot imagine doing this project without you. Your patience and ability to make me laugh are seemingly endless, as is your belief in me. Life has always been better together.

Abstract

This dissertation examines lexical borrowing from Gallo-Romance into Ibero-Romance within a socio-historical framework. This study proposes a model in chapter one that integrates language internal factors with a macrolinguistic analysis of the social networks and discourse coalitions at work in eleventh- through thirteenth-century Ibero-Romance in order to elucidate the processes involved in the spread and assimilation of more than eighty Gallo-Romance loanwords selected for this study. Chapter two details the integrated borrowing model, including linguistic factors frequency, word class and semantics as well as the connections between speakers. The investigation argues that the historical circumstances favored two types of contact-induced change between members of the Gallo- and Ibero-Romance speech communities. One was through face-to-face contact due mainly to religious, political/military, and commercial population movement. Another type was indirect, through purpose-oriented coalitions. Chapter three demonstrates the first type of contact by tracing the three macrosocial networks, ecclesiastic, military and commercial, that contributed to the adoption and diffusion of a number of Gallicisms (e.g., *capiscol*, *linaje*, *garnacha*). These networks are identified by close examination of the notarial and legal documentation, which confirms the terms spread in correspondence with areas of Gallic population movement, generally from east to west as well as north to south as territories were repopulated during the Reconquest. Chapter four presents evidence that indirect contact among members of two discourse coalitions, that of the *mester de clerecía* composers and that of the Alfonsine collaborators, influenced the adoption and spread a number of loanwords (e.g., *solaz* and

lisonjar). Detailed study of the poems created by the *mester de clerecía* and of the various learned works produced under the aegis of Alfonso X reveals the shared discursive goals, high level of erudition of these men and common stylistic features, including the use of Gallicisms. The investigation is one of the first on the history of the lexicon in Spanish to apply socio-historical models of social networks and discourse coalitions. The proposed model can be applied to other periods and contexts that resulted in borrowing and presents the utility of these modern sociolinguistic constructs to shed light on historical situations of contact.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments i

Abstract ii

Chapter 1: Introduction 1
- 1.0 Background and state of the question 1
- 1.1 Using the present to explain the past 5
- 1.2 Use of expanded corpus of sources 10
- 1.3 Objectives and research questions 11
- 1.4 Method and contribution of the integrated borrowing model 12
  - 1.4.1 Phase I Gallicisms 13
  - 1.4.2 Phase II Gallicisms 14
  - 1.4.3 Contribution 15
- 1.5 Organization of the investigation 16

Chapter 2: Theoretical foundation for an integrated lexical borrowing model in Ibero-Romance 19
- 2.0 Introduction 19
- 2.1 Diachronic lexical borrowing investigations in Spanish 24
- 2.2 Borrowing as an effect of language contact: Linguistic factors 30
  - 2.2.1 Frequency 33
  - 2.2.2 Grammatical category 35
  - 2.2.3 Semantic considerations and synonymy 36
- 2.3 Borrowing as an effect of language contact: Social factors 39
  - 2.3.1 Socio-centric networks: Ecclesiastic, military and commercial 44
  - 2.3.2 Discourse coalitions and borrowing 49
- 2.4 Gallicisms in Old Ibero-Romance: An integrated model 54
  - 2.4.1 Combining the diachronic and synchronic 55
  - 2.4.2 Gallicisms in Old Ibero-Romance: Our contribution 59

Chapter 3: Phase I Gallicisms 63
- 3.0 Introduction 63
- 3.1 Gallicisms spread via social networks: A socio-centric approach 66
- 3.2 Ecclesiastic Gallicisms: Gallic monastic orders and Iberia 70
  - 3.2.1 Ecclesiastic network types and loanword diffusion 75
  - 3.2.2 Gallicisms spread through ecclesiastic networks 81
- 3.3 Military and political Gallicisms 90
  - 3.3.1 Military and political networks: Type one 91
  - 3.3.2 Military and political networks: Type two 98
  - 3.3.3 Gallicisms spread through political networks 103

3.4 Commercial network structures: Single type 114
3.4.1 Commercial growth due to pilgrimage 116
3.4.2 Commercial and communication routes in reconquered territory 121
3.4.3 Gallicisms through commercial ties 124
3.5 Conclusion to Phase I 132

Chapter 4: Phase II Gallicisms 136
4.0 Introduction 136
4.1 Distinguishing sets of Gallicisms 137
4.2 Thirteenth-century Ibero-Romance discourse coalitions.......... 140
4.2.1 Common interests 141
4.2.1.1 Didacticism 143
4.2.1.2 Use of the vernacular 147
4.2.2 Intercommunication 152
4.2.3 Discoursal expectations: Topics and style 161
4.2.3.1 Discoursal expectations: *Mester de clerecía* 165
4.2.3.2 Discoursal expectations: Alfonsine coalition 169
4.2.4 Discourse coalition characteristics: Summary 173
4.3 Gallicisms spread via discourse coalitions 174
4.3.1 *Mester de clerecía* Gallicisms 175
4.3.2 Alfonsine coalition Gallicisms 191
4.4 Conclusion 205

Chapter 5: Conclusions 208

Appendix 219

Bibliography 244

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.0 Background and state of the question

It has been long acknowledged that the Ibero-Romance of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries demonstrates a lexical legacy left by Gallo-Romance speakers that has lasted in many cases to the modern language[1]. Beginning with prescriptivists who wanted to keep the Spanish language "pure" to later linguists who sought to catalogue the origins of the lexicon, there has been recognition by scholars of the important Gallic lexical influence on Ibero-Romance. A vast bibliography exists of investigations on the diachronic changes in phonology, morphology, and syntax in Spanish, such as recent work written from the perspective of sociolinguistic theories of language change (see Gimeno Menéndez 1995; Penny 2000, 2002; Tuten 2003). Although Pratt (1980) used the combination of synchronic and diachronic perspectives in his study of Anglicisms in Spanish that Hope (1971) had advocated, lexical change in Spanish remains less studied from the perspective of the language users (Dworkin 2005). It is in this light that the study seeks to incorporate insights from sociolinguistic theory as well as expand the number of source texts through the use of a large database, the *Corpus diacrónico del español* (CORDE) to examine the effects of borrowing on the lexicon of twelfth- and thirteenth-century Ibero-Romance.

[1] This investigation employs these linguistic labels broadly. Ibero-Romance is the overarching term used to designate the varieties of Romance that were used in the central and northeastern Iberian Peninsula, while Gallo-Romance is the broad term that describes the Romance varieties used by individuals in what is today France as well as Cataluña in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The dialects are labeled *langues d'oïl* and *langues d'oc* varieties, referring to the manner of saying 'yes' in the respective dialect continuum. In general terms, the *langues d'oïl* are spoken in the northern half of what is today France, while the *langues d'oc* are spoken in the southern half, with a third group, called Franco-Provençal spoken in southeast central France (see Harris 1988a:13-17).

In contrast with the studies available on the phenomenon in other languages such as French, German and English, linguists have shown limited theoretical investigation on the process and result of borrowing in the development of Spanish[2] (see Gómez Capuz 1998:14-16). In addition, the important works on the topic (see Colón 1967a, Colón 1967b, Corominas and Pascual 1980-91, De Forest 1916, Dworkin 2012, Hess 1966, Lapesa 1960, 1981, 1984, Maíllo Salgado 1998, Pottier 1967) present loanwords as the result of a single process, motivated by the cultural prestige of Gallo-Romance. The format of the above studies indicates a simplified approach to the different types of contact that occurred in the eleventh through the thirteenth centuries, generally grouping the Gallicisms into semantic fields in which Gallic culture was perceived to be superior.

It is the intention of this study to present a holistic view of lexical borrowing that reconsiders the results of previous studies noted above by recognizing that there are additional linguistic and social factors that influence borrowing. Thus, the lexical data available on the loanwords from Gallo-Romance will be analyzed in light of the contributions of contemporary sociolinguistic theory relevant to the historical and linguistic circumstances of Iberia in this period that affected lexical changes like the adoption and spread of borrowings. In this way, the proposed study will update the history of the Spanish lexicon in general and the history of Gallicisms in particular.

The previous borrowing studies noted above have added much to the study of the history of the Spanish language, but did not use modern theoretical approaches as they examined limited source material. De Forest (1916) studied lexical borrowing into Old

---

[2] To avoid tedious repetition, the terms borrowing and loanword will be used interchangeably, except where the process (borrowing) and result (loanword) are discussed in detail.

Spanish from Gallo-Romance varieties from a non-prescriptive stance, but his scope was narrow, using only the *Poema del Cid*, works of Berceo, the *Libro de Alexandre*, and the *Poema de Fernán González* as source documents. Some decades later, Lapesa picked up the topic and published much (see 1948 [1984], 1960, 1981) on the presence of Gallicisms in Spanish, in his view a broad category that comprised *langue d'oc* and *langue d'oïl* varieties of Gallo-Romance (see Lapesa 1960), his work did not discuss etymologies. Instead Lapesa focused on explaining the presence of loanwords through the historical contacts between Spain and France through the centuries, finding evidence in the political alliances through marriages, military ties, and the reforms of the Church instituted by French monastic orders. Through these influences, borrowings such as *doncel* 'young man', *fraile* 'monk, friar', and *preste* 'priest' came into the Spanish lexicon (Lapesa 1960:598).

Corominas and Pascual (1980-1991), in turn, present in their *Diccionario crítico etimológico castellano e hispánico* (DCECH) the detailed etymologies of numerous lexical borrowings from across the Pyrenees. Citing the above-mentioned *doncel* (s.v. *dueño*), Corominas and Pascual determine that this item is Catalan in origin. Although the exhaustive detail contained in the DCECH will be the primary source of etymological information for our study, one criticism made of Corominas and Pascual is the tendency to find Catalan origins of forms that are not necessarily strictly Catalan (Colón 1967a:158). Given the important role that Occitan had in the literature of the Iberian Peninsula of the Old Spanish period and their close linguistic relationship to Catalan, it is not always clear what the source language was for an item such as *doncel*. Lapesa views

it as part of the larger category of Gallicisms (1960: 598), while Corominas and Pascual are certain that it is a *catalanismo*.

The argument presented here is that, although it may be impossible to make a definitive determination for every lexeme, including data on the sociolinguistic factors of lexical borrowing can provide additional support to help settle questions of etymology when phonological change does not definitively determine a form's origin, particularly given the modern rejection of strict dialect boundaries, which prefers terms like Ibero-Romance and Gallo-Romance to describe the language situation of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

Two other general works on Gallo-Romance lexical contributions to the lexicon of Spanish were published in 1967 in Alvar's *Enciclopedia lingüística hispánica.* Pottier listed items determined to originate from what is today French under the heading *Galicismos*, and divided them by centuries and semantic fields, following many of Lapesa's classifications: military life, courtly life, and religious life. Like Lapesa's, Pottier's lists did not include etymologies in his chapter, nor the documents used to locate these *galicismos*. The second chapter of the *Enciclopedia lingüística hispánica* devoted to trans-Pyrenean lexical borrowings follows a slightly different format. Colón includes brief etymologies of these lexemes as well as a longer discussion of the historical aspects and the lexicographical sources of the terms he determines to be *occitanismos*, a term he prefers to the then common *provenzalismo* because it is more geographically correct (1967a:153) given that Provençal is a variety within the Occitan dialect continuum.

Finally, in addition to the above investigations, there has been one monograph written specifically about Gallicisms in Old Spanish, that of Hess (1966). In his unpublished dissertation, Hess includes the latest information then available on the etyma and previous scholars' analyses, as well as a brief background history on the influence of trans-Pyrenean peoples in the Iberian Peninsula. Although detailed, the work is limited by several factors. One is that Hess restricted his sources to literary texts dated to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, with one historical text from the Alfonsine scriptorium. Second, Hess did not discuss lexical theories of borrowing, beyond that of the prestige of the Gallic peoples who came into the Peninsula, either through the Church, military and political alliances, or commercial developments due to the pilgrims to Santiago de Compostela. Third, Hess did not place the borrowing of individual forms within the larger sociolinguistic situation of the Iberian Peninsula, understandable given the timing of his work, prior to the explosion of sociolinguistics and its subsequent application to historical linguistics.

Both linguistic and social factors affect the process and result of lexical borrowing. The study proposes that an integrated approach to the study of borrowing will help us fill in the gaps of knowledge regarding the Gallicisms of the period of study.

1.1 Using the present to explain the past

The borrowing model employed in this study begins with theoretical innovations that can be effectively applied to the study of lexical borrowings. Modern linguistic investigation has shown that variation is a part of language at every level, including the

lexicon. Lexical borrowing is a form of lexical variation and should be studied as a category of linguistic change (Dworkin 2012:2). Labov (1977) has discussed the use of the present to explain the past, writing specifically about phonological change, but whose ideas can be applied to lexical changes as well:

> A linguistic change begins as a local pattern characteristic of a particular social group, often the result of immigration from another region. It becomes generalized throughout the group, and becomes associated with the social values attributed to that group. It spreads to those neighboring populations which take the first group as a reference group in one way or another. The opposition of the two linguistic forms continues and often comes to symbolize an opposition of social values. These values may rise to the level of social consciousness and become stereotypes, subject to irregular social correction, or they may remain below that level as unconscious markers. Finally, one or the other of the two forms wins out. There follows a long period when the disappearing form is heard as archaic, a symbol of a vanished prestige or stigma, and is used as a source of stereotyped humor until it is extinguished entirely. (230)

Labov uses the results of modern linguistic variation as a way to explain variation and change in the past[3]. The same can be done in a study of lexical borrowings in medieval Spanish, although factors like systems of communication, education and social distinctions are quite different today than in the period of study. Dworkin has noted that, "se ven en el léxico los mismos procesos de coexistencia de las variantes conservadoras e innovadoras, fenómeno estudiado muy de cerca con respecto a los cambios fonéticos dentro del marco teórico esbozado por los sociolingüistas de sesgo laboviano" (2005:60).

There are important discoveries from contemporary language variation studies that are applicable to the study of lexical borrowing. Throughout the history of studying Gallicisms, consideration of individuals or social groups has been reduced to the concepts

[3] Labov (1994:9-27) contains a good introduction to the use of the present to study in the past in historical linguistics.

of prestige and historical circumstance. The groundbreaking work of Milroy and Milroy (1985) has demonstrated on a microlevel the importance of social networks in the diffusion and acceptance of linguistic innovations. Trudgill (1986) and Britain (2002) have also provided insight by demonstrating how factors such as geography, communication networks, and space influence language use. This confluence of three areas, linguistic geography (dialectology), urban dialectology (sociolinguistics), and human geography (geography and demographics) (Chambers et al. 2002) allows the complexity of language use to be studied at both a macro-societal level as well as at a finer level of detail in terms of individual language use. Hernández-Campoy (2003) has studied the modern linguistic situation of Murcia from this geolinguistic perspective, providing a model that can be modified in order to be applied to historical linguistics where the only sources are written documents, not live speakers. The advantages of the geolinguistic approach include the ability to use the reality of geography, historical communication networks, and population demographics as evidence of the spread of given lexical changes, including borrowing.

Lexical changes diffuse geographically according to various factors. One is the role of the history of a region's communication networks with another region. The more features shared between the two implies stronger communication ties (Penny 2000:82). Another factor is the relative population size and density of a given location, as well as the location both socially and geographically of the innovating group. Finally, factors such as the degree of prestige between social groups in question, the linguistic distance between the varieties, and the linguistic system itself as it embraces or rejects innovations

in the language affect the spread of features (Hernández-Campoy 2003:235). Geolinguistic studies such as Hernández-Campoy's have shown that distance interacts with population size such that larger urban centers that are more distant can have more contacts between them than with smaller centers that are more proximate.

In the diffusion of linguistic innovations then, the influence of population is a key component because changes spread from speaker to speaker through interaction (Trudgill 1983). A large population using a particular innovation will be more likely to diffuse that change to smaller populations. As Hernández-Campoy observes,

> The inhabitants living in the sphere of a given urban field will travel to a given city, or central place, rather than to another depending on the services provided by each city. It is in this way that the city polarizes space, and that polarization is shown through population, merchandise, and currency movements, which constitute the flow systems among urban settlements, with transportation and communication networks as their physical medium. (2003:236-237)

Although communication is much faster among modern people, even in rural areas, than the much slower networks of communication and transportation of medieval societies, the theory of the sphere of influence of an urban center can still be applied. One key difference between the urban centers of today and those of the medieval period is that population size was much smaller and therefore a small group of Gallo-Romance speakers could have a noticeable linguistic influence. For example, it has been estimated that the number of inhabitants in twelfth century León, Burgos, and Santiago was no greater than 2000 in each locality (Reilly 1988:152). People in the Middle Ages may have been less mobile than people are today, but they moved around, set up new communities, created new social networks, and created centers of cultural influence.

These shifts in population allowed speaker innovations to diffuse as social networks shifted as well. It is this evidence that can be applied to existing lexical knowledge on Gallicisms in order to provide a more contemporary approach to the topic.

One of the key social factors of the integrated borrowing model that the investigation proposes is how individuals interacted, either face to face through their social networks, or indirectly through written means as in the discourse coalitions that were key to the adoption of Gallicisms in learned works. Two constructs shed light on our understanding of the data available. As social network pioneers Milroy and Milroy have found in their work (see Milroy 1992, Milroy and Milroy 1985, Milroy 1987), the number and types of connections between language users affect the ways these speakers express themselves. From their work, the network concept has been studied from a historical linguistic perspective by scholars such as Bergs (2000, 2005), Lenker (2000), Nevalainen (2000), Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg (2003) and Tieken-Boon van Ostade (2000).

Similarly, Fitzmaurice (2000, 2010) has employed the discourse coalition concept, which was defined by Boissevain (1974:171) as a short-term alliance by groups or individuals for a specific purpose and further developed by Swales (1988) and Watts (1999) in their investigations of the common language used by groups as they work to promote a shared goal. Fitzmaurice (2000, 2010) has shown that the coalition concept is useful to understand the common linguistic features of a group of eighteenth-century essay writers in London. Thus, in spite of the fact that sociolinguistic data from the past can be fragmentary, and the details of linguistic variation due to social factors are specific

to each period of study, the fact that language variation is a constant of human language requires the inclusion of these social factors in the present investigation of lexical borrowing. It is of course people who change their language use, adopting innovations like loanwords to express themselves as they wish in a particular context.

1.2 Use of expanded corpus of sources

In addition to including both linguistic and social factors as part of the study, the number of source texts that include Gallicisms in the period of study is greatly expanded, thanks to modern electronic databases such as the *Corpus diacrónico del español* (CORDE) that provide the data analyzed here. Due to the overview nature of previous studies like those of Colón (1967), Dworkin (2012), Lapesa (1981) and Pottier (1967), these authors discuss the phenomenon in more general terms. Similarly, the dissertation by Hess (1966) and the pioneering article by De Forest (1916) both employed limited sources. Although Hess included both literary and notarial works, the latter was limited to the material of Ramón Menéndez Pidal's *Documentos lingüísticos de España* (1919).

In contrast, CORDE allows ready access to hundreds of different texts from all categories known in the period, including historiographical, legal, literary, notarial, sapiential and scientific documents. While by no means entirely conclusive, given that the database consists of those works edited and published and does not include those texts found only in manuscript form, CORDE permits token counts as well as the number of

texts for each Gallicism of this study[4]. These numbers, in combination with the geographical distribution of the texts in which the term is employed, help to determine the relative integration of a term in question into twelfth- and thirteenth-century Ibero-Romance.

1.3 Objectives and research questions

With the consultation of additional sources, as well as the integrated approach to studying Gallicisms, the basis of the investigation is the truism that it is the users of a language who vary in their use of said language and cause it to change. Thus, the primary objective of the study is to demonstrate the utility of a comprehensive borrowing model that highlights how both the linguistic and the social factors influenced the adoption of loanwords from Gallo-Romance in the period of study. In particular, the research emphasizes the contributions of the social network construct that shed light on the adoption and integration of a set of twelfth- and thirteenth century-borrowings from Gallo-Romance in Old Ibero-Romance. This approach will then be readily applicable to other periods of language contact that resulted in borrowing in Spanish. Different historical circumstances naturally result in different network types, but the basic model will be readily adapted to illustrate the adoption and spread of borrowings from other periods. As noted above, the questions that the study seeks to answer include what factors can be seen to have influenced the spread into Ibero-Romance of the Gallicisms of the

[4] One of the disadvantages of using CORDE is that the database does not provide a total word count by century. This prevents us from analyzing the token numbers in terms of the frequency per 1000 words. In spite of this, we believe that including token counts per lexeme, as well as the number of texts in which the term is found provides key information about the degree of integration into different registers of the language of this period.

period, given the fact that it is the language users themselves who alter their language. What linguistic and historical facts play a part in the words' presence in different types of texts? What can linguistic variation and contact situations that resulted in lexical borrowing in the present tell us about the phenomenon in the past?

By using an integrated approach that examines the diachronic and synchronic data available on *galicismos* in light of both internal and external factors, including the typological similarity between Gallo-Romance and Ibero-Romance, the frequency of loanwords in different types of texts, which suggests the type of contact that allowed their adoption, and the relationships speakers had with their environment and society, the study of borrowing moves beyond the word list by semantic field and date and more fully account for the presence of these words in the texts of the first centuries of written Ibero-Romance. Discoveries by modern linguistic research have demonstrated that both internal and external factors influence lexical borrowing, and therefore suggest the re-examination of the data available on loanwords from Gallo-Romance integrated into the Romance of Iberia is a welcome contribution to the field of historical linguistics.

1.4 Method and contribution of the integrated borrowing model

The methodology employed in the investigation began with the lists of Gallicisms that were identified diachronically by Colón (1967a, 1967b), Lapesa (1981) and Pottier (1967). From this lexical starting point, based on the amount of data available in

CORDE[5], a group of some 84 loanwords is analyzed in light of the factors involved in the proposed integrated model of lexical borrowing that will be applied to the data available on the list of loanwords. These include, frequency, word class, and social network ties. The related discoveries of modern sociolinguistics demonstrate how the relationships and social connections of individuals play a part in the spread of linguistic innovations like borrowings. Thus the study's model of lexical borrowing combines relevant factors such as the composition of the social networks of the period with the linguistic evidence available of the Gallo-Romance terms in thirteenth-century Ibero-Romance. Through the examination of the data available, including the macrosocial network connections of the period, Gallicisms of the period can be divided into two main groups. The first set of loanwords was adopted and spread through direct face-to-face contact, while the second set is characterized by a diffusion through indirect means through exposure to written texts containing Gallic lexemes.

1.4.1 Phase I Gallicisms

The analysis of the data available on the Gallicisms in the period of study points to two main phases of borrowing, depending on the information on the spread of the loanwords. The first group, labeled Phase I borrowings, will be described in detail in chapter three and are characterized by a diffusion through loose-knit social networks, from the macro-social perspective proposed by Bergs (2005). As Britain (2002) and

---

[5] In order to keep the investigation manageable, the list of Gallicisms examined in light of the integrated model is limited to those terms that have reached the modern language. An area of future research is to return to the larger list of terms from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries that did not remain in the lexicon to study what factors may have affected their loss versus the maintenance of other loanwords.

Hernández-Campoy (2003) have shown, the patterns of interaction of people in a given area affect the spread of language change. A major route like the Camino de Santiago transported not only goods, but also words via the pilgrims and merchants who traveled along it. This overall diffusion pattern of Gallic population, in combination with the general north to south movement as the Reconquest progressed, provides us with the geographic and demographic context behind the textual evidence of the use of *galicismos* like *garnacha* 'cloak' and *hostal* 'inn' in the twelfth and thirteenth century Ibero-Romance.

1.4.2 Phase II Gallicisms

Phase II Gallicisms differ from Phase I terms in that the evidence shows a diffusion through indirect contact between individuals rather than through face-to-face interactions. The discourse coalition construct sheds light on the means of diffusion of Phase II loanwords. The coalition, as defined by defined scholars like Swales (1988) and Watts (1999), is a group of individuals whose language use reflects a common purpose, a means of intercommunication, often through written texts, similar topics as well as shared discoursal markers. The investigations by Fitzmaurice (2000, 2010) have applied discourse coalition concept to a set of eighteenth-century writers, effectively demonstrating the mutual influence noted in the texts produced by the writers of the London periodical *The Spectator*. Through their writing, these men set and followed certain discursive expectations. Similarly, evidence gathered in the present study points to the existence of two coalitions of thirteenth-century writers of Ibero-Romance, the

writers of the *mester de clerecía* and the collaborators on the works of the Alfonsine scriptorium, had indirect connections via writing rather than the direct contact that happens through everyday social network connections. In the same way, the study details in chapter four how shared features of a group of learned texts produced in the thirteenth century argue for the existence of two discourse coalitions of erudite men who were writing in Ibero-Romance that influenced the adoption of Gallic vocabulary[6].

1.4.3 Contribution

The main contribution of this study to the field is how the integration of both linguistic and social factors in the study of borrowing in Old Ibero-Romance reveals previously unexplored information on their diffusion. In particular, the application of social network theory to the evidence available on these two groups of loanwords has not been done before. The evidence gathered points to both direct and indirect types of contact and corroborate the categorization by Pottier (1967:129-130), who divided the Gallicisms of this period into four main groups based on implied cultural influence: political, commercial, religious and literary. The data collected on the loanwords indicate that the establishment of loose-knit social connections was key to the adoption and subsequent diffusion of the first three groups by Pottier. For example, there are a large number of ecclesiastic Gallicisms, including *calonge* 'canon' and *chantre* 'cantor', that entered Ibero-Romance through the establishment of Cluniac-affiliated monasteries in

[6] Different opinions about the validity and reach of the term *mester de clerecía* can be found in Uría Maqua (2000:15-51) and Weiss (2006:1-3), both of which discuss the extensive bibliography on the topic. For our study, we follow the view of Uría Maqua and see an equivalent between her term *escuela poética* and our definition of the discourse coalition associated with the texts composed in *cuaderna vía* in the thirteenth century.

Iberia. The powerful Gallic monastic order had a major influence over the Iberian Church hierarchy for over a century, including a large number of bishops and abbots of Gallic origin. From these connections, Ibero-Romance speakers have contact with Gallo-Romance ecclesiastic terminology. In turn, the evidence presented here suggests that loanwords that Pottier termed literary terms (1967:130) were adopted and spread by a group of individuals who formed a discourse coalition, a group of language users whose texts demonstrate shared goals, appropriate topics for their texts, as well as common stylistic markers (see Swales 1988, Watts 1999). The investigation will demonstrate that the application of social network theory from a macroscopic perspective provides a method of providing data to support the traditional assumption of cultural influence to explain lexical borrowing.

The holistic approach to the study of borrowing in Ibero-Romance provides a more complete picture of the adoption and spread of terms, through both direct and indirect contact between speakers, moving beyond explaining loanwords as simply cultural artifacts, instead acknowledging the influence of linguistic factors like frequency and word class along with that of social factors through the establishment of network ties. This model will then be appropriate to shed light on other situations of language contact that have resulted in borrowing.

1.5 Organization of the investigation

The study is divided into five chapters, the first of which consists of the introduction to the topic of study. Chapter two introduces the theoretical background of

lexical borrowing in general, and then specifically present the components of the integrated borrowing model that will be included in the analysis of the linguistic and social data available on the Gallicisms of Old Ibero-Romance. Through this model, the data available suggests a division of the terms into two phases of borrowing from Gallo-Romance, depending on the social networks involved in their diffusion.

Chapter three proposes how the model can be applied to the terms of Phase I, those that were adopted through personal contact and diffused more widely into Ibero-Romance. The investigation corroborates the semantic groups that Pottier (1967) presented in his study of Gallicisms, but the present study provides data on both the linguistic and social factors that played a part in their adoption and spread. In particular, it highlights the influence that loose social network ties had as speakers of Gallo-Romance interacted with those of Ibero-Romance. Specifically, the linguistic evidence confirms that religious loanwords are concentrated in the areas of strongest ties with Gallic ecclesiastic institutions. Due to the strong political ties between the rulers of Iberian kingdoms and the Gallic nobility, another set of social networks created language contact opportunities between the Gallic soldiers who came to Iberia to participate in Reconquest battles. In turn, commercial terms correspond with the establishment of services for pilgrims and travelers along the Camino de Santiago.

Chapter four analyzes Phase II Gallicisms, which were limited in the period of study to erudite works, including historiographical, legal, literary, religious, sapiential and scientific texts. The evidence suggests that the type of social construct that influenced the adoption and spread of these terms is the discourse coalition. The coalition concept

allows the spread of mutual influence without the requirement of face-to-face interaction that the loose social networks described in chapter three likely entailed. In this way, the prestige associated with the literary works in Occitan and other Gallo-Romance texts influenced the adoption of literary Gallic terms by the men involved with the production of educated works.

Chapter five contains the conclusions to the study of Gallicisms in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Ibero-Romance and reflects upon the specific findings that result from the application of the integrated borrowing model outlined in the investigation. In addition, future areas of research are proposed that emerge from the model's incorporation of contemporary sociolinguistic theory within a historical linguistic examination of lexical variation and change that can be adapted to other circumstances of language contact. It is followed by the Appendix that consists of the complete list of Gallic loanwords from the period of study whose data was gathered and analyzed.

Chapter 2: Theoretical foundation for an integrated lexical borrowing model in Ibero-Romance

2.0 Introduction

Lexical borrowing has long been recognized as a universal linguistic phenomenon. New words are continually created to label innovations as human beings regularly invent new objects and concepts. Additionally, meanings of terms can shift over time, with words acquiring new connotations and denotations in usage, leaving semantic gaps in the vocabulary previously filled by these terms. In order to meet these linguistic needs, all languages possess neological resources, one of which is borrowing from another language. There are several ways to view borrowing, including as a neological process as above, or as one result or effect of language contact.

The modern theoretical underpinnings of lexical borrowing and the proposed model that integrates the linguistic factors with the social factors involved are based in the study of languages in contact. Human beings have always moved and interacted with speakers of other languages, thus the types of effects due to language contact that can be observed today that influence or lead to lexical borrowing can also illuminate historical linguistic data and past situations of language contact. The studies on borrowing in Old Ibero-Romance have never approached the topic using the pioneering work of Haugen[7] (1950) and Weinreich (1968), in spite of their discoveries being decades old. Nor has

[7] We recognize the metaphorical inadequacy of the term *borrowing* in that the process of taking and adapting a word or form from another language is linked to the end result of the process, causing ambiguity that is not seen in other linguistic terms such as phoneme, morpheme, etc. That said, as Gómez Capuz notes, "la citada desventaja semántica es ampliamente compensada por sus ventajas prácticas (antigüedad y difusión en su uso metalingüístico, por ejemplo) y las limitaciones prácticas de los términos alternativos (difusión, adopción, etc.)" (1998:27). We will use the traditional metaphor given its widespread use in the literature and its ease in comprehension, in spite of its disadvantages.

anyone examined borrowing in light of an integrated model as Goddard (1980) proposed. The present investigation of borrowings in Old Ibero-Romance attempts to respond to Goddard's proposal, analyzing in terms of both the internal and the external factors that influenced the adoption of a given item. By investigating contemporary linguistic communities in contact, the resulting sociolinguistic methods and discoveries can be effectively applied to historical data, as Labov first noted in 1977.

The objective of this chapter is to present the theoretical aspects relevant to the study of lexical borrowing from an integrated perspective. By viewing the available lexical evidence from the perspective that borrowing is a process affected by both internal (linguistic) and external (social) factors, the study provides insight into the specific process of borrowing Gallo-Romance terms in twelfth- and thirteenth- century Ibero-Romance as well as the historical process in general. That is, the investigation will explore Gallicisms using an approach that applies social network theory, including the discourse coalition concept, both relatively recent findings of sociolinguistics that have yet to be incorporated into any investigations of the topic in early Ibero-Romance. After establishing the theoretical foundation of this study, the goal in the two subsequent chapters will be to analyze the lexical data available in light of both the internal and external factors that have proven to influence the adoption and diffusion of some 84 Gallicisms[8].

---

[8] The process of borrowing can occur interlinguistically, that is, between two historical languages whose speakers recognize them as separate, or intralinguistically, between varieties of a single language, which comprises a diasystem of diatopic, diastratic and diaphasic varieties, which can lead to intralinguistic borrowing. The inclusion in our analysis of external factors, that is, those that are not strictly linguistic or internal, such as different social networks through which words spread, we will argue that most *galicismos*

The focus on the social factors involved in the borrowing of Gallic loanwords that date from the earliest period of written Ibero-Romance that have reached Modern Spanish has led to the identification of two different methods of diffusion, through face-to-face contact or through written connections. The collected data show the first method of borrowing through close, person-to-person contact as in groups who migrate from one area to settle in another and then interact with locals. In the period of study, this interaction between speakers left behind borrowings such as ecclesiastic terms *capellán* 'chaplain' or *monje* 'monk', which arose in a situation of close linguistic contact between speakers. Based on their high frequency of appearance in a variety of texts, especially notarial, documents written by clerks to record donations, property sales and other official interactions, generally ecclesiastic institutions, the assumed means of transmission was direct from person-to-person. These terms and their means of diffusion are the topic of the third chapter of the study.

The second type of borrowing occurs from a distance via media such as written texts, film, radio or television, all of which have been particularly influential in the last century as technology has made sharing information easier. In this situation of contact, a voluntarily bilingual speaker, that is, one with the means and access to learn a foreign language, may adopt a foreign term to create a particular stylistic effect. A group of such speakers may come together to form a discourse coalition, a community of language users who share a common purpose and follow certain discoursal expectations in their writing. In the period of study, in contrast to the above ecclesiastic terms, loanwords such

---

were interlinguistic in nature at the time of their borrowing, and only over time were they fully integrated into Ibero-Romance.

as *asaz* 'quite, rather; enough' or *lisonjar* 'to flatter', limited to literary or learned texts, suggest adoption via contact between educated Ibero-Romance speakers voluntarily bilingual, who would have been a rather limited group of individuals. As part of their education, possibly at the nascent universities of Iberia, they had exposure to written Gallo-Romance texts and models or interacted with Gallo-Romance masters.

Borrowing through a discourse coalition lacks the requirement of close, extended contact between speakers of the source language and receiving language to be influential, a fact that bolsters the argument that it was through the indirect contact between and among educated men that the second set of Gallicisms was adopted and spread. Given the importance of basing one's work on an authority, through adapting a previously written model to the writer's purpose, a lexeme could be adopted from a Gallic source text or authority and diffused relatively widely. The rise of university and schools attached to monasteries and cathedrals led to a relative increase in literacy and erudition in Spain. The *studium generale* at Palencia was supported by Alfonso VIII of Castilla (r. 1158-1214), and it has been suggested that clerical poet Gonzalo de Berceo studied there in the beginning of the thirteenth century (Dutton 1973; Uría Maqua 2000). Literary models such as the epic and alexandrine verse originated in Gallo-Romance (Deyermond 1980:127) and strongly influenced the creation of the thirteenth-century school of poetry known as the *mester de clerecía*. The foundational work of this school, the anonymously written *Libro de Alexandre*, used as its principal model a twelfth-century version of the exploits of Alexander the Great, the *Alexandreis*, composed in Latin by Gautier de Châtillon, as well as a secondary source written in Old French, the *Roman d'Alexandre*

(see Uría Maqua 2000). This author, as well as Gonzalo de Berceo, who wrote more or less contemporaneously, used many terms that are limited in the period studied to learned or literary texts, including *folía* 'insanity', 'folly', *solaz* 'solace', and *vergel* 'garden, orchard', among others, revealing his educated background. All of these factors suggest a strong Gallic influence on the learned writers in Ibero-Romance who had indirect contacts through the formation of discourse coalitions. This will be outlined in section 2.3 of the present chapter and presented and illustrated in the fourth chapter of this study.

The investigation divides the discussion on linguistic theory relevant to loanwords into four main sections, the first of which (2.1) is a discussion of the traditional diachronic study of borrowing in Spanish, effectively demonstrating the need for a different approach. The second section (2.2) explores how the linguistic factors of the analysis of lexical data enhance our understanding of the phenomenon in the period of study and beyond. Section three (2.3) describes how a social network analysis and the discourse coalition construct can contribute to a comprehensive sociophilological analysis of lexical borrowing in Old Ibero-Romance. The final section (2.4) concludes with an integrated theoretical model that highlights the factors relevant to the adoption and spread of Gallicisms in Ibero-Romance and how this model can be fruitfully applied to the data available in chapters three and four of the present study.

The period of study is limited to the earliest manifestations of Gallicisms in Ibero-Romance, with the first documented loanword from 1069, according to CORDE[9], up to

[9] Given that we base our analysis on the information available in CORDE, when we refer to the earliest example of a given Gallicism, we mean the earliest example available in this database, unless otherwise indicated.

the end of the thirteenth century. All sources are obviously written documents, and the focus is on those Gallicisms that have reached the modern language. The source texts relate to or originate from various regions of what is today Spain, including Andalucía, Aragón, Castile, León, La Rioja, Murcia and Navarra. Due to the above limits, the study's discussion of lexical borrowing necessarily involves only those points relevant to analyzing the phenomenon in relation to the historical and social context in which they arise.

2.1 Diachronic lexical borrowing investigations in Spanish

Dworkin has argued that, "la historia del léxico debe constituir uno de los enfoques principales de los manuales y tratados de la Historia de la Lengua Española" (2005:60). One facet of the lexicon's change over time includes the adoption of terms from other languages, the study of which requires input from multiple disciplines besides linguistics, such as history and cultural studies. In Spanish, marginalization of borrowing research has been persistent, as can be observed in the contemporary bibliography (Gómez Capuz 1998:14). Investigations on lexical borrowing in Spanish have centered on word lists and etymologies, based on the traditional assumption that cultural factors sufficiently explained the existence of loanwords in Spanish (see Colón 1967a, 1967b, Corominas and Pascual 1980-91, Hess 1966, Pottier 1967, Maíllo Salgado 1998).

In traditional historical linguistics the approach is diachronic, with its emphasis on studying how a language changes over time. Loanwords are identified through

comparison of the phonological form of a word with the expected pattern given the preponderance of linguistic evidence of that particular language. As De Forest wrote,

> A word adopted by an allied language will betray its foreign origin either because 1. it shows no sound development where it would do so if it were native or 2. it shows sound development where it would not if it were native or 3. it shows sound development other than it would if it were native. (1916:374)

Examples of category one include *argent* 'silver' and *son* 'sound', which both lack the diphthongization of native words (e.g. *arienzo* and *sueno*). Type two examples include *ligero* 'light (weight)', 'swift', whose native counterpart was *liviano* 'light (weight)'. The final type includes the words with the suffix -*age* < ATICUM, which became -*adgo*, -*azgo* natively.

The other main means of identifying borrowings is by grouping terms that are adopted in a given historical period in which the source has a perceived cultural superiority in a particular field. A borrowing is viewed as an item of cultural exchange, but not as the result of extensive bilingualism through language contact. That is, a word is adopted from a source language by a receiving language because of a perceived cultural prestige, most likely by an educated speaker who had exposure via his education to texts and other source language content. In this scenario, the two languages are essentially equals in status except in a particular field. Calvet, writing about French and English in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, stated that "los préstamos que se hacen una a otra dos comunidades lingüísticas dan testimonio de las relaciones que sostienen o sostuvieron entre sí" (2005:109). He argued that such testimony refers to both the quantity and balance or imbalance of this quantity, as well as to the semantic fields of the loanwords

(Calvet 2005:109). Calvet was paraphrasing Meillet's declaration that "tout vocabulaire exprime une civilisation" (1921-1936:145). De Forest recognized the risk of arguing that these words indicate the type and intensity of the influence that what is now France had over Iberia when he observed that "the obvious danger here is that of reasoning in a circle; one might deduce loanwords from the known historical and sociological conditions and then infer historical events and social conditions from the borrowed words" (1916:377).

In spite of this risk, the traditional diachronic view of lexical borrowing is that the number of loanwords and their nature determine the intensity and character of the interaction between two groups of speakers (De Forest 1916:377). The view that words are "witnesses of history", as the title of Brunot's book (1928) proposed, places the emphasis on the environment in which the words were adopted and on the study of the referents of the loanwords in question. In turn there is a reduction of interest in the borrowings' own linguistic characteristics. Instead, as individual entities with their own histories per Gilliéron's affirmation that "chaque mot a son histoire" (cited in Iordan (1970:170)), the analysis of the cultural and historical relationships between the source and the receiving languages dominate any study of the words' linguistic features. Loanwords are categorized by historical period and semantic fields, with the assumption that the new words referred to new objects or concepts previously unknown in the borrowing tongue.

In studies on Gallicisms in the Spanish of this period[10], in line with the diachronic tradition, two main scholars of the topic, Lapesa (1981) and Pottier (1967), used similar methods to organize their lexical studies. Pottier, for example, divided the terms first by century and then by cultural fields of influence (military, court, public, civil, private life). Within those categories, Pottier made further divisions, not all of them clear at first glance, e.g. including *deán* 'deacon', *frere* (*fraile*) 'religious brother', *preste* 'priest', and other ecclesiastic terms under the general category of court life. Given the limitations of the type of article Pottier was writing, that is, a chapter in a much larger encyclopedic work on the history of Spanish, it is understandable that much detailed information about specific Gallicisms and their histories was not included. But the reader is left with the suggestion that these collections of words then explain the historical relationships that were maintained around the period of adoption, with little specific data regarding the routes of diffusion of given terms or given semantic fields. Even less attention was paid to understanding why a particular item was prone to adoption. It is taken as a given that the reason a word was adopted was due to the cultural prestige that speakers of French possessed.

One clearly identifiable semantic field from the earliest phase of the collected data can illustrate the diachronic perspective that labels these terms cultural borrowings. This

[10] The recent study by Varela Merino (2009) examines Gallicisms in Spanish from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries from the perspective of loanwords as evidence of the influence of French culture in the Iberian Peninsula of this period. She divides borrowings into two main groups, depending on their integration into Spanish. The first type is labeled a 'préstamo íntimo', which is a word that enters the language through situations of bilingualism. The second type is a 'préstamo cultural', adopted through cultural influences (2009:97). Varela Merino argues that the majority of loanwords of her period of study are in fact cultural borrowings and thus does not discuss in great detail the potential social networks of speakers of Spanish in contact with those of French.

group includes all of the ecclesiastic terminology (*capellán* ‘chaplain’, *maestre* ‘master’, *monje*, etc.) brought by French monks from Cluny as part of the initiative in the late eleventh century to switch to the Roman liturgical rite[11]. By only presenting a general division by semantic group into courtly terms, etc., there is no information on the types of texts in which the terms appear, nor where they appeared first. Rather, the suggestion is that the borrowings resulted from the cultural influence that the influential monastic order of Cluny possessed. Therefore the adoption of the French terms for new positions within the church hierarchy derived from the speakers’ of Ibero-Romance desire to use terms associated with the same prestige. This explanation seems logical, culturally speaking. It is incomplete, however, from a linguistic point of view given the existence in every language of neological resources such as derivation using native forms or semantic expansion of existing terms. One solution to the problems of this perspective is to include synchronic information, especially on the social factors that affected the adoption and diffusion of the terms in question.

In contrast with Pottier and Lapesa, but still within the same traditional cultural perspective on lexical borrowing from Gallo-Romance, was Colón (1967a), who offered a chapter on *occitanismos* in the same *Enciclopedia lingüística hispánica* in which Pottier’s overview on *galicismos* is found. Colón rejected the emphasis on prestige, particularly that afforded to cultural influence of Occitan, arguing that:

> muchas veces los investigadores se han dejado llevar por consideraciones extralingüísticas y se han basado en criterios de prestigio político-cultural. El occitano o “provenzal”, la lengua romana por excelencia, ha venido

[11] The important role of French clerics in the Spanish church and their lexical legacy is discussed in detail in chapter three.

> siendo considerada lengua privilegiada, capaz de proveer a las demás. (1967a:160)

While the rejection of the primacy of cultural influence to justify lexical borrowing contrasts with the views of Pottier, among others, Colón's emphasis on the date of first attestation to distinguish words whose origin is unclear due to a lack of obvious phonologically identifying characteristics is in line with other investigators of this tradition, which focuses on the diachronic aspect of borrowing. Regarding the traditional perspective, Gómez Capuz observes that, "los hechos lingüísticos no son estudiados en sí mismos, sino como instrumentos válidos para conocer determinados aspectos de otras disciplinas humanísticas: en suma, lo lingüístico se subordina a lo histórico y a lo socio-cultural" (1998:131). In cases of doubtful origin, Colón turned first to chronology, although cautiously, noting that the dating of a given document "siempre ha de considerarse aleatoria" (1967a:164). With less focus on the cultural aspect of borrowing, Colón's list of Occitanisms was ordered alphabetically, emphasizing the collection of loanwords originating from Occitan as a whole. The determining criteria used were etymology, chronology and, in some cases, historical circumstances. Only in his concluding remarks did he discuss the general cultural influences that affected the particular words adopted, dividing the terms into two main groups, "occitanismos de carácter religioso" and "otros que son consecuencia de un modo de vida refinado y cortesano" (1967a:191).

While the integrated model uses some of the criteria used in the diachronic method of studying borrowings, including the contributions of historical and etymological studies of the period, they will be combined with aspects of the other main

approach to linguistic borrowing investigation, the synchronic focus, the topic of the following section.

2.2 Borrowing as an effect of language contact: Linguistic factors

This section discusses the factors of the synchronic methodology related to the study of lexical borrowing, emerging from the development within linguistics in the mid-twentieth century that began to investigate language and variation due to various factors including situations of language contact. These studies have examined borrowing based on the investigation of bilingual or diglossic communities (see Haugen 1953, Labov 1966, Milroy and Milroy 1985, Poplack et al. 1988, Weinreich 1968). While a diachronic approach does not require bilingualism on a large scale to be effective or influential in terms of lexical borrowing, synchronic studies focus on speakers of the culturally dominant language who are bilingual or diglossic in a minority language as well. Sociolinguists like Labov (1966), Mackey (1976), Milroy and Milroy (1985), and Poplack et al. (1988), among many others, have studied how innovations either spread or are restrained by the characteristics of a particular language community in contact with another within a relatively short period of time. More recently, a corpus-based investigation of lexical borrowing has demonstrated statistically significant linguistic factors related to the adoption and spread of loanwords (see Chesley and Baayen 2010). These factors include frequency and dispersion or spread into a variety of text types

(Chesley and Baayen 2010:1344), which can be relevant to the borrowings of the present investigation as well[12].

Instead of the previous emphasis on the diachronic investigation of borrowings, with comparison of one state of language with a later state of the same language in relationship with the history or the culture of the speakers of said language being primary, in the synchronic focus the basis of the methodology is the bilingual or diglossic community. In an expansion of earlier synchronically-focused studies, sociolinguistic methods can quantify the effects of contact, including lexical borrowing, placing the study of linguistic interference within the larger field of bilingual studies, a multidisciplinary area that includes sociology, psychology, pedagogy and linguistics (Gómez Capuz 1998:178). Culture and history are not used to explain the linguistic borrowing, but rather the types of contact between speakers of the borrowing language and those of the source language illustrate the conditions in which borrowing occurred.

From this context the term *interference* has emerged as the all-encompassing concept that covers all types of effects of language contact, including lexical borrowing, but also morphosyntactic effects. It is the interaction of the two languages within the bilingual speaker that result in alterations to the norms of both languages, that is, interference as Weinreich termed it (1968:2). The term itself has been criticized by some linguists as pejorative (see Fishman 1964 and elsewhere), leading to the suggestion of the

[12] The challenge with analyzing frequency is CORDE's lack of total word count by century. This means frequencies cannot be normalized per thousand or million words. In spite of this, the analysis is based on the information provided by CORDE for several reasons. The first is that CORDE is the largest electronic database available. Second, our focus is on both linguistic and social aspects of borrowing, with a particular focus on the means of diffusion through space and time. We provide raw token counts alongside the number of different texts in order to provide a point of comparison for other Gallicisms studied here, rather than a statistical analysis of frequency.

alternative terms *transfer* and *transference* for the same concept (see Clyne 1967). Haugen has defended it (1972:364-365) and interference continues to be used, including in studies of contemporary Spanish, as Gómez Capuz notes (1998:151). Weinreich's conception of interference was structural, implying the "rearrangement of patterns that result from the introduction of foreign elements into the more highly structured domains of language, such as the bulk of the phonemic system, a large part of morphology and syntax, and some areas of the vocabulary (kinship, color, weather, etc.)" (1968:1). True additions to the recipient language occur only within certain less-structured semantic fields within the lexicon, but these additions affect the system as a whole as the lexicon is altered and relationships between and among words change.

The synchronic approach posits a role for both linguistic and social factors promoting an individual item's borrowing. The following subsections describe linguistic factors found to affect the borrowability of a form, its token count (frequency), its word class (noun, verb, adjective, etc.), the semantics of the borrowing and how it affected the semantic field it joined in the receiving language. The borrowings *capellán*, *fraile* and *monje* can be viewed from the perspective of the synchronic tradition. Seen in this light, these terms were borrowed due to the close contact between speakers of the source and the receiving languages, with the loanwords being used to refer to new positions within the Church's hierarchy, a central institution in medieval life. The three terms, *capellán*, *fraile* and *monje*, designate common positions or offices within a monastery or church. Given the placement of Gallo-Romance speakers at the top of the hierarchy, they would have employed their organization and terminology to refer to monastic or church roles.

Ibero-Romance speakers simply needed to make the connection between the sign (e.g. *capellán*) and the person or position that it denoted. Due to the prominence of the church in medieval society, it seems safe to assume that in twelfth- and thirteenth-century life Ibero-Romance speakers had regular exposure to a number of Gallic ecclesiastic terms. Thus following the linguistic or internal factors of frequency, grammatical category and semantic considerations, the study will discuss the social or external factors such as the social networks of speakers that can affect the use and subsequent integration of a borrowing.

2.2.1 Frequency

The first linguistic factor of the borrowing model that is prominent in synchronically focused borrowing studies is frequency[13] (Weinreich 1968:61). Frequently occurring items in the donor language allow greater salience for the speakers of the recipient language and reduced processing cost (see Bybee and Hopper 2001 and Bybee 2010 for a general overview). The effects of frequency appear primarily with content items such as nouns, verbs, and adjectives (Field 2002:5). In a recent study on the factors influencing whether a particular Anglicism has spread into contemporary French, Chesley and Baayen (2010) have found that frequency alone is not enough to ensure adoption. Instead, their research has shown that frequency interacts with what they label dispersion, that is, whether the term is used in different sections of a longer text (Chelsey

[13] As already noted, the token counts provided by CORDE cannot be regularized due to the limitations of the information available in the database. That said, they form part of the analysis alongside text counts because they give an idea of the degree of integration into multiple registers of the language of the period.

and Baayen 2010:1344). Although the study's analysis is not statistically based, the gathered data support this finding as well, as chapter three will develop.

Frequency for the purposes of the investigation is a raw token count of the lexeme in CORDE, which does not provide a mechanism for analysis of the frequency of the individual term in comparison with the rest of the thirteenth century. In spite of this, frequency is seen to be important in that a high token count in a variety of texts suggests broad integration into the Ibero-Romance of the period. For example, *monje* (and its variant spellings), occurs over 500 times in some 200 different documents, according to the data available in the CORDE. While it is impossible to know the frequency of its use in spoken language, the numerous uses of this term and others of its class in a wide variety of text types (historical, literary, legal, and notarial) indicate their widespread comprehension and diffusion.

Field (2002:6) has pointed out that the effect of frequency on borrowing occurs mainly with content items, whether free-standing or bound roots or bases, which have different roles in a language than grammatical forms. While the most frequent forms are grammatical function words, roots and affixes, they are not borrowed nearly as often as content items. Thus, frequency may be important in the integration and spread of a particular content item into the receiving language, but its overall effect may depend on other linguistic factors such as semantic transparency or the ease with which a speaker can connect the sign with the referent. Some of the clearest examples are those terms that designate titles or positions within the church, such as *capellán* and *fraile*, as noted previously. These terms refer to concrete concepts, not abstract ideas, and a broad cross-

section of speakers would have had frequent exposure to these terms due to the importance of the church in medieval society. In this way, frequency seen in the higher tokens counts of these terms was supported by their semantic transparency.

A second limiting factor on the influence of frequency is that numerous instances of a given word do not necessarily determine an individual's or group of recipient language speakers' relative exposure to that one item. Certain words only appear in literary or learned texts, which would suggest a more limited audience that would be familiar with them, as well as vocabulary that would be present only in certain types of texts. In the case of the period of study, an item's frequency of appearance in the textual evidence is but one key linguistic factor identifiable in the process of its adoption.

2.2.2 Grammatical category

The second internal component relevant to the integrated lexical borrowing model is grammatical category. A scale of borrowability predicts which types of elements may be adopted as contact intensity increases. Through analysis of the evidence of linguistic influence between languages, a borrowing language is more likely to adopt lexical items before phonological or structural characteristics (see Field 2002; Haugen 1950, 1953; van Hout and Muysken 1994). Haugen, in his work with Norwegian Americans, proposed a scale of borrowability that predicts that nouns are most commonly borrowed, followed by adjectives, adverbs, and other parts of speech, respectively (1950:224). For his part, Field has offered a slightly different hierarchy of borrowability, finding that nouns are the most frequently borrowed grammatical category, followed in declining order by verbs,

adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, and interjections (2002:35). In his analysis that includes the entirety of Gallic influence on the Spanish lexicon, Dworkin argued that the close genetic relationship between Gallo-Romance and Ibero-Romance possibly led to the adoption of a relatively high number of Gallo-Romance verbs, adjectives, and function words, the idea being that speakers did not perceive the words as morphologically foreign as they would have items of Arabic origin (2012:119). The morphological similarity allowed importation of verbs and adjectives, with only phonological adaptations to Ibero-Romance.

It can be observed that the patterns of borrowing noted by Field (2002) and Haugen (1950, 1953) are also seen in the study of Gallicisms in Ibero-Romance and are supported by the data. Of the borrowed items identified in this study, there are seventy nouns, eight verbs, five adjectives and one adverb, clearly supporting the existence of a hierarchy of borrowing. That is, forms borrowed first and in greater quantity are concrete nouns, with two thirds being visible things or nouns denoting people, including *batalla* 'battle', *mensaje* 'message', and *garnacha* 'robe, cloak'. The remaining third designate concepts or abstractions, such as *folía* 'folly' and *lisonjar* 'to flatter'.

2.2.3 Semantic considerations and synonymy

The issue of synonymy is important in the examination of the internal motivations behind lexical borrowing, as Goddard (1980), Gómez Capuz (1998), and Hope (1971) have noted. While the idea of a loanword may bring to mind a new sign as well as a new thing as its referent, this is not always the case, as observed previously. Hope observed

that, “borrowed words which relate wholly or partially to objects, situations or ideas already current, or at least not entirely unknown before and already catered for by an existing lexical sign are more numerous than generally realized” (1971:669). The loanword appears to be synonymous with an existing native term, that is, it duplicates symbolically via more than one word the same signification.

This *appearance* of synonymy is the key distinction. In practice the two (or more) terms do not overlap absolutely in every context, disputing the existence of synonymy. Harris stated that “synonymy is held to be sameness of meaning of different expressions. If this is correct, then to interpret claims that A is synonymous with B, we need to clarify 1. the ‘sameness’ involved and 2. the ‘meaning’ involved” (1973:11). The sameness of two synonymous expressions is in a given meaning, that is, they are used in the same way or ways by users of the language. But this definition is problematic because two words or expressions may not occur in the exact same contexts for different speakers. Lyons detailed three conditions that must be satisfied for two or more expressions to be absolutely synonymous: 1. all their meanings are identical 2. they are synonymous in all contexts and 3. they are semantically equivalent on all dimensions of meaning, descriptive and non-descriptive (1995:61). Two words or expressions, such as *fraile* and *monje*, can be synonymous in one, but not all of their meanings. As noted, these two loanwords can be translated as ‘monk’. But *fraile* also has the sense of ‘friar, brother’, in addition to performing a different role in the community as a *monje*. These two terms are really best termed partial synonyms, although they are clearly members of the larger semantic field relating to men devoted to a religious life.

The reality is that the meaning of a word includes both denotative (descriptive) and connotative or emotive (expressive) elements, thereby reducing the likelihood of true synonymy. Two partially synonymous terms do not share the same meaning in the exact same contexts because of the different connotations associated with each term. So while terms can overlap semantically, true synonymy between a borrowing like *cuita* 'trouble, care, worry; longing, yearning' and its native counterpart(s) *aflicción* 'affliction, sorrow, regret', *ansia* 'longing, desire', *duelo* 'grief', *problema* 'problem, worry', etc. does not and did not exist. Instead, the borrowing in this case offers an emotional or stylistic feature that can be exploited by the speaker/writer. Two lines from Berceo's *Vida de San Millán de la Cogolla* (ca. 1230) give an example of its use in context, in which *cuita* is placed beside *planto* 'tears' and *duelo*, three semantically-related terms:

> La **cuita** e el planto, el duelo general
> tan fiera perdición, pecado tan mortal[14] (375ab)

The use of *cuita* and near synonym *duelo* emphasizes the eternal damnation and suffering caused by sin. Berceo creates an impact on his audience by demonstrating his mastery through both the metrical requirements of the *cuaderna vía*, and his extensive vocabulary, including a Gallicism from the broad semantic field relating to affliction, problems and sorrow.

The distribution of synonyms is particularly relevant in the period of this study. As Ullmann observes:

---

[14] Unless otherwise indicated, the textual examples that illustrate the Gallicisms studied in this investigation are taken from CORDE. In light of the ease of searching the database, we provide stanza and verse numbers only for examples taken from other sources, such as the semipaleographic transcriptions by Casas Rigall (2007) of the extant manuscripts of the *Libro de Alexandre*.

> There are in each idiom and each period certain significant clusters of synonyms, or 'centers of attraction'...Subjects in which a community is interested will attract synonyms from all directions; many of these will be metaphorical in character. If there is some lessening of interest in these themes, then the synonyms relating to them will be thinned out. (1962:149)

The loanword *batalla* may be used to illustrate this statement, given the frequency of armed conflict in the period, particularly between Christians and Muslims. The regularity of war's occurrence was bound to affect the words speakers employed to describe it, which is reflected in the high frequency of *batalla* (and its variants). In a CORDE search during the period 1100-1300, there are over 3000 tokens of *batalla* in some 60 documents, while *lid* and *contienda* occur much less, the former in some 500 examples in 46 texts and the latter 670 times in 152 texts in the same period. The partial synonym *pelea* appears 118 times in 36 texts. To the modern day, *batalla* is the most frequent term to describe combat, either between armies or in a metaphorical sense. In contrast, *lid* (or *lidia*) is mainly used today in the context of bull fighting. *Contienda*, in turn, remains in use in many of the same contexts as in the medieval period, referring to combat, both armed and metaphorical, but is still used less frequently than *batalla*.

2.3 Borrowing as an effect of language contact: Social factors

The integrated approach to the study of borrowing includes both internal or linguistic features that influence borrowing, as well as external or social factors. Thus, the setting of language contact is important in the adoption and spread of loanwords and its exploration requires an interdisciplinary approach that includes both the linguistic conditions and the social situation of the contact between speakers (see Haugen 1953,

Hope 1971, Goddard 1980). As the investigation turns from the relevant linguistic factors of the proposed integrated borrowing model to its social factors, the present section examines the contributions of modern synchronic studies on social network ties, discourse coalitions and the patterns of interaction relate to the adoption and diffusion of Gallicisms in Ibero-Romance.

As stated in the introduction, the starting point is that it is the users of a language who vary and change the language. The present study is macroscopic in nature given the lack of data to determine individual-to-individual networks, but is informed by the idea that it is possible to use the present to help us understand and explain the past. Although it is clear that we cannot know how different the past was from the present, this fact does not, however, negate the likely existence of similarities between the behavior of people today and the observable effects of social network ties on their language use and those networks of the people living in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Iberia. These similarities are the basis upon which the study's argument is made.

This study uses the same theoretical approaches that other recent investigations have employed in order to show that social structures and changes throughout the history of English can be correlated with major linguistic innovations (see Janda and Joseph 2003; Kuteva 1999; Lass 1997) as Bergs detailed (2005:53). Corresponding periods of linguistic change have been tied to changes in network structures under the basic tenet of social network theory that posits that weak ties promote change while strong ties facilitate language maintenance. Milroy and Milroy argued that the maintenance of strong network ties among speakers in Iceland had the effect of restricting variation in Icelandic

(1985: 377). They used the example of London as a situation contrasting with the close-knit nature of social networks in Iceland (Milroy and Milroy 1985: 379). Nevalainen agreed with their argument, finding that the transformations in the economy of England in this period increased social and geographic mobility, and subsequently correspond with the wider diffusion of linguistic innovations in areas of looser networks (2000:264).

Similarly, the evidence confirms a connection between population movements, establishment of urban centers, as well as the rise of a merchant class and the introduction and spread of Gallic loanwords into the lexicon of Ibero-Romance in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg have pointed to the key role in language change of urbanization and growth of London to speed up the spread of innovations in the early Modern English period, noting that because of this growth, the social networks were looser and more uniplex than in the countryside (2003:211). Particularly important are the individuals who were upwardly mobile, as in the case of the rise of the merchant class in Iberia and settlers who were able to take advantage of reconquered territory to build wealth. These individuals had social and geographic mobility, a fact that promotes spread of change, as Hernández-Campoy and Conde-Silvestre note by writing, “it seems, therefore, that the social and geographic mobility contributes to the diffusion of innovations and that weak ties between different groups provide the bridges for process to unfold” (2005:104). Given the important role that social networks have played in language change, as the above investigations have demonstrated, this investigation examines the linguistic data available to propose how the

nature of the ties between speakers influenced their linguistic behavior, specifically the adoption and spread of Gallicisms through personal contact.

Interaction among speakers affects the spread and diffusion of linguistic innovations like loanwords, which can be analyzed in light of social network theory, but also the human geography of the interactions of speakers that led to the integration of *galicismos*. Researchers like Britain (2002) and Trudgill (1983) have studied how the physical setting of groups of speakers influences linguistic change. Hernández-Campoy (2003) investigated patterns of interaction across space (e.g. commercial routes between towns and cities) that have affected the adoption of certain linguistic features. That is, the interaction of human beings is affected by their geography. Hernández-Campoy writes:

> From the point of view of human geography, every urban center can be classified according to its interurban status (form, size, function, historical transformations, etc.), which implies the establishment of a hierarchy of central places with regard to their demographic elements. At an interurban level, not all cities play the same role nor have they the same importance; rather, they constitute a hierarchy in which both demographic and functional distance have a significant influence, together with physical distance...The larger a city is, the greater the number of different activities and functions it monopolizes; this in turn results in a wider area of influence that embraces other urban centers with a lower centrality (or accessibility) and functional range. (2003:236)

There is evidence to suggest this was a factor in the period of study as well.

So what does this mean for lexical borrowing in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Spain? If we consider that the history of communication in a given area is largely responsible for the distribution of isoglosses, in that greater or lesser similarity of features between any two given varieties implies stronger or weaker communication between their speakers (Penny 2000:82), then it is possible to study the available lexical data in light of

the geography, urban history, and demographics of Spain in this period to better account for the diffusion of *galicismos*. For example, the Camino de Santiago served as a route for pilgrims on their way to Santiago de Compostela, and as a commercial route. Generally speaking, the diffusion of Gallicisms moves east to west across time. Thus, the first examples of French loanwords occur in texts from Navarra and Aragón in the twelfth century. The concentration of loanwords remains higher in the east than in areas farther west.

The information on the exact demographics of the time is sketchy, but what is known is still useful in combination with the linguistic data collected. Larger cities such as Pamplona, Burgos, León, Oviedo, and Santiago itself had populations of French settlers, as well as other, smaller towns along the border between Christian and Muslim territory. Markets were established by the rulers of given areas, which resulted in the interaction of speakers as they contracted their business. Larger annual fairs also encouraged movement and interaction through commercial activity. The first fair in Castilla was established in Miranda de Ebro in 1099 by Alfonso VI, with additional fairs granted in towns along the Camino de Santiago (Ladero Quesada 1994). The fairs were much larger than the weekly market, attracting traders and consumers from more than just the local area, and were the point of merger between commercial routes from the south and those of the north and northeast, especially Burgos (Ladero Quesada 1994:24). As Hernández-Campoy (2003) and Britain (2002) have shown in their contemporary investigations, the roads along which commerce moves affect the way the population interacts, influencing language change. In the case of twelfth- and thirteenth-century

Iberia, there are two tendencies for movement of trade (and population): one is the movement from east to west, and the second is from the north to the south, as the Christian reconquest moves south. These tendencies can be seen in the textual evidence of *galicismos*, explored in detail in chapter three (sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4) by the representative terms of the ecclesiastic, political and commercial macrosocial networks.

2.3.1 Socio-centric networks: Ecclesiastic, military and commercial

This section further elaborates on the fundamental linguistic construct noted in chapter one, the social network, which comprises the set of ties between individuals. Sociolinguists such as Milroy and Milroy, in studying language use in social networks, have demonstrated how social connections between and among speakers, whether close or loose, affect the spread of linguistic innovations (see Milroy 1992, Milroy and Milroy 1985, Milroy 1987). The basic principles of social network theory assume the number of ties between and among members of a speech community has a linguistic effect. The greater the number of ties, the tighter the network and more resistant to change is the language used by the members.

When speakers interact in more than one sphere together (e.g. work, church, or social), these ties are multiplex and result in a denser and therefore tighter social network. Looser network ties result in greater linguistic variation, through a relative lack of internal norms and greater social and geographic mobility. The closer-knit the language group, in contrast, the more resistant to change their language is, while speakers with more connections to other groups (weak ties) will be more influenced by the surrounding

society in their speech (Milroy 1987:196). Both are highly relevant to the historical context of the period studied as population migration patterns suggest a loosening of network ties, allowing for groups to interact. In other areas, however, the evidence confirms an extended period of living separate from the native population, which had effects on the language of the area.

Along with the basic assumption that the spread of Gallicisms occurred via speakers who had loose connections in several social networks, Conde-Silvestre noted that studying social networks from a macroscopic perspective is useful in diachronic sociolinguistic investigation. This is because they do not "necessarily rely on the establishment of proper links [from individual to individual as in an ego-centric network], but on the effects that the global, inclusive structure of networks has on the behavior (linguistic or otherwise) of groups and populations" (Conde-Silvestre 2012:335). Bergs, too, has argued that social network analysis can be done, even when the precise social environment is not known, noting that "certain social data may indicate in what kind of group structure individuals must have lived" (2005:51). He used the specific example of monasteries, given that the type of social structure involved was close-knit, based on the same values and purpose of serving God. Similarly, Lenker has studied the use of particular lexemes in the texts produced in a tight-knit monastic community in tenth century England, demonstrating that the network functioned as a "mechanism of norm enforcement and maintenance" (2000:226), a topic that is expanded in chapter three . Both of these investigators indicate that the construct of socio-centric networks can be fruitfully applied to historical linguistic data.

In spite of an inability to directly draw the links between known individuals within a network due to a lack of detailed records, the investigation argues that what we do know about the social history of this period indicates much about the types of social relations contracted and maintained by individuals. The criteria involved in the investigation of social networks in a historical context including the ecclesiastic, military and commercial networks studied here, have two main components. The first is structural, relating to the density or quantity of links, whether they are direct links in the network as well as indirect connections (Bergs 2005:25-27; Lenker 2000:234). That is, the more direct links, the closer-knit the network, which suggests less openness to changes from outside the group.

The second component is made up of the interactional criteria, which describe the quality of the ties in the network, including multiplexity, frequency and duration of interaction and the content of the transaction between individuals. In the network strength scale proposed by Milroy (1987:141-142), multiplexity is enhanced by living in close proximity, same occupation, same sex, friendship and kinship. Lenker concluded in her study on the Old English used by members of the Winchester School of Benedictine monasteries that the network ties within a monastery demonstrated a greater degree of density and multiplexity, the two most important criteria in determining the structure of a network (2000:234). The same situation likely existed for the social networks within the walls of numerous Cluniac monasteries in Iberia in the period of study. Additionally, it is possible to apply similar criteria to the evidence available to describe the nature of other types of social networks that are relevant to the borrowing of Gallo-Romance vocabulary.

Both structural and interactional network criteria components in this investigation, as in Lenker's, must be inferred from socio-historical information from the period, as will be described below for each of the three sets of Phase I borrowings.

The fundamental argument is that major societal changes and greater mobility of groups of the population, both native and Gallic, created an overall environment conducive to linguistic change, specifically lexical borrowing through the creation and adjustment of the members of social networks as individuals moved. With the arrival of Cluniac-affiliated ecclesiastics and the change in liturgical rite, the battles of the reconquest in Iberia from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries (and beyond), as well as the rise of holy pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela and other religious sites, among other historical circumstances, population movement in the Peninsula was not infrequent. The presence of Gallo-Romance speakers created the opportunity for initial contact between them and Ibero-Romance speakers, while the diffusion of the loanwords was promoted by weak networks. These less dense networks were created through population movement and societal changes, and in this way the small-scale structures of individual social networks are linked with larger-scale social factors, thereby creating the opportunity for the diffusion of linguistic innovations like *galicismos*. The history of the Gallo-Romance settlers who established separate neighborhoods known as *barrios francos* in numerous towns both along the pilgrimage route and along the border between Christian and Muslim territory can demonstrate the variety of social networks in existence in the period of study. In various regions of Iberia there were laws that encouraged the repopulation of newly reconquered lands, mainly by *francos*, a term used

to designate both the origin from Gallic territory and being legally free, as opposed to tied to the land. The need for Christian settlers to hold the newly reconquered areas was so great that rulers like Sancho el Mayor of Navarra (r. 1004-1035) had favorable terms written into the legal charters, called *fueros*, that were granted to towns and cities throughout Christian Spain. Many included special exemptions for these individuals from certain taxes and military responsibilities to the lord of the area. These historical circumstances promoted population movement as well as an environment in which individuals were likely to establish loose-knit social networks.

With the increase of pilgrimage to holy sites, especially to Santiago de Compostela, an arduous journey of several hundred miles across northern Spain, settlements along the way provided services to travelers, providing numerous linguistic contact opportunities. Some of these travelers remained in Spain, becoming part of the local community. The conditions were right for this influx of immigrants to have a linguistic effect, as they loosened or broke ties with those back home and interacted with locals, creating the opportunity for linguistic change. The study has already noted the *fueros* in eastern Iberia, but another example is from Oviedo in Asturias. Records from 1100-1230 demonstrate a dual system of governance, with a separate *fuero* for the *francos*, the majority of whom were of French origin, based on their names (Ruiz de la Peña Solar 1995:137-141). The documents at first show individual men who came to Oviedo and settled, who then married local women. The separate system of governance disappears by the thirteenth century, effectively demonstrating complete integration of the two different groups. While it is impossible to determine the exact percentage of the

population they formed, Ruiz de la Peña Solar suggests some 20% of the residents were of French origin based on his research (1995:146). What is known is their influence in the upper echelons of society given their donations of property, as well as their prominence among the hierarchy of the church.

Linguistically, the evidence of the presence of Gallo-Romance speakers is noted in the *Fuero de Avilés*, which was studied by Lapesa (1948 [1984]). In the lexical data from the region, the strongest indication in the *fuero* of their presence are several forms with the Gallo-Romance suffix -*age*, including *portage* 'toll'. Overall, the data collected show that the areas of greater Gallic population and multiple social ties show more frequent use of *galicismos*, not surprisingly. Chapter three will detail the three sets of social networks involved in the person-to-person diffusion of Gallicisms all demonstrate some degree of reduced network density through the effects of social mobility and population migration.

2.3.2 Discourse coalitions and borrowing

Related to influence of social networks on the spread of Gallicisms in the period of study is the discourse coalition or community, which is a social factor particularly relevant in the analysis of the lexical data available on the works by the clerical poets and those of the translators and writers of Alfonso X. The study supports the view of the *mester de clerecía* authors as a school of poetry limited to the group of poems written in *cuaderna vía* in thirteenth century Ibero-Romance (see Uría Maqua 2000). The first *mester de clerecía* work was the encyclopedic *Libro de Alexandre*, written in the early

part of the thirteenth century. The first poet known by name in Ibero-Romance, Gonzalo de Berceo, wrote of religious themes in his *cuaderna vía* poems, including hagiographies and hymns. The *Libro de Apolonio* and the *Poema de Fernán González* also form part of the *mester de clerecía*.

The figure of King Alfonso X was key to the creation of numerous erudite works in Ibero-Romance. His evident desire to learn and share that knowledge inspired his patronage of the collective work of translators, scholars and scribes who composed historiographical, legal, religious, scientific and sapiential texts in Romance. Among these numerous works are the *General Estoria*, the *Estoria de España*, *Judizios de las estrellas,* and *Setenario*.

Having briefly described what is meant by *mester de clerecía* and the Alfonsine collaborators, the next step is to present the perspectives that help to define the coalition concept that the evidence suggests can be exemplified by these two groups. First the study outlines the coalition's utility in historical linguistic research and then outline the two discourse coalitions involved in the adoption and spread of 38 learned Gallicisms in the thirteenth century.

There are several perspectives that have shaped the present study's view of the discourse coalition with regard to the historical and linguistic evidence from the period of study. One is the definition of Boissevain (1974:171), who wrote that a discourse coalition is "a temporary alliance of distinct parties for a limited purpose", which is applicable to both the *mester de clerecía* writers of the thirteenth century as well as the translators, scholars and scribes of the Alfonsine scriptorium. Swales (1988) too, has

described in detail the defining characteristics of a discourse coalition, distinguishing this linguistic construct from another, that of the speech community. His argument is that a socio-rhetorical construct such as a discourse community is medium neutral, while a speech community is not because it is dependent upon speech and personal interaction (Swales 1988:211). In contrast, a discourse coalition is unconstrained by space and time as members can correspond through the medium of writing as well as through speech, but not necessarily in the same place. The difference for Swales between a speech community and a discourse community is that in a speech community, "the community creates the discourse, while in a discourse community, the discourse creates the community" (Swales 1988: 212). This is clearly germane to the circumstances of the thirteenth-century group of scholars and writers due to the foundation of the first universities in the Iberian Peninsula at Palencia and Salamanca, as well as the variety of centers of translation and text production, including Toledo, Sevilla, Murcia, and Burgos. The individual writers may or may not have had close personal contact, but were influenced by the power of the discoursal conventions of the time.

Keeping in mind the perspectives of Boissevain (1974) and Swales (1988), there are three defining characteristics of the two discourse coalitions or communities of the period of study that the evidence presented shall subsequently develop. These two communities are the *mester de clerecía* poets and the collaborators on the body of Alfonsine historiographical, legal, religious texts as well as works of science and wisdom. The first characteristic is that a coalition demonstrates shared interests, such as the didacticism evident in the texts both the *mester de clerecía* and Alfonsine coalitions.

Second, the discourse community has a mechanism of intercommunication among its members, which is mainly through writing. This indirect communication contrasts with the social networks of the previous chapter in which members had much more face-to-face interaction. Finally, the community develops and shares similar discoursal expectations in their texts. These may include which topics are suitable or appropriate, as well as the form and function of discoursal features, both of which will be detailed with regard to the two main coalitions of the period of study. Before returning to the set of thirteenth-century Iberian texts produced by the coalitions of *mester de clerecía* writers and the Alfonsine collaborators, let us examine how the coalition concept can be useful in studying historical contexts.

In contrast with the socio-centric view of social networks applicable to the three main social network types involved in the oral transmission of Phase I loanwords that will be detailed in chapter three, a discourse coalition does not require close proximity of its members to be influential, as Swales (1988:212) has argued. The evidence does not point to the existence of the types of social networks that were involved in the transmission of ecclesiastic Gallicisms, for example. It is likely, however, that there was at least some person-to-person contact among members of both the *mester de clerecía* and the Alfonsine coalitions, based on the idea that the texts produced required higher education, possibly acquired at a university.

A model for the utility of the discourse coalition concept is found in Fitzmaurice (2000, 2010). She has effectively applied the concept to her investigations of eighteenth century English, in particular to the influence of *The Spectator*, an important but short-

lived periodical of early eighteenth century England, producing some 555 issues in its original run (Fitzmaurice 2010:110). Fitzmaurice has maintained that the writers of *The Spectator* formed a coalition for a specific period of time, that is for the duration of its publication and for a specific purpose, that of producing a daily periodical (2010: 274). Once publication of the periodical ended, the coalition dissolved. The benefit of using the concept in the analysis of linguistic data is that "it allows for the interaction of different kinds of ties...Such ties may be evidenced by political connection, literary collaboration or business contract" (Fitzmaurice 2000:274). In the case of the writers of *The Spectator*, their shared political ambitions and literary interests came together and acted as a powerful cultural influence in London and beyond as they wrote about language usage and literary style as well as popular taste (Fitzmaurice 2010:106). The discoursal expectations created by the coalition served as a norm-enforcing mechanism as demonstrated, for example, through the writers' similar relative marker usage (Fitzmaurice 2000:267) and common political and cultural concerns (Fitzmaurice 2010:120).

The evidence highlights a corresponding function in the discourse coalitions of phase two borrowing in that the words used overwhelmingly appear in learned texts, that is, those texts written by and principally for those with education, in some cases university education. There was an effort made to make the texts produced by the coalition in question conform to the discoursal norms, including topics that were appropriate as well as the stylistic markers of that coalition, as in the use of relative markers by the *Spectator* coalition noted above (Fitzmaurice 2010) or in the use of

Gallicisms in Ibero-Romance. The most salient types of discourse practice which indicate membership in a discourse community are explicit references to earlier works and the reworking of sections of text from earlier works, with or without acknowledgment of the source (Watts 1999:43). For example, the works by the *mester de clerecía* writers followed the same form and appropriate themes and topics developed by the coalition, including lexical forms like loanwords *folía* 'folly, insanity' and *solaz* 'pleasure, consolation, respite'.

Similarly, alongside the historical evidence, the collected lexica data provide the linguistic support for the argument that different circumstances stimulated distinct social network types, whether direct or through coalitions, influenced the adoption and diffusion of the two phases of borrowings from Gallo-Romance.

2.4 Gallicisms in Old Ibero-Romance: An integrated model

The synchronic method offers the investigation of borrowing a quantifiable means of studying the lexical results of language contact, including linguistic factors of typological similarity, frequency and word class that influence adoption of loanwords. The findings of sociolinguistics demonstrate that factors such as the quality and quantity of social connections, interaction among speakers in space and discourse coalitions are also key influences in the adoption and spread of loanwords. In spite of these contributions to the study of lexical borrowing that derive from the synchronic method; however, a model that uses only this focus leaves out the contributions of the diachronic method. Thus, the synchronic method includes linguistic and social factors involved in

language study, but may leave out the background history and culture of the period and etymological studies of words, all of which are aspects of the study of language change over time.

An integrated model of lexical borrowing, therefore, includes the historical context because without that information, we cannot understand the relationships established between the speakers of the source language and those of the recipient tongue. While the evidence is necessarily confined to examination of texts, in some cases the evidence reveals indirect contact through writing within the period in question. A writing system must be taught, so it was done only by those with at least some education, which suggests a bias toward an educated register of language. Additionally, the types of words adopted tended to be select and designate prestigious objects or concepts and were more likely to be used by educated speakers. This implies that many Gallicisms in Ibero-Romance will be limited to texts produced by elites, such as the numerous *galicismos* in the work of cleric and writer Gonzalo de Berceo, including *rima* 'consonance; poem', and *son* 'sound, tone, melody', both referring to artistic production. It is easily understood how, in the search for vocabulary specific to his stylistic needs, Berceo adopted items from the literary models in vogue at the time, like Occitan troubadour verse. But this explanation lacks the scientific rigor to justify a term's integration and adoption in more than just Berceo's idiolect. The following section seeks to combine diachronic and synchronic methods in an integrated model of lexical borrowing in the twelfth and thirteenth century Ibero-Romance.

2.4.1 Combining the diachronic and synchronic

Diachronic and synchronic methods are incomplete on their own in an investigation of the historical context and linguistic results of lexical borrowing from Gallo-Romance by Ibero-Romance. Therefore, an integrated theoretical model in the context of twelfth and thirteenth century Iberia is necessary. By using the diachronic tradition's emphasis on etymology and phonological characteristics as key factors in the identification of *galicismos*, as well as the historical background in combination with the synchronic focus of contact linguistics, an integrated, complementary approach will better illuminate the contexts and influences of borrowing in an historical context. This study begins with the terms that have been previously identified as *galicismos* by diachronically focused scholars Colón (1967a, 1967b), Lapesa (1948 [1984], 1960, 1981, 1984), and Pottier (1967). Through the analysis of both internal and external factors, however, it will be seen that terms can be grouped by means of diffusion, whether through person-to-person contact via loose social networks or through discourse coalitions of erudite authors and collaborators.

The adverb *asaz* 'quite, sufficiently' can serve as an illustration[15]. In its entry in the dictionary by Corominas and Pascual (1980-1991:s.v. asaz), *asaz* is identified as originating from Provençal *assatz* 'sufficiently'. It first appears in Ibero-Romance in the *Vida de Santa María Egipcíaca*, a hagiographical poem that dates from the first quarter of the thirteenth century[16]. This text is an adaptation of a Gallo-Romance version of the

---

[15] See chapter four for a full discussion of *asaz* in light of the borrowing model proposed here. In addition, the Appendix contains the orthographical variants found in the corpus of texts studied.

[16] A single manuscript exists, in the same late fourteenth-century codex as that of the *Libro de Apolonio*.

legend of the saint and has numerous phonological and spelling features of Aragonese (Lapesa 1960:600). Until the second half of the thirteenth century, *asaz* and variant *assaz* are found in texts of the eastern regions of the Iberian Peninsula (Aragón, La Rioja, Navarra). By the second half of the thirteenth century, it can be found in other learned texts such as the *Fuero Juzgo*, *Estoria de España*, and the *General Estoria*. It is possible to infer that the motivation for its adoption was the strong influence of Occitan literary models or as a result of the Gallic presence in the eastern Iberian Peninsula due in part to geography. However, if additional linguistic features are examined, including the diffusion of *asaz* over time as well as in different types of texts along with its semantics, the model provides a full perspective on both linguistic and social influences. Goddard argued:

> The products of [borrowing] have no more extra-linguistic and cultural implications and significance than any other constituent elements of the vocabulary, for borrowings, like all other linguistic signs, symbolize and stand for non-linguistic and cultural facts and concepts, and they carry no additional cultural value or information at the functional level. (1980:12)

The presence of *asaz* in only literary texts such as the *mester de clerecía* texts and those produced by the Alfonsine scriptorium, suggests that its spread was most likely though exposure to written models, not through speech, in contrast with notarial texts[17]. The semantics of *asaz* demonstrate an overlap with more widely used *mucho* or *muy*, but not absolute synonymy. To the writers of this period like Berceo, words of foreign origin like *asaz* were clearly part of the discoursal expectations of the *mester de clerecía* coalition, recognizable by other members of the discourse community. An effective approach to the

[17] While all texts of this period are to a certain extent formulaic, notarial texts often record direct testimony and therefore are notably less polished than other genres.

study of loanwords and lexical borrowing includes the historical context, formal and functional analyses. As neither model is fully capable of adequately account for the variety of *galicismos* first documented in this period, the advantages of their combination are clear.

Hope (1971), in his analysis of borrowing between French and Italian, and Goddard (1980) in his reappraisal of loanwords in Spanish, both argued for the need to integrate diachrony and synchrony in a study of loanwords. Diachronically, loanwords assume importance as linguistic signs of foreign origin, but function just like native terms. Synchronically, the words borrowed become part of the adopting language, with varying degrees of formal adjustment and integration at a given moment in time. Hope asserted that with the combination of the diachronic and the synchronic, a more complete picture is drawn of the phenomenon as both a cultural and linguistic symbol at the same time. He viewed the relationship between culture and vocabulary as complex, “with many different factors contributing to explain any single lexical transfer” (1963:36). Goddard viewed the integration as using the semantic focus of diachronic studies with the formal emphasis of the synchronic approach (1980). This approach has the advantage of avoiding the assumption of a parallel between the prestige of a culture in a given field leading automatically to lexical borrowing, which both Hope and Goddard disavowed, instead allowing for the continual process of the renewal of the lexicon to be studied in functional terms. Goddard stated:

> The key development, upon which all the others depend, is the elucidation and definition of a linguistic cause of borrowing. Since all loans are neologisms, the underlying cause of borrowing will be fundamentally the same as that of neologism in general, that is, the need for language, as a

> means of communication and expression, to take account of change in the non-linguistic world...It should be emphasized, however, that this neither means nor implies that there is a close parallel between lexical change, on the one hand, and cultural and historical evolution, on the other, to the extent that the former may be regarded as a mirror image or even as an accurate reflection of the latter, for changes frequently occur in the material world which leave no trace in the vocabulary. (1980:12)

That is, the lexicon expands using available neological resources, including lexical borrowing, but cannot be assumed to be an exact parallel of culture. It is logical that culture affects borrowing, but it is not the only influence, as the evidence has shown that linguistic factors like frequency, word class, and semantics play a role. Other social factors like the geographical and demographical evidence suggest that the long-held assumption that the words indicate the history of the relations between the groups of speakers should be qualified with the recognition that multiple forces affect the lexicon.

2.4.2 Gallicisms in Old Ibero-Romance: Our contribution

From the additional internal or linguistic factors in the integrated borrowing model, the study returns to the external or social factors in the integrated, panchronic method in order to investigate the process of borrowing, which is one of a variety of neological processes that speakers of human languages actuate. One of the goals of this study is to demonstrate how the social factors involved in lexical borrowing help to better account for the hows and whys of the diffusion patterns discernible in the evidence, including both direct contact via social networks and indirect contact through discourse coalitions between language users favored the adoption and diffusion of Gallo-Romance items into Ibero-Romance.

There must be some sort of interaction between source language speakers and those of the recipient language for borrowing to occur. With the first set of loanwords, the data suggest that personal contact among members of loose-knit social networks was integral to the adoption and diffusion of these terms. The loanwords adopted and spread this way are labeled Phase I borrowings. The investigation will examine the external factors involved and update the base of knowledge on lexical borrowing in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in Spain by using the innovations of modern sociolinguistics to study the linguistic evidence in light of the available demographic and historical data available in order to trace the diffusion and integration of Gallicisms in this period.

Similarly, the gathered documentation point to the importance of three main macro-social networks to the adoption through direct, person-to-person contact, the topic of chapter three. These include ecclesiastic, military and commercial networks of individuals. They brought into Ibero-Romance Gallic terminology related to these main influential groups, as with the example *batalla*, which were subsequently adopted and spread through the social networks created by military connections between what is now France and Iberia in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

Chapter four presents the second type of social connections that result in the diffusion of Gallicisms, which is termed Phase II and refers to the set of terms adopted through indirect contact. When educated, culturally elite speakers became 'voluntarily bilingual' through study of different languages, they had a different, indirect type of language contact, one outcome of which was the adoption of foreign terms. With regard to this second set of Gallicisms, the discourse coalition concept provides a theoretical

basis to explain the integration of these terms in the learned Ibero-Romance of the period. The discourse coalition or community does not require extended personal contact in order to be influential. While in modern society, it is easy for speakers of Spanish to experience at least a little English, even if they have no personal contact with an English speaker given the spread of English-language media such as movies, music, and the internet, this obviously was not the case for the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In the specific context of this investigation, such indirect contact is key to the creation and maintenance of discourse coalitions, the means by which members were exposed to written literary models of expression. Berceo and other writers had contact through their education and training with written texts and probably teachers from France. These erudite individuals could in turn adapt source texts to their purposes, creating the *mester de clerecía* school of poetry. Through reading and education, they encountered Gallicisms in a written context, forms that could be adopted in their own written texts and not necessarily through direct exposure from speakers of the source language. Corresponding with the cultured Gallo-Romance vocabulary used in some of the source texts for works like the *Libro de Alexandre*, the Gallicisms employed tend to be limited to learned compositions. As writing in Ibero-Romance increased, particularly with the large projects undertaken by the Alfonsine scriptorium, the lexicon expanded as well. With the production of texts using *galicismos*, the audience encountering them also grew, leading to further diffusion. This point will be further detailed in chapter four.

The investigation shows that a variety of factors play a role in lexical borrowing. In the chapters on each of the two phases of borrowing that follow, the relevant linguistic

and social factors for each group of lexemes will be discussed in greater detail. The use of an integrated approach allows the examination of the diachronic and synchronic data available on *galicismos* in light of the etymology, frequency, word class and semantics of loanwords. The different types of texts in which the terms appear, and their region of production where relevant, point to the type of contact that allowed their adoption and the relationships speakers had with their environment and society. The analysis of all of these linguistic and social aspects of the 84 loanwords of this study allow the enhancement of the word list by presumed cultural dominance in order to more fully account for the presence of these words in the texts of the first centuries of written Ibero-Romance. Discoveries by modern linguistic research have demonstrated that both internal and external factors influence lexical borrowing, and therefore the investigation proposes that the re-examination of the data available on loanwords will shed light on how these terms from Gallo-Romance came to be integrated into the lexicon of twelfth- and thirteenth-century Ibero-Romance.

Chapter 3. Phase I: Gallicisms spread via direct contact

3.0 Introduction

This chapter will examine the lexical data gathered in light of the linguistic and social factors of the borrowing model proposed in chapter two. Both the present chapter and the following will demonstrate how the integrated borrowing model highlights the influence of different types of social networks on the spread of *galicismos*. In particular, a social networks analysis of the historical and linguistic data reveals diffusion patterns and groups of borrowings according to the types of social ties contracted among speakers of Ibero-Romance and Gallo-Romance that the study has labeled Phase I and Phase II. The documentation supports the existence of three different macrosocial networks, specifically monastic, military and commercial, influenced the adoption and diffusion of Phase I loanwords, the focus of this chapter, that is, those Gallicisms spread via face-to-face contact.

The components of the integrated model that were described in the previous chapter will be explored for the nine lexemes that illustrate this phase of borrowing, including etymology, frequency, word class, semantics, influence of social networks and geolinguistic factors[18]. By viewing available linguistic data on twelfth- and thirteenth-century Gallicisms in Ibero-Romance in light of the network construct, the study presents evidence that individuals interacted in a particular space and through the different types

[18] In the Appendix to this investigation are all of the Gallicisms that were analyzed in the process of the study. Information included is related to a lexeme's etymology, word class, orthographical variants, classification based on social network type as well as an example token from the period of study.

contracted between speakers of Ibero-Romance and Gallo-Romance, they adopted and spread loanwords in this period.

Based on the nature of the social factors involved in their adoption and diffusion, the set of Gallicisms from twelfth- and thirteenth-century Ibero-Romance can be divided into two sets, the first of which is the subject of the present chapter. The question the investigation seeks to answer, and the contribution of the study to the field of historical lexical studies in Ibero-Romance, is to demonstrate how these loanwords spread. The Gallicisms that are the focus of the present chapter are those adopted via personal contact. The second collection of borrowings, in contrast, reveals transmission via discourse communities that do not require personal contact, unlike those discernible in the first group. They will be examined in the following chapter.

Phase I loanwords are found first in notarial texts, which through their purpose as records of transactions of land sales, donations, complaints, etc. tended to be less polished and were more likely to record everyday activities in the local language than other, more erudite text types such as the historiographical, scientific and sapiential works produced by the Alfonsine scriptorium. Although these terms might also appear in other text types, indicating broad integration into multiple registers and styles of the language, including historiographical, literary, religious and scientific/sapiential documents[19], tokens from notarial and legal documents suggest oral transmission. Notarial documents like wills, donations and sales records were given orally in the

---

[19] The classification of texts used here follows that of the *Corpus diacrónico del español* (CORDE), with the exception of our category of "literary". We collapse several of CORDE's distinct classes into a single one, labeled literary, which includes epics (e.g. *Poema de Mio Cid),* clerical (e.g. *cuaderna vía* texts), and prose romances (e.g. *Libro del caballero Zifar*).

presence of the scribe. The *fueros* were sets of local laws and as such contained vocabulary known and used in the community the individual *fuero* governed, with the except of the typical formulaic introductions and conclusions they contained. Thus it is possible to assume that the diffusion of words found in the body of notarial documents and local *fueros* was through person-to-person contact.

This chapter will show that long-term linguistic change in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Ibero-Romance, including lexical change, was influenced by both strong (see Lenker 2000) and weak social network ties (see Milroy 1992; Nevalainen 2000). The main proposal of this study is that this group of borrowings was adopted via situations of face-to-face contact and ultimately spread through the social networks of individuals, influenced by the nature of ties between speakers. The chapter first outlines the basic assumptions on the social network structures involved in the adoption and spread of these borrowings. Then, through the analysis of the data available, the influence of three different sets of macro-social networks is shown, with both shared features and characteristics particular to a given network.

The chapter has four sections, the first of which (3.1) will present the hypothesis that the unique features of the three network structures can be tied to groups of loanwords associated with each network type. The second section (3.2) will deal specifically with the networks of ecclesiastics that led to the spread of religious Gallicisms, which will present lexical illustrations of ecclesiastic influence, *capiscol*, ‘cantor’, *chantre* ‘cantor’ and *maestre*, ‘master’. The following section (3.3) discusses the details known about the networks that connected Gallic armies and native Iberians as Christians worked to take

territory held by Muslims, promoting the adoption and diffusion of military and political loanwords, as illustrated by *adobar* ‘to prepare, repair’ *batalla* ‘battle’ and *mensaje* ‘message’. The final section (3.4) examines the features of commercial networks of individuals in Iberia and their corresponding loanwords *garnacha* ‘cloak’, *gris* ‘grey’ and *hostal(aje)* ‘guesthouse, inn’. Finally, the chapter concludes with a summary of the Gallicisms spread via person-to-person contact through social networks, setting the stage for the discussion of Phase II Gallo-Romance borrowings, to follow in chapter four.

3.1 Gallicisms spread via social networks: A socio-centric approach

It has been previously noted that the present investigation begins from the truism that it is the users of a language who change the language. The study is macroscopic in nature given the lack of data to create individual to individual networks, but is informed by the Uniformitarian Principle by Labov, which essentially states that language processes in the past functioned like those we can study in the present (1994:21). Larger societal changes imply related alterations in structures like the networks of connections between individuals, with a corresponding promotion of language change through weak ties, in contrast with the maintenance of linguistic norms through strong ties (see Milroy and Milroy 1985:377-379).

In a similar way, larger social forces of the eleventh through the thirteenth centuries, such as the Reconquest and pilgrimage to the holy sites like Santiago de Compostela implies that people moved, urban centers expanded, and new social class made up of merchants and craftsmen developed in Iberia. All of these changes had an

effect on the social ties and connections between individuals, as well as their language use. An aspect of these social changes in Iberia included the migration of Gallo-Romance speakers into the Peninsula, which created opportunities for contact with Ibero-Romance speakers.

The evidence supports a connection between these larger forces and linguistic change, specifically lexical borrowing. Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg point to the key role in language change of urbanization and growth of London to speed up the spread of innovations in the early Modern English period (2003:211), noting that because of this growth the social networks were looser and more uniplex than in the countryside. One especially influential group consisted of those who were able to move in order to take advantage of opportunities to acquire reconquered lands. As social ties are broken by those able to move, these individuals establish new ties in their new home, becoming in effect a means by which innovations like loanwords are spread (see Hernández-Campoy and Conde-Silvestre 2005:104). Given the important role that social networks have played in language change, as the above investigations have demonstrated, the approach will be to examine the linguistic data available to propose how the nature of the ties between speakers influenced their linguistic behavior, specifically the adoption and spread of Gallicisms through personal contact.

The starting assumption is that the individuals who spread Gallicisms had loose-knit connections in more than one social network, based on the idea that close-knit networks impede the diffusion of linguistic innovations. Due to an inability to reconstruct individual networks of different communities, the study employs the social network

construct from a macrosocial or socio-centric perspective, as described in chapter two (see section 2.3.1). In spite of the lack of detailed records, the macrosocial view of network connections is particularly useful for tracing the effects of networks historically because what is important is the global structure of the networks in existence. These networks affected the behavior of the people involved, including their language use (Conde-Silvestre 2012:335).

Two recent examples of investigations on social networks provide support for the use of macrosocial networks of monastic communities in the analysis of historical linguistic data. First, Lenker (2000) has concluded that the network of a tight-knit monastic community in tenth-century England worked to restrain linguistic innovation. Bergs (2005), in turn, argues that a social network analysis of a monastery can be done, because the types of relationships within a monastery revolved around a common purpose, that of serving God. The network structure was therefore likely to be close-knit as the men lived, worked and prayed together.

These two investigations suggest that in spite of our inability to directly draw the links between known individuals within a network due to a lack of detailed records, what information is known about the social history of this period indicates much about the types of social relations contracted and maintained by individuals. There are two main components of social networks examined in a historical context, including the ecclesiastic, military and commercial networks studied here. The two key criteria for measuring network strength are a greater number of network connections (density) and the degree of multiplexity of those relationships (Lenker 2000:234). In light of this, it is

likely that the social networks within the walls of Cluniac monasteries in Iberia in the period of study likely demonstrate a similarly high degree of density and transactional multiplexity. Thus the same criteria can be applied to the evidence available to describe the nature of other types of social networks that are relevant to the borrowing of Gallo-Romance vocabulary. The structural and interactional network criteria components of the networks relevant to Phase I borrowings, are surmised from the available socio-historical information from the period.

As stated in chapter two, there were three larger social forces in Iberia who influenced the adoption and spread of *galicismos* through face-to-face contact. The first was the influx of Gallic ecclesiastics as they came to reform the Iberian Church. The second was the movement of military forces from what is today France who came to fight battles in the Peninsula against the Muslims in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The third was the economic expansion initially connected with pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela. These historical circumstances attracted the presence of Gallo-Romance speakers, whose face-to-face contacts with Ibero-Romance speakers were the means by which borrowing occurred. The spread of the loanwords was achieved by individuals who had less-dense network connections. The larger-scale factors have an effect on the small-scale structures of individual social networks, all of which is connected to the diffusion of linguistic innovations. The three sets of social networks all demonstrate some degree of reduced network density through the effects of social mobility and population migration, which will be explored in sections for each of the three socio-centric networks below, including loanwords that serve as illustrations of the argument of this study.

3.2 Ecclesiastic Gallicisms: Gallic monastic orders and Iberia

There are several network types both within a monastery and among houses of the same order that can be described through a presentation of a brief historical background of the two main Gallic monastic orders in the Peninsula: first, the more influential house of Cluny, followed by the later order of Cister. Next, the evidence gathered supports the idea that language contact was facilitated through different social network types between Gallo-Romance speaking ecclesiastics and Ibero-Romance speaking lay and cleric populations. Finally, this section concludes with three lexemes that whose data demonstrate support for the network hypothesis of this investigation, *capiscol*, *chantre* and *maestre*.

The monastery founded at Cluny in Burgundy in 910 was a powerful force in the Church from the tenth to the twelfth centuries. In order to maintain the abbey's independence, the abbot of Cluny was subject only to the Pope, and controlled the daughter houses associated with the order, which at its peak numbered in the hundreds. The abbey and its monks became known for their reforms, including adherence to the vow of celibacy of the ordained clergy and eliminating the practice of simony, although over time the order's discipline was to disintegrate, giving rise to other monastic orders, including the Cistercians.

The first Iberian monarch to support Cluny was Sancho Garcés III, also known as Sancho el Mayor (r. 1004-1035), who traveled to the abbey in 1024 and requested that the order send some monks to San Juan de la Peña in Navarra, although there is little

evidence that they had a lasting effect in the area (Bishko 1980:4). In contrast with Castilla and León, there is little linguistic evidence to support their legacy in Navarra. As evidence of the reduced influence of Cluny in Navarra and Aragón, Odilo of Cluny wrote to Sancho's sons some time after the death of Sancho, reminding each of them of the generous financial support that their father had given to Cluny (Laliena Corbera 2001:65). Of the three, García Sanchés III of Pamplona (r. 1035-1054), Fernando I of Castilla and León (r. 1037-1065) and Ramiro I of Aragón (r. 1035-1063), only Fernando appears to have renewed the donation, establishing an annual payment of 1000 pieces of gold to Cluny, a vast sum of money at the time (Bishko 1980:4). The reign of his son Alfonso VI (r. 1065-1109) saw the expansion into Castilla and León of Cluny and with it a corresponding number of Cluniac ecclesiastics.

One main impetus for the great expansion of Cluny and clerics of Gallic origin was Rome's desire to eliminate the Visigothic or Mozarabic liturgical rite by replacing it with the Roman rite. It is Sancho Ramírez (r. 1063-1094) who first introduced the Roman rite in Aragón in 1071, followed by Castilla in 1080 through a mandate by Alfonso VI. To accomplish this major change new clergy in the Peninsula who were skilled in the liturgy were required. Given the connection between Pope Gregory VII and Cluny, as well as the political clout that the order possessed, it is not surprising that Cluniac ecclesiastics formed the bulk of those who implemented the liturgical transition. This Gallo-Romance speaking community introduced new positions like the cantor, bringing their own term for this church office, including *capiscol*, and *chantre*. For offices like that of a monk, which existed before the Cluniac monastic and liturgical reforms,

indigenous terms *monago* and *fradre* existed, but the documentation has many more tokens of *monje* and *fraile*, likely due in part to the large numbers of Gallic ecclesiastics, particularly those in positions of power.

In Castilla and León, Alfonso VI became Cluny's great patron and in return received spiritual support through intercessional prayers as well as political support. As Reilly writes, "The profound and lasting involvement with Cluny and León-Castilla was to blossom during the reign of Alfonso VI and would influence everything from dynastic marriages to liturgical practices" (1988:95). There were numerous bishops, abbots and other clerics who had affiliation with Cluny. One key figure is Bernard of Sédirac, who was first abbot at the important monastery at Sahagún and later named archbishop at Toledo and primate of the Iberian Church. From his key position, Bernard appointed Cluniacs as bishops at Braga, Osma, Sigüenza, Santiago, Segovia, Palencia, Salamanca, Zamora and Coimbra (Reilly 1988:265). Pierre d'Andouque was named bishop at Pamplona in 1085 and his successor was of Gallic origin as well (Lapeña Paúl 2004:294).

In addition to numerous Cluniacs holding bishoprics in Iberia, there were a number of monastic houses that were either under the direct authority of Cluny or followed its reforms, including San Juan de la Peña (Aragón), San Isidro de Dueñas (Palencia), San Salvador de Palat del Rey (León), Santiago de Astudillo (Palencia), San Juan de Hérmedes de Cerrato and Santa María de Nájera (La Rioja). Reglero de la Fuente (2009: para. 11) points out that up to the first part of the thirteenth century, "la casi totalidad de los priores fueron de origen 'francés', pues el principal sistema que los abades de Cluny tuvieron para controlar los monasterios...fue el nombramiento de los

priores entre monjes de su entorno". Being centrally organized, Cluny also moved priors and other personnel between monasteries due to promotion of a prior of a lesser monastery to a larger center or for disciplinary reasons (Reglero de la Fuente 2009: para. 11). All of this movement created opportunities for both consolidating linguistic influence in Cluny-controlled houses as well as the potential for new social networks among monks.

After the peak of Cluny's power, the Gallic influence on the religious practices of Iberia continued through the influence of the Cistercian order. King Alfonso VII of Castilla and León (r. 1126-1157) was "pour Cîteaux, ce qu'avait été son grand-père Alphonse VI pour Cluny, un protecteur et un ami fidèle" (Défourneaux 1949:50). Several Cistercian monasteries were founded or followed their reforms, with the support and patronage of the king and his family (Défourneaux 1949:51). Although there is no comparable "invasion monastique" from Cîteaux that followed after the arrival of Bernard of Sédirac, the use of Gallo-Romance terminology in religious activities was reinforced through this renewal of Gallic monastic influence.

In spite of the reduced number of Cistercian personnel entering Spain in comparison with the early wave of Cluniacs, there were ties between the royal family of Castilla and the abbots of Cister. In particular, Alfonso VIII (r. 1158-1214) and his wife Eleanor, whose dowry included Gascony, were great patrons of Cister, donating the monastery of Santa María de las Huelgas (Burgos) to the abbey in 1187 (Défourneaux 1949:55). Although other convents in Castilla and León in 1189 by Alfonso VIII were made dependencies of Las Huelgas, a certain number of them maintained their

independence, thereby diluting the influence of Cister in their affairs. Also important in terms of continuing Gallic influence in the Iberian church was the involvement of the king (including Alfonso VI, Alfonso VII, and Alfonso VIII) in selecting the bishops of León and Castilla because bishops were not only religious leaders but also lords who participated in the royal councils and often accompanied the king. This close relationship meant that although bishops were elected according to canonical rules, the rulers of Iberia offered recommendations that were often followed (Martínez Díez 1995:284). The leaders of both the temporal and the spiritual parts of Iberian society saw benefits to maintaining close connections, evidenced by the presence of Bernard and other bishops as signatories to numerous documents from the king. This close-knit network was an additional reinforcement of the Gallic terms for ecclesiastic positions due to the predominance of first Cluniac and subsequently Cistercian bishops and priors in Iberia.

Although not all monasteries in the regions of Alfonso VI and his heirs were Cluniac, the influence of the powerful order was widespread and lasting. Centers such as San Salvador de Leire (Navarra), San Salvador de Oña (Burgos) and San Pedro de Cardeña (Burgos) followed Cluniac reforms, beginning sometime after 1080 (the introduction of the Roman rite in Iberia by Alfonso VI), but they never became part of Cluny's chain of abbeys and priories. In these places, Reglero de la Fuente observes that "la vinculación con Cluny sería estrictamente personal, sin una adscripción jurídica, y las costumbres habrían sido un elemento inspirador de la reforma, que se adaptaría a las tradiciones locales" (2008:146). Important Iberian monasteries that were Cluniac included Santa María de Nájera (La Rioja), San Isidro de Dueñas (Palencia), Santa María

de Villafranca de Bierzo (León), San Zoilo de Carrión (Palencia), Santa Coloma de Burgos and San Martín de Frómista (Palencia).

3.2.1 Ecclesiastic network types and loanword diffusion

Having briefly described the historical background of Cluny and Cister in Iberia in the period of study, the next relevant point is how the nature of the social networks of religious institutions affected the diffusion of ecclesiastic Gallicisms in the period of study. In addition to the close network of connections between the secular elite (e.g. the king and his family) and those at the top of the church hierarchy previously mentioned, the evidence reveals three different types of ecclesiastic social networks related to the subset of religious Gallicisms detailed in this section through the examination of the investigations of monastic history (see Bishko 1961; Défourneaux 1949; Martínez García 1994, 2000; Reglero de la Fuente 2008, 2009). One is the close-knit, dense set of networks among members of monastic houses and other religious personnel, networks in which the members knew each other, had regular interactions with multiple members of the same network, and, in the case of a monastery or church, served a common purpose. The members of a monastery generally lived and worked together within a given space, increasing their direct links and the likelihood that all members of the monastery had frequent and reciprocal interactions. In examining the Winchester School, Lenker argues that the most important criterion in the strength of a monastic network was the fact that its members were linked by the transactional content and the shared goal of serving God and the Benedictine Order (2000:234). The ostensible common purpose of the members

of the monastic community reinforced the social norms and linguistic use within and among monasteries.

Given the presence of bishops and other positions of authority such as monastic priors of Gallic origin as noted above, the assumption is that these men used the Gallo-Romance terms to refer to positions in the church hierarchy (e.g. *capellán*, *capiscol*, *maestre*). As men of power, their language use possessed prestige that led to linguistic accommodation, that is, the individuals lower in the hierarchy would have used the Gallo-Romance terminology used by their superiors (see Giles et al. 2010 for a recent discussion). Whether the individuals who filled positions lower down in hierarchy were of Iberian or Gallic origin, it would be likely that they too used the same terms, thereby spreading these words among their individual networks.

In contrast with the above type of social network, the second set of ties between ecclesiastics was less dense due to the frequency of movement by various members of the monastic hierarchy, which meant that ties were continually being created as well as broken. In this way, the use of Gallic terminology was reinforced within a community in a given place but subsequently spread by those who traveled to other Cluniac houses. While it is likely that within each monastery there were close ties among the members of the community, Cluniac houses were known for their hospitality for both lay and ecclesiastic travelers (see Hunt 1967 and Reglero de la Fuente 2009), thereby increasing the possibility of interaction with individuals from outside the specific monastery, even for those monks who remained within the walls of the cloister. Additionally, some monks did not necessarily live within the walls of the monastery, separate from the lay

community, but rather within the community surrounding the monastery, particularly in smaller houses (Hunt 1967:55).

The most relevant point in terms of establishing the nature of social networks in relation to the diffusion of Gallic religious terminology was the frequent movement of clerics as part of their work. Ferreira Priegue (1994) has studied the degree of mobility of all aspects of medieval society, noting that ecclesiastics were often moving between places, on various types of trips, both short and long distance:

> Itinerante también en alto grado es el estamento clerical: la organización eclesiástica, cada vez más centralizadora, moviliza a su personal: visitas *ad limina* de los obispos a Roma, visitas pastorales de gira por la diócesis, no siempre estrictamente cumplidas, pero importantes en la medida en que no pueden descansar mucho en el clero rural; asistencia a sínodos y concilios, participación en legaciones, misiones...todo esto dentro de su actividad estrictamente religiosa, porque en su dimensión de grandes propietarios con dominios extensos y dispersos, aun en los momentos de mayor estancamiento económico vemos a monjes y clérigos desplazarse a realizar compras para la catedral o la abadía, y acarreando de un lado a otro los productos de sus tierras. Y a esto se suman los desplazamientos impuestos por sus funciones de administración como gobernantes de territorios o enviados de sus soberanos. (Ferreira Priegue 1994:46)

Given this degree of mobility of clerics and monks, even among the lower levels of church hierarchy, ecclesiastic social networks were not static. On the one hand, individuals established close ties within their monastic community, but on the other hand, these ties were continually loosened, broken and recreated in the process of promotion and movement as part of the work done by religious institutions. These latter network ties were key to the spread of ecclesiastic loanwords.

The data available on these men is related to those of the highest echelon of the hierarchy, the bishops, such that it is known that Bernard of Sédirac was at Sahagún and

then subsequently at Toledo, succeeded by another Gallic cleric, Raymond of Sauvetat. Another famous figure was Jerónimo of Périgord, bishop first at Salamanca. After Valencia was conquered by the Cid, Jerónimo became the bishop there until the city was lost to the Muslims in 1102. The social networks of these important figures would have included the nobility and royalty of their time, such as Alfonso VI and his family, but also other high-level ecclesiastics. As observed above, a number of priors were Gallic in origin, and while at the top of the hierarchy within the walls of the monastery they headed, they had connections with lower level personnel as well through the communal nature of life in a Cluniac monastery.

Indeed, the movement of lower-level clerics helps to answer the question of how the laity would have come into contact with Gallo-Romance terms referring to the church hierarchy. This is the third set of network ties in the adoption and diffusion of Gallic ecclesiastic terms, the connections between the individuals tied to either a church or monastery and the laity. As the quote from Ferreira Priegue (1994:46) above indicates, the work of maintaining and increasing the holdings of the Church was done by ecclesiastics who interacted with the laity, through the purchase or receipt of donations. Numerous examples of these interactions are found in the data from CORDE, in notarial texts that recorded the sales and donations of real estate, but there were no doubt face-to-face interactions in the collection of tithes and the attendance of religious services.

While the study will be addressing the role of the Camino de Santiago in relation to the transmission of Gallicisms related to commerce and trade in section 3.4 of this chapter, pilgrimage affected the spread of the subset of religious borrowings. As was

pointed out above, the provision of hospitality was an important characteristic of Cluniac houses. As such, travel permitted and promoted both language contact and looser social network ties through the services provided for religious pilgrims, particularly to Santiago de Compostela (see Santiago-Otero 1992). There was a great deal of population movement as seen in investigations of the hospitality provided by monasteries in relation to pilgrims to Santiago and other travelers who stopped at facilities established in the period of study to care for the growing number of pilgrims. One estimate suggests that the number of pilgrims who traveled annually to Santiago (or attempted to) in the period of study was between 250,000 and 500,000 (Martínez García 2000:108). The primary institutions for the care and services that were provided to the pilgrim in this period were associated with monasteries. Martínez García writes,

> Una primera cobertura asistencial[...]se distinguía por su carácter afrancesado, monástico e integral. Aun siendo de fundación particular los hospitales quedaron en su mayoría de forma inmediata bajo el control de monasterios benedictinos vinculados, más o menos directamente a Cluny. (1994:76)

Cluniac-affiliated pilgrim hospices had ample opportunities for individuals to create ties of short duration and uniplex in nature with the pilgrims they served, a type of social network that promoted diffusion of linguistic innovations like borrowings.

Through an analysis of the relationships and connections between religious personnel, it is possible to hypothesize about the use and spread of the ecclesiastic loanwords through social networks both inside and outside the walls of the monastery based on the linguistic data available. In the case of terms with higher token counts, such as *fraile* and *monje*, the evidence supports greater contact with the laity, both due to their

presence in all text types examined in the present study as well as to the nature of both of their functions within monastic hierarchy. That is, there were simply many more *frailes* and *monjes* than other offices, including that of *capiscol*/*chantre*, studied below, increasing the chances of interaction and contact with or knowledge about the more numerous individuals who carried the title of monk.

Before continuing the discussion of representative terms, let us sum up the key shared features of the set of ecclesiastic loanwords. First, these terms follow the general pattern of Gallic influence on Iberian religious institutions. The lexical data gathered in this first phase of borrowing related to religious terms correspond on a macroscopic level with the known areas of Gallic monastic influence in the regions ruled by Alfonso VI, including Castilla, La Rioja, León and Navarra. The region of Aragón, in contrast, shows fewer tokens. The ones that are found in texts dated later than those in Castilla and León, the two regions with the most individual forms as well as the greatest token frequency. Significantly, Aragón did not have any monastic centers that were under the auspices of Cluny, nor were there any major pilgrimage hospitals in the region. It is not surprising then that the highest concentration of lexemes and tokens occurs in Castilla and León, which saw the greatest influx of Gallic ecclesiastics, particularly Cluniac but also Cistercian.

Second, the fact that the majority of ecclesiastic borrowings relate to the personnel of either a church or monastery points to the influence of the renovation of Iberian religious practices brought by adoption of the Roman liturgy and corresponding introduction of Cluniac reforms in the Peninsula. With the adoption of Benedictine

reforms, it is likely that the labels and names of specific titles and positions within a monastery or church, increased both the salience and frequency of the terms used for speakers of Ibero-Romance. Third, the application of the network concept to the diffusion patterns of these loanwords suggests that three types of social networks were involved in the adoption and spread of these ecclesiastic Gallicisms. The first network type occurred within the space of the monastery and was a close-knit, norm-enforcing set of connections. The second type occurred within the order but was looser and less dense due to the mobility of the ecclesiastic stratum of Iberian society in this period. The final network type included links that were established between clerics and the laity, also typically less dense, but through the institutional power and prestige of the Church, promoted the use and spread of these borrowings among the lay population. By highlighting the role of social networks in the diffusion of these terms, the study sheds additional light on lexical borrowing in general and Gallicisms in particular in twelfth and thirteenth century Ibero-Romance. Below, three examples illustrate the diffusion of this set of loanwords, *capiscol*, *chantre*, and *maestre*, whose diffusion demonstrates features that other borrowings in this subset share as well.

3.2.2 Gallicisms spread through ecclesiastic networks

1. **CAPISCOL**[20] *nm* 'cantor' < OOc. capiscol < Late Latin CAPUT SCHOLAE 'head of the school'
2. **CHANTRE** *nm* 'cantor' < Fr. chantre < CANTOR

---

[20] See the Appendix for all variant orthographical forms for each of the Gallicisms studied as part of this study. Where relevant for an individual lexeme, orthographical variation that correlates with geographical tendencies will be noted. All textual examples, except where noted, are taken from CORDE. Examples from notarial texts indicate the region and date of the document's composition.

The diffusion of these *capiscol* and *chantre* points to how the larger subset of ecclesiastic terms was first introduced and later spread via the networks of Cluniac-affiliated individuals. The evidence that supports this is found in the geographical diffusion pattern common in the set of ecclesiastic Gallicisms, with a concentration in Castilla and León. Specifically for *chantre* and *capiscol*, there data found have no tokens of either one in the documents from Navarra and Aragón, the regions geographically closer to France, but with fewer ties to Gallic monastic centers. How these two lexemes differ from other terms in this set is that the two differ in their geographic distribution. *Capiscol* is found in documents primarily in Castilla, particularly Toledo, with six indicating Roy Martínez as *capiscol* at Toledo for documents from Sancho IV. *Chantre* appears in numerous Leonese documents, with the first dating to 1216. In several of the documents from Salamanca, the Gallic names Paschal, Phelippe, Arnalt, and Guilelmo appear in the list of clerics who served as witnesses, while the witnesses listed in the Castilian texts have indigenous names. Although there is a lack of sufficient demographic data to demonstrate that more individuals from the northern region of France took up positions in León, or that more from Provence and other regions of southern France settled in Castilla, it is nevertheless interesting that the linguistic and social data available for *capiscol* and *chantre* suggest this possible future area of research.

The evolution of the offices within the Church, included several with overlapping responsibility, depending on the individual church (Edwards 1967:176). For example, the office of *capiscol*, as studied by Edwards (1967:177), was found in numerous cathedrals of Provence and combined the roles of head of the school affiliated with the church in

question and precentor, also known as the cantor. It seems to have been more typical of Provence to have a person act as head of the cathedral school, known as the *magister scholarum* or *capiscol* (Edwards 1967:178). This individual also often served as the bishop's secretary in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. In northern France, in contrast, about half of the cathedrals never had dignitaries with any of the overlapping titles, *chancellor*, *scholasticus* or *capiscolus* (Edwards 1967:177). Both terms appear for the first time in very similar contexts, as in examples 1) and 2), in which the title is used in reference to witnesses to an event recorded in a notarial document. What is unclear in the available data is whether there was any qualitative difference between the titles.

(1) Ferrando Helias, **capiscol**
(Castilla, 1200)

(2) el **chantre**, Pedro Estevan
(Salamanca, 1190)

Chantre, in contrast with *capiscol,* which likely originates from Old Occitan, is from the nominative case of Old French, which maintained a two case system until the fourteenth century (Harris 1988b:217). Although the term is not documented in Gallo-Romance until the thirteenth century (Rey et al. 2012:s.v. chantre), *chantre* is first found in Ibero-Romance in an 1190 notarial document from Salamanca, in a similar context as the first documented use of *capiscol*, as one of a list of witnesses.

Although the contexts in which the terms are found are similar, the collected data do show a geographical distinction in use. *Capiscol* counts only some 20 tokens in 18 different documents in this period, mostly notarial texts in which the *capiscol* served as a witness, while *chantre* is more frequent, with over 100 tokens in 66 texts. The semantic

overlap between the two terms is noted in the *Primera Partida*[21], in which *chantre* is defined in the same section as *capiscol*, "...**chantre** tanto quiere dezir cuemo cantor" and it is noted that "algunas eglesias cathedrales son en que ha **capiscoles** que han esse mismo oficio que los **chantres"** (Primera Partida, ca. 1256-1265[22]). *Capiscol*, in the same section, is defined as "...**capiscol** en latín tanto quier dezir cuemo en romanz, cuemo cabdiello de escuela" (Primera Partida, ca. 1256-1265).

The fact that these two terms appear only in the regions of Iberia with a strong Cluniac influence in the hierarchy of the church reinforces the study's argument that it is via personal contacts made through social networks that the terms spread. The appearance of the *chantre* or *capiscol* in a list of witnesses, usually listed in some type of hierarchical order, indicates that the position was one of power and authority. Thus it was likely that the individual who held the title had some mobility, increasing the creation of loose-knit social ties. In addition, a *capiscol* or *chantre* who was in charge of a cathedral school interacted with students, another means of diffusion for Gallic loanwords through the authority and prestige of the language use of those in charge. The geographic distribution in Castilla and León of these two terms points to a possible difference in the regional origins of the Gallic ecclesiastics who came to take positions within the Iberian church. Unfortunately, the lack of personal data on these individuals prevents us from

---

[21] It is noted that the original title for the text commonly known as the *Siete Partidas* was the *Libro de las leyes*. However, given the greater familiarity of the work under the denomination as the *Partidas*, it is this title that is used in the present study.

[22] The complicated nature of the text known as the *Primera Partida* includes the date of its composition. The manuscript cited here is the one in CORDE, that of the British Library, dated by Craddock (1986) to the period between 1256 and 1265. He based this date on information in the text itself, while the manuscript dates from the late thirteenth century. See Martin 2006 for a recent discussion.

offering definitive proof, but *chantre* and *capiscol* do suggest that this hypothesis is possible.

3. MAESTRE *nm* 'master (title); leader' < OOc. maestre 'master (title); leader'< MAGĬSTER, -TRI 'teacher'

Maestre is a polysemic term that denoted ecclesiastic positions or individuals associated with the church, functioning as a title that signified the equivalent of doctor or master, as well as indicating the 'superior de su género' (Kasten and Cody 2001:s.v. maestre). The existence of two related forms, with *maestro* 'teacher', likely the indigenous development from the accusative MAGĬSTRUM, requires some explanation. *Maestro* shows the expected development while the final *-e* of *maestre* is phonological support for the classification of the term is a Gallicism, but could also be an indigenous development of the vocative form of this noun. Colón (1967a:180) views *maestre* as a likely Occitanism due to both phonological and semantic factors. First its phonological development is not that noted above, that is, the normal result in central Ibero-Romance was *maestro*. Its use in a military sense 'maestre de campo' as well its existence in mid-twelfth century documentation in Occitan suggest that it is the source language of *maestre*. While not discounting a possible Catalan origin, Colón goes on to say that, "en esa lengua lo normal, ya desde antiguo, es mestre y que en un término como el aquí tratado el influjo de la cultura caballeresca ultrapirenaica es más plausible" (1967:180). In contrast, Corominas and Pascual indicate that *maestre* is likely a borrowing from Old Catalan or Old Occitan, "por el empleo caballeresco (*maestre de orden*, *maestre de campo*)" (1980-1991:s.v. maestro). Due to the difficulties in distinguishing the exact

source language[23], it is not particularly important to the present study to establish whether *maestre* is from Old Catalan or Old Occitan[24]. In the case of *maestre* and other terms listed in the Appendix, such as *bel* 'beautiful', the combination of linguistic and social data available confirm their classification as Gallicisms. Thus, this study validates these scholars' classification of *maestre* as a Gallicism because of the influence of Gallic ecclesiastics. The application of the borrowing model proposed here to suggests that the social networks involved in the spread of Gallic ecclesiastic influence in Castilla and León promoted the adoption and diffusion of *maestre* with the sense of master or leader in Ibero-Romance. Its first use in Ibero-Romance is in a Leonese notarial text from 1186 in reference to the Order of Santiago, a religious order founded to protect pilgrims on their way to Santiago de Compostela.

(3) **maestre** don Pedro Fernández (León, 1186)

The data on the social factors affecting the borrowing of *maestre* point to its spread through person-to-person contact through their social networks. The semantic content of the term suggests that a *maestre* was a respected individual in the hierarchy, someone who had reached a position of authority. As such, within the ecclesiastic social network types as described here, a person denominated *maestre* was likely to have ties with other powerful clerics as well as ties with those beneath him, particularly as a leader

[23] We agree with Pottier, who writes "Es que muchas veces no se puede saber a punto fijo si la palabra viene del catalán, del provenzal o del francés" (1967:129).

[24] Colón (1967a:161-162) notes the difficulty in determining some cases whether a loanword is from Catalan or Occitan (and in a few cases from French), "ya que existen rasgos semejantes en la evolución fonética del occitán del francés y del catalán, es a menudo prácticamente imposible decidir...cuál de las tres lenguas entra en cuenta". Given the political and cultural ties between Cataluña and Provence in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, along with the similar phonetic developments in both Occitan and Catalán, we see little justification for distinguishing between a *catalanismo* and an *occitanismo* in this study as our data do not show support for such a clear distinction in this period.

or superior of his group. Being part of the upper echelon of the hierarchy also supposed additional mobility, something that is implied in the documentation as numerous *maestres* serve as signatories on notarial texts. There are dozens of notarial documents that either use the title as in a 1216 text from Burgos, which mentions "maestre Mauriz" or another from Calahorra in La Rioja dated to 1227 that was witnessed by the archdean of Nájera, "maestre Bernalt", a Gallic name. Others refer to the office as in a 1233 text that lists "fray Fernando, maestre de Salamanca". All of these indicate their importance as witnesses as well as demonstrate person-to-person transmission given the frequent purpose of notarial documents as records of oral testimony.

As previoulsy noted, the introduction of the Roman rite in Iberia brought with it many Cluniac monks to implement the new liturgy, who used their terminology in their new positions in Iberia. Beyond ecclesiastic social networks, however, the presence of the term *maestre* in several *fueros*, including the *Fuero de Zorita de los Canes* (1218-1250), *Fuero de Usagre* (1242-1275) and *Fuero de Béjar* (ca. 1290-1293) indicates that the concept was known and understood in various networks as well, not just those related to church business. Due to the need of the secular rulers of Iberia to reinforce and justify their authority, ties between kings and the upper hierarchy of the Church enabled the spread of the terminology used originally by Gallo-Romance speaking clerics into the language of legal documents drafted by the king and his legal team. In this way, the term *maestre* became a term to designate an authority or 'master', as in the purpose of establishing a text's veracity through the frequent citation of an accepted source. This accounts for how just one text, the *General Estoria*, contains over 700 of the 2200 tokens

of *maestre* found in more than 420 texts, which repeatedly cites the authority of Maestre Pedro as a source of historical information.

The geographical distribution of the tokens of *maestre* demonstrates a strong concentration in Castilla and León, with a few notarial texts from La Rioja. *Maestro* is the term used in Berceo's works. The lack of the term's use in Navarra and Aragón suggests the title of *maestre* was not used in these regions. In contrast, in Alfonsine documents, the role of *maestre* was important as seen in the numerous tokens, typically as signatories in texts directed to newly reconquered areas in Murcia, Extremadura and Andalusia. This evidence supports the claim that its adoption was first through the contacts between Gallo-Romance speaking Cluniac ecclesiastics and their indigenous clerics, particularly at the higher levels of the hierarchy. They had the mobility and status to move beyond the close-knit network within a monastery, coming into contact with others of high status, such as secular networks of individuals composing the *fueros* in which *maestre* appears.

Although the evidence in the documents points to ecclesiastic networks being the means of adoption and transmission, there are also later tokens of *maestre* in its sense of military leader. It is possible that the sense of 'master' or 'leader' spread beyond the ecclesiastic realm or that through a more or less contemporaneous establishment of military ties between Castilla and León and regions of France the term with its sense of leader was introduced. Section 3.3. further develops these political and military networks in. Military leaders were important figures and likely also well-connected to others with high status, like the above-mentioned ecclesiastics. Below is an example in a royal

document with many signatories, such as the individual in example (4) that lists his position as 'master of the cavalry':

(4) Don Pero Nuñez, **maestre** de la caualleria
(Sevilla, 1284)

The semantic overlap of *maestre* and the native development *maestro*, both of which have their ultimate etymon in MAGĬSTER, is clear in many contexts.

(5) Estos son los derechos que deue auer el **maestre** en Osagre
(*These are the rights that the master should have in Usagre*[25])
(*Fuero de Usagre*, ca. 1242-1275)

(6) Si por auentura ante que la obra sea acabada, el **maestro** ouiere de finar
(*If by chance the master dies before the work is finished*)
(*Fuero de Zorita de los Canes*, ca. 1218-1250)

(7) do a los freires de Calatrava & al **maestro** don Nuno la mja casa
(*I give my house to the friars of Calatrava and to Master Nuno*)
(Castilla, ca. 1194-1198)

Compared with the related form *maestro*, whose frequency was much lower, with 1000 tokens in 160 documents, *maestre* is the preferred title form, a use it continues to have today. As in example (7) above, however, there are numerous tokens of *maestro* used as a title, particularly before 1250. While it is possible that *maestre* could have evolved as an indigenous development of MAGĬSTER, the evidence on the social factors offered here suggest that *maestre* was indeed brought by Gallo-Romance ecclesiastics and spread among the monastic networks and religious orders. A related introduction of *maestre* in the sense of military leader corresponds with the military and political alliances formed between Iberian kingdoms and nobles of what is today France, likely Occitan-speaking

[25] Glosses are provided for longer examples for each illustration and are intended as rough translations of the use in context of a given Gallicism.

given the existence of *maestre* with the sense of leader in Old Occitan (see Thomas 1888).

By studying the data from a social networks perspective, the similarities between the three representative terms of the ecclesiastic *galicismos* examined here, *capiscol*, *chantre*, and *maestre*, represent the similar diffusion and concentration pattern in areas of León and Castilla of this subset of loanwords from Gallo-Romance in this period[26]. Close-knit networks ties acted as a norm-enforcing mechanism within the walls of a monastery, but that due to the mobility of clerics, especially the prestigious upper levels of the religious hierarchy (e.g. abbots and bishops), the spread of Gallic ecclesiastic terms was facilitated, as the evidence suggests. In the regions that saw the most Gallic influence, particularly from Cluny in the form of abbots, priors, monks and other personnel, the documents that were produced there have correspondingly higher token counts of related *galicismos*.

3.3 Military and political Gallicisms

As stated in the previous section, the objective in section 3.3 is to establish how social networks influenced the adoption and diffusion of military and political terms, another important subset of loanwords from Gallo-Romance, through the ties between the various political and military factions in Iberia in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. This period saw various rulers of Christian Iberia establish alliances and use family ties in order to gain the military support of powerful nobles of what is now France to support

[26] See the Appendix for the data on the additional terms adopted and spread via ecclesiastic networks.

their political aspirations. The earliest networks included those between elites such as the kings with concrete ties with what is today France. These ties formed the background of the growth in migration and immigration of Gallo-Romance soldiers into Iberia for both short-term military campaigns and permanent settlement due to rights and privileges granted to *francos* by Iberian rulers in this period. One result of this Gallic military involvement in Iberia and its corresponding population movement was the creation of two different types of social networks through which a set of military and political loanwords was adopted and spread into Ibero-Romance. This section will outline the key political figures and events that facilitated the creation these networks between and among Ibero-Romance speakers and those of Gallo-Romance, using as lexical illustrations *adobar*, *batalla* and *mensaje*. The main argument is that through the analysis of the linguistic data available in light of social networks, the influence of this type of person-to-person contact helps to account for the appearance of many tokens of military and political Gallicisms in the texts from the eastern Iberian Peninsula as well as the lack of ecclesiastic loanwords in these areas, as noted in section 3.2.

3.3.1 Military and political networks: Type one

The first set of military and political networks is observable through the close connections between the rulers of Iberia during the eleventh and twelfth centuries and the nobility and religious authorities of France. As in the prior section, the ties among the elites of society tended to be close as they had frequent personal interactions with the same people regarding the same subjects. This section will highlight those rulers with

extensive personal ties with France and those that therefore established type one military and political networks with multiple links and reciprocal transactional content. These networks were often reinforced through family ties, given the frequency of intermarriage. One example was Sancho el Mayor of Navarra, who was very close to his Gascon cousin Sanche, who fought with his chevaliers alongside Sancho's men against the Muslims (Défourneaux 1949:15). This first type of network eventually led to the second type of network as the military alliances established among the elites eventually involved individuals of the lower levels of society, soldiers and immigrants. The former came to fight in reconquest battles, while the latter came to resettle the territories reconquered from the Muslims.

As noted in the earlier discussion about ecclesiastic ties between an Iberian ruler and his counterparts over the Pyrenees, Sancho el Mayor of Navarra was the first to establish military ties between his kingdom and Gallo-Romance speaking territories. Sancho el Mayor's kingdom was geographically and culturally close to bordering regions Gascony and Béarn along the Pyrenees. Due to the close relationship between Sancho el Mayor and his Gascon cousin, Sanche Guillaume, it is possible and even likely that Sancho's sons interacted with Gallo-Romance speaking nobles at the court of their father, considering the norms of the nobility of the time.

Upon his death, the expansive kingdom of Sancho el Mayor was divided among his heirs per Navarran tradition. García III (r. 1035-1054) inherited Navarra, Ramiro I (r. 1035-1063) became the de facto first king of Aragón, while Fernando I (r. 1035-1065) received Castilla and subsequently León upon the death of his father-in-law Bermudo III

in 1037. All three battled to maintain and enlarge the territories they were granted upon the death of Sancho Garcés. Fernando and García had ambitions to expand their lands at the expense of the other, with the result of García's death in battle at Atapuerca in 1054. Ramiro, in turn, worked to maintain Aragón's independence in the face of his brothers' fighting. He expanded Aragón by annexing Sobrarbe and Ribagorza and maintained an alliance with neighboring Béarn, on the French side of the Pyrenees, which would strengthen during the reign of his son Sancho Ramírez (Barraqué 2001:176). All three had an effect on the creation of social network ties between Iberia and France, as the study details below.

The third son of Sancho el Mayor, Fernando, inherited Castilla (r. 1028-1065), at the time not a separate kingdom, and later became king of León (r. 1037-1065) upon the death of Bermudo III, brother of his wife Sancha of León. Like his brothers, Fernando had ambitions to expand his territory and saw in his father's connection with Cluny an ally in these endeavors (Bishko 1980:2). The alliance between Fernando and Cluny was materially advantageous as the abbey received much monetary support, although the reforms of the Benedictine order did not take hold in León and Castilla until the reign of Fernando's son Alfonso VI. In turn, Cluny supported Fernando and Alfonso in their Reconquest activities and did not intervene on behalf of García of Navarra as Fernando sought to reunite his father's territory. By 1065 Fernando was in charge of all of La Rioja and had made Zaragoza a tributary state, thereby thwarting the efforts of Sancho Ramírez to reconquer this powerful Muslim taifa.

Fernando's nephew, Sancho Garcés IV, son of García and Estefanía of Foix, a small Pyrenean region, inherited the kingdom of Navarra (r. 1054-1076). Sancho IV in turn married Placencia of Normandy, creating another marital bond with a Gallo-Romance speaking region. He used these ties to receive Gallic assistance in the siege of Barbastro in 1064, an act that pushed the Muslim ruler of Zaragoza to pay *parias* to the king of León and Castilla in exchange for protection from Sancho Ramírez (Laliena Corbera 2001:68). The presence of Gallic women in the courts of both García and Sancho Garcés indicates that these two men were likely exposed to multiple Gallo-Romance varieties and speakers given the probability that Estefanía and Placencia brought an entourage of Gallo-Romance speaking servants and associates. Likely as well is the fact that García and Sancho Garcés were surrounded by Gallo-Romance speakers in their early childhood given the customs of the time for raising royal children that established the importance of the mother's influence in a child's early years and then that of the father (or one of his close allies) of the adolescent years.

The next Iberian ruler who created network ties with Gallo-Romance speaking elites was Sancho Ramírez (r. 1076-1094 in Navarra, 1063-1094 in Aragón), son of Ramiro I of Aragón and Ermesinda de Foix. He married first Isabel of Urgel and later Felice de Roucy, both women of Gallo-Romance speaking areas. His reign in Navarra and Aragón is particularly important for this study for several reasons. One was the submission to papal suzerainty that allowed Sancho the backing of the Church in his reconquest efforts. The campaign to regain Barbastro in 1064 was labeled a crusade by the Church and brought soldiers into the Peninsula from all of Europe, particularly

various regions of France (Lapeña Paúl 2004:74). In return for the backing of Rome, Sancho agreed to switch to the Roman rite in Aragón, the first kingdom of the Iberian Peninsula to do so and a change long sought by Rome in order to standardize the liturgy. Along with the change in liturgical rite, the Cluniac monastic reforms are first adopted in Aragón at San Juan de la Peña in 1071. Somewhat tangentially related, but nevertheless revealing an additional trans-Pyrenean tie is the fact that Ramiro, one of Sancho Ramírez' sons, was a cleric at Saint-Pons de Thomières in southern France (García Mouton 1979:37). More details about the influence of Cluny in Iberia are found in the study's discussion of ecclesiastic Gallicisms, but this is evidence of the cultural influence that Cluny had in the political sphere.

By having the support of the two spiritual powers of the time, Sancho effectively prevented the absorption of Aragón by his rivals in León-Castilla and opened his kingdom to external influences, especially from neighboring France (Lapeña Paúl 2004:85). The results of his efforts included the expansion and enrichment of the noble class in the combined kingdom of Aragón and Navarra. In addition, by his death in 1094, the relationships established through his second marriage to Felicia of Roucy had created a "red de alianzas que se extendía desde Normandía hasta Champaña, que perduraba puesto que la reina todavía vivía y sus hijos ocupaban lugares esenciales en el dispositivo del clan real" (Laliena Corbera 1996:151). Again, the study points to the indirect power of Gallic women like Felicia of Roucy in the political affairs of Iberia, both with her husband and through her son, Alfonso el Batallador. The existence of more evidence of military and political Gallicisms in the texts of this regions parallels the documented

strong military alliances between regions of what is today France and the eastern Iberian regions of Navarra and Aragón.

Returning to the western kingdoms of León and Castilla, the powerful figure of the son of Fernando I, Alfonso VI (r. 1065-1109) is found, who tightened connections with not only the important religious center at Cluny, but also with key powerful families, first in Aquitaine and then in Burgundy. Alfonso no doubt saw the practical advantages of alliances with powerful families from beyond the Pyrenees, just as his cousin Sancho Ramírez did, as it was during his reign that a particularly strong Gallic influence began, lasting multiple generations in Castilla and León. In 1069 Alfonso married his first wife, Agnes of Aquitaine, daughter of William VIII, Duke of Aquitaine and Gascony. The duke and his men were among those ultra-Pyreneans who had participated in the siege of Barbastro, a key battle that had the result of attracting numerous fortune-seekers from France during the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries (Reilly 1988:80). Later, Alfonso sought the assistance of Hugh, abbot of Cluny, in the king's negotiations to marry Constance, daughter of Robert II, Duke of Burgundy and niece of both Henry I, king of France, and Hugh.

The alliance between Cluny and the Leonese-Castilian crown suited both sides. Cluny gained adherents to its order and reforms as well as financial support for its expansion. Alfonso was able to counterbalance any potential competition from an alliance between Rome and Aragón through his long-term, close relationship with Hugh, the abbot at Cluny from 1049-1109. In addition, the generosity of León's rulers and members of their families made them recipients of Cluniac liturgical intercession to a

degree rivaled only by that for the Holy Roman Emperors (Williams 1988:93). Hugh also supported Alfonso after the death of Sancho II of Castilla (r. 1065-1072), after which Alfonso renewed and increased his kingdom's contribution to Cluny that his father, Fernando I, had begun.

Earlier, Alfonso had also mandated the adoption of the Roman rite in Burgos around 1080, replacing the Visigothic rite, although the exact date is unclear (Reilly 1988:101). This change created a need in the kingdoms of both Alfonso VI and Sancho Ramírez for individuals trained in the new rite. Due to the lack of trained clerics in Iberia to implement the switch, many came from Cluny, often taking leadership positions at the behest of Archbishop Bernard, named the primate of Spain and close associate of Alfonso. The lexical effects can be seen in the data that include a number of clerical terms that are present in the documents of the first phase of borrowing, as noted in section 3.2.

In contrast with Alfonso VI, who used marital ties with French elites to bolster the support of his kingdom, upon becoming king of Aragón, Alfonso I (r. 1104-1134) sought the military support of various Gallic nobles to help him accomplish his territorial expansion. These men included Rotrou de Perche, Centulle de Bigorre, Bertrand de Laon, Hugo de Chalon, Pierre Petit and Gaston de Béarn, all of whom were granted lands in Aragón for their support (Défourneaux 1949:216-221). The predecessors of Alfonso I had maintained ties with Aquitaine since the era of Sancho el Mayor and William IX, Duke of Aquitaine fought with Alfonso in 1120 at the battle of Cutanda. Once the ill-fated marriage with Urraca, daughter of Alfonso VI was annulled by the Pope in 1111, Alfonso

I of Aragón focused his efforts on reconquering Muslim held cities. A large number of soldiers accompanied their lords to fight in the battles of Huesca, Barbastro, and later, Zaragoza, Tudela and Soria.

The social networks of the above Iberian rulers with trans-Pyrenean ties all shared a common type of links. That is, those in regular contact with royalty were elites and as such formed a small circle of individuals who no doubt at a minimum knew of each other, and likely traveled together, possibly shared family ties and saw mutual benefit through their association. On the one hand, Iberian rulers sought access to additional men to fight for territorial expansion at the expense of the Muslims, as well as enhancement of their power through connections with the powerful house of Cluny. On the other hand, the Gallic nobles were driven by both material and spiritual gains through fighting Muslims. The nobles who came from France often had extended stays in Iberia, including Gaston de Béarn, who was married to Alfonso I's cousin and participated in the siege of Barbastro and the reconquest of Zaragoza. Thus the evidence suggests one type of social network that influenced the spread and adoption of military and political *galicismos*, that of the upper echelon of political society. The language use of these elites had prestige and was a reinforcing element in the use of Gallicisms in this sphere, but it was through the second type of social networks that military and political loanwords spread into Ibero-Romance.

3.3.2 Military and political social networks: Type two

Given that the king sat at the top of the political hierarchy, his social networks were mainly limited to nobility and the highest-level religious authorities, as in Alfonso VI's relationship with Archbishop Bernard. This created a close-knit, dense circle of ties in that the members in it had frequent interactions and the content of those interactions reinforced their connections. Later, in the twelfth century, as the intensity of Gallo-Iberian relations increased as repopulation efforts through immigration reached their peak by mid century, another type of social network developed, one less dense in nature. While the closer-knit network structure of the elites established an environment of prestige related to Gallo-Romance speaking elites, the actual spread of loanwords was facilitated by the looser networks of soldiers and other immigrants who had more opportunities to interact with native Iberians.

These individuals came to Iberia to fight against the Muslims and in return gain material wealth in the form of booty. As there were no standing armies in Iberia or France, all military operations were essentially ad hoc (O'Callaghan 2003:125). This is important to the idea that the social network ties created among soldiers were not lasting, nor did they remain in a particular place for long, given the short length of service. Vassals were typically required to serve their lords in battle for three months, although if the lord offered additional compensation, vassals could be convinced to continue to fight (O'Callaghan 2003:125). The fighting season was normally from the spring through fall, with military planning occurring in the winter. The earliest battles that involved Gallic soldiers fighting along with their Iberian counterparts occurred in Aragón, specifically at

Barbastro in 1064, but later at Jaca, Huesca and Zaragoza, among numerous other locations. Jaca, Huesca and Zaragoza were subsequently granted *fueros* specifically designed to attract permanent settlers, many of whom were of Gallic origin (García Mouton 1979:10).

A major reason for the importance of the reign of Sancho Ramírez in the establishment of network ties between and among Ibero-Romance and Gallo-Romance speakers is the start of an urban society in Aragón, encouraged through royal support via *fueros* or town charters that established special rights and exemptions designed to attract trans-Pyrenean settlers. Sancho granted Jaca its *fuero* or town charter in 1063, thereby elevating the town to city status and allowing for the establishment of a see at Jaca. The *fuero* resulted in a large number of immigrants from Gascony and Béarn moving to Jaca, a process that would be repeated in other towns and cities throughout the twelfth century. The *Fuero de Jaca* and subsequent *fueros francos*, that is, those charters that were designed to attract population, were key in creating more opportunities for Ibero-Romance speakers to come into regular contact with those of Gallo-Romance.

The granting of *fueros* was a trend that began in the second half of the eleventh century and continued into the twelfth century. These charters had a major influence on the population movements that fueled the situations of language contact between speakers. As the reconquest moved south, Iberian monarchs saw the need for a stable population to hold on to the areas retaken. While the term *franco* referred mainly to those settlers who were from what is now France, it did acquire a broader sense of a person free to migrate, as opposed to those tied to a particular area due to feudal bonds. For the

purposes of this investigation, the presence of *francos* is important because of the implication of population movement and language contact.

The *Fuero de Jaca* served as the model *fuero* for other towns and cities in the kingdom of Sancho Ramírez. In towns like Huesca and Zaragoza, both important Aragonese cities, a number of ultra-Pyreneans were attracted to the economic opportunities to be found in towns and urban centers, creating opportunities to mix with the native population as well as move to other areas in search of economic opportunities, especially to other towns along the Camino de Santiago (García Mouton 1979:39). As García Mouton observes, "Los francos de Huesca, como en todo el Valle del Ebro, no conservaron su lengua durante siglos, ya que las circunstancias los llevaron a una igualdad y a una convivencia con sus vecinos aragoneses que les obligaron a asimilarse" (1979:58). A period of transition between the exclusive use of Gallo-Romance to the complete integration of Ibero-Romance did, however, leave a legacy in the higher number of Gallicisms found overall in the Ibero-Romance of the area, such as *batalla* 'battle', *jornada* 'day's journey; day' and *vianda* 'provisions, food'. Through his military successes, Alfonso I played an important role in repopulating reconquered areas of Aragón and parts of Castilla through the concession of *fueros francos*, in cities including Zaragoza, Huesca and Soria. To the west in La Rioja, Alfonso VI recognized the political and economic advantages that foreign settlers could bring by granting Nájera its *fuero franco* in 1076 and Logroño in 1095 after Alfonso took control of La Rioja in 1076.

The concession of special privileges and exemptions to foreigners and other free settlers continued into the twelfth century as well. Although the eastern Iberian Peninsula

sees more Gallic influence due to geographic proximity, other areas of Iberia well away from the Pyrenees had Gallo-Romance speaking residents. For example, Castilla and León saw populations of *francos* settle, often with the above mentioned royal intervention, including Salamanca and Zamora by Raymond of Burgundy, husband of Urraca, Alfonso VI's daughter. Numerous towns and cities, including Burgos, León and Santiago de Compostela, had *barrios*, or neighborhoods, that were populated by *francos*, mostly dedicated to merchant activities along the *camino francés* that passed through town.

So how does population movement and the establishment of *barrios francos* affect the diffusion and adoption of military and political Gallicisms in the Ibero-Romance of the period? The earliest linguistic evidence of Gallicisms is found in *fueros* and follows the general trend of Gallic military involvement in reconquest battles moving south and west from Huesca to Soria and Zorita de los Canes, the last conquered by Alfonso I of Aragón. Migration loosens network ties among speakers as old social networks are broken and new ones created. Individuals coming from what is today France in order to take advantage of privileges granted in a *fuero* often initially had a legal status that set them apart from the native population. These *fueros* can be found in various regions of Iberia, indicating the immigration of a number of Gallic individuals in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

One example is Avilés in Asturias. Lapesa (1948[1984]) studied its *fuero* and found clear linguistic evidence of the Provençal origin of its scribe. Another is Oviedo, studied by Ruiz de la Peña Solar (1995), who examined the demographic data on the

ultrapirenaicos present in Oviedo from 1100-1230, where initially these settlers were granted their own set of laws. In Huesca and Zaragoza in Aragón, however, the *francos* who came to settle were not granted a special legal status. Instead, in spite of at first living in the separate neighborhoods as *francos* did in Avilés and Oviedo, the *francos* of Huesca and Zaragoza never showed the same degree of cohesion. This was due to the fact that many of the settlers who came to Huesca and Zaragoza had moved from Jaca. Once Huesca was reconquered, many *francos* moved south from Jaca to Huesca; the same was true for the resettlement of Zaragoza (García Mouton 1979:66). Given that this movement occurred within just a few years, it is likely that these *francos* did not live apart in tight-knit social networks. Instead, in cities reconquered after Jaca, Christians, including Ibero-Romance speakers, established new ties. The integration of the *francos* into Huesca and Zaragoza created opportunities for spreading borrowings as individuals from the two speech communities interacted, as tokens of *adobar*, *batalla* and *mensaje* in early twelfth-century Ibero-Romance documents from Aragón demonstrate, words found later in Castilian texts.

As with the social network types among ecclesiastics, there are two main types of military and political networks among Gallo-Romance speakers. The first, as described above, was the close-knit, exclusive network of elites, the rulers and their Gallic counterparts. The second was a result of the alliances that the elites established, bringing into the Peninsula a large number of men to fight reconquest battles in places like Barbastro, Huesca and Zaragoza, as well as to settle in territory retaken from the Muslims, in places farther west such as Logroño, Burgos, León and other towns both on

the Camino de Santiago and off it. Population movement was actively promoted by Hispanic monarchs in order to maintain settlers as reconquest activity recruited others away from already developed territory and pushed Christian lands south.

3.3.3 Gallicisms spread through military and political networks

The following set of lexemes are representative of the larger group of Gallicisms that were adopted and spread due to the creation of new social networks as a result of political and military alliances that rulers of Iberian kingdoms established with their trans-Pyrenean counterparts[27]. These alliances permitted the contact between speakers of Ibero-Romance, exposing them to Gallic terminology for military items and concepts. Below the available data on three loanwords are highlighted, *adobar*, *batalla* and *mensaje*, all of which followed a similar pattern of diffusion Ibero-Romance, beginning in the eastern regions of the Peninsula and subsequently spreading south and west as the Christian armies took towns from the Muslims, in some cases with Gallic armed forces and in others the territory taken was held in part with population who moved in from Gallo-Romance speaking areas. This pattern supports the argument that it was through military and political networks that these words were introduced and subsequently spread in Ibero-Romance.

4. **ADOBAR** *v* 'to fix, arrange, put in order, prepare', 'to decorate, adorn' < OFr. *v* adober 'to knight' < Frankish *dubban 'to push', 'to hit'

[27] See the Appendix for all military and political *galicismos* in light of the integrated borrowing model.

Adobar was likely an early loanword given its diffusion pattern, appearing in texts from Aragón westward to León, demonstrating wide penetration of the term by the early thirteenth century. The early concentration of examples in Aragón suggests that the main route of transmission was through contact with Gallo-Romance speakers who came either to fight the Muslims in Iberia or to settle in towns and cities like Huesca, Zaragoza and Soria. The longtime connections between the rulers of Gascony, Béarn and Aragón included various waves of Gallic soldiers coming to fight in reconquest battles, including Barbastro, Huesca, Tudela and Zaragoza. Additional tokens found in notarial documents from religious houses indicate another transmission route, through contact with Gallo-Romance speaking individuals along the pilgrimage route to Santiago due to the tokens from notarial texts from the monastery at Carrizo as well as the cathedral at León, both on the Camino de Santiago. These examples also date a century later than the earliest tokens found in the eastern Peninsula, supporting the argument that it was through contact with military and political networks that resulted in the adoption and spread of *adobar*.

Although in Gallo-Romance the first notices of the term demonstrate a meaning of ‘to knight’, as in the similar English expression ‘to dub’, there is no example of this sense in any of the numerous Ibero-Romance texts in which it appears. Instead, along with Occitan, *adobar* in Ibero-Romance developed a broad meaning that included the general idea of repair and preparation, including seasoning and curing (Müller 1995: s.v. adobar). A common trade among Gallic immigrants was that of furrier or leather tanner

(see García Mouton 1979), both requiring preparation of animal skins, the term for which was *adobar*.

With the relative frequency and polysemy of *adobar*, as well as its frequent appearance in notarial texts, it was likely introduced via oral means by Gallo-Romance speaking immigrants who then spread it via social networks that included ties with Ibero-Romance speakers. As noted, the lack of a separate legal status for *francos* who came to settle in Jaca, Huesca and Zaragoza permitted earlier integration into the Ibero-Romance population. Its distribution follows the general pattern seen in many terms spread through the movement of Gallic population, first from east to west along Camino de Santiago, then to the south as the reconquest moved. In addition, the semantic connection with the Occitan equivalent as opposed to the meaning found in northern Gallo-Romance, suggests that the military and political alliances with Gascony and other southern regions of what is today France were the macrosocial means of diffusion. The interpersonal links that were created between the native population and the new Gallic residents of towns like Jaca and Huesca, and subsequently the larger city of Zaragoza, who were mainly from the southern regions of France as García Mouton (1979) has shown, spread the term *adobar* via their loose ties. The lack of tokens in Ibero-Romance of *adobar* with the sense of 'to dub, to knight' supports the hypothesis that the term was brought by southern Gallo-Romance speakers. As the word spread, it was often used in its broad sense of preparation through repair, cleaning or decorating, depending on the context. Its earliest example comes from a notarial document from Huesca dated 1134, written in formulaic Latinized Romance.

(8) Ego Ramon belenger Comite de Barcelona, atorco et confirmo illos foros et illos donativos, quos Rex Petrus, et Rege Ranimiro dedit ad illos homines de Oscha, et illos mille solidos quos dedit per illos muros **adobar**.
(*I, Ramon Berenger, Count of Barcelona, grant and confirm the fueros and donations, those of King Peter, and King Ramiro gave to the men of Huesca, and the 1000 sueldos that he gave for the repair of the city walls*)
(Huesca, 1134)

In a text related to the military and political events of the period, the Castilian text *Poema de Mio Cid*, the collected data provide additional tokens, which contains nine separate uses as in these examples.

(9) pensólas de **adobar** de los mejores guarnimientos
(*He planned to deck them out in the best dress adornments*)

(10) el Campeador a los sos lo mando que **adobassen** cozina
(*the Campeador to his men ordered that they prepare food)*

(11) que destas siete semanas **adóbes** con sus vassallos
(*That he may prepare for these seven weeks with his vassals*)
(*Poema de Mio Cid*, ca. 1207)

With multiple meanings from the first texts in Ibero-Romance (Kasten and Cody 2001: s.v. adobar), the verb *adobar* is, like *batalla*, one of the earliest widespread *galicismos*, appearing first in notarial, legal and early literary texts like the *Poema de Mio Cid*, but subsequently in all text types by the end of the thirteenth century. Its token count in comparison to other Phase I terms is high, some 300 tokens in over 70 different documents. As with the other two Gallicisms that exemplify the diffusion pattern that corresponds with military and political social networks, *adobar* was found first in notarial documents from the eastern Peninsula and subsequently spread south and west through the loose connections between individuals involved in the reconquest and repopulation activities of the period.

5. BATALLA *nf* 'battle' < OOc. batalha < BATTUALIA 'skirmish'

The diffusion of *batalla* clearly relates to the military and political social network types this section has detailed. The historical events that promoted the adoption and diffusion of *batalla* so quickly and broadly into Ibero-Romance include the frequency of battle, which had an effect on loosening social networks and increasing population movement as forces moved from one battle site to the next. As noted earlier, Sancho el Mayor maintained lifelong ties with Gascony, particularly military ones. Battles known to have had Gallic participants include those during the reign of Sancho el Mayor, in which there were Gascons and Béarnais, both regions that bordered the Pyrenees, as well as Normans (Défourneaux 1949:129). Later, the first organized armed force in notable numbers from what is today France crossed the Pyrenees in 1063, with the goal of taking Barbastro from the Muslims (Lacarra 1981:154). This army was made up of knights and soldiers from Aquitaine and Normandy (Défourneaux 1949:133). Their success led to subsequent campaigns in the reign of Pedro I and Alfonso I of Aragón at Zaragoza, Tudela and Calatayud, although none with as much material success as the fleeting conquest of Barbastro (Lacarra 1981:155). An additional factor that promoted Gallic military intervention was the Papal declaration of a crusade in Iberia, which was equally supported by the rulers of Spain and the rising influence in Iberia of the Cluniacs. The result, as noted by Lacarra, was that "muchos [caballeros] acudirían espontáneamente a enrolarse en las filas del ejército cristiano, a cuya lucha el rey de Aragón había impreso un sello de Cruzada" (1981:156).

In Castilla and León, the same desire for Gallic military support for reconquering and resettling Muslim-held territory brought Alfonso VI to marry his two daughters Urraca and Teresa to two Burgundian nobles, Raymond and Henry. It is not clear whether they participated in the 1085 takeover of Toledo, but they did receive significant territories to repopulate. While Raymond and Urraca received parts of western León and Galicia, Henry and Teresa ruled Portugal. These grants had a political motivation, as Défourneaux observed, noting "la place qu'il donna dans ses États à Raymond et Henri de Bourgogne montre que...il voulut s'assurer de façon permanente leur service" (1949:146). Gallic military participation in León and Castilla became less organized, and with the death of Pedro I of Aragón, became more focused in territories sought by his brother and heir Alfonso I. Given the above facts of the military intervention by Gallic soldiers, it is safe to assume that the term was heard frequently by their Ibero-Romance speaking counterparts, who would have then spread it among their social networks.

Batalla is notably fully integrated into Ibero-Romance by the beginning of the thirteenth century, like *adobar* and *mensaje*. In Gallo-Romance, the earliest known example is found in the *Chanson de Roland* from 1080 (Rey et al.: s.v. batalha). The first example found in CORDE is a notarial document by Pedro I of Aragón from 1099 written in *romance latinizado*.

(12) Quando habuimus illa **batalla** de Alcoraz promisi Deo
(*When we had the Battle of Alcoraz, I promised God*)
(Aragón, 1099)

The information gathered on *batalla* includes over 3000 tokens of *batalla* in some 60 documents, a quarter of which are in *fueros*. The word occurs in all text types

analyzed in the study--histories, religious and literary texts, as well as Alfonsine scientific and sapiential documents. Its partial synonym *lid* appears some 500 times in 46 texts in the same period, while another partial synonym is *contienda* particularly common in notarial documents with some 670 examples in 152 texts. In historiographical texts like the *General Estoria*, *contienda, lid* and *batalla* are closer to being synonymous, but *batalla* clearly outnumbers the native terms by a wide margin.

Batalla is an example of a borrowing that partially replaces a sign in the receiving language, offering a specific meaning that the user desires. *Batalla* overlaps semantically with above-mentioned native forms *lid* 'combat, fight' and *contienda* 'fight, dispute'. When the specific contexts are examined in which the texts' writers employed *batalla*, the meaning is most often armed conflict between armies. In contrast, *contienda* is often in the sense of 'dispute' or 'disagreement', especially in notarial texts. *Lid* in its frequent uses in the *fueros* has the sense of 'duel', fought between two men to settle a dispute, but also shares the sense of battle with armed forces in the same way as *batalla* in texts like the *General Estoria* and the *Poema de Mio Cid*, but much less frequently.

After its first appearance in the late eleventh century as noted above, in the twelfth century *batalla* spread west and south. Its pattern of diffusion and its semantic content support the hypothesis that loose-knit social networks created through the links between Ibero-Romance speaking soldiers and their Gallo-Romance speaking counterparts initiated the spread of *batalla* to those involved in the resettlement of territories gained from the Muslims. Its presence in literary texts *La Fazienda de Ultramar* and *Poema de Mio Cid* by the end of the twelfth and beginning of the thirteenth

centuries suggests integration into the language use of individuals in educated social circles, a topic to which the following chapter returns as the study examines these types of networks and the Gallicisms found in texts produced by the members of such groups.

6. MENSAJE *nm* 'message' < Oc. messatge, derivative of MĬSSUS 'sent'

Based on the textual evidence, it is assumed that contact between Gallo-Romance speaking soldiers and Ibero-Romance speakers facilitated the adoption and diffusion of *mensaje* through loose network ties. Due to the presence of various military leaders and their soldiers, they would understandably have used their own vocabulary to refer to objects and people relevant to communication in battle. The geographical diffusion of *mensaje* follows an east to west, north to south diffusion pattern, first in Aragón, but soon seen in Castilla and La Rioja as reconquest battles moved south and west of Aragón and pilgrims made their way west along the *camino francés*. In the period of study, the term was used commonly in the *fueros*, including those of Alarcón, Alcaraz, Béjar, Cuenca, Plasencia, Soria, Teruel, Úbeda, as well as the *Vidal Mayor* of Navarra[28]. The inclusion of the term *mensaje* or a derived form such as *mensajero* in these *fueros* is a strong indication of diffusion through political and military social networks as part of the reconquest. The study has already established the important role that early settlers from Gallo-Romance speaking areas had in holding territories taken by Christian armies, which results in the spread of *mensaje* into the legal codes of these areas.

[28] The fact that many *fueros* of the Castilian frontier form a related set could help explain the use of *mensaje* in the texts listed here, except the *Vidal Mayor* (see Gacto Fernández et al. 1997:133-134 for an overview of related *fueros*). Despite this, it is assumed that the language of the *fuero* that governed a community was comprehensible to its residents, thus demonstrating the understanding, if only passive, of *mensaje* in the towns listed here.

Mensaje designated a written or oral communication addressed to a particular recipient. The indigenous partial synonym, *nuevas* 'news', denoted information but not necessarily directed to a receiver. In addition to *mensage*, two derived forms are found early. *Mesaiero* (*mensajero*) is found in the thirteenth century poem in the *Razón de amor*, while *mesageria* appears in the *Fuero de Zorita de los Canes* (ca. 1218) in the more abstract sense of the occupation of messenger or a legation. *Mensaje* and *mensajero* are concrete nouns, which aided in their adoption. *Mensajería* contains the derivational suffix *-ería*, which is a compound suffix that combines *-ero* and *-ía* (Pharies 2002:s.v. -ería). The suffix generally has the same semantic functions as *-ía*, including its functions in *mensajería*, that of designating an occupation or a collection of messages. Pharies notes that the designation of an occupation implies an agent such that it is not surprising that many derivations are from *-ero* words (2002:s.v. -ería). The derived forms support the argument that it was through person-to-person contact through weak social ties that facilitated the spread of terms like *mensaje*. The agent carrying the information had to present it to the receiver as there was no other means of sharing information in this period. A message was written and sent via a carrier, i.e. messenger, to the desired recipient.

While *mensaje* appears in the documentation much less frequently than other loanwords from this sphere of language contact, it is not rare, counting some 340 tokens in 50 different texts, with its frequency increased through the derived forms. In spite of the lower frequency, *mensaje* is an early borrowing given the varied types of texts in which *mensaje* appears, with a notable presence in the *fueros*, but also appearing in

literary texts such as the *Poema de Mio Cid*, and *La Fazienda de Ultramar* and in several of Berceo's works:

(13) Embio a Rabcesse con so **message** con sos menaças al rei
(*He sent Rabcesse with his message and his threats to the king*)
(*Liber Regum*, 1194)

(14) embiaré por ellas e vós sabed el **mensage**
(*I will send for them and you know the message)*
(*Poema de Mio Cid,* ca. 1207)

(15) quand' sopo estas nuevas, el **message** certero
(*When he learned this news, the message was certain*)
(*Vida de San Millán,* ca.1230)

(16) Del andador que el **mensage** del conceio mal fiziere.
(*Regarding the courier who delivers the message of the council poorly)*
(*Fuero de Alcaraz*, ca. 1296)

Semantically, *mensaje* described a more specific communication from one individual to another than that of the indigenous *nuevas*, and therefore was a useful addition to the lexicon of Ibero-Romance for speakers of the period. *Mensajero* also designated an important individual in a period when communication was far from instant. Many of the tokens of *mensaje* and *mensajero* are found in the context of the importance of the information to be transmitted to its recipient, both oral and written.

The three Gallicisms included as illustrations of adoption and diffusion through the political and military social networks created as a result of the particular historical events in the eleventh through the thirteenth centuries, *adobar*, *batalla* and *mensaje*, as well as *dardo* 'dart', *duque* 'duke', *linaje* 'lineage' and *vianda*[29] 'provisions, supplies'. They all share similar patterns of usage based on the textual evidence, appearing first in

[29] See the Appendix for all Gallicisms spread through military and political networks.

notarial and legal documents that indicate oral transmission. The facts regarding the intervention in Iberia of Gallic armies and settlers attracted by the opportunities offered to them through the rights granted in the *fueros* also point to how Gallo-Romance speaking individuals established connections with the Ibero-Romance speaking population. The political elites of Iberia and France sought to take mutual advantage of military alliances at the expense of the Muslims with the result of population movement. Both those men who fought in reconquest battles and those who settled in areas taken as a result of those battles by definition loosened or broke their established social networks. In this way, these individuals had the opportunity for language contact through the creation of new social ties, indirectly seen in the set of words examined here. The key characteristic of military and political Gallicisms is the pattern of diffusion that starts first in the eastern Iberian Peninsula and moves with the reconquest and repopulation.

3.4 Commercial network structures: Single type

Unlike the network types found in the previous two sections of this chapter, the subset of commercial loanwords can be seen to relate to a single network type, that of the looser set of connections that arise due to population movement. There were two key factors that influenced the creation of the social networks through which the *galicismos* related to commercial interactions spread. First was the rise in pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela and the second was the general trend of urban growth with its corresponding rise of the merchant class in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. These historical and social events promoted connections between speakers of Gallo-Romance with those of

Ibero-Romance that were generally uniplex in nature. As observed at the beginning of this chapter, the integrated borrowing model highlights how the construct of social networks can be used to shed light on the spread of linguistic innovations like Gallicisms. The basic argument for the loanwords related to commercial and merchant networks is that the rise of an urban society and migration of population had the effect of creating a large number of weak ties among speakers. As the research on the spread of changes in early Modern English has shown, those individuals who traveled more widely had an increased incidence of linguistic innovations in their language use (see Bergs 2000, 2005, Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg 1999, and Tieken-Boon 2000).

The hypothesis regarding the spread of commercial *galicismos* is similar in that the network type involved in the diffusion of these terms is not the close-knit, multiplex network that the evidence suggests likely operated among ecclesiastics. Rather, the ties between merchants selling Gallic goods at fairs and markets are more likely to be uniplex, with the business transaction being the only sphere in which merchant and customer interact, and the transaction between them non-reciprocal, as the customer purchases the goods from the merchant, thereby ending their interaction. Although the market might have been daily or weekly, depending on the size of the town or city (see García de Valdeavellano 1975:68-74), the nature of the transaction was superficial and not lasting, characteristic of a weak social tie.

The concept of open or loose networks is often associated with social and economic mobility. In the period of study, this means that those individuals tied to the land and those at the very highest levels of society were less mobile and therefore more

likely to have closer-knit and more dense social networks, which by nature impeded the spread of innovations. In contrast, groups like merchants and craftsmen who needed to interact with customers and possibly traveled to markets and fairs to sell their goods, were likely to have peripheral connections to multiple networks. Milroy has argued that changes spread across weak ties between groups (1992:178). In the case of twelfth- and thirteenth-century Iberia, weak ties were also key to the spread of commerical Gallicisms, based on the demographic evidence that early merchants were Gallic in origin (see Ruiz de la Peña Solar 1995 and García Mouton 1979 for examples from Oviedo and Jaca, respectively). Thus a hypothetical Gallo-Romance speaking fur trader who set up his business in a town along the route to Santiago de Compostela had contacts with residents of the town and areas served by the market, creating a language contact opportunity. The contact was fleeting, but if the product he was selling was desirable, as in the case of *garnacha*, an item that was valuable enough to be documented in a will, it is likely the name of the item was notable to the craftsman's clients, and by extension, known to their networks as well. In this way, an interaction between two individuals that lasted little time could have a lasting impact on the lexicon of the Ibero-Romance speaking customer.

3.4.1. Commercial growth due to pilgrimage

One of the major drivers of economic expansion and population movement in Iberia, as has been mentioned throughout this chapter, is the growth in popularity of pilgrimage. The pious had been trekking to Santiago de Compostela since the ninth century, after Alfonso III of León (r. 866-910) built a larger church at the site where the

remains of St. James were said to have been found in the early ninth century by the monk Pelayo. As the number of individuals climbed, the route that became the Camino de Santiago began to take shape.

Religious and political factors aided the success of the pilgrimage. First, those able to complete a pilgrimage to a holy site like Compostela were granted indulgences by the Church. Second, after the official route was moved south by Sancho el Mayor, the trek became physically easier. The result is an established route for travelers and commerce from Puente la Reina through Pamplona, Logroño, Nájera, Santo Domingo de la Calzada, Belorado, Villafranca Montes de Oca, Arlanzón, Ibeas de Juarros, Burgos, Castrojeriz, Carrión, Sahagún, León, Astorga and finally to Compostela. Martínez García observes that:

> la monarquía (Alfonso VI en Castilla-León y Sancho Ramírez en el reino navarro-aragonés), la alta nobleza, los obispos y los monjes, sobre todo los monjes cluniacenses, fueron los primeros en dedicar al Camino una parte de su tiempo y de sus fortunas, en unos casos acondicionando el camino físico y en otros fundando hospitales y monasterios. (2000:89)

By the end of the eleventh century, there were hospices for pilgrims in all of the main stops of the route, including Jaca, Pamplona, Estella, Nájera, Burgos, Frómista, Carrión, Sahagún, León, Foncebadón, Villafranca del Bierzo and Compostela (Martínez García 2000:90). These were mainly at monastic centers, several of which were linked with Cluny, including Santa María la Real in Nájera, Santa Coloma in Burgos and San Zoilo in Carrión. Alongside the services provided by religious charity, an industry of private facilities grew, although the innkeepers often had a reputation for trickery and thievery,

as seen in the *Codex Calixtinus*, a twelfth century manuscript written by a Frenchman that contains practical information on the pilgrimage route (see Bravo Lozano 1989).

As more travelers came, bridges, churches and hospices were built as towns expanded, often with a commercial district stretching along the sides of the road toward Santiago. Cities and towns grew due to the labor required to construct the new facilities. In the twelfth century, as noted above in section 3.2, royal intervention was codified in the form of *fueros* that dictated certain provisions aimed at ensuring a stable population (Gautier Dalché 1979:69). But it was the pilgrimage route that started the process that the monarchs strengthened with their policies. Ruiz de la Peña Solar states:

> Ya tempranamente la ruta jacobea es percibida como principal cauce de comunicación de los espacios norteños peninsulares con la Europa de ultrapuertos; así si en un documento najerense se sitúa el monasterio de Santa María de Nájera "latus de illa via que discurrit pro ad Sanctum Iacobo", en ese mismo año esa misma vía recibe el significativo nombre de "strata de francos". (2000:136)

As part of the expansion of services for pilgrims, the development of regular markets and fairs along established communication routes ultimately affected the diffusion of linguistic innovations like loanwords. The concentration of population in towns and cities created new social networks and facilitated the spread of *galicismos*. The diffusion of the terms related to commercial interactions generally follows the pattern of human geography and concentration of pilgrim services, that is, from east to west and then along established routes from north to south.

Parallel to the rise in pilgrimage is the economic expansion that occurred in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The improvement of infrastructure meant major construction projects, including bridges, churches, hospitals and inns, all of which were a

factor influencing the growth in population of urban centers by attracting a large number of workers. These workers required necessities like food, creating a need for markets in towns and cities. Gautier Dalché (1979:73) notes that Sahagún, for example, had a regular weekly market on Mondays and included the activities of blacksmiths, carpenters, tailors, furriers, cobblers and makers of furniture and armor, who were able to import luxury items from regions well outside Iberia. Cities like Burgos, León, Pamplona, Santiago and Toledo each had daily markets to supply the needs of workers and tradesmen (see García de Valdeavellano 1975).

Other cities that saw great commercial expansion due to the influx of pilgrims include Nájera, Burgos, León, Astorga and, of course, Santiago. These had been urban centers even before the transformation that pilgrimage brought to Logroño, Sahagún and Carrión. In Burgos in the twelfth century, of the names noted in the documents from the area, it has been estimated that one fifth of the population was of Gallic origin (García de Cortázar 1994:175). If many of these immigrants were craftsmen and merchants as in the data gathered on Jaca, Huesca and Zaragoza (see García de Mouton 1979), there were numerous opportunities to interact however fleetingly with their customers. With the construction of new hospices and the cathedrals at Burgos and León, large neighborhoods of *francos* sprouted up near the entrances or exits of the cities (Gautier Dalché 1979:77). These new *barrios* often contained the market, as in the *barrio de mercato* in Nájera, or were located near it. Through this fact, it is possible to infer that the *francos* were involved in selling goods in the marketplace, which offered opportunities for the native population to interact with immigrant merchants.

Oviedo, Valladolid and Palencia, too, had important communication routes with other cities. The growth of Valladolid is tied to the conquest of Toledo in 1085, which helped Palencia and Valladolid expand, with their locations on the road between Burgos and Toledo. What is interesting to note is these cities' artificiality. That is, they did not arise spontaneously, but rather, their establishment and growth were in response to the need to repopulate the area (Gautier Dalché 1979:87). The fact that these cities began as a result of a conscious effort to settle an area implies that the social networks established, at least at first, were loose because the new residents likely came from different regions, in addition to simply setting up in their new home. As already noted, the pressure to maintain the linguistic variety that an individual uses is weaker in networks where not everyone knows everyone, with connections in a single sphere, a situation that likely was found in places like Valladolid and Palencia and others through intervention of the king in the form of a *fuero* that granted rights and privileges to the *francos* who settled in these areas.

García de Valdeavellano notes that the first *burgueses*, that is, those individuals who resided in towns and cities and earned their living through craft and merchant activities:

> constituyen ya el germen activo de un grupo social característico que se define como tal, no sólo por su profesión artesana o mercantil, sino específicamente por su cualidad ciudadana. Porque ya en la realidad social del siglo XI, la ciudad empieza a ser, sobre todo, el asiento de una población que sus actividades, su género de vida, su accesión a nuevas formas de riqueza, sus aspiraciones y su unión en la protección y defensa de sus comunes intereses comienzan a diferenciarse como un elemento nuevo en la sociedad medieval. Un elemento social nuevo que, en la Baja Edad Media, hará de la ciudad el centro más activo de la vida económica, como antes lo había sido el Señorío, la gran explotación agraria. (1969:28)

So in spite of their exclusion from the literature of the period, which includes only three social groups, the knights, the clerics and the laborers, the *burgueses* in reality were an important social and economic force. Research by Raumolin-Brunberg and Nevalainen has demonstrated more highly mobile individuals, with contacts in different social networks, both close knit and loose, demonstrate greater use of linguistic innovations (1997:713). Linguistically, they formed the bridges between social networks that interacted and spread many Gallicisms of this study, because of their mobility and the loose-knit, open nature of their social networks.

The influence that large numbers of pilgrims passing along the route to Santiago left behind can still be seen today in the urban geography of towns that grew along the road. Gautier Dalché writes:

> Las poblaciones del Camino de Santiago tienen a veces un plan regular, modelado por el propio camino: la ciudad se extiende longitudinalmente a ambos lados de éste. El *camino francés* se convierte en calle, unas veces única, otras principal. A lo largo de su trayecto urbano se multiplican las iglesias, hospitales, albergues. En su parte central se establecen extranjeros y judíos, artesanos y comerciantes. (1979:305)

He also argues that it was the reconquest that prevented a great expansion of merchant activity farther south of the route, because men could move south to acquire land and make a living in that way as opposed to becoming urban entrepreneurs (Gautier Dalché 1979:401). Given that the cities of the northern Iberian Peninsula were better established, as well as on a well-used transportation route, the result was that the economic opportunities for the professions and trades of many Gallic immigrants remained to the north and east. This, in turn, kept the most intense French linguistic influence more north

along the *camino* and to the east, where Aragón and Navarra bordered Gallo-Romance areas.

3.4.2 Commercial and communication routes in reconquered territory

After Toledo was seized by Alfonso VI, he granted the right of the repopulation of Ávila, Salamanca and Segovia by his son-in-law Raymond of Burgundy. Although the data on the demographics of Ávila and Segovia are sparse, in Salamanca, Jerôme of Périgord was active in its resettlement under the order of Raymond. Its location on a road that linked Toledo and Santiago through Astorga, was a key defensive position in the late eleventh century and attracted a number of *francos*. As Gautier Dalché observes, "Extremadura se convertía en un lugar de paso y era rentable canalizar el tráfico con el fin de percibir más fácilmente derechos sobre las mercancías" (1979:106). In contrast with the cities along the Camino de Santiago, the growth of those in Extremadura, however, was more related to the defense of territory and much less about commercial growth, which was an area of influence for Gallo-Romance speakers. Moxó states:

> Por supuesto que los repobladores utilizaron fundamentalmente para su avance la infraestructura viaria premusulmana, como las calzadas y puentes romanos e incluso los viejos miliarios, en cuanto tales vías de comunicación eran las que utilizaban habitualmente los guerreros, los pastores y los fugitivos, destacando al oeste de la Meseta la antigua Vía de la Plata, que otorgó valor singular al establecimiento cristiano en Zamora. Al este, otra calzada importante era la que partiendo de la general norteña-que enlazaba Vasconia con Astorga, conducía hacia Clunia y Osma, junto al Duero. (Moxó 1979:73)

Moxó is speaking specifically about the repopulation efforts of the tenth century in Castilla and León, but given the long history of their use, those roads maintained their

importance and were used by merchants to transport their goods between markets and fairs. Notably, tokens of *garnacha*, to be analyzed below in section 3.4.3, are found in texts from Salamanca, Jérez and Toledo, suggesting that goods of Gallic origin were available and known in these places.

Salamanca, Segovia and Ávila were all settled by Raymond of Burgundy, under the mandate of Alfonso VI, and included settlers from France, although Moxó comments that, "la presencia franca fue un hecho efectivo, pero no decisivo, salvo en lo que concierne a la dirección de la empresa atribuida por el rey a Ramón de Borgoña" (1979:210). The *francos* were a minority of the settlers, centered in the cities. Zamora, too, was under the influence of *francos* through the efforts of Raymond and later Alfonso VII, who restored the cathedral there.

Unique for its history of religious coexistence of Muslims, Jews and Christians, Toledo was a commercial, religious, and military center. The Gallic population settled near the cathedral, the seat of Archbishop Bernard of Sédirac. The influence in Toledo was from powerful ecclesiastics like Bernard in addition to merchants who set up their businesses near the cathedral and must have been rather numerous to have justified having their own *fuero* and *barrio franco* situated between the cathedral, Zocodóver and the Alcázar (Moxó 1979:223). As in Oviedo, it is important to note that the *francos* soon blended in with the other Christians of Toledo as their separate *fuero* was not maintained, although the ecclesiastic influence Archbishop Bernard and his successors had would mean an extended period of French influence on the Iberian church, as section 3.2 of the present chapter has presented.

In spite of less intense influence from Gallo-Romance in areas of León and Castilla, as the evidence confirms in the eastern Peninsula as well as in cities along the Camino de Santiago, the establishment of commercial links between the cities of Castilla and León affected the spread of related Gallicisms. The type of ties involved were not the same as those that affected ecclesiastic borrowings, nor those of political and military terms, but rather commercial networks were uniplex and of intrinsically non-reciprocal transactional content. Thus by their nature the weak links promoted the diffusion of the terms used in business interactions.

3.4.3 Gallicisms through commercial ties

Having provided the social and historical context in which commercial social networks were contracted in towns and cities as urban centers grew along with the rise of a merchant class in Iberia, the study now turns to the final set of examples of Gallicisms that were diffused into Ibero-Romance through language contact in this setting. *Garnacha*, *gris(a)*, and *hostalage* highlight how a social network type in which the structure of the network was generally of uniplex, low-density links and interactions tended to be non-reciprocal was capable of spreading Gallicisms in twelfth and thirteenth century Ibero-Romance.

7. **GARNACHA** *nf* ‘cloak’ < OOc. ga(r)nacha < GUANACA ‘type of furry cloak’

8. **GRIS(A)** *adj* ‘grey’ < Oc. gris < Frankish *GRIS *adj*

These two words are linked by their nature as items of luxury, both referring to items of clothing worthy of declaring in a will. A *garnacha* was either made of animal fur or *bruneta*, a black fabric of decent quality that was also of Gallic origin (Vicente Miguel 2009:506). The feminine adjective *grisa* entered Ibero-Romance as part of the set phrase *peña grisa*, which referred to the fur trim made from the grey squirrel. Corominas and Pascual note that the term is not used to describe other items grey in color until the sixteenth century (1980-91:s.v. grisa). Instead, the more vague *pardo* 'brownish grey' was typical.

The presence of 25 tokens of *garnacha* in 19 texts, mostly legal documents like the will dated to 1244 from León and a mandate from Jerez dated 1268 that set the price of the garment suggest that the adoption and spread of *garnacha* was through oral means:

(17) Mando ela mia **garnacha** a un clerigo
(*I send my cloak to a cleric*)
(León, 1244)

(18) pellote o **garnacha** con mangas
(*sheepskin or cloak with sleeves*)
(Jérez, 1268)

The language contact that facilitated the adoption and spread of these two terms was through the social networks that linked merchants who sold such goods and their customers. These customers then spread the term within their social connections, leaving evidence of the terms' use in legal documents such as those examples included here. Contact between Gallo-Romance speaking merchants who used the term and Ibero-Romance customers was made possible through regular trade and annual fairs in various locations in Europe. Numerous traders from Flanders, Lombardy, Provence, England,

Scotland and Germany, as well as from Iberia traveled to and from the Peninsula (García de Valdeavellano 1975:58). The first notice of a fair was the one granted to Belorado by Alfonso el Batallador in 1116 (García de Valdeavellano 1975:60). The granting of fairs was one of the means that kings had to promote population growth and cities and towns like Valladolid, Sahagún, Cuenca, Cáceres, Sevilla, Segovia, Alcalá de Henares, Burgos, Santiago and Palencia, among others, all had annual *ferias*. These fairs brought different merchants and items to town than the regular weekly markets that provided goods for local consumption (García de Valdeavellano 1975:64). Due to the popularity among the wealthy of French fabrics and goods, *garnacha* would have been one of several new terms, including *bruneta* and *camelín*, a textile made of animal fur that was one of the fabrics used to make *garnachas* (Vicente Miguel 2009:512) that referred to such luxury items, adding to its salience for Ibero-Romance speakers.

The data available suggest that the trade networks and contact between social networks allowed neologisms like *garnacha* and *(peña) grisa*, among others in this section, to spread. Both of these terms appear in documents mainly from Castilla and León, all from the mid-thirteenth century on. Reading between the lines of the textual evidence, the market for items of luxury was growing, as is also evident in the growth of annual fairs, which occurred either in late spring or after the fall harvest to coincide with agricultural seasons (García de Valdeavellano 1975:170). Without goods to sell and those with the means to purchase, there would have been no reason to promote annual fairs, which were particularly common in Castilla and León. The Camino de Santiago served as an important commercial route, along which goods to and from France traveled, as well

as the later innovation of annual fairs that brought foreign goods (and their names) to Iberia. In addition, the information on roads demonstrates that besides the east to west path of the *camino*, there were also important ties between north and south, from León south to Zamora, Salamanca, Cáceres, all the way to Jérez. Another important north-south commercial route linked Burgos, Palencia, Valladolid, Segovia and Toledo (García de Valdeavellano 1975:62).

Given these trade routes, the evidence suggests that terms like *garnacha* and the color word *gris*, as in *peña grisa*, a type of adornment made of animal fur spread via merchants who carried their goods from France throughout the Peninsula. With the rise of urban centers in the eleventh and twelfth centuries and expansion of Christian-held territories in the thirteenth, the market for such luxury items developed as well. The means of diffusion into Ibero-Romance was through the individuals who had the means to purchase such items and subsequently bequeath them to their heirs, leaving a textual trace of these terms' early use in Ibero-Romance. The first documentation of *garnacha* in Ibero-Romance is in a passage of the *Libro de Apolonio*[30] (ca. 1240) that lists not only *garnacha*, but also other expensive goods. This text of uncertain origin, along with the various wills which mention *garnacha*, offer a glimpse of the importance of this item to the individuals who owned such goods and property that merited a bequest in a will.

The data available on relevant social factors also reinforce the idea that *gris* entered via trade in animal skins, as noted for *garnacha*. The six uses in the thirteenth

---

[30] The single extant copy of the text is from a late fourteenth-century codex. Its scribe was likely Aragonese or Catalan. The date listed by CORDE is approximate, based on features similar to other thirteenth-century compositions composed in *cuaderna vía*.

century all contain the phrase *peña grisa* in reference to adornments for clothing. Four of them are in decrees issued by Alfonso X, mandating prices for certain fabrics and trim as in this example:

> (19) Et la penna arminna e la penna **grisa** que non vala mas de .xxxv. moravedis
> (*And the ermine fur and the grey squirrel fur should not be worth more than 35 maravedis*)
> (Castilla, 1252)

A fifth token is from the *Libro de Apolonio*, in a verse that emphasizes the expensive nature of a *peña grisa*, listed alongside other luxury goods and adornments, such as *peña vera* and *peña armiña*, other types of fur trim used to adorn garments in this period.

> (20) mucha penya vera & **grisa**, mucha buena garnacha
> (*a lot of marten and grey squirrel fur, very good cloak*)
> (*Libro de Apolonio,* ca. 1240)

The other use is in a customs document from Cantabria that lists all of the types of animal furs that require the payment of a toll.

> (21) Pennas ueras nin **grisas** nin arminnas
> (*Colored furs neither grey squirrel nor ermine*)
> (Cantabria, 1295)

The borrowing model offers several internal factors that support the classification of *gris* as a *galicismo*. First, like and *garnacha*, *grisa* is a neologism that includes both a term and a referent new to Ibero-Romance. In the case of *gris*, the phrase *peña grisa* is part of a larger category of Gallic luxury items that were new to the Peninsula. Each term in the set would have increased the overall salience of the Gallic terms, so in spite of the low frequency of *gris* in the thirteenth century, the word was adopted by Ibero-Romance users and ultimately spread as a color term.

9. **HOSTAL(AJE)** *nm* 'inn, house' < OOc. ostal 'inn, house' < HOSPĬTALE *nm* 'guest room'

Hostal and its derived form *hostalaje* are interesting due to their likely introduction into Ibero-Romance by Cluniac clerics in contact with those who provided those services, who were often lay people (Hunt 1967:65). The Gallic author of the twelfth century *Liber Sancti Jacobi*, in the fifth book of the codex, warns of the frequent dishonest practices of innkeepers along the route (Shaver-Crandell and Gerson 1995:22). This made the charitable work by religious houses even more important as travelers tried to avoid abuse. While the origin of *hostal* was likely ecclesiastic, the networks through which it spread soon moved beyond the realm of the monastery, a factor also suggested by the nature of hospitality in this period. Although monasteries often were the site of hospices and served those travelers passing through, these hospices were typically outside the walls of the cloister (Hunt 1967:65). In this way, the term was brought by Gallic monks, but diffused into Ibero-Romance through uniplex and non-reciprocal ties established by travelers. The nature of providing service to travelers created short-term ties with transactional content that was non-reciprocal. With the rise in popularity of pilgrimage and the growth in population migration, came a corresponding growth in places to stay, both associated with monasteries and privately run (Hopper 2002:110-119).

The texts in which the term appears offer clues to the relevant social factors involved in its adoption and spread through oral transmission, suggested by the appearance of *hostal* in notarial and legal texts. Particularly relevant to the discussion of commercial networks is the use in numerous *fueros*, which shows that the term was used

in areas that did not see much Cluniac influence. But as has been established in this section, travel and movement was common along commercial routes between cities as the areas were settled by Christians as the reconquest pushed south. The requirement for shelter was such that regulation of the activity was required, as the evidence found in many *fueros* confirms.

Geographically, the texts in which *hostal* is found generally follow an east to west pattern, with the first found in Aragón and La Rioja. The first uses of *hostal(aje)* date from the first quarter of the thirteenth century, including the section in the *Fuero de Zorita de los Canes*, a town south of Guadalajara that details the regulations regarding the payment for shelter and services by guests:

> (22) Mando otroquesi que si huesped en casa desu huesped conpra fiziere de pan, ode vino, ode çeuada non de **ostalage**
> (*I mandate also that if a guest in the house of his host purchases bread or wine or food he not pay for his room and board*)
> (*Fuero de Zorita de los Canes*, ca. 1218-1250)

In addition *hostal* is found in the *Vida de Santa María Egipcíaca*[31], which is as noted earlier, a hagiographic poem from the beginning of the thirteenth century, an adaptation of a French original, *La Vie de Sainte Marie l'Égyptienne* (see Alvar 1970-72 for an extensive analysis):

> (23) allá va prender **ostal**
> (*there she goes to take shelter*)
> (*Vida de Santa María Egipcíaca*, ca. 1215)

As the concept spread among travelers, *hostalage* appears in *fueros* for towns in Aragón, Navarra, Castilla, as well as Andalucía as the reconquest moved south.

[31] A single manuscript exists, in the same late fourteenth-century codex as that of the *Libro de Apolonio*.

The token count of the noun is not high. *Hostal* appears 24 times in 9 texts, while *hostalaje* has some 41 tokens in 13 different texts, mostly *fueros* and notarial documents. In this period, *hostal* could signify both 'house' and 'inn', as in Old Occitan, although the examples in notarial documents and the *fueros* refer to inns, often in reference to monastic houses that provided shelter for pilgrims:

(24) el mayordomo del **hostal**, sesaenta morabedis
(*the majordomo of the inn, 70 marvedis*)
(Sahagún, 1255[32])

(25) Esta terra concamio yo con don García el **hostalero** de Sant Fagund
(*This land I exchange with García the innkeeper of Sahagún*)
(Sahgún, 1232)

In contrast, in Berceo, the usual sense is 'house' but often at the end of a verse and therefore part of the consonant rhyme scheme of the stanza:

(26) Tovieron su vigilia con grandes estadales
udieron los matines, las missas matinales
fizieron sus ofrendas largas e generales,
con muy grand alegría fueron a sus **ostales**
(*They had their vigil with candles, they heard matins and morning mass, they made their offerings and with great happiness they went to their houses*)
(*Vida de San Millán*, ca. 1230)

Hostalaje, in turn, appears only in the sense of the payment for providing of shelter and meals to a guest, typically in the context of a vendor as in this example from two *fueros*:

(27) Et demaes sabuda cosa sea que maguer que el mercador en otra casa tenga sus cosas, do él posare y deue dar **hostalage**.
(*And let it be known that although the merchant has his things in another house, wherever he stays he must pay for his room.*)
(*Fuero de Baeza*, ca. 1300)

---

[32] The *Crónica anónima de Sahagún* is found in a sixteenth-century copy.

(28) deue .i. dinero de **ostalage** al uespet
(*He owes one coin for room and board to the host*)
(*Fuero General de Navarra*, 1250)

Based on the evidence of the spread of the term of *hostal(aje),* the term spread through the loose-knit social ties between individuals who moved along the commercial routes through the Iberian Peninsula, possibly itinerant merchants or pilgrims on their way to Santiago. Its spread beyond the route to Compostela suggests that merchants affected its diffusion, but pilgrims were no doubt influential as well. This was due to the initial introduction of *hostal* to Ibero-Romance by the clerics associated with Cluny, part of whose mandate was to provide shelter for pilgrims and travelers. Early contact with these hospices introduced the concept and term beyond the monastic sphere, a diffusion via the reconquest and rise in trade, as other terms in this section illustrate as well.

The three *galicismos* detailed here, along with the others adopted via commercial networks[33], including *cebellina* 'sable', and *escote* 'individual portion of a shared expense', have in common a similar diffusion pattern. These terms spread along communication routes west from the Pyrenees and south into southern Castilla, León and Andalucía as lands taken from the Muslims as part of the reconquest were settled by those coming from the northern peninsula. Through the textual evidence, it is clear luxury goods from France reached well into the Iberian Peninsula, no doubt purchased at the market or fair. The nature of the connections established by merchants and vendors as they sold goods in the markets of Iberian towns and cities was uniplex and transactionally

[33] See Appendix for additional commercial network loanwords.

non-reciprocal. It was through these loose ties that terms such as *garnacha*, *gris(a)* and *hostal(aje)* were spread into the Ibero-Romance of the period.

3.5 Conclusion to Phase I

By examining the data available on twelfth and thirteenth century Gallicisms in light of social network theory previously unexplored information is revealed on their diffusion through person-to-person contact. What the loanwords in this chapter share is their diffusion via loose social networks, typically along routes established due to major societal changes such as the introduction of the monastic and liturgical reforms brought by clerics associated with the powerful monastery at Cluny, as well as the rise in pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela and reconquest of much of the Iberian Peninsula by the early thirteenth century. These three large-scale changes in Iberia created opportunities for speakers of Ibero-Romance and those of Gallo-Romance to interact, whether that was through contact with clerics either inside or outside the walls of a monastery, through everyday transactions in the market or through the provisioning of pilgrims to Santiago. As ultra-Pyrenean immigrants, including those for religious, military and commercial motivations, moved into the Peninsula, these Gallo-Romance speakers naturally had contact with the native Ibero-Romance population. These immigrants included clerics who instituted the Roman rite starting around 1080, allowing use to suppose a fair amount of interaction given the key role of the church in this period. The prestige and power possessed by the high number of bishops of Gallic origin who were in positions of the upper echelon of church hierarchy in the twelfth century and into

the thirteenth points to the likelihood that the terms these men used to refer to church offices were their own, Gallo-Romance terms. Those lower down in status would have linguistically accommodated their superiors by employing these terms as well in their social networks. Given the special environment of the monastic house and the relationships between its members, a social network approach to the linguistic data offers a means to better understand the language use of a religious community (see Lenker 2000).

There were numerous ties between the rulers of the kingdoms of Iberia and important nobles from Aquitaine, Gascony, Normandy, and Burgundy due to the exigencies of fighting to retain or regain territory from the Muslims. Battles like the one at Barbastro in 1064, for example, attracted a number of ultra-Pyrenean soldiers, who would have used their native tongue. In order to meet their basic needs for food and other supplies, these men interacted with indigenous Ibero-Romance-speaking residents. While many returned to France after the fighting season ended, others chose to take advantage of privileges conceded to settlers. Rulers like King Sancho Ramírez of Aragón used these rights, spelled out in legal terms in a town's *fuero*, to encourage permanent residents in order to hold on to territory regained from the Muslims. In this way, these concessions and privileges were a successful legal method to achieve population growth. Research by García Mouton (1979) on Jaca, Huesca and Zaragoza and by Ruiz de la Peña Solar (1995) on Oviedo provides demographic evidence that individuals came from various parts of France to establish new businesses, particularly along the *camino francés*. This overall east-west diffusion pattern in combination with the general north to south

movement south as the Reconquest progressed provides us with the geolinguistic data behind the textual evidence of the use of *galicismos* in the twelfth and thirteenth century Ibero-Romance, supporting the premise that social networks were instrumental in the diffusion of a number Gallicisms in this period.

The study explains the diatopic and diastratic diffusion patterns of Phase I terms by viewing the data in light of social factors such as macro-social networks as well the geographic and demographic information available. Terms acquired through person-to-person contact with the ecclesiastic and commercial networks of speakers designated concepts and objects that were new to Ibero-Romance, such as *capiscol* and *garnacha*. But the approach also includes linguistic factors like frequency, word class and semantics that affect the integration of a term into the larger lexical system, through which the model better accounts for the adoption of terms that had native partial synonyms like *batalla* and *mensaje*. What the integrated approach to the study of Gallicisms in this period demonstrates is the connection between the speakers and their language use missing in previous studies. That is, a macrosocial networks perspective helps us to understand the presence of Phase I Gallicisms in texts produced in or near Ibero-Romance-speaking places with evident Gallic ecclesiastics, soldiers and military allies and merchants. In combination, the model provides a holistic perspective of the multiple influences on the process and result of borrowing.

Chapter 4: Phase II Gallicisms

4.0 Introduction

This chapter continues the exploration of the factors of the integrated borrowing model that affected the adoption and spread of lexical borrowings from Gallo-Romance in twelfth- and thirteenth century-Ibero-Romance that began in chapter three. Although the bulk of the evidence of the two larger sets of borrowings is found in the same period, the thirteenth century, the two differ in their means of diffusion. The first set of Gallicisms, which is labeled Phase I, is characterized by the transmission through person-to- person contact and presence in various regions of Iberia. The concept of macro-social networks is thus an effective explanatory approach to study many loanwords from the period of focus, as seen in the previous chapter.

In contrast, the second group of terms spreads through users whose style and language suggest connections were established among erudite circles, including personal contact with both educated men as well as learned texts containing Gallo-Romance words. The data available, however, do not point to the same type of social networks that were influential in the spread of Gallicisms of chapter two. For this reason, another sociolinguistic construct is necessary in order to elucidate the diffusion of loanwords of Phase II without requiring personal contact in order to describe the adoption and spread of the rest of the Gallic loanwords from this period. One such model is the discourse coalition or community, the definition of which is a group of writers who share similar interests and discoursal expectations (see Fitzmaurice 2000, 2010; Porter 1986; Swales

1988; Watts 1999), which will be the theoretical basis of this chapter. The innovative application of the discourse community concept in Ibero-Romance studies on borrowing will show that the characteristics of the two coalitions of the period can be illustrated by two subsets of *galicismos* from thirteenth century Ibero-Romance.

4.1 Distinguishing sets of Gallicisms

The words spread via discourse coalitions are different in that the types of texts in which the coalition words appear are almost exclusively erudite in nature in contrast with the *galicismos* spread through social network ties. The texts containing Phase II borrowings demonstrate polished language. They were likely produced by and for the educated, as opposed to many of the notarial documents of Phase I that were written records of oral testimony of legal transactions and complaints. The number of learned texts is a fraction of the quantity of notarial texts, specifically 72 in contrast with over 400 different non-erudite texts[34]. Given their different purposes, it is no surprise that these 72 texts demonstrate major linguistic and stylistic differences from the documents studied in the previous chapter. Works like the *Libro de Alexandre*, *Estoria de España* and the *Siete Partidas* demonstrate their authors were writers with more than just the ability of putting pen to paper. These men were capable understanding and manipulating source texts in Latin and other languages as these authors composed their texts in Ibero-Romance.

[34] The count is the number of source texts that include at least one of the Gallicisms identified in our study in the CORDE database. The token counts we provide are meant to give an indication of the term's degree of diffusion into Ibero-Romance, but due to the limitations of the CORDE database no empirical study of frequency is included. There is no overall word count by century such that we could compare the appearance of the forms in question with the number of words used in texts of the thirteenth century.

The geographical distribution of the texts produced by the two discourse coalitions presented here is less relevant than the evidence shows for the terms spread by person-to-person contact through social network ties, unlike the loanwords studied in the previous chapter. This is for several reasons, the first of which is that the nature of the coalition construct allows mutual influence through the establishment and maintenance of shared discoursal features like loanwords without close interaction. The second is the nature of the content in the documents themselves. While notarial texts often recorded the place of composition as part of the events they recorded, the texts that contain erudite Gallicisms cover topics (e.g., literary creations, scientific treatises and world histories) that meant the place of creation was not germane to the works' content.

A second factor is that the texts containing the items studied here generally do not specify the place of production. Many of the Gallic loanwords spread throughcoalitions are found in texts with complicated manuscript traditions. The *Libro de Alexandre* can serve as a well-studied example. It survives in two main manuscripts, O, named for the Duque de Osuna, dated to the early fourteenth century and P, the so-called Paris manuscript, which is a copy from the fifteenth century. While O has features of western Ibero-Romance, P contains characteristics of eastern Ibero-Romance, yet both are clearly copies of the same extensive work in *cuaderna vía* verse. The result is a complicated situation of what to use as the definitive version, a circumstance that affects other texts used as sources here, such as the works by Berceo[35]. Similarly, the large historiographical works of Alfonso demonstrate manuscript traditions that complicate the study of regional

[35] See Lappin (2008) for a recent analysis of the manuscript tradition of the poems by Berceo.

features of the text. Thus the geographical diffusion of terms of this chapter, both those of the *mester de clerecía* coalition and the Alfonsine, is not as useful in the present chapter as in chapter three to demonstrate the influence of the social factors in the spread of Gallo-Romance loanwords in thirteenth century Ibero-Romance.

In an attempt to keep things reasonably simple for most Phase II texts, given the number of source texts and terms to investigate, the analysis is based on the information available in CORDE[36]. That said, in order to supplement information on the *Libro de Alexandre* unavailable in CORDE (i.e., there is only a single edition, rather than details about the two main extant manuscripts), analysis of the semi-paleographic transcriptions by Casas Rigall (2007) was also done. The excerpts of the *Libro de Alexandre* that contain examples of particular Gallicisms are from these transcriptions both because the poem was such an important text to the *mester de clerecía* coalition and because the O and P manuscripts often differ in a term's location. They both, however, demonstrate numerous *galicismos*.

The evidence suggests that the adoption and spread of phase two Gallicisms was through the influence of highly educated individuals, using the coalition concept as formulated by Swales (1988) and further developed by Watts (1999). Porter (1986) and Fitzmaurice (2000, 2010) have employed the construct in their studies of eighteenth century texts, finding that the discourse produced shows indications of shared interests, form and function. Similarly, the discourse coalitions formed by groups of poets such as

[36] Where we use data on borrowings gathered from different versions of the *Libro de Alexandre*, we specify the copy, either O or P. We also assume, following Uría Maqua (2000) an earlier date of composition, closer to 1225 than the date of 1240 proposed by CORDE.

Berceo as well as the scholars of the Alfonsine school of translators were the initial means of diffusion of a set of *galicismos* in thirteenth century Ibero-Romance. In much the same way as chapter three demonstrated that the application of social network theory to the available data on the Phase I Gallicisms enhances our understanding of their adoption and spread into Ibero-Romance, this chapter examines data on Phase II in light of the discourse coalition construct to aid in explaining the diffusion patterns of this second group of Gallicisms. Illustrating the *mester de clerecía* discourse community are *asaz*, *folía* and *solaz*. In turn, the coalition of the collaborators of the royal scriptorium and school of translators are the representative terms *cobarde*, *ligero* and *lisonjar*.

Having provided an overview of the coalition concept and determined the study's method of identification of the Gallicisms adopted through the *mester de clerecía* and Alfonsine coalitions, the rest of this chapter is divided into two main parts. The first (4.2) provides a discussion of how the characteristics of a discourse coalition that chapter one introduced correspond with the historical and linguistic evidence available on the context of writers of thirteenth-century Ibero-Romance and the cultured texts they produced. As in chapter three, the following section (4.3) presents specific loanwords, *asaz* 'quite; enough', *cobarde* 'coward', *folía* 'folly, insanity', *ligero* 'light, fast', *lisonjar* 'to praise, to flatter', and *solaz* 'solace' that serve to illustrate that the application of the integrated borrowing model sheds light on the social and linguistic factors involved in the adoption and spread of borrowings from Gallo-Romance that occurred through the two main discourse coalitions in learned thirteenth-century Iberia.

4.2 Thirteenth-century Ibero-Romance discourse coalitions

As noted in the introduction, the contribution of this chapter to the study of Gallicisms of this period is to indicate how the discourse coalition construct enhances our understanding of the available data on the diffusion of Gallicisms of the period in Ibero-Romance. The next step is to show how the available evidence supports the argument that there were two main discourse coalitions that influenced phase two loanwords, that of the *mester de clerecía* authors and that of the Alfonsine collaborators. This section describes the socio-cultural background of the thirteenth century relevant to the adoption and diffusion of the Phase II loanwords from Gallo-Romance. The external factors of the borrowing model point to a different means of diffusion than the three types of social networks that were involved in the spread of person-to-person borrowings as detailed in chapter three. Instead of direct contact between speakers, in the second phase of borrowing, two groups of learned men who created texts in thirteenth-century Ibero-Romance formed discourse communities or coalitions that supported their collective goals and demonstrated shared stylistic markers. The data collected support the main characteristics of the discourse coalitions of the period, including evidence of common or similar interests (4.2.1) such as didacticism (4.2.1.1), use of the vernacular (4.2.1.2), mechanisms for intercommunication (4.2.2) and shared discoursal expectations (4.2.3). These features will be illustrated by Gallicisms adopted and spread through the *mester de clerecía* (4.2.3.1) and the Alfonsine (4.2.3.2) coalitions.

4.2.1 Common interests

The first characteristic of a discourse coalition in relation to Phase II Gallicisms is a commonality of interest, which may not be conscious or obvious to the writers themselves (Swales 1988:212). In both the works of the *mester de clerecía* and those of the Alfonsine scriptorium, centers of higher learning, such as the universities at Palencia, Salamanca, Valladolid, as well as others outside of Iberia, played a large part in the creation of the two main coalitions because many of the same texts were studied as part of the university curriculum, as section 4.2.2 details[37]. According to the thirteenth-century *Historia de rebus Hispaniae* by Jiménez de Rada, the educational system in Iberia included masters of Gallic origin, who introduced or at least influenced poetic composition in the vernacular, as they were doing in France (Fernández Valverde 1987:256). In light of this, the fact that the literary productions by the *mester de clerecía* and other clerical authors demonstrate *galicismos* is not surprising. In turn, the erudition of the collaborators in the royal scriptorium is evident in their ability to translate and manipulate various sources to produce numerous scientific, sapiential and legal works in the vernacular. As the adoption of the vernacular in royal chancery began and expanded during the reign of Fernando III and the translations by the royal scriptorium[38], the overlap of various Gallicisms limited to learned registers in both clerical and royal texts is understandable.

---

[37] For example, the grammar manual the *Verbiginale*, as well as the twelfth century *Alexandreis* were known to have been textbooks in the thirteenth century.
[38] We are including under this broad heading texts that were produced after the death of Alfonso X, but which can be seen to be associated with the general environment of text translation and production such as the *Castigos* of Sancho IV.

Two shared interests permeate both sets of texts, with centers of higher learning serving as the backdrop and source for the educated writers and collaborators of the erudite texts of the thirteenth century. The first is the evident didacticism that is seen in both. The second is intertwined with the first in that if one of the goals was to teach, the use of the vernacular was a better means of transmitting knowledge in a society where few were *letrados* in the sense of knowing Latin. Thus, the second shared interest among both coalitions was the elevation of Ibero-Romance to the level of Latin through its use in erudite texts, an aspect of which was to create an educated written register of Ibero-Romance. This required sufficient vocabulary to denote certain concepts found in texts that were translated or adapted to Romance, neologisms obtained in part through the borrowing of existing terms from Gallic works and spread through the textual production of the coalitions.

4.2.1.1 Didacticism

It is evident in the texts studied in the present chapter that sharing knowledge and learning from the examples of the past were perceived as a means of perfecting the imperfect human being. To this end, the texts were explicitly educational in nature, based on the authority of their sources. The nature of teaching and learning in this period was a mixture of the oral and the written. Texts were read aloud but private reading began to be more common as universities trained scholars to be capable of reading and writing. The two activities were related in that one needed to be able to read in order to write and both were intellectual tasks essential to the composition process (Ancos 2012:200). The *mester*

de clerecía texts, in turn, were written creations, but were also meant to be read aloud, the contents of which had an "epistemological basis of didacticism...shaped by the conditions of a predominantly oral society" (Weiss 2006:6). In his analysis of the transmission and reception of the mester poems, Ancos examines the textual allusions to the methods of composition, reception and spread of these works, finding a separation between the way the authors took in their sources, through reading of the written text, and the way they expected their audience to receive the poems they composed, through hearing them read aloud (2012:217-218).

The clerical authors served as mediators, adapting source materials to the needs of their audience in thirteenth-century Iberia. Weiss views the clerical class as a diverse group, including some who were part of the church hierarchy and others who were employed by powerful patrons to promote their interests and less tied to the church (2006:9). While not using the term discourse community, the way Weiss describes the intellectual elite upholds the argument that the group of clerical writers, consciously or not, promoted multiple common interests when he observes:

> The medieval cleric could be bound, whether by filiation or by affiliation, to the cause of a particular institution but also recognize a higher loyalty, or be subject to pressures from a different quarter. Berceo wrote monastic propaganda, but he did not write as a monk; he composed doctrinal poems that promoted the cause of the reformist Church, but they cannot be reduced to the mere articulation of a prevailing orthodoxy. (2006:10)

The common didactic interest of the authors of the *mester de clerecía* is also seen in the vast production sponsored by Alfonso X, the audience for which was likely the nobility for the Alfonsine works (Fernández Ordóñez 2002-2003:94). The histories of Alfonso X, the *Estoria de España* and the encyclopedic *General Estoria*, exemplify the

goal of the king to create a singular narrative of history and therefore knowledge, "[n]os...queremos contar la estoria toda como contesçió & non dexar della ninguna cosa de lo que de dezir fuesse" (*General Estoria* II). Martin notes that beyond the wish to produce a complete history, there is the evident "representación constante de la autorizadísima mirada de la corona, que filtra y ordena autoridades en una figuración indefinidamente repetida de la autoridad" (2000:17). By encompassing all possible sources, including legends, *gestas* and poems about figures like the Cid and Fernán González, the Alfonsine concept of knowledge was vast, yet reducible to a single, coherent narrative of history, in contrast with earlier, annalistic accounts of history like that of Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada in his *De rebus Hispaniae*. In his description of the innovations of Alfonsine historiography, Márquez Villanueva writes:

> Una gran receptividad ante todo lo literario caracteriza a la historiografía alfonsí y decisivamente contribuye a moldearla, igual que, como no ha dejado de observarse, ocurre también entre los árabes...Y sin embargo su obra también más allá de absorber aquel otro sentido de lo humano para trabajar en todo momento al filo de un problema puramente narrativo que recuerda aún más de cerca a la cuentística oriental, por la que el rey había sido cautivado en sus días juveniles. Los heroicos comienzos de las órdenes militares le han arrancado un borbotón de ambicioso lirismo casi hímnico, allí donde Ximénez de Rada se limitaba al seco enunciado de un hecho. El posterior desarrollo de su línea historiográfica hizo un uso todavía más central de materiales legendarios que en un principio habían quedado al margen de las versiones regias, como ocurrió con la historia de Alfonso VIII y la judía de Toledo. Las fuentes oficiales nada decían de aquellas cosas, pero la historiografía alfonsí ha sabido recorrer otros caminos, a impulsos de un designio que no cabe llamar más que artístico. Se hace entonces imposible no recordar la apertura de la *Estoria de Espanna* a una acogida masiva de gestas prosificadas y otros materiales de procedencia literaria. Dicha presencia es solo una extensión del principio de conceder igual peso heurístico a poetas e historiadores que representa, como se recordará, una de las características básicas de la historiografía alfonsí y que también abre allí las puertas a poemas del *mester de clerecía*. (1994:150-151)

The use of literary sources was acceptable because of the inherent authority of the written word. A text had (and has) the power to record for posterity "un contenido en una memoria pública y perenne" (Grande Quejigo 1998:128). The historiographical and scientific works of the scriptorium and the *mester de clerecía* texts were reflections of a common view in this period of knowledge as way to help men find the right path in life as well as a method of giving authority to the language of Castilla and the Castilian crown. Evidence of this view can be found in the *General Estoria*, "e la remembrança es la cosa en que yaze el pro dela razón pora membrarse d'ella, e castigar se omne del mal e meter mientes en el bien" (*General Estoria* I). Scholars have written extensively about the innovative ambition of Alfonsine texts to teach, including Martin, who argues that the didacticism:

> también conllevó una fundación mayor: la de una prosa amplia y redundante, minuciosamente articulada, insistentemente deíctica, esclarecedora de sus términos y su ordenación, llevada por el modelo de la *lectio* escolástica, prolija en razonar y explicar, la cual sigue ofreciendo zonas casi vírgenes a la investigación. Y por último también otra creación, totalmente dejada de lado por los estudiosos[...]: una nueva y madurada concepción del libro, de su utilidad y de su presentación, instigadora de un muy extenso aparato paratextual y de pormenorizadas razones para explicar su materia y organización. (2000:14-15)

In this way, writers in both coalitions could conform to their common discourse by composing works that served to teach and reinforce the didactic purpose of texts. As in the quote above from the *General Estoria*, the Alfonsine coalition demonstrated in the content of their works the hortative aim of texts, which provides a vast body of knowledge as a means of self-improvement. For *mester de clerecía* writers like Berceo, teaching was done through using examples and subjects that emphasized the value of

Church doctrine composed in the form of verse learned in the university setting. In a similar way, the anonymous author of the *Libro de Apolonio* Christianized his classical hero as a means of demonstrating his knowledge of both the source text and Christian doctrine.

4.2.1.2 Use of the vernacular

Swales notes that discourse coalitions are "composed of those who share functional rules that determine the appropriacy of utterances" (1988:211). In Fitzmaurice's analysis of the shared practices of eighteenth-century essay writers, she argues that the language used by writers of *The Spectator* demonstrated certain features that were highly influential:

> The historical record shows that the material conditions that characterize the production, distribution and consumption of the eighteenth-century essay are highly salient for the nature of the language or register that marks essay writing of the period. The outcome is that public language use is identified with that of the essay, and in turn the essay is equated with and shapes good language. (2010:131)

Similarly, the evidence suggests that within the two main coalitions of thirteenth century Iberia, the use of written Romance in texts for a cultured audience was deliberate and demonstrates a shared interest related to the common didactic intent of the texts. Just as the essay writers of *The Spectator* shaped what was considered 'good language' in eighteenth-century London, the texts produced by both coalitions helped to establish an educated register of written Ibero-Romance. Over the course of the thirteenth century in the Iberian Peninsula writing in the vernacular became more and more common as part of making learning available to the larger non-Latin speaking audience, with a

corresponding development of a written register of Ibero-Romance equal in expressive capacity to Latin. The use of *castellano* in royal documents during the reign of Fernando III expanded under Alfonso X, to the point that the only documents written in Latin were those for recipients outside his kingdom (Fernández Ordóñez 2005:383). The exclusive use of Romance in official chancery documents required the creation of a written code capable of communicating the desired message effectively and appropriately.

In the first fifteen years of the thirteenth century, several key events occurred in the transition from writing in the Latin system to using a separate Romance practice[39]. One was the foundation of the *studium generale* at Palencia where Latin was studied and likely a center of the creation of Romance writing, which will be addressed in section 4.2.2. A second event was the use of Romance in the Treaty of Cabreros (1206), which established a conscious linguistic distinction between Ibero-Romance and Latin in a political document. As Wright points out, a change in writing system has political implications (2000:107-108). Thus by writing in the vernacular as opposed to the Latin system, the members of both coalitions were demonstrating their acceptance of the new way of writing and a common interest in expanding the notably Romance system's expressive capacities.

Another event that affected the shift from Latin to the vernacular was the Fourth Lateran Council that met in 1215. Both Lomax (1969) and Fernández Ordóñez (2005) write about royal influence on the vernacularization of knowledge in relation to the

[39] Wright (1982:208-254) discusses the effects of the introduction of the Roman liturgical rite along with the new method of pronouncing each letter as written in the Iberian Peninsula. These consequences included the conceptual separation of Latin and Romance writing systems as the system used for Latin could not be used to symbolize the Romance vernacular. The new writing system was developed to represent more closely the vernacular pronunciation of Ibero-Romance.

Fourth Lateran Council. Fernández Ordóñez observes that, although the council occurred early in the thirteenth century, it had lasting effects:

> Las producciones alfonsíes se encuadran, sin duda, en el enciclopedismo didáctico y el deseo de vulgarización del saber que recorrió Europa tras el IV Concilio de Letrán (1214) [sic], afán de secularización que se esconde tras la primera literatura culta en romance...Pero no hay que olvidar que, a diferencia de la mayor parte de las obras anteriores, la iniciativa de su creación fue regia, no eclesiástica, y que tanto la selección de la lengua vehicular como de las materias seleccionadas para ser expuestas está estrechamente conectada con las labores de gobernante del rey Sabio. (Fernández Ordóñez 2005:388)

The expansion of written Romance was promoted by the Fourth Lateran Council, but the role of the crown was also key.

It is during the reign of Fernando III, king of Castilla (1217-1252) and León (1230-1252) that the documents of the royal chancery switched from being written in Latin to Romance. Wright (2000:113) points out that the existence of translations of chancery texts into Romance is clear evidence for the official recognition of two separate writing systems in Castilla. The first documents produced by the chancery in Romance spelling were *fueros*, which, as the evidence of the previous chapter demonstrated, were meant to be shared orally to the general public who needed to understand the language of the precepts contained in the legal code governing their town. Harris-Northall (2007) and Fernández Ordóñez (2011) separately analyze the transition to vernacular in chancery documents, with both scholars noting the switch is seen in the reign of Fernando III. Harris-Northall argues that the shift to Romance writing from Latin was a practical choice due to the extra time, skill and effort required for clerks to express in Latin what was written in Romance, with the result of "the language being left in its vernacular form

or with a less skilled Latin varnish applied" (2007:169). Fernández Ordóñez concurs, finding that Romance is used earlier in the texts that were meant for the wider public, such as mandates, legal decrees and *fueros* (2011:325).

The figure of Alfonso X was key to continuing and expanding the use of the vernacular in Alfonsine coalition documents. One aspect of this was to use Romance in chancery texts and *fueros*, as his father had done. A second facet of the use of Romance in official texts is related to his political and cultural agenda as Alfonso sought to justify his imperial interests. Alfonso emphasized the shared interest of using Romance by the works compiled, translated and otherwise created by his collaborators. He tasked his scriptorium with translating works into the vernacular, not Latin, as had been the case for the twelfth century school of translators at Toledo. The process involved one scholar who translated the original language of the text (Arabic, Hebrew or Latin) into Romance. A second translator converted the Romance into Latin. Toledo was one of the major sites of translation and text production, but it was not the only location. An important indication of the active interest that Alfonso X had in the work of the translators is found in the text of the *Libro de Açafeha*, which notes that the translation from Arabic to Romance was done for a second time in Burgos, by order of Alfonso:

> Et este libro sobredicho traslado de arabigo en romanço maestre fernando de Toledo por mandado del muy noble Rey don Alfonso...en el anno quarto que el regno. Et despues mandolo trasladar otra uez en Burgos meior & mas complidamientre a mestre Bernaldo el arabigo...en el .xxxvj. anno del so regno
>
> (*Libro de Açafeha*, 1277)

This involvement is also relevant to the means of intercommunication (section 4.2.2) among members of the coalition as well as to the development of its discoursal expectations (section 4.2.3).

In order to promote the improvement of education and produce more scholars capable of translating texts into the vernacular, Alfonso declared in 1254, shortly after taking the throne, that a *studium generale* be established in Sevilla where experts in Arabic could work to translate texts into Romance, as well as continuing the support to the *studium generale* at Salamanca that his father had founded in 1243. Cárdenas argues that the importance placed on learning by Alfonso was an influence of Fernando on his son:

> That Alfonso inherited the chancery from his father, that Alfonso essentially inherited his legal program from his father, that the father commissioned the historical treatise *De rebus Hispaniae* which Alfonso used as one of the main sources for his *Estoria de Espanna*, and that Alfonso continued using the vernacular, a practice begun by his father--all make clear that Alfonso essentially continued the impetus provided by his father, and that his royal scriptorium found many of its roots in the chancery which, again, was inherited from Fernando III. (1990:103)

In Sancho IV's reign (1284-1295), the situation shifted away from the active involvement of the king in the textual production of the royal scriptorium and chancery, leaving instead what Fernández Ordóñez calls the 'eclesiastización' of the cultural production, with the delegation to the cathedral school of Toledo and its clerics (2005:396), and in effect ending the Alfonsine coalition.

To sum up, a commonality of interests, the first of three defining characteristics of the discourse coalition of *mester de clerecía* writers and that of the Alfonsine scriptorium, is seen in two ways. The first was the didactic nature of the texts produced by both

discourse coalitions, with the evident goal of sharing knowledge so that the audience could use the information for self-improvement. The second was the desire to use the vernacular to transmit this knowledge and elevate the expressive power of Ibero-Romance to that of Latin. Implicit in this expanded use of the vernacular is a requisite expansion in the lexical resources of Ibero-Romance, such as *desdén* 'disdain' and *prez* 'honor, glory'[40]. One of the sources of this vocabulary is through the adoption of Gallo-Romance terms, acquired either through face to face contact as described in chapter two or through written texts as the present chapter argues.

4.2.2 Intercommunication

In addition to the shared interests of a discourse coalition, the second feature of a coalition is the existence of a means of intercommunication (Swales 1988:212). This mechanism for both discourse coalitions in thirteenth-century Iberia can be identified through reading and writing as members were exposed to other texts and shared them among the members of their respective discourse community. As noted previously, Fitzmaurice (2000, 2010) has demonstrated that the principal means of communication among the group of eighteenth-century essay writers who formed a discourse coalition connected by common political and literary characteristics was the publication *The Spectator*, an influential but short-lived daily periodical. Once the two main figures, Joseph Addison and Richard Steele, sold their interests and publication ceased, the coalition dissolved (Fitzmaurice 2010:114). Similarly, the two coalitions identified in

[40] See Appendix for information on these two Phase II loanwords.

thirteenth-century Iberia needed to have a means of intercommunication in order to maintain the coalition. This is discernible for both of the main communities relevant to the adoption and diffusion of *galicismos* through the formal education required to translate, compile and create a coherent work for both the coalitions of the scriptorium and the *mester de clerecía*. After acquiring a higher education, ongoing contact with members of each respective coalition was maintained through written texts. As Fitzmaurice notes, the conversations of the *Spectator* discourse community "took place, not in the coffee houses and clubs frequented by the coalition and its supporters, but in the pages of the periodicals and pamphlets" (2010:107). Similarly, the writers of the *mester de clerecía* as well as the Alfonsine collaborators maintained indirect ties via written texts and the challenge of the *cuaderna vía* verse form. Additionally, the intercommunication for the Alfonsine coalition occurred through the intervention of the king himself in the production of texts like the encyclopedic histories, legal treatises and translations such as *Libro de la açafeha*. Thus, initial contact occurred at centers of higher education for both coalitions and was maintained through written means, either through the poems of the *mester de clerecía* or through the Alfonsine method of compiling, writing and revising texts.

The evidence for intercommunication via contact with the university must be inferred for both coalitions given the lack of records. It is likely that some if not all writers and collaborators in both discourse communities studied in a center of higher education given the evident ability to translate and adapt sources from Latin, Arabic and

other languages into Ibero-Romance. This skill and knowledge was acquired through working with the masters of rhetoric and other arts at an *estudio general*.

By the thirteenth century, the centers of scholarship were no longer monasteries, as they had been in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Although some clerics who were university-educated, as has been supposed in the case of Gonzalo de Berceo, still had ties to monasteries, the monasteries themselves no longer attracted those seeking higher education. Instead, this period sees the establishment and growth of university culture in Europe at Bologna, Paris, Oxford, and in the Iberian Peninsula at Palencia, Salamanca, Valladolid, and Sevilla. Not all of these survived the thirteenth century, but are evidence of the growth in education of the period, which was mandated as part of the Fourth Lateran Council reforms in an effort to improve the education of priests and other church personnel.

The naming of a *studium generale* implied an already well-established cathedral school because that was where there were already masters teaching pupils in the seven liberal arts (Verger 1992:45). Being granted the status of *studium generale* meant these schools could in theory grant degrees as well as teach law, medicine and theology (Barcala Muñoz 1985:91). Two examples were the cathedral schools at Palencia and Salamanca that both became centers of higher learning in the thirteenth century, with the establishment of a *studium generale* at both. Later in the century, the *Siete Partidas* defines the difference between two different types of study, that of the more formal study of the liberal arts and that of the tutor who teaches several village students:

> Estudio es ayuntamiento de maestros et de escolares que es fecho en algunt logar con voluntad et con entendimiento de aprender los saberes: et

> son dos maneras dél; la una es á que dicen **estudio general** en que ha maestros de las artes, así como de gramática, et de lógica, et de retórica, et de arismética, et de geometria, et de música et de astronomia, et otrosi en que ha maestros de decretos et señores de leyes: et este estudio debe seer establescido por mandato de papa o de emperador o de rey. La segunda manera es á que dicen **estudio particular**, que quier tanto decir como cuando algunt maestro amuestra en alguna villa apartadamente á pocos escolares; et tal como este puede mandar facer [sic] perlado o concejo de algunt logar (Partida II, 1491, emphasis ours)

The distinction that existed between the two different centers of learning for clerics, the *studium generale* or university and the *escuela* is evident. As Rico notes, the term *clerecía* signified both the set of knowledge as well as a social class, while observing that education was a means of gaining money and influence (1985:127). The members of the scriptorium and *mester de clerecía* coalitions thus had shared the physical and metaphorical space in the university, in which they studied similar texts and language that influenced the development of their shared linguistic features including *galicismos*.

The educational system that trained both the *mester de clerecía* poets and the members of the Alfonsine coalition was influenced by the political and religious environment of the thirteenth century, when the conceptual distinction between Latin and Romance in the documents issued by the royal chancery was made (see Wright 1982, 1991). Without the introduction of the new pronunciation of Latin writing, there would have been no need to devise a new writing system for Ibero-Romance, which in turn created the distinction between the two languages (see section 4.2.1). The fact that Iberian universities were staffed with masters of grammar and rhetoric from Paris, according to the *Historia de rebus Hispaniae* by Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada (Fernández Valverde 1987:256), means that not only did they teach the new Latin pronunciation, but

also that they brought their own varieties of Gallo-Romance with them, creating opportunities for language contact.

Any *studium generale* would have had a focus on Latin, given that the texts to be studied were written in that language. Wright, writing about the teaching of Latin in Castilla in the early thirteenth century, sees Palencia as “the main center of both Latin knowledge and vernacular Spanish writing. This is no coincidence, for only a Latinate scholar would be likely to feel the need for a distinctive consistent Romance orthography in addition to the traditional one” (1982:257) and was due to the new pronunciation of written Latin in which each letter was pronounced, as noted in the previous section. Corresponding with this specialized group of educated men that formed the *mester de clerecía* school as well as the clerics who were tasked with the production of chancery and scriptorium documents was the expansion of the use of Romance in written texts, a process that in León and Castilla started with documents that were meant to be shared with a larger public and then subsequently spread to all types of texts produced by the chancery by the time Alfonso X became king (see Fernández Ordóñez 2011). The intervention by Alfonso VIII of Castilla to establish a university at Palencia, and that of Alfonso IX of León to establish a *studium generale* at Salamanca, later recognized by Alfonso X all point to the importance that these schools had for the crown, particularly for Alfonso X as he worked to centralize institutions under his authority.

Alongside the influence of university masters was that of the Latin grammar texts used as university textbooks on the *mester de clerecía* authors. It is clear that works like the *Libro de Alexandre* and the vast encyclopedic histories of Alfonso X were produced

by well-educated men. To better understand the cultural background informing the university and educational environment, one can study the textbooks known to have been used at the time. According to Aguadé Nieto (1994:163-164), these include manuals on prosody in Latin as well a Latin grammar manual, the *Verbiginale*, written between 1215-1225 (Pérez Rodríguez 1990:107-109), and the *Alexandreis* by Gautier de Châtillon, the main source of the *Libro de Alexandre*. Both textbooks were written in Latin. Rico (1985:22-23) notes the *Doctrinale* by Villedieu was also used in the teaching of Latin grammar at Palencia and elsewhere reached wide use in universities the thirteenth century. Rico has suggested, for example, that masters at Palencia could have come from Chartres, as citing in particular the possibility that the author of the *Verbiginale* was Peter of Blois, a *magister* at Chartres in 1181 (1985:15-16). Uría Maqua states that because the authors of the *mester de clerecía* used the same poetics and the same rhetoric:

> hemos de pensar que su común formación se debe a que todos estudiaron en Palencia con los mismos maestros y puesto que algunos de esos maestros procedían de Francia, pudieron recibir de ellos esa influencia gálica, lo mismo que a través de ellos conocieron el *Ars Versificatoria*[41] de Mateo de Vendôme. (2000:86)

The *mester de clerecía* writers, who used multiple sources and rhetorical techniques in their works, including adapting religious texts used as textbooks for clerics to the entertainment and edification of a lay public adapted original material in Latin or French to an Ibero-Romance speaking contemporary audience. For example, the *Vida de Santo Domingo de Silos* by Berceo used as its source the eleventh century original in Latin by Grimaldo, but altered it to suit the thirteenth century, including the elimination

[41] A manual of poetry written in the twelfth century.

of the contempt for secular learning (Lomax 1969:307). The influence of French saints' lives on the *mester de clerecía* was most evident in the structure of Berceo's poems. Lappin finds this in the stated desire to write in Romance in Berceo, which is comparable to the declaration of the same wish in the *Vie de sainte Julienne* (2008:119) to stanza two of the *Vida de Santo Domingo*, "Quiero fer una prosa en román paladino / en cual suele pueblo fablar con su vecino".

Lappin goes on to connect the structure of the *Poema de Santa Oria* and the *Vida de Santo Domingo* with other French hagiographies, including the opening invocation of the Virgin Mary and the Trinity and found in the *Vie de saint Jean Baptiste*, writing that "the initial verses to Gonçalvo's hagiographies...suggest a knowledge of Old French saints' lives" (2008:120-121). Other connections include the commonplaces of the poet's hope for salvation through his work as in verse four of the *Vida de Santo Domingo*, among many other examples and the description of the poet as needing to rest from the exertions of his difficult work. Although there are structural connections between the Gallic hagiographies and Berceo's, the Gallo-Romance lexical influences are less direct, with the loanwords found in Berceo's works not necessarily found in the early French saints' lives, but rather in other works of verse like the *Chanson de Roland*.

While it is possible that the University of Palencia was where Berceo was educated and where the *Libro de Alexandre* was created, as Uría Maqua has argued (2000:63), the evidence is not definitive. Even more significant than the specific location of Palencia is that the texts themselves suggest the existence of intercommunication among *mester de clerecía* writers through reading and studying similar texts and using

these as sources and the foundation of their own school of poetry and discourse coalition. Their works incorporate and emphasize similar knowledge found at other schools of higher learning, including outside the Peninsula.

Implicit for both coalitions is great skill in Latin and other languages. For the Alfonsine coalition, this is seen in texts like the *Lapidario* and *Libro de Açafeha*, which were translated into Ibero-Romance from Arabic. The Latin *Historia de rebus hispaniae* and *Chronicon mundi* as well as sources in Arabic were used in the compilation of the large encyclopedic histories, *Estoria de España* and the *General Estoria*, are not mere translations of their principal sources, but rather coherent narratives in Ibero-Romance. What is less clear is specifically where the education of these men occurred.

Having a center of higher education like the university as the place of at least initial contact with each other as they studied the same texts together, it seems safe to assume that there was some close personal contact within a specific space for a time for both coalitions. However, this personal contact was not likely sustained over the course of decades. For the *mester de clerecía*, for example, suggests a potential common origin around a center of higher learning, one with which Gonzalo de Berceo had contact. The influence of their community, however, was longer lasting as the authors of the *Libro de Apolonio* and *Poema de Fernán González*, for example, continued to use the poetic model learned at the university. The evidence of this is seen in content and form of the texts themselves, as well as the scant biographical information on the one known poet of the *mester de clerecía*, Gonzalo de Berceo. Similarly, the collaborators on the diverse

Alfonsine products worked in various places in the territory controlled by the crown, including Sevilla, Toledo, Murcia and Burgos (see Márquez Villanueva 1994).

The Alfonsine coalition had also a means of intercommunication through the methodology followed in the translation and compilation of the works. As scholars like Catalán (1997) Gonzalo Menéndez Pidal (1951) and Fernández Ordóñez (1999) indicate, there were teams of men who worked together on different works, including, as Fernández Ordóñez notes, "traductores (*trasladadores*) y glosadores (*esplanadores*)", as well as those charged with compiling and dividing the material into chapters (2010: 239). No less important in the final result is the involvement of the king, the degree of which has been debated, but must have been considerable if we take into account the breadth and depth of the texts produced under his auspices. As already noted, Alfonso had the *Libro de Açafeha* translated again, apparently because he was not happy with the first translation. As Procter observes:

> If taken together, the prologues of all these astronomical and astrological works show that Alfonso was more than a mere patron: that he sought for books, initiated projects, allotted work among his collaborators, gave them their instructions, and to some extent revised their work; finally he was a scholar who could appreciate the results of their labours. (1945:22)

Cárdenas (1990:92), too, views the direct intervention of Alfonso as likely as seen in the prologue to the *Libro del saber de astrologia*. However personally involved he may have been, it seems clear that the king was quite interested in the gathering, sharing and expression of different areas of knowledge through written means. As the patron and guide of the large project, the king was ultimately responsible for the final approval of the works produced. He was central to the intercommunication of the Alfonsine coalition,

approving the expression of his collaborators as they articulated the topics of their particular texts. Alfonso's death in 1284 essentially brought to an end the active promotion and involvement by the crown in the products of the chancery and scriptorium (Fernández Ordóñez 2005:396).

The evidence presented in chapter two that demonstrates a parallel in Ibero-Romance for the use of the discourse coalition concept in historical linguistic analysis that corresponds with Fitzmaurice’s (2010) study of the set of eighteenth-century essay writers for *The Spectator,* in which she demonstrates that the figures of Joseph Addison and Richard Steele were key to the intercommunication and indeed existence of this coalition. The coalition was in existence as long as these men served as the publication’s editors and the community of essay writers centered around *The Spectator* could have conversations through the texts they wrote. She argues that early eighteenth-century literary London was distinguished by a discourse community of essay writers and journalists whose conversations occurred through written texts (Fitzmaurice 2010:107). When Addison and Steele sold their interests in the publication, however, this intercommunication ended, and coalition surrounding *The Spectator* dissolved after some 555 editions.

Analysis of the documentation leads to the identification of two main coalitions, that of the *mester de clerecía* poets and that of the royal scriptorium. The two communities both suggest the requirement of having a mechanism for intercommunication through their members’ connections with centers of higher learning. In addition, there is evidence the members maintained their community via reading and

writing, as writers created their works, based on the authority of their written sources but adapting them to suit their common goals of promoting learning and Christian doctrine. Finally, similar to the importance of the editors of *The Spectator* to the maintenance of that publication's coalition of writers, the central figure for the intercommunication and maintenance of the Alfonsine discourse community was King Alfonso X.

4.2.3 Discoursal expectations: Topics and style

Along with the means of intercommunication, another notable feature of a coalition are the expectations of the language used by members. A discourse coalition develops and continues discoursal expectations of the topics and style used by members, as well as topics suitable or appropriate for the texts produced by coalition and effectively limit what things are written about and how (Swales 1988:212). In her investigation on the coalition features of eighteenth century English language use, Fitzmaurice writes:

> Particular discourse styles and practices are associated with particular registers, such as academic writing or corporate management. These practices and conventions may not necessarily be explicitly prescribed, but they must be sufficiently valued to be upheld as norms of the domain, and targets for participants new to the field. (2010:109)

Porter sees the discourse community as part of a particular cultural and rhetorical milieu (1986:35). As such, the community produces discourse that is "composed of 'traces', pieces of other texts that help constitute its meaning" (Porter 1986:35). In the same study, Porter analyzes the Declaration of Independence and argues that the document was composed of these intertextual traces and fragments of other texts, which resulted in a team-written text that contributed to the defining of America for its discourse coalition

(Porter 1986:41). In other words, these traces are part of the features that characterize a genre.

In the case of Alfonsine prose and *mester de clerecía* works, some of these features are seen in both coalitions, including the topics that supported the ultimate function of promoting the use of knowledge as a means of self-improvement. One shared stylistic feature in both coalitions examined here was the repeated citation of a text's sources, which served to ground the members' compositions in the authority of written texts. These characteristics form a set of rhetorical and stylistic markers that identify the genre of writing, easily recognizable by members of the coalition in question. In the same way, the texts produced by the authors of the *mester de clerecía* and those of the Alfonsine scriptorium demonstrate shared fragments and traces that serve to both determine the approved discourse as well as influence potential members of the coalition. In this way, loanwords like *folía*, *cobarde* and *lisonjar* offered coalition members lexical resources to refer to shared interests, values and topics like the promotion of self-improvement through knowledge.

The theme of Christian values and practices is central because in this period the Church was fighting several heresies like Catharism through various means, one of which was the improved theological education of clerics. Canon XI of the important Fourth Lateran Council declared that priests and other religious men needed to be better educated in order to perfect themselves, provide models for laymen and to explain and convey Christian doctrine correctly. The education of the clergy was a preoccupation of Berceo, appearing in *Milagros de Nuestra Señora*, his four saints' lives, as well as *Loores*

de Nuestra Señora and *Del sacrificio de la misa*. Also notable in Berceo's works are numerous references to the importance of the sacraments and other Christian doctrine, all in line with the canons of the Fourth Lateran Council. Uría Maqua argues that, "sus poemas tratan materias específicamente religiosas, con una finalidad catequística. Son obras que contienen doctrina teológica, dogmática y litúrgica" (2000:128). This was due in part as a response to the ignorance on the part of parish priests in this period about Christian doctrine (Lomax 1969:304). Additionally, the topic of Christian practice itself points to the appropriate value and use of erudition and study in order to improve mankind.

Although *mester de clerecía* works share with other thirteenth- century works their religious themes, they have a unique form, as detailed below. In turn, what distinguishes Alfonsine works from other thirteenth-century works in prose is the thoroughness and breadth of the types of knowledge they offer and the fact that they were produced by authority of the king himself, implying the crown's approval and indeed the promotion of the study of their contents. Talking about the scientific works by the scriptorium, Cárdenas observes:

> The *Lapidario* (his earliest work, if the date provided is trustworthy) claims on its first folio that Alfonso had it translated 'from Arabic into Castilian so that men would understand it better and better know how to take advantage of it'. The requisites for understanding this text, however, make it clear that *los omnes,* or men, are not everyone. Rather they are the select few: (1) who knew astronomy (which included astrology), (2) who knew how to distinguish between the subtlety of stones, and (3) who knew the art of medicine. (1990:105)

Numerous other scientific works included the astronomical works, the *Canones de Albateni*, the *Libro del Açafeha*, *Libro de las estrellas de la ochava espera* as well as the

treatise on magic, *Picatrix*. Besides scientific works, three additional subjects were obviously of great concern to Alfonso, seen in the studies on wisdom, laws and history produced by his scriptorium. First, the sapiential texts presented advice on the correct behavior of those privileged enough to have either inherited it or been granted positions of power. These works included the *Libro de los doce sabios*, translated and compiled during Fernando III's reign as well as other works of the type *speculum principis*. Similarly, the works on laws offered justification to the efforts of Alfonso to centralize authority in the crown, also notable in the two large historiographical works, the *Estoria de España* and the *General Estoria*. The gains provided by the study of history are seen in the prologue of the latter, which states that history is written down "porque de los fechos de los buenos tomassen los omnes exemplo pora fazer bien e de los fechos de los malos que recibiessen castigo por se saber guardar de lo non fazer" (General Estoria).

Having established the appropriate topics shared by both coalitions, those that supported Christian values and dogma and those that demonstrated the benefits of erudition and study, the following two subsections detail the specific discoursal expectations developed and continued first by the *mester de clerecía* community (4.2.3.1) and then by the Alfonsine coalition (4.2.3.2).

4.2.3.1 Discoursal expectations: *Mester de clerecía*

The discoursal expectations of the mester de clerecía works can be seen in the features that literary critics like Uría Maqua (2000) and Ancos (2012) have identified in what they label a 'school of poetry', which is viewed in this study as equivalent to a

discourse community. There are three main factors that determine the use of the term, according to Uría Maqua (2000:15-171): the use of a particular meter and rhyme scheme, that is, four line stanzas of fourteen syllables, divided into hemistichs, with monorhyme. The second characteristic of this set of texts is the nature of the topics the writers use in their works, which generally promote Christian practices. Third, many demonstrate a concern for the importance of the profession of the author to spread his knowledge, including adjusting Classical sources to appropriately espouse Christian values and theology, as in the *Libro de Alexandre* and *Libro de Apolonio*. These characteristics relate to a discourse coalition's shared assumptions about what topics are appropriate and the conventions of their expression. Uría Maqua notes that the allusions and invocations of God and Christ are constant in this poem and in the other works of the mester de clerecía, in line with the writers' promotion of Christian ideas:

> En suma, la dimensión cristiana, didáctica y ejemplar, es singularmente relevante en los poemas del 'mester de clerecía' y cumple...una función pastoral, o simplemente educativa, que responde a un plan de la Iglesia. Ésta, a partir del s. XII, pone un singular empeño en la educación intelectual y moral del clero, puesto que sólo un clero debidamente preparado podría, a su vez, formar al pueblo en la pura ortodoxia de la doctrina cristiana. (Uría Maqua 2000:131-132)

The defining form, *cuaderna vía,* for the *mester de clerecía* coalition was learned in the university, with its strict rules on meter, consonant rhyme and stanza form. As noted, the learned form corresponds with the erudite themes and topics of the works themselves and the obligation of the writers, who viewed their work as a 'mester' or profession, to share their knowledge with their audience. Uría Maqua argues that:

> Su poética tiene una sólida base gramatical, se basa en un 'arte' o técnica que...supone el estudio en un centro académico, pues los conocimientos de

> las gramáticas latina y romance, que revelan sus autores, son escolásticos, y...también lo es la retórica que utilizan. Por tanto, los poetas del mester de clerecía están unidos por vínculos espacio-temporales, culturales, lingüísticos y--lo que es más importante--por unos propósitos y fines comunes. (2000:77)

The writers of the *mester de clerecía* demonstrate this, not just through the topics treated in their words, but also through the constraints of the form of the monorhymed alexandrine stanzas. It is Menéndez y Pelayo who first argued for the link between the *mester de clerecía* and the educated clerical elite in the broader sense of a profession as well as in the religious sense of religious clerics. In this way, Menéndez y Pelayo sees little reason to connect *mester de clerecía* works with the popular nature of other works in verse in the period:

> En suma, el mester de clerecía, socialmente considerado, no fue nunca ni la poesía del pueblo, ni la poesía de la aristocracia militar, ni la poesía de las fiestas palaciegas, sino la poesía de los monasterios y de las nacientes universidades o estudios generales. Así se explica su especial carácter, la predilección por ciertos asuntos, el fondo de cultura escolástica de que hacen alarde sus poetas, y la relativa madurez de las formas exteriores, que son ciertamente monótonas, pero nada tienen de toscas y sí mucho que revela artificio perseverante y sagaz industria literaria. (1911-1913:159-160)

Through the verbal skills demonstrated in the form of the *mester de clerecía* works, "es evidente que los autores del *mester de clerecía* conocían a fondo la estructura de la lengua romance y por eso podían utilizar las formas sintácticas más complicadas y crear nuevas palabras por derivación" (Uría Maqua 2000:70). The rhetorical devices, poetic techniques, historical and legal information, theology, and their language "rico en cultismos y latinismos sintácticos y prosódicos" (Uría Maqua 2000: 64) imply that all of this erudition had to be obtained from studying in a place with masters of these fields of

study, that is, the university. Dutton suggests that the *mester de clerecía* was created by university students, which would explain "the sense of intellectual and artistic superiority that one notes in *clerecía* authors" (1973:87).

Additionally, the shared language and verse form used by the composers of the *mester de clerecía* functions as a discourse of expressing complex material in what Berceo termed "romanz paladino" through various means, as in the description of Berceo's lexical use by Alarcos Llorach:

> No siempre el *romanz paladino* disponía en su inventario de palabras para designar esos conceptos elevados. Se impuso, pues, Berceo la tarea de dotar de trascendencia a las sustancias sobre las que operaba la lengua hablada de todos los días. En consecuencia (y tal como luego en prosa hizo el rey Alfonso el Sabio), echó mano Berceo de numerosos términos que encontraba en los textos latinos manejados y los adaptó con mejor o peor fortuna a las normas del vulgar hablado, explicándolos cuando era preciso. *Esta actitud idiomática de Berceo es común a todos los escritores del mester de clerecía*. En resumen, se trataba de dignificar el romance. Sería actitud aprendida en el Estudio General de Palencia, donde, como sugiere plausiblemente Dutton, habría adquirido Berceo su formación latina y eclesiástica, en contacto con clérigos de ultrapuertos. (1992:26, italics ours)

Although the evidence that Palencia was where Berceo studied is not necessarily as convincing as Alarcos Llorach believed, it is clear that the elevated poetic form and obvious linguistic and artistic skill that Alarcos Llorach refers to was not akin to the norms of the "vulgar hablado". The writers of the *mester de clerecía* and the prose writers of Alfonso worked to elevate the expressive capacity of Ibero-Romance, sharing a common linguistic perspective in order to "dignificar el romance", as Alarcos Llorach observes above.

Various rhetorical devices are seen in the *mester de clerecía* works, including syllogism, *disputatio*, *abreviatio*, *amplificatio*, *interpretatio*, *expolitio*, *digresio*, *descriptio*, periphrasis and comparison (Uría Maqua 2000:83-89). One function of the inclusion of these elements in the form of *cuaderna vía* is to express the erudition of *mester de clerecía* coalition members in an inventive way, while still teaching and exalting the values of the cultural and political environment of thirteenth century Iberia. The works demonstrate a similar attitude toward learning and erudition, which is valued in order to work toward perfection. Alexander is even the student of Aristotle, noting his skill in the seven liberal arts:

> Asas se cleresσia quanto me es menester
> fuera tu no aue omne que me pudies vençer
> coñoσco que a ti lo deuo agradesçer
> que me enseneste las artes todas a saber
> (*Libro de Alexandre* P 38a-d, ca. 1225)

The quote here is from the *Libro de Alexandre*, but this shared attitude can also be seen in the *Libro de Apolonio*, and to certain extent, in the hagiographies by Berceo.

4.2.3.2 Alfonsine coalition: Discoursal expectations

The Alfonsine coalition shared a style of prose as identifiable as the *cuaderna vía* verse form, with a shared function as well. Although the formal characteristics of Alfonsine works are less obviously strict, in part because of the use of prose as opposed to strict meter and rhyme constraints, there is evidence in the works of the Alfonsine scriptorium that the style of the presentation of the material was important. The sheer quantity of knowledge that Alfonso X had translated or adapted (scientific and legal

treatises, for example) or created into encyclopedic histories aids in the sense of the exhaustive nature of texts produced by the scriptorium. As the use of Ibero-Romance spreads into erudite texts, loanwords like Gallicisms helped to expand the expressive capacity of the language, but also form part of the style of the texts, which will be developed below, forming part of the stylistic markers of the coalition.

For example, the collaborators of the *Estoria de España* and the *General Estoria* demonstrate an ability to understand and integrate multiple source texts to create large, comprehensive histories. They are distinguished by the evident intent to include as much information and as many sources as possible. The argument presented here is that the result of the discourse community both set the discoursal expectation of form as well as maintained itself through the continued use of the same stylistic markers. The members of the scriptorium needed to be capable of reading and manipulating their sources, thus by definition were erudite. The effort of the writers of the scriptorium was deliberate as they worked to create a voice of authority in the vernacular, compiling a definitive work based on the strength of the authorities cited, as seen in the numerous 'segund la fuent' examples as coalition members cited the authority of their sources:

> E segund que fallamos en escritos de arávigos sabios que fablaron en las razones d'estas cosas dizen en aquella echada del paraíso que dio otrossí Nuestro Señor a Adam e a Eva las simientes de los panes o de las legumbres e de las otras cosas que sembrassen en la tierra e cogiessen dond se mantoviessen.
>
> (*General Estoria* I, ca. 1275)

The evidential weight of piling on the evidence was a critical feature of these works, demonstrating to the reader that the text was encyclopedic and conclusive. Indeed, as Fernández Ordóñez has recently pointed out, a fundamental aspect of the creation of the

General Estoria and *Estoria de España* histories is the evident effort to organize the different sources:

> Gran parte de los estudios contrastivos entre las fuentes y sus versiones románicas están centrados en el estudio de las técnicas de traducción, tanto en lo relativo a los procedimientos sintácticos y léxicos desarrollados por los traductores alfonsíes, como en lo relativo a las técnicas de glosa y actualización puestas en práctica. Sin embargo, la actividad organizadora del texto fue también uno de los procedimientos fundamentales de modificación de los modelos, tanto para crear una nueva estructura como para introducir sobre ella nuevos valores, destacando a través de los epígrafes los contenidos que se consideraban más relevantes. (2010:239)

In this way, one of the important stylistic features of these works is the evident effort to organize the material so that the most important content was easily understood.

The evidence points to the same degree of effort to translate source texts from the original Arabic, Greek, Hebrew or Latin into Romance in the Alfonsine sapiential and scientific works. In addition, texts were often amended and redone, such as the two versions of the *Libro de Açafeha,* as well as the expansion of the scientific work the *Lapidario*, in the form of the *Libro de las formas e ymágines*. A similar approach was used with the legal texts like the *Espéculo*, *Setenario* and the *Siete Partidas*, demonstrating another of Alfonso's concerns, establishing his authority through legal precedents. These corrections, adaptations and expansions demonstrate the desire for perfection, in both content and expression. Not only was the goal to include as much information as possible, but to present it in a way that created a singular authoritative version of the content of the text in question.

An additional discoursal element of the royal scriptorium works was the involvement by the king in the textual activity of his collaborators in order to provide a

single, coherent voice to a literate lay audience, which was made possible by the use of a similar style and form. As already noted in section 4.2.2 about the communication within the Alfonsine coalition, the king was actively involved in the activities of his scriptorium. Due to the frequent mentions of Alfonso either ordering a text be translated or otherwise engaging in the production process, one can assert a greater or lesser degree of active participation by the king. Kasten views the participation of Alfonso as active:

> So far as the methods of work at the royal scriptorium are known, these texts presumably bear the approval of Alfonso, who as architect and general editor prescribed procedures and standards. The scribes were clearly trained with great care in the use of the French Gothic miniscule script, which characterizes all of the manuscripts produced at the royal scriptorium. (1990:36-37)

This supports the idea that there were concrete efforts made to produce texts of similar standards. Indeed, Kasten sees in the reduced variation in preterite endings for the third-person plural a deliberate effort to use language to be imitated, arguing that, "from bits of evidence such as this, it is clear that a good deal of uniformity was operative among the scribes and that the best examples of writing and language that the age could offer as worthy of emulation were indeed these" (1990:41). In other words, the scribes used similar language to create their translations and adaptations of material, providing additional reinforcement for the basic argument about the adoption and diffusion of erudite and literary Gallicisms in the thirteenth century.

Related to the authority of the king in the production and improvement of texts is the clear effort by writers to ground their texts in the authority of other written sources, with those having more prestige having more *auctoritas*. In the period of study, the modern idea of creating a completely original work was unknown. Due to the desire to

grant their own words and texts power, writers consulted other texts and based their work upon the source material for their own creations. In essence, a new text needed to be founded upon another in order to have legitimacy in the eyes of their expected audience. As Kasten observes,

> Perhaps little original work was accomplished, but at a time when authority was stressed, it must not seem surprising that authority is constantly cited for everything. On those occasions when there was a conflict in the authorities, it was incumbent upon the scholars to reconcile if possible, to explain away the differences. (1990:35)

Thus an important feature of the discoursal expectations of the Alfonsine coalition was to follow the desired standard of expression of King Alfonso X.

To conclude the discussion of the discoursal expectations of the *mester de clerecía* and Alfonsine communities, the evidence confirms that while the two coalitions studied here share certain topics like the value of knowledge and the tenets of Christianity in addition to the desire to ground their texts in the authority of other written sources, each group had their own notable styles as well. First, the *mester de clerecía* used the *cuaderna vía* verse form and numerous rhetorical devices to express in Ibero-Romance their support of Christian doctrine and value of erudition. The second community of writers identified, in turn, developed techniques to organize and present material from multiple sources in a single narrative that was deemed acceptable by the members of the Alfonsine coalition and especially by its patron, Alfonso X.

4.2.4 Discourse coalition characteristics: Summary

The discourse coalition linguistic construct offers us a compelling model through which to examine the social factors involved in the adoption and diffusion of a group of Gallo-Romance borrowings in thirteenth century Ibero-Romance, divisible into two subsets, that of the *mester de clerecía* school of poetry and the Alfonsine collaborators. While a social networks analysis functions well when the historical circumstances offer greater evidence of personal contact as chapter two has described, a discourse coalition model better suits the situation and evidence of the learned texts of the thirteenth century. This is because the construct does not require a high degree of personal contact in order to influence the language use of its members, nor that the members even be conscious of their shared norms. Several key features of a discourse coalition can be related to the data available on the circumstances of thirteenth century Iberia, including shared interests like the use of the vernacular and teaching through texts, means of intercommunication between members and evident discoursal expectations like the use of *cuaderna vía* and weaving multiple sources into one within the *mester de clerecía* and Alfonsine discourse coalitions respectively. The first appearance and concentration of the collection of phase two Gallicisms in two main sets of texts with shared features suggests that the writers were following the norms of their respective coalitions, which included the adoption and spread of certain loanwords from Gallo-Romance. The second section of the chapter will use *galicismos* to illustrate the fruitfulness of the discourse coalition construct in the study of borrowing in a historical context.

4.3 Gallicisms spread via discourse coalitions

As this chapter has argued throughout, there are two discourse coalitions identifiable in the historical data, although the Gallo-Romance terms that are found in the works produced by the two groups overlap in some cases. This is not particularly surprising given that both the writers of the *mester de clerecía* and those of the scriptorium translators and compilers were well-educated, likely by masters who used similar texts as they taught, especially grammar. That said, the terms used below to illustrate the two different coalitions are notably different in their diffusion. The first group addressed here is the discourse coalition formed by the writers of the literary texts that contain phase two *galicismos*, which will be illustrated by *asaz*, *folía*, and *solaz*, borrowings whose form was useful to *mester* authors as they worked within the constraints of consonant rhyme and syllable count of *cuaderna vía*. The loanwords also offered semantic content that was relevant to the message they wished to express, related to but not identical to existing native terms as the evidence will support and thus were chosen in part for their aesthetic effect. Interestingly, these three terms also likely come from Old Occitan, the language of the troubadours, the itinerant poets and performers for those with the means and time for edification and entertainment[42]. These terms also remain limited to erudite registers of Modern Spanish. These factors will be seen to reflect the shared discoursal expectations of this coalition.

---

[42] As we have previously asserted, the distinction between Old French and Old Occitan is not particularly important to our argument about the social factors influencing the adoption and spread of Gallicisms. Thus the fact that the forms *asez* and *fol/folie* are found in the Old French *Chanson de Roland*, as well as Occitan troubadour poetry simply suggests that these literary works were part of the cultural background of the erudite writers of Ibero-Romance in the thirteenth century.

Immediately following the *mester de clerecía* set of loanwords, the features of the second group will be described. This list comprises *cobarde*, *ligero*, and *lisonjar*, which illustrate the coalition formed by the collaborators in the royal scriptorium. The diffusion of these three terms is rather different than that of the *mester de clerecía* terms due to the nature of the texts in which they are found, which were generally aimed at an elite audience of nobles, who were not necessarily university-educated.

4.3.1 *Mester de clerecía* Gallicisms

10. ASAZ *adv/adj* 'very, quite', 'sufficient' < Oc. assatz < AD SATIS

The first *mester de clerecía* coalition term is *asaz* 'sufficiently; a lot', an adverb and invariable adjective whose adoption demonstrates an unusually early adoption of a Gallicism that remained in the educated register of erudite language users, in contrast with a borrowing like *ligero*, which did spread to other registers. According to Corominas and Pascual (1980-1991:s.v. asaz), AD SATIS left descendants only in Gallo-Romance, noting the expected Ibero-Romance result, **assades*, is not found. Likely originating from the Provençal *assatz* 'sufficiently', its early documentation is in literary texts like the *La Fazienda de Ultramar*, which includes a sort of travel guide for pilgrims to the Holy Land as well as early Romance translations of sections of the Bible. Other early thirteenth-century works that contains *asaz* include those of the *mester de clerecía* coalition like the *Vida de San Millán* by Berceo and the *Libro de Alexandre*, along with a non-*mester de clerecía* work in verse, the *Vida de Santa María Egipcíaca*. The source for this hagiographical poem was a Gallic original. In some cases, *asaz* suited the rhyme

scheme, which could have encouraged its use and spread given the constraints of *cuaderna vía*, as in Berceo's *Del sacrificio de la misa* and the *Libro de Alexandre* cited below:

> (29) Comió con sus discípulos, fízolis buen solaz,
> de la su grant duricia encrepolos **assaz**;
> a toda criatura mandó predicar paz,
> ca el bien d'este mundo todo en ella yaz.
> (*He ate with his disciples, made for them a good respite, he scolded them quite a lot, to every creature he ordered peace to be taught because the good in this world all lies in it.*)
> (*Del sacrificio de la misa*, ca.1228-1246)

The term has several tokens as well in the *Libro de Alexandre*:

> (30) **Assaz** se sauieza: quanta me es mester
> mas tu non yes ombre: que me puedas uençer
> coñosco que a ti: lo deuo gradeçer
> que me enseñaste: las vij artes a entender
> (*I know rather a lot of wisdom, as much as I need, except for you there is no man who can best me. I know that I must thank you for what you taught me: to understand the seven arts.*)
> (*Libro de Alexandre* O 37a-d, ca. 1225)

> (31) Dixo Ector al padre: fincat uos en paz
> auedes buenos fijos: & uassallos **assaz**
> nos iremos a ellos: & ferirllos de faz
> nunca se iuntaron: con tan cruo agraz
> (*Hector said to the father: remain in peace, you have good sons and enough vassals. We will go to them and hurt them in the face. They had never met with such raw bitterness*)
> (*Libro de Alexandre* O 429a-d, ca. 1225)

Used primarily as an adverb and therefore part of a word class less frequently borrowed, *asaz* is an unusual borrowing in comparison with other Gallicisms. Both coalitions seem to have adopted the term early on, given the appearance of *asaz* in *La Fazienda de Ultramar*, as well as the early sapiential collection that possibly was produced during the reign of Fernando III, the *Libro de los doce sabios*:

(32) era **asaz** mal.
(*It was quite bad.*)
(*Libro de los doce sabios*, ca. 1237)

Although it occurs relatively frequently, nearly 400 instances in over 40 texts[43], almost all of which can be classified as erudite[44], this number is a fraction of that of *mucho* (7000 in 300) or *muy* (19000 in 360), the closest synonyms of *asaz*. While there is overlap, *asaz* does not occur in exactly the same semantic contexts that *muy* and *mucho* do. *Asaz* demonstrates a sense closer to *bastante* 'sufficient, enough', found in four tokens in the thirteenth century. *Bastante* eventually becomes the more common term for this sense by the fourteenth century and beyond. In addition, its presence nearly exclusively in erudite texts such as the *mester de clerecía* texts and those produced by the Alfonsine scriptorium suggests that its spread was most likely through exposure to written models, not through speech. These contrast with notarial texts, which can record instances of more spontaneous testimony due to the purpose of these notarial documents, as noted previously.

One of the features of a discourse coalition is the use of a similar form, including aesthetic choices like vocabulary and rhetorical devices easy to discern by other writers. Writers of the period were using similar language as a way of consciously identifying themselves as erudite or simply using the language learned in their studies. This

[43] As we have stated earlier in this investigation, we count some 72 texts as 'learned' including legal, literary, historiographical, and sapiential/scientific texts. In contrast, the texts determined to be 'non-erudite' number over 400 and are notarial in nature, generally short texts recording events occurring around a church or monastery where such records would have been archived.
[44] There are a few tokens in the *Fuero de Burgos, Fuero de Navarra* and *Vidal Mayor*, which in theory express the laws of the respective town or territory in a way understandable by the residents of said area. That said, then as now, legal language tends to be formal and formulaic, so including an adverb normally limited to educated registers like *asaz* in a legal code does not seem unusual.

education occurred either at the nascent universities of the thirteenth century or in cathedral schools, the quality of which was a concern of the Fourth Lateran Council. Coalition members use stylistic markers to be mark their work as part of the discourse community. In much the same way as modern academic writing uses formal language, in many instances using vocabulary specific to the field in question to express their arguments and assertions, the use of a *galicismo* like *asaz* in a text produced by either thirteenth century coalition would demonstrate the user's erudition and exposure to prestigious literary models of the period through his studies.

Asaz remains in use in modern language, in literary and academic registers, with some 140 tokens in 80 texts since 1900, according to CORDE. In contrast, *bastante* has over 9000 tokens in more than 1100 different texts while *harto* numbers some 1400 tokens in over 400 texts of all types. Although *asaz* appears in non-*mester de clerecía* texts, it is included here because of the number of *mester de clerecía* texts that contain numerous tokens of the form, including the *Libro de Alexandre,* the first *mester de clerecía* text and the works by Berceo, demonstrating its use among those with education and exposure to erudite models of writing.

11. FOLÍA *nf* 'insanity, madness' < OOc. folía < fol 'fool' < FŎLLIS 'bag, sack', 'empty head, fatuous or crazy man'

The noun *folía* demonstrates a diffusion focused on literary texts, and unlike *asaz* and *solaz*, was almost exclusive to *mester de clerecía* works, with only six tokens in Alfonsine works in the form of *fol*. In particular, the term appears most frequently in those of Berceo, with six of the nine works attributed to him containing at least one

token. The position of numerous tokens of *folía* at the end of the line within a stanza suggests that the term was used to suit the metric structure and rhyme constraints of the *cuaderna vía*, possibly a factor aiding in its adoption. The same is true for the first text in which *folía* appears, the *Vida de Santa María Egipcíaca*, which, although written in rhymed couplets and not *cuaderna vía*, still reflects a source of many clerical texts, hagiographical texts either in Latin or, as in the case of this text, in French.

> (33) De pequenya fue bautizada,
> malamientre fue ensenyada.
> Mientre que fue en mancebía,
> dexó bondat e priso **follía**:
> (*She was baptized when little, she was taught badly. While she was a youth, she left behind goodness and took up folly)*
> (*Vida de Santa María Egipcíaca,* ca. 1215*)*

Similarly, in the *Vida de San Millán de la Cogolla*, Berceo employs the form three times, all forming part of the rhyme scheme of the stanza in which they are used.

> (34) Metié doctrina sana entre la clerecía,
> ca tales avié d'ellos que trayén grand **follía**,
> con legos e con clérigos lazdrava cada día,
> contendié por levarlos todos a mejoría.
> (*He put correct doctrine among the clergy because there were those who brought great folly)*
> (*Vida de San Millán*, ca. 1230)

This is not to say that *folía* is only used in response to the exigencies of the rhyme scheme as in the following examples:

> (35) Las sus grandes mercedes ¿qui las podrié contar?
> Madre, serié **follía** en sólo lo asmar;
> (*Her great mercies, who could count them? Mother, it would be insanity to even think of it.)*
> (*Loores de Nuestra Señora*, ca. 1236-1246)

> (36) El aruol q*ue* temprano comjença floreçer
> q*ue*malo la elada non lo dexa creçer

avert a otrosy a ti a conteçer
sy en *e*sta **follia** qujsieres contender
(*The tree that flowers too early is killed by the frost. If you persist in this insanity, it will happen to you.)*
(*Libro de Alexandre* O 764a-d, ca. 1225)

Malkiel (1984) included *fol* in his article about the tendency to avoid monosyllabic adjectival forms in Spanish, and thus his concern was the disappearance from the lexicon of Ibero-Romance of *fol* and its related form *folía*. The principal significance of Malkiel's analysis of the data from the earliest uses of *fol/folía* to their complete replacement by other terms to the present discussion is the observation about their presence in Galician-Portuguese lyric, which was contemporaneous with the works of the *mester de clerecía* and influenced by the troubadour poetry in Occitan (Sánchez Jiménez 2004). Malkiel writes, "En el nivel literario, pudo tratarse de una enérgica reacción contra el léxico de la lírica galleguizante, peligrosamente propicia al empleo de *fol* y *folía*"(1984:24). So while it is possible that the immediate source for *folía* was Galician-Portuguese, its ultimate origin is Gallic as its use in the *Chanson de Roland* (ca. 1080) with the same ironic metaphorical sense (Rey et al. 2012:s.v. fou).

With the strong influence of Occitan lyric on the verse created in Galician-Portuguese, the sociohistorical circumstances suggest that what is most relevant is the fact that *mester de clerecía* coalition of authors were aware of literary currents of the period, including Occitan as well as Galician-Portuguese poetry. Support for this is found in the fact that while the monosyllabic form *fol* is used in five tokens total in the *General Estoria*, *folía* is not present in the historiographical or other learned works of Alfonso. The frequent position of *folía* at the end of a line means that the choice of the word was

in part dictated by the rhyme scheme the poet had chosen for the stanza in question. In this way, the adoption of *folía* was in part an aesthetic choice by the *cuaderna vía* authors. For the purposes of the present investigation, what is most interesting are the patterns of use of *folía* in the period that were influenced by Occitan troubadour poetry.

As previously stated, one of the features of a discourse coalition is the creation of formal characteristics that set apart the group's writing. The presence of the word at the end of a line offers evidence that its phonetic shape was useful in rhyming with numerous other -*ía* words such as *día*, *clerecía*, and the imperfect verb endings for the second and third conjugations. Within the *mester de clerecía* coalition, the *cuaderna vía* verse form consisted of monorhymed tetrastrophic stanzas of fourteen syllable lines, although in reality the syllable count varied[45]. Thus, the strictures of the verse form strongly influenced the word choices of the poets, especially at the rhymed word at the end of each line of verse. In this way, *folía* had the advantage of a similar form to numerous other terms in Ibero-Romance.

Beyond the metrical convenience of the phonetic shape of *folía*, the semantics of the term were also significant in its adoption. The connection that the *mester de clerecía* authors make between the sin and insanity or madness expressed through *folía* is seen several times. Given that one of the purposes of the *mester de clerecía* is to share the authors' knowledge, it is not surprising that they share examples of the folly of sin, which

---

[45] As Lappin notes in his study of Gonzalo de Berceo, the traditional manner of editing was to regularize the meter (2008:ix), while he and Casas Rigall (2007) are more cautious about altering lines for metrical reasons.

is a behavioral choice to be avoided. Note the position of the term at the end of the line, a key component in the consonant rhyme scheme of example 38 below:

(37) Un fraire de su casa, Guiralt era clamado,
ante que fuesse monge era non bien senado;
facié a las debeces **follía** e pecado
como omne soltero que non es apremiado.
(*A brother of his house, whose name was Guiralt was not very mature before he was a monk. He often used to commit folly and sin, like an unfettered single man*)
(*Milagros de Nuestra Señora*, ca. 1246-1252)

(38) <García>, dixo, <sepas que yo esto temía
lo que te ovi dicho por esto lo dicía
que si nunca tornasses en essa tal **follía**
cadríes en logar malo, e en grand malatía>
(*García, he said, know that I feared that what I had said to you, that if you were to ever return to such folly, you would fall into a bad place*)
(*Vida de Santo Domingo*, ca. 1236)

This aspect of *folía* offers a nuance of meaning that the extant native terms in use in thirteenth-century Ibero-Romance did not. As Malkiel notes in his study of *fol* (1984), there were several terms already to refer to the concept of insanity or lack of good sense, including the noun *locura*[46], and the adjectives *loco* and the less common *sandio/sendio*[47]. These terms demonstrate different diffusion patterns in comparison with *folía*. While *sandio* counts some 25 tokens in 7 erudite texts, in contrast, *locura* counts some 400 tokens and in a greater variety of text types than both *folía* and *sandio/sendio*.

---

[46] The native terms *locura* 'insanity; foolishness' and *loco* 'insane; silly, dumb' are of uncertain origin, according to Corominas and Pascual (1980-1991:s.v. loco) in their extensive discussion of the lexeme. They lean toward a possible origin from the Arabic adjective *'álwaq*, feminine *laúqa* 'foolish, dumb'. *Loco* is first found in the *Vida de Santo Domingo* by Berceo (ca. 1236), although the *Fuero de Zorita de los Canes* (ca. 1218-1250) also contains a token of *loco* 'insane'.

[47] Sandio 'fool; dumb' is also of uncertain origin. In context the term could contain a dipthong, as in the modern form, or a hiatus to suit the rhyme scheme as in stanza 1270 from the P MS of the Libro de Alexandre cited.

The adjective *loco* has a similar count[48] and contexts of use as seen in the examples below:

> (39) Et todas estas cosas ffazíen, creyendo que la tierra era Dios e non parando mientes cómmo era la más baxa cosa e la más vil que él ffiziera. Et non les abondaua esta **locura**, e ffazíen ymágines de tierra a que ffazíen oración.
> (*And all these things they did, thinking that the land was God and not stopping to that it was the lowest thing he had created. And this insanity was not enough and the made idols of earth that they prayed to*.)
> (*Setenario*, ca. 1272-1284[49])

> (40) & aquel que lo ferió peche demás X soldos por la **locura** que fizo.
> (*And the one who injured him pay in addition ten* soldos *for the insanity that he did*)
> (*Fuero Juzgo*, 1268)

> (41) Otrossi mandamos del que ffuere **loco** o **ssandio** que despues que tornare en ssu acuerdo ssi quissiere demandar alguna cosa o otro por el que aquel tienpo en que non era en ssu acuerdo non deue sseer cuntado.
> (*In addition we order that he who goes crazy that later returns to himself, if he wishes to petition something or someone for the period in which he was out of his mind should not be considered*.)
> (*Espéculo,* ca. 1255)

> (43) Eres niño de dias: & de seso menguado
> andas con grant **locura**: & seras malfadado
> se te fuesses tu uia: series bien acordado
> se te guias por otro: eres mal conseiado
> (*You are young child, with little sense, you go around with great madness and you will be unfortunate. If you were to go your way, you would be wise. If you go another, you are misguided.)*
> (*Libro de Alexandre* O 736a-d, ca. 1225)

---

[48] We have not included the numerous tokens of the Latin form *loco* 'place' (< LOCUS) found in CORDE, which clearly have no semantic connection to *loco* 'insane; foolish'. This form is found in texts written in notarial Latin such as this sales record from 1225:

> Ego, don Abbe, et uxor mea donna Mayor, facimus cartam vendicionis et roborationis vobis capitulo ecclesie Sancte Marie de Salamanca de tres aranzadas de vineas minus media quarta, quod habemus in **loco** nominato enno castro de Villa Mayor
> (1225, Salamanca)

[49] The dates of the large legislative works of Alfonso X have been debated for some time. We agree with Craddock (1986) and Martin (2006) that the estimated date of composition for the *Setenario* of 1252-1270 in CORDE is too early.

(44) Quanto que Dario me manda yo tengolo por mjo
quj me non obedesçe tengolo por **sendio**
mas sy Dios lo qujsiere commo en El fio
yo le fare leuar el gato de aquj al rrio
(*As much as Dario sends me, I take as mine. He who disobeys me, I take him for a fool. Because I have faith in Him, if God wishes it, I will take the cat from here to the river*)
(*Libro de Alexandre* P 1270a-d, ca. 1225)

The use of *folía* in more the limited sense of deliberate foolish choice than either *loco*/*locura* or *sandio* suggests the Gallicism filled a semantic gap as well as implies that *folía* was a lexical marker of the coalition's shared discursive expectations.

After the thirteenth century, *folía* continued to be used as a synonym of *locura*, particularly in *cancionero* poetry, although not a common form in comparison to the much more common *locura*. In the fourteenth century, the frequency of *folía* is reduced, some 40 tokens in fourteen texts, still mainly in poetic works, while *locura* counts some 300 tokens in 60 texts. The fifteenth century counts close to the same number of tokens, 45 in 18 texts, all but one a literary text, mainly *cancionero* poems. The fact that *folía* was present in the works of the *mester de clerecía* discourse coalition but absent in the larger Alfonsine body of texts bolsters the idea that it was through the influence of this group of men interested in following particular discursive expectations in order to create their works in verse that the term became part of the poetic register of medieval Ibero-Romance[50].

[50] The term *folía* is borrowed in another sense in the seventeenth century, that of a type of musical composition, which is the first acceptation listed in the 22nd edition of the DRAE. The first use of folía with this meaning in CORDE is in a poem dated to prior to 1607 by Pedro Liñán de Riaza:

y al chorro del estropajo
que mansamente corría,
cantaba aquesta **folía**

12. SOLAZ *nm* 'pleasure', 'comfort, consolation', 'relaxation, relief' < OOc. solatz < SOLACIUM 'comfort, consolation'

While *folía* is found first and primarily in the works of the *mester de clerecía*, *solaz* counts many tokens in prose works as well, both literary and otherwise. Its diffusion points to a term adopted first by the literary authors, however, due to the first documentation of the term occurring in early works like the *Vida de Santa María Egipcíaca* and the *Poema de Mio Cid*, as well as tokens in the *Libro de Alexandre* and five works by Berceo.

(45) Mançebos hi abiá livianos
que se tomaron de las manos;
metiéronse a andar,
por las riberas van **solazar**;
(*There were youths there that took each other by the hand, going off to walk along the shore to enjoy themselves)*
(*Vida de Santa María Egipcíaca*, ca. 1215)

(46) Ý yazen essa noche e tan grand gozo que fazen,
otro día mañana piensan de cavalgar.
Los de Sant Estevan escurriéndolos van
fata río d'Amor, dándoles **solaz**.
(*There they lie that night and such great enjoyment they make, planning the next day to ride. Those of Saint Stephen go out to say goodbye to them until the River Amor, giving them comfort*.)
(*Poema de Mio Cid*, ca. 1207)

(47) Quj oyrlo q*ui*sier: a todo mjo creer
aura de mj **solaz**: en cabo g*ra*nt plazer
(*He who wants to hear all my belief will have solace, in the end great pleasure*.)
(*Libro de Alexandre* O 3a-b, ca.1225)

(48) Estando a la tabla, en **solaz** natural,
demandóles quál era el senyor del reyal.
(*Sitting at the table in natural relaxation, he asked which of them was the lord.)*
(*Libro de Apolonio*, ca. 1240)

---

con tono suave y bajo

Based on the available documentation, *solaz* has been a term limited to learned registers of the language since its adoption and spread into Ibero-Romance, in spite of its relative frequency in the period of study. In the thirteenth century it counts 232 tokens in 34 different texts, all of which can be labeled erudite, including a derived verb, *solazar* that appears in 9 different learned works, numbering 18 tokens. *Solaz* is found first in works of verse as noted and then later in texts from the royal chancery, including the *Libro de los doce sabios*, which is dated to 1237. All tokens are seen in works either from the Castilian royal chancery or a literary creation, except for two appearances in the *Fuero de Navarra* and the *Vidal Mayor,* also Navarran. The native form *plazer* (Modern Spanish *placer*), in contrast, outnumbered *solaz* with a token count of over 700 in the thirteenth century.

The popularity of poetic verse at the Castilian court had been a tradition from the twelfth century and continued into the thirteenth by Alfonso VIII and subsequently by Alfonso X (see Sánchez Jiménez 2004 and Snow 1990). In his study of Catalan and Occitan troubadours at Alfonso VIII's court, Sánchez Jiménez (2004:115) argues that the high frequency and number of Occitan poets at court revealed the prestige of vernacular literature to the Castilians and thus influenced the creation of a separate writing system from Latin. As previously noted above, it is during the reign of Alfonso VIII that the Treaty of Cabreros, a 1206 document was written in Ibero-Romance. In addition, it seems likely that the composition of the *Poema de Mio Cid* occurred around 1207 (Smith 1983:70).

As part of the lexical resources of troubadour poetry in Occitan, the noun *solatz* was often present alongside *joy*, as Miruna Ghil notes:

> When the troubadours adopted the two terms in their poetry, a partial semantic leveling seems to have occurred, with the result that *joy* and *solatz* become quasi-synonymous. In the love lyric, *solatz* implies comforting of the suffering lover to be achieved through either social or private contact with the beloved. (1995:460)

While the *mester de clerecía* was a separate school of poetry, the works were written by poets who were part of a given cultural background, one that included the tradition of Occitan lyric. The following examples from late twelfth century troubadour poetry in Occitan demonstrate the semantic expressivity of *solatz* as well as its useful phonetic shape noted above. The choice of the term was affected by the meter and rhyme scheme, which is an important factor in the lexical selections of the *mester* coalition as with *asaz* and *folía*:

(49) S'anc jorn agui joi ni **solatz**
(*If ever I had joy or solace*)
(*S'anc jorn agui joi ni solatz* v. 1, Giraut de Bornelh, ca. 1173)

(50) **Solatz**, jois e chantar
Es eras oblidatz,
(*Pleasure, joys and singing are forgotten*)
(*Solatz, jois e chantar* v.1-2, Giraut de Bornelh. ca. 1175)

(51) E miels parlanz e de meillor **solatz**
E.n conois miels los pros entre.ls malvatz
(*And better at speaking and of greater pleasure and better at knowing the good from the bad*)
(*Si ja amors autre pro non tengues* v. 3-4, Raimbaut de Vaqueiras, ca. 1200)

Within this environment, it is not unusual that Ibero-Romance poets adopted an Occitan poetic term that at first signified comfort and solace as the original Latin form

did, but by the end of the twelfth century had expanded to signify pleasure and happiness and solace (Rey et al. 2012:s.v. soulas). The presence of *solaz* in *cuaderna vía* implies that it was a term that the composers of these works expected to be known and understood by the audience of *mester* works. Let us remember that the *mester de clerecía* coalition was composed of poets who studied rhetoric as part of their evident education, including the *topoi* that were part of the resources of the poet. As Porter (1986) demonstrates, a discourse community produces works that have common elements borrowed or shared among them. The writers of these works use references that will be understood by their audience and by other members of the coalition. The poetic currents of the period were strongly influenced by troubadour verse. The use of a *solaz* by Berceo makes a connection between his poems and other works of verse known to his audience texts that contained the term, such as the example below :

> (52) Comió con sus discípulos, fízolis buen **solaz**,
> de la su grant duricia encrepólos assaz;
> a toda criatura mandó predicar paz,
> ca el bien d'este mundo todo en ella yaz.
> (*He ate with his disciples, made for them a good respite, he scolded them quite a lot, to every creature he ordered peace to be taught because the good in this world all lies in it.*)
> (*Del sacrificio de la misa*, ca. 1228)

> (53) Cuando veno la noch, la ora que dormiessen,
> fizieron a los novios lecho en que yoguiessen;
> ante que entre sí ningún solaz oviessen,
> los brazos de la novia non tenién qué prisiessen.
> (*When night came, the time to sleep, the made for the bride and groom a bed in which to lie, before they could have any pleasure between them, the bride had nothing to hold onto*)
> (*Milagros de Nuestra Señora*, ca. 1246-1252)

Subsequent literary texts in prose such as the *Poridat de poridades*, *Bocados de oro* and the *Libro de los buenos proverbios* adopt the term, along with historiographical, legal, sapiential and scientific works produced by the royal scriptorium as in this example from the *General Estoria*:

> (54) & por temor de dios uiene iusticia & por la iusticia uiene compannia & de la compannia uiene fraqueza & de la franqueza uiene **solaz** & del **solaz** uiene amiztad
> (*And for fear of God comes justice and for justice comes companionship and from companionship comes sincerity and from sincerity comes solace and from solace comes friendship*)
> (*Poridat de poridades*, ca. 1250)

> (55) Et cuenta otrossi el Autor que algunos dessos dioses de los que non eran tristes mas alegres. & que querien el **solaz** del mundo.
> (*And the Author also recounts that some of the deities were not sad but happy and that they wanted the consolation and happiness of the world*)
> (*General Estoria* II, ca. 1275)

Semantically overlapping in some senses with *plazer* 'pleasure' and *gozo* 'joy, happiness', *solaz* 'pleasure', 'comfort, consolation', 'relaxation, relief' offered the poets a polysemic term already associated with troubadour verse that could be used to fit the constraints of *cuaderna vía*, like the examples with *folía* have shown, as in the example of a miracle from Berceo's *Milagros de Nuestra Señora*:

> (56) Yazié en paz el niño en media la fornaz,
> en brazos de su madre non yazrié más en paz;
> non preciava el fuego más que a un rapaz,
> ca·l fazié la Gloriosa compaña e **solaz**.
> (*The boy laid in the middle of the furnace, the fire not touching the boy because the Glorious One gave him companionship and comfort*)
> (ca. 1246-1252)

Due to the term's presence in early works of verse like the *Poema de Mio Cid* and *Vida de Santa María Egipcíaca* and subsequently in *mester de clerecía* poems, *solaz* was

adopted by the coalition as part of the poetic resources acquired through exposure to higher education and the rhetorical models of learned poetry. The form of *solaz* was adaptable to the consonant rhyme scheme required by *cuaderna vía*, which aided in its use in *mester de clerecía* works. As the writers of erudite texts in the vernacular sought to expand written Ibero-Romance's expressive capacity, the polysemic nature of *solaz* suited the content of topics shared by the *mester de clerecía* coalition. As the term spread via poetry, both *mester de clerecía* and Occitan through the troubadours, the Alfonsine coalition spread the term in numerous works that promoted their shared interest, that of translating into the vernacular didactic works that could serve as material for self-improvement.

The three terms described above*, asaz*, *folía* and *solaz,* illustrate the diffusion of terms that were used first within the discourse community of university-educated secular clerics who left us the poems and hymns written within the demanding metric and rhythmic constraints of *cuaderna vía*. These terms and others like *coraje* 'courage' and *deleite* 'delight, pleasure' appear first in *mester de clerecía* works, and do not introduce completely new concepts along with the signs, but rather offer additional lexical resources to refer to existing semantic fields in Ibero-Romance. The diffusion of all three terms corresponds with multiple characteristics of the *mester de clerecía* discourse coalition, including the expansion of the vernacular to express complex ideas like *folía* and *solaz*, the means of intercommunication both through the centers of higher learning and contact with educated or elite audience, and shared discoursal expectations like the use of the *cuaderna vía*, where the borrowings did not need adaptation to fit the rhyme

scheme, suiting one function of the *mester de clerecía* coalition, that of demonstrating the erudition of the work's creator. By choosing a term like *solaz*, the author was also making an aesthetic choice that connected his poem with popular court verse, what Porter calls the intertextuality within a discourse community (1986:35). In addition, *asaz*, *folía* and *solaz* have continued to be limited to formal uses of the modern language, which is typical of the set of Gallicisms adopted and spread through the *mester de clerecía* coalition[51], in contrast with various terms of the scriptorium coalition, as the following section details.

4.3.2 Alfonsine coalition Gallicisms

Like the *mester de clerecía* borrowings, the vast majority of tokens of each lexeme in the set spread by royal scriptorium translators and collaborators are limited to erudite text types. While many words appear first in *mester de clerecía* works, the terms included here those that are found primarily in official translations, creations and compilations authorized or directed in some way by the crown, mainly during the influential reign of Alfonso X. Below, analysis of the evidence suggests the representative characteristics of loanwords *cobarde*, *ligero*, and *lisonjar*, thereby highlighting the characteristics of the Alfonsine coalition relevant to each loanword.

13. COBARDE *adj* 'coward' < OFr. couard or OOc. coart < coe < CODA 'tail''

[51] See Appendix X for complete list of *mester de clerecía* loanwords.

The first term of the Alfonsine set of loanwords, *cobarde*, shares with the three *mester de clerecía* terms described above a diffusion limited to erudite texts. Its 88 tokens in 20 different works include literary works in prose and verse as well as those produced by the scriptorium, such as didactic texts and the large histories, *Estoria de España* and the *General Estoria*. The aspects of the coalition illustrated by *cobarde*, include the shared interest of the Alfonsine discourse coalition to express via the vernacular knowledge that aided in the betterment of the king's subjects. In this way, texts produced by the scriptorium coalition were exemplary in two senses, first in the content of the message expressed but second in the use of Ibero-Romance in translations, adaptations and creations of historiographical, legal, sapiential and scientific works. The audience for the products of the coalition could thus see in both the content of a text as well as the manner of linguistic expression of the content as a model to be imitated.

The adjective *cobarde* reflects the discoursal expectations of function and topics of the texts of this coalition, as an important term borrowed to reflect the value of military leadership and bravery with its meaning of just the opposite. In its expansion from literal meaning of 'tail' to its metaphorical sense of a fearful man who lacks the courage to stand at the frontlines of battle, the term denoted and connoted the values of the period. Its first use in Old French was in the *Chanson de Roland* (Rey et al.:s.v. queue). Given the existence in English of *coward*, from the same Old French term, the term obviously spread widely.

The particular practices of the members of a coalition may not be explicitly declared (see Fitzmaurice 2010), as previously stated. Rather the value of these

conventions and markers is seen in their maintenance and use as targets for other writers. The adoption of *cobarde* supports the function of using language in a such a way as to maintain the discourse coalition by following similar stylistic features such as vocabulary. Clearly one of the topics of Alfonsine works was the description of the ideal (noble)man. Interestingly, while *cobarde* appears in those *mester de clerecía* texts that espouse the characteristics of a military leader, that is, *Libro de Alexandre* and *Poema de Fernán González*, it is not in Berceo's works and counts more tokens in Alfonsine texts. For these reasons, the term is included among the Gallicisms of the royal scriptorium discourse coalition.

As noted, *cobarde* first appears in a *mester de clerecía* text, the *Libro de Alexandre*, highlighting the link between a lack of effort and daring with *cobarde*:

> (57) Dizen que buen esfuerço vençe mala ventura;
> meten al que bien lidia luego en escriptura;
> un día gana omne preçio que sienpre dura;
> de fablar de **covarde** ninguno non ha cura.
> (*They say that a good effort conquers bad fortune. They write later of the one who fights well. One day a man gains what lasts forever but no one has a cure for speaking of a coward.)*
> (*Libro de Alexandre* P 70a-d, ca. 1225)
>
> (58) Por esso quiso fer: estos adelantrados
> por prouar quales eran: **couardes** o osados
> ca muchos fazen poco: que mas eran nombrados
> que otros por uentura: que fazen fechos granados
> (*These precocious men wanted to prove whether they were cowardly or courageous. Many do little but they who do great deeds were more proclaimed than others for luck.)*
> (*Libro de Alexandre* O 1390a-d, c. 1225)

In some contexts, like the previously discussed *folía*, the derived form, *cobardía* 'cowardice', suits the rhyme scheme, falling at the end of the line, possibly encouraging its use due to the requirements of *cuaderna vía*, as in the example below:

> (59) Ector e Diomedes por su caualleria
> ganaron pres q*ue* fablan d ellos oy en dia
> non farian de Archilles tan l*ue*nga ledania
> sy sopiessen en *e*l alguna **couardia**
> (*For their military prowess Hector and Diomedes won honor that they speak of today that they would not do such a long litany for Achilles if they knew any cowardice in him.)*
> (*Libro de Alexandre* P 69a-d, ca. 1225)

After the *Libro de Alexandre*, *cobarde* next appears in texts of the royal scriptorium coalition, specifically the *Libro de los doce sabios*, a text composed at the initiative of Fernando III in 1237:

> (60) E los que con el reyno oviesen guerra, cobrarían osadía veyéndolo más flaco e de poco esfuerço e fortaleza, e muy de ligero podría el reyno pereçer quando non oviese cabeçera buena. como muchas vezes ayamos visto muchos reynos ser perdidos por aver rey o prínçipe o regidor **cobarde** e flaco e de paco [sic] esfuerço, e por contrario con esfuerço e fortaleza levar lo poco a lo mucho e lo menos a lo más
> (*And those who had war with the kingdom, they would get more daring, seeing it weakened and of little strength and very quickly the kingdom could perish when it did not have a good leader as many times we may have seen many kingdoms be lost due to having a cowardly, weak king or prince or ruler of little strength and in contrast with effort and strength raise little up to a lot and less to more*)
> (*Libro de los doce sabios,* ca. 1237)

As noted, one of the common interests of the Alfonsine coalition was to create exemplary texts to promote models of ideal behavior that their audience could imitate or avoid, as in the inclusion of negative models of conduct. The result was the repetition of certain ideals of what a man should be and do. A second result was the creation of a common style of writing that included the lexical options to effectively describe these models. The

writers of erudite texts in Ibero-Romance adopted a Gallic term to express the important concept of ‘coward’. A broader autochthonous term, *flaco*, includes multiple senses ‘weak; vulnerable; fragile; timid, cowardly; thin’ and thus is found much more frequently, with more than 600 tokens. Another patrimonial form, in turn, *medroso* ‘frightened; frightening’ somewhat overlaps with *cobarde* and counts over 60 tokens in 17 texts, although none in the *mester de clerecía* texts. In the didactic work *Poridat de poridades*, translated from the Arabic as example of a *speculum principis*, *cobarde*, *medroso* and *flaco* are found in the same context:

> (61) la ondeçima que sea firme en las cosas que deue fazer & que non sea **couarde** nin **medroso** de **flaca** alma & que aya el coraçon muy firme. & que ame caualleria. & lidiar batallas.
> (*The eleventh is that he stay determined in the things he ought to do and that he not be a coward or fearful of a weak soul and that he should have a firm heart and love cavalry and fighting battles.)*
> (*Poridat de poridades*, ca. 1250)

Similarly, the *Estoria de Espanna* contains a reference to a battle between the Castilian hero Fernán González and the Count of Toulouse, effectively demonstrating that a leader does not flee from battle, but rather bravely engages with his enemy to set an example for his men:

> (62) Et quando uio que el Conde fernand gonçalez le andaua uuscando. por quel non touiessen por **couarde** & **medroso** aparto se de su companna. & fueron se ferir amos ados uno por otro.
> (*And when Count Fernán González saw that he was going around looking for him, in order that they not take him for cowardly and timid, he moved away from his companions and the two went to hurt each other.)*
> (*Estoria de España* II, ca. 1270-1284)

In these two examples, the semantic overlap of the three terms is evident. *Cobarde* had the advantage of the simplicity of a single term to describe someone who lacked courage,

not being simply fearful but a combination of fear and weakness that was to be avoided and despised in a culture that exalted bravery on the battlefield and off. The members of the discourse coalition expressed their common values and assumptions through the form of didactic prose and shared lexis that repeatedly exalted the values of the courageous knight and nobleman, the primary audience of the works of the Alfonsine scriptorium. With the rise of the popular genre of literature of the *libros de caballerías* in the fourteenth century, the simplicity of a single term to designate the opposite of the brave knight who was the hero of chivalric novels aided the spread of *cobarde* into literary works like the *Libro del caballero Zifar*, was a factor in favor of its use in this genre. In addition, as books of wisdom and advice like the *Poridat de poridades* grew in popularity in the latter half of the thirteenth century and into the fourteenth[52], a term like *cobarde*, which denoted a model of what not to imitate spread. By the end of the medieval period, *cobarde* is found in additional registers of Ibero-Romance[53], including common usage in Modern Spanish in numerous text types as evidence from CORDE demonstrates.

14. LIGERO *adj* ‘quick, agile’, ‘light’, ‘easy’ < léger < *LEVIUS < LEVIS, LEVEM

Ligero is the next representative Gallicism spread via the Alfonsine coalition. The diffusion of *ligero* is notable in particular for its presence in the scientific works of the Alfonsine scriptorium, thus illustrating the discoursal expectations of the coalition that

---

[52] These include thirteenth-century texts like the *Libro de doce sabios, Bocados de oro*, *Libro de los cien capítulos*, as well fourteenth-century works like Juan Manuel's *Conde Lucanor*.

[53] In the fourteenth century, the token count is 45 in 33 different works, including historiographical, literary and scientific texts. During the fifteenth century, 154 examples of *cobarde* can be found in 84 texts, including a few notarial documents. In subsequent centuries, as the printing press makes text production and diffusion easier, there is a corresponding rise in overall word count and use in both literary and non-literary works.

created and maintained the coalition's style. The larger scriptorium itself was an institution that became one of the cultural products and essential constitutive factors that help us to define the period of Alfonso X (see Watts 1999). In other words, as the use of a particular Gallicism became a part of the lexis available to the collaborators of the scriptorium, the term was a part of the creation of the appropriate topics and form of the group[54]. The repeated use of *ligero* in the scientific works of the scriptorium suggests that this term was the preferred form to express the concepts of 'quick' or 'easy', as the Gallic equivalent signified, first documented in the *Chanson de Roland* (1080) (Rey et al. 2012:s.v. léger). The loanword is found repeatedly in works like the *Judizios de las estrellas*, *Lapidario* and *Libro del astrolabio redondo*, which were produced under the supervision of the king himself, as seen in the commissioning of a second translation of the *Libro de Açafeha* as noted above in section 4.2.3.2. Indirectly, then, the vocabulary choices formed the register and genre of thirteenth-century erudite prose in Ibero-Romance. In this way, the spread of a loanword like *ligero* to the large historiographical works points to its value as a stylistic marker of the discoursal expectations of function and form, easily recognizable by the members of the Alfonsine coalition.

Ligero demonstrates a derived noun *ligereza*, as well as the adverbial construction *ligera m(i)ente*. In combination the forms of the lexeme add up to a relatively high frequency in comparison with the other loanwords spread through discourse coalitions, with almost 700 tokens in 51 different learned texts, with a few found in *fueros*. The

---

[54] As we detail in section 4.2.3, each discourse coalition consciously or unconsciously develops particular discoursal expectations, including appropriate topics and stylistic markers such as shared vocabulary that members of a coalition recognize and include in their work.

majority of the tokens of *ligero* are from Alfonsine texts, although it is first present in the *Libro de Alexandre* and counts under 48 tokens in 7 other *mester de clerecía* works. Both the borrowed term and the native form *liviano* are limited to literary and erudite texts. The patrimonial form is seen mostly in works in verse, especially those of the *mester de clerecía*, with 44 tokens in 13 different texts. Other semantically related terms include the native partial synonym adverb *aína* 'quickly' and adjective *rabdo*, which are subsequently replaced by *rápido* (see Dworkin 2002). In spite of the fact that the first texts that contain *ligero* in Ibero-Romance are those of the *mester de clerecía*, the preferred term for the concept of 'quickly' in these works is *aína*, based on a comparison of frequencies.

The earliest examples of *ligero* are from the *mester de clerecía* works, the *Libro de Alexandre*:

> (63) So **ligera** de pies & se bien cavalgar,
> se bien tener mis armas, de ballesta tirar;
> (*I am quick on my feet and I know how to ride well, I know how to use arms and shoot a crossbow*)
> (*Libro de Alexandre* P 356a-b, ca. 1225)

In two similar uses, both the anonymous author of the *Libro de Alexandre* and Berceo in his *Vida de San Millán de la Cogolla* use the phase *voluntad ligera* in a similar sense and in the same place in their respective stanzas, demonstrating another lexical parallel between the two texts:

> (64) Non quiso nengun prazo: metios en carrera
> auie con el sabor: uoluntat **ligera**
> mas tanto quiso fazer: dessora sobrançera
> que perdio de sus yentes: muchas enna carrera
> (*He refused to pause, he got on his way. He was light-hearted; in his desire to accomplish a great feat he lost many of his people on the journey*)

(*Libro de Alexandre* O 1983a-d, ca. 1225)

(65) Entendió el sant' omne el pleit' e la manera,
fincando so blaguiello, metióse en carrera;
non quiso prender bestia, maguer qe flaco era,
avié por en tal cosa la voluntad **ligera**.
(*The sainted man understood the petition and planting his walking stick, went on his way. He refused to take a beast, although he was weak, He had from then the will for such a thing.)*
(*Vida de San Millán* 188a-d, ca. 1236-1246)

What distinguishes *ligero* both from *mester de clerecía* as well as other scriptorium Gallicisms is its broad diffusion into Alfonsine works, in various derived forms. *Ligero* becomes much more common throughout the thirteenth century as the translations of scientific and other texts from Arabic are completed by the Alfonsine translators. Other texts where the term is used frequently include various Alfonsine texts, as in these examples below, all of which contain numerous tokens of the loanword, with the majority of those in the sense of 'quick, agile' or 'easily':

(66) Que assí commo el león es más **ligero** que otra bestia en saltar e correr ayna, assí la **ligereza** de Nuestro Ssennor [sic] Ihesu Cristo non ha par
(*That just as the lion is faster than any other beast in jumping and running quickly, the quickness of our Lord Jesus Christ has no equal*)
(*Setenario,* ca. 1272-1284)

(67) significa que aura sus rentas de buena manera. & **ligera** miente.
(*It means that he will have his income in a good way and quickly*.)
(*Judizios de las estrellas,* ca. 1254-1260)

(68) Et esta es la carrera mas cierta & mas **ligera** que ombre puede auer pora saber esto.
(*This is the most correct and quickest route that a man can take in order to know this*.)
(Rabi Zag, *Libro del astrolabio redondo*, ca. 1275)

(69) Et fecho auemos tablas con que se pueden saber las horas mediannas de las reuoluciones de los annos. & los medios curssos de las planetas. & en aquel logar

> auemos escripto commo obran con ellas quando las ouiere ell omne menester. por tal de seer mas breue. et mas **ligero** de saber.
> (*And we have made tables with which the midpoint of the years can be known and the middle of the turns of the planets. And in that place we have written how they work with them when necessary such that it be brief and quick (easy) to learn*.)
> (*Cánones de Albateni*, 1279)

> (70) Dixol el Rey En esto non quiero yo que me seas tu mandada ca **ligera** cosa es.
> (*The king said to him, in this I do not want you ordered to me because it is a trivial thing*.)
> (*General Estoria* II, ca. 1275)

Ligero represents a diffusion of a learned Gallicism by the Alfonsine coalition beyond the *mester de clerecía* works where it is first found. Analysis of the available evidence points to a high degree of institutionalization of the written discourse as well as the common goals and interests. These common interests include, as previously noted, the use of Romance to transmit knowledge that was previously unavailable to Ibero-Romance speakers. In her description of the body of Alfonsine works of prose, Fernández Ordóñez writes,

> El empleo del castellano en este vasto conjunto de obras prosísticas contribuyó sin duda, a la fijación de sus usos lingüísticos, esto es, a su codificación. No sólo porque tuvo que ejercitarse en materias antes siempre reservadas al latín o al árabe, tarea en la que a menudo se tuvo que decidir entre varias soluciones posibles, sino sobre todo porque se propuso como modelo de lengua escrita en esas áreas de conocimiento [...] (2005:398-399)

The derived form *ligereza* as well as its frequent adverbial use in constructions like *ligera miente* show integration into the educated register of Ibero-Romance. Although the lexeme counts tokens in *mester de clerecía* works, its presence throughout many of the scientific and historiographical works of the Alfonsine scriptorium point to its broad

acceptance as a lexical item appropriate to learned works, exemplifying the shared discoursal, topical and stylistic expectations of the Alfonsine coalition.

15. **LISONJAR** *v* ‘to praise’, ‘to flatter’ < OOc. lauzenjar < Late Latin LAUDEMIUM, deriv. of LAUDARE.

The verb *lisonjar*[55] is another term adopted from Occitan troubadour lyric that was often performed at the courts of wealthy nobility as well as the monarchy as the source for the loanword. The key aspects of the discourse coalition that the verb *lisonjar* illustrate include the adaptation and spread of vocabulary taken from this popular poetry to suit the discoursal expectations the Alfonsine collaborators. The use of a similar style, including vocabulary, supported the coalition’s goal of expressing in exemplary Romance, topics and models worthy of imitation. This ties back to the idea of the intertextuality within a discourse community (Porter 1986:35). That is, the conventions of the writing produced by coalition members reflects common pieces of other texts, which in the case of *lisonjar* is a reference to troubadour poetry as well as the concept of flattery. Knowledge of the work by Occitan troubadours likely influenced the adoption of the verb *lisonjar* and the noun *lisonjero* in Iberia given the forms *lauzenjar* and *lauzengier* ‘flatterer’ in use in Old Occitan. A subsequent derived noun, *lisonja*, is also found.

Lisonjar is notable for its early appearances in works in verse, including the poem fragment *Disputa del alma y el cuerpo*, where *solaz* is first seen as well:

[55] The alternate forms *lossenia* and *losenjar* point to the original adaptation to Ibero-Romance. Corominas and Pascual (1980-1991:s.v. lisonja) propose an intermediate form *_losinja_, showing the effect of the adjacent palatal on /e/, before metathesis of /i/ and /o/ resulted in the modern form *lisonja*.

(71) o son los pala[fres] que los quendes ie los res
te solien dar por to **loseniar**?
(*Where are the palfeys that the kings used to give you in order to praise you*?)
(*Disputa del alma y el cuerpo*, ca. 1200)

After this use, however, there is little evidence that suggests diffusion via poetic texts of the *mester de clerecía*, except for a single token in the *Libro de Alexandre*:

(72) Saben esto los dioses que **lisonja** non digo
non presçio contra vos todo lo al vn figo
que ante fallesce rregno que non el buen amjgo
uj amigos non ha pobre es e mendigo
(*The gods know that I do not flatter. I do not devalue you. A kingdom will fail you before a good friend. A poor man is he who has no friends*)
(*Libro de Alexandre* P 927a-d, ca. 1225)

While not part of the lexicon frequent in *mester de clerecía* works, *lisonjar* counts 65 tokens in 21 different erudite works, mainly Alfonsine, but also literary works from the later thirteenth century like the *Libro del caballero Zifar* and *Calila and Dimna*, as in the following examples:

(73) & sepas que el mostramiento de la bien querençia del omne flaco tienelo por **lossenia** & el mostramiento del grant omne tienelo por omildança & por alteza.
(*And know that the demonstration of the good desire the weak man takes for flattery and the great man takes for humility and nobility*.)
(*Poridat de poridades*, ca. 1250)

(74) No cuydes que te quiero fablar a **losenia**. mas dezirte lo que me descubrieron los dioses.
(*Do not worry that I want to flatter you but to tell you what the gods divulged to me*.)
(*Estoria de España* I, ca. 1270)

(75) Ca los omnes de cansada natura ablándanse sus coraçones con lo que oyen dezir a sus enemigos de **lisonja** o de omildat
(*Because the men of reduced character become soft with what flattery or humility they hear said of their enemies*)
(*Calila e Dimna*, ca. 1251)

(76) Cata no me respondas con **lisonja** o con otra arte, cuidando así escapar de

mí, ca más sé de quanto tú piensas.
(*Take care that you do not respond to me with flattery or other cunning, taking care in this way to escape from me, because I know a lot more of you than you think*.)
(*Libro del caballero Zifar*, ca. 1300)

The following excerpts present examples of the frequent polysyndetic technique of Alfonsine writers who, as part of their goal to establish their texts' authority, employed the coordinating conjunction 'y' in order to create a cohesive text as well as emphasize the strength of their argument through the quantity of evidence.

(77) E esta se faze por palabras de **losenia** & de escarnio. & de remedijos. & cae mas en los ioglares. & en los remedadores que en los otros omnes.
(*And this is done by words of flattery and derision and mockery and is found more in jongleurs and jesters than in other men*.)
(*Primera Partida*, 1256-1263)

(78) ca si de otra guisa le fablasse en ello. serie y **losengero**. & que la **losenia** serie con mentira. & la mentira con peccado.
(*Because if he were to speak about it in any other way, he would be a flatterer and that flattery would be a like a lie and a lie a sin*.)
(*General Estoria* IV, ca. 1280)

As the above examples show, *lisonjar* and its variants contain a negative nuance. It has been established that one of the shared interests of the Alfonsine discourse coalition was to provide advice on self-improvement and how to lead an exemplary life, particularly to an audience of nobles. One of the behaviors to recognize and shun was flattery or false praise, thus suggesting the utility of the term to writers of the period given the generally positive associations with other terms in the same semantic field like *loor* and *loa/loar*, as well as *alabanza*/*alabar*.

(79) sepas que te quiere bien. & ques **loa** de ti. & que te es uerdadero. & que te faz buena fama.

(*Know that he loves you, that it is in praise of you, he is true to you and he works for your good reputation*.)

(*Judizios de las estrellas*, ca. 1254-1260)

(80) respusol el. Mio sennor Rey. loado a dios e acabado todo quanto tu quesist de guisa quet plazra mucho
(*He responded to him "Praise God I have finished everthing that you wanted in such a way that will please you"*)

(*General Estoria* IV, ca. 1280)

(81) a grand onrra e a grand **loor** de toda Espanna
(*To the great honor and praise of all of Spain*)

(León, 1270)

(82) Si ante fuera buena fue después muy mejor,
plazié el su servicio a Dios Nuestro Señor,
los pueblos de la tierra faziénli grant honor,
salié a luengas tierras la su buena **loor**.
(*If before she was good, after she was even better. Her service pleased our lord God. The peoples of the earth did her great honor. Praise of her went to distant lands*.)

(*Poema de Santa Oria*, ca. 1252-1257)

While *loor* and *loa* are used exclusively for the positive side of praise and most commonly in relation to the praise of God, *alabanza* is the broader term to denote praise or adulation, either postive or negative. In contrast, *lisonjar* is most often presented in context of praise's negative aspect, that of flattery. Given the shared interest of the Alfonsine coalition to use texts to teach by providing information on how to set an example for his subjects and successors, it is clear how the term *lisonjar* could be useful for the recognition and avoidance of false praise. In this way the diffusion of *lisonjar* into Alfonsine prose provides additional support that the shared goals and interests of the coalition were a factor in the adoption and use of vocabulary to refer to topics like flattery, relevant in particular to an audience of nobles and in general for the edification of all of thirteenth-century Iberian society.

4.4 Conclusion

The terms that illustrate the Alfonsine coalition, *cobarde*, *ligero* and *lisonjar*, along with others not described in detail here like *desdén* 'disdain, contempt', and *truhán* 'rogue', demonstrate several features of this coalition, including their common use in royal scriptorium and other erudite texts of the later thirteenth century. Two main shared interests can be seen. One was to make knowledge available to a broad audience, thereby educating the texts' audience. The second interest, related to the first was to create a written register of Romance at the same level of erudition and culture that Latin possessed, a process that included the addition of vocabulary through borrowing to denote complex concepts like cowardice and flattery. To this end, the members of the coalition followed similar discoursal expectations of form and topics, including stylistic markers that were identifiable to other members. Some stylistic factors contained references to other genres like troubadour poetry, including lexical traces, to use Porter's (1986) term to refer to intertextual elements that contribute to the constitution of a style of writing or genre.

Using loanwords from Gallo-Romance such as those above was both a technique to expand the lexicon of erudite Ibero-Romance as well as proof of the user's education, given our assumption of contact with centers of higher learning, for both the Alfonsine coalition and the *mester de clerecía* group of poets. It is possible to assume this based on the skillful adaptation and manipulation of sources in Latin and other languages to create each coalition's respective works that included Gallicisms. By following the discoursal expectations of the coalition, a writer was showing his association with said group,

including the use of the appropriate topics and form, which provided content that supported the desired function of texts and the employment of similar vocabulary like borrowings.

Much like the connections between texts that can be seen today in contemporary discourse communities (e.g., academic articles), the writers of the learned texts of thirteenth century Iberia were following the norms of their respective coalition. In the case of the *mester de clerecía*, the form to follow was *cuaderna vía* and the topics to write about promoted Christian values and the value of education, not surprising considering the coalition likely began at centers of higher learning like the nascent Iberian universities of the period. For the Alfonsine coalition, the norms were also clear and established what is labeled today Alfonsine prose. The examination of the documentation suggests that the discoursal expectations of both groups involved lexical items limited (at least in the period of study) to set of some 70 erudite texts and not included in less polished genres like notarial documents.

In this way, the evidence gathered demonstrates that the discourse coalition model can successfully shed light on the patterns of diffusion of thirteenth century Gallicisms in Ibero-Romance. The coalition model does not require the close, personal contact as required by the social networks discussed in the previous chapter. Instead, the features of a coalition include shared interests like the promotion of the vernacular as a written language of culture, erudition and didacticism by providing models of behavior either to emulate or avoid. The discoursal expectations of the texts of each respective coalition is additional evidence of the utility of the application of this linguistic construct to historical

evidence. The *mester de clerecía* coalition followed the *cuaderna vía* model of verse, with its particular meter, rhythm and rhyme scheme, while one signature of the Alfonsine coalition was its breadth of topics, including historiographical, legal, religious, sapiential and scientific. Gallicisms were useful to both coalition as writers sought to express their ideas following the appropriate topics in the expected coalition manner. The diffusion of loanwords like *asaz*, *cobarde*, *folía*, *ligero*, *lisonjar* and *solaz*, is illuminated by the discourse coalition model, thus providing evidence of the process and result of lexical borrowing in the historical circumstances of erudite texts and writers of thirteenth-century Iberia.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS

This study began with reflecting on the fact that the presence of Gallicisms in Spanish has been noted by language historians for well over a century. Some were prescriptivists who wanted to keep the Spanish language "pure" to later linguists who sought to catalogue the origins of the lexicon, such as those items borrowed from Gallo-Romance varieties like French, Occitan, and Gascon. Although there is extensive bibliography on the diachronic changes in phonology, morphology, and syntax in Spanish, along with works that contain sociolinguistic theories of language change (e.g. Gimeno Menéndez 1995, Penny 2000, Tuten 2003), lexical change in Spanish has been less studied from the perspective of the language users (Dworkin 2005).

Modern linguistic investigation has shown that variation and change is a part of language at every level, with the lexicon being no exception. It has been the intention of this study to examine from an integrated perspective the presence and influence of Gallo-Romance speakers and the borrowings adopted from their languages by users of Ibero-Romance through the analysis of an expanded corpus of lexical data that previous studies did not survey. By reconsidering the process and result of borrowing from Gallo-Romance in light of the latest in sociolinguistic theory on lexical change and diffusion, this investigation offers a view of the history of the lexicon on Spanish in general and on Gallicisms in particular that takes into account the way individuals interacted.

Chapter two detailed how the previous studies briefly reviewed here on approached borrowing in Old Spanish from different perspectives, such as descriptive

(see De Forest 1916), historical (see Lapesa 1948 [1984], 1960, 1980, 1984), etymological (see Corominas and Pascual 1980-91) or semantic (see Colón 1967a, 1967b and Pottier 1967). What none of these studies had done was to integrate all of these, nor did they offer any theoretical explanation of these linguistic innovations based on the evidence available. The goal in chapter two then was to specify the features of the integrated borrowing model. After a review of the relevant literature from contemporary synchronic linguists that offer a theoretical foundation that can be readily applied, the study has proposed a model that includes information on the effects of frequency, word class and semantics of loanwords as well as the demographic and geographical information on the macro-social networks that likely influenced the language contact between speakers, whether direct through everyday personal connections or indirect through contacts with written texts. In addition, the advantages and limitations of using the *Corpus diacrónico del español* database of the Spanish Royal Academy are detailed, including the benefit of its use by providing the lexical data from a vast body of texts produced in the period of study. The inclusion of this database greatly expands the number of source texts upon which the conclusions can be drawn, and has allowed us to seek and find patterns of use of the loanwords in different types of texts, produced for distinct purposes and audiences, based on both geographical and text types in which the terms are found. In this way, analysis of the evidence has highlighted two main means of penetration of the loanwords, via direct means through face-to-face contact or through indirect channels through discourse coalitions.

Chapter three applied the proposed integrated theoretical model of borrowing to the first of these channels through which *galicismos* spread, labeled Phase I. This set of Gallicisms was spread through person-to-person or oral contact through the creation of loose-knit social ties. A social networks analysis of the data available has highlighted how speakers of Gallo-Romance interacted with those of Ibero-Romance, which offers an explanation of how the words came to be a part of the lexicon of Ibero-Romance. By incorporating a networks approach in the study's analysis, three macro-social networks, ecclesiastic, military and commercial, are identified.

The evidence collected suggests that among ecclesiastics it was the men in the middle of the hierarchy who were involved in the spread of loanwords (see Lenker 2000). This is because their networks overlapped with those of the many Gallic bishops and abbots as well as the lower clergy who were either Iberians or who had direct contact with Ibero-Romance speaking parishioners. Three terms illustrated the macro-social networks in existence that affected lexical borrowing in the period, *capiscol*/*chantre* and *maestre* for ecclesiastical networks, but as can be seen in the Appendix, other terms like *capellán* 'chaplain', *deán* 'deacon' and *hereje* 'heretical' were spread via these networks as well.

For military networks, the data point to the existence of loose-knit networks of soldiers who fought in reconquest battles, with Gallo-Romance speaking soldiers having contact with their Ibero-Romance speakers, including perhaps other soldiers as well merchants selling them supplies. These ties from the military relationships that were established resulted in the spread of terms like *adobar*, *batalla* and *mensaje*, along with

forms found in the Appendix like *dardo* 'dart', *homenaje* 'homage, tribute', *linaje* 'lineage'. The integrated model also suggests semantics as an additional influence (see Ullmann 1962) for the adoption of a term like *batalla*, which had partial synonyms in Ibero-Romance, as speakers of the time adopted additional lexical resources to refer to common semantic fields in a place and period when armed conflict and battles were so frequent.

Finally, chapter three detailed a third set of Gallicisms that spread via loose-knit networks created through commercial ties, illustrated by *garnacha*, *gris* and *hostal*(*aje*). Other loanwords of this set of networks are found in the Appendix, such as *joya* 'jewel', *merchante* 'merchant' and *portage* 'toll'. The diffusion patterns seen followed the east-west trajectory of the Camino de Santiago, which by the twelfth century had become an important commercial route as well as a path of religious devotion. Commercial *galicismos* also spread along the north-south routes of repopulation of territory regained from the Muslims, following the growth of cities like Salamanca, Zamora, Cáceres and Jérez. As Hernández-Campoy (2003) has demonstrated, transportation patterns affect linguistic innovations spread between different communities. The argument here is that the established patterns of commercial contact between these cities, through their markets and annual fairs, allowed loose, uniplex social ties to promote the spread of Gallic terminology to refer to luxury goods like a *garnacha* into Ibero-Romance.

The integrated model that includes an analysis of the ties between speakers of both Gallo-Romance and Ibero-Romance better explains how the terms came to be adopted and spread into Ibero-Romance. Rather than relying on just historical

information, etymology or cultural explanations of Gallic influence to justify the adoption of Gallicisms, the integrated model includes the theoretical discoveries of the effects of social networks on our language use. We have argued that the model permits the corroboration of the historical evidence available on the Gallic presence in the Iberian Peninsula in the eleventh through the thirteenth centuries with patterns of diffusion of Phase I terms seen in the textual evidence. These patterns also relate to the macro-social networks of each of the groups involved in the adoption of the three main sets of Phase I *galicismos*. Additionally, the investigation effectively demonstrates that while the ecclesiastic and commercial *galicismos* refer to new concepts or objects that were previously unknown in Iberia, the integrated model also suggests why borrowings occurred in semantic fields that already existed in Ibero-Romance, as seen with the terms borrowed through contact with military networks. The study also has discussed the influence of semantics in the adoption of the loanwords of this investigation and their subsequent integration into Ibero-Romance in both chapters three and four, along with the relevant details on the social factors of the integrated model. These include the terms' diatopic and diastratic distribution, otherwise absent from previous investigations.

Chapter four discussed the second main route of diffusion of the loanwords studied here, what we have designated Phase II. The diffusion of this group of Gallicisms is notable for the influence of educated individuals in the adoption and spread of learned terms via writing, through particular social networks of individuals known as discourse coalitions (see Fitzmaurice 2000, 2010, Porter 1986, Swales 1988, Watts, 1998). A coalition defines itself in its shared goals, form, topics and style, as well as sharing a

means of intercommunication. The integrated model permits the study of borrowing from an updated perspective that includes modern linguistic theory and models like the discourse coalition construct, which offers a better means of explaining the patterns of diffusion of loanwords in contexts where no direct contacts can be established, yet the language used by different individuals has much in common, including the lexicon.

The present investigation's application of the coalition concept is innovative in the study of loanwords in Ibero-Romance, but one that is well-supported by the data available. The evidence suggests that two coalitions were responsible for the adoption of 38 *galicismos* of the total examined in this investigation, the majority of which remain in the learned register of the modern language. Both the *mester de clerecía* and the Alfonsine coalitions shared an interest in using the vernacular for works aimed at an elite, if not literate in Latin, audience. In addition, through their writing, the members of the two coalitions manifested their erudition and connection with centers of higher learning like the universities at Palencia, Salamanca and Valladolid, among others, even if indirectly given the lack of data on the individuals of each coalition.

The first coalition described, the *mester de clerecía* writers, demonstrated their shared interest in following the strict form of *cuaderna vía* verse as well as similar topics that promoted Christian orthodoxy like the sacraments, as the canons of the Fourth Lateran Council instructed. This group of men employed similar language like Gallicisms *asaz*, *folía* and *solaz* as well as additional *mester de clerecía* coalition loanwords as described in the Appendix such as *coraje* 'courage', *emplear* 'employ' and *tacha* 'stain'. Their texts were likely aimed at an elite, educated audience, whose language would have

been associated with erudite works, thereby limiting their reach, given the limited access to education. This helps to explain why most terms have not become more widespread in the modern language, as the terms were associated with a learned register of the language encountered through education, especially at centers of higher learning.

The second coalition studied consisted of the collaborators on the considerable body of Alfonsine works, comprising historiographical, legal, religious, sapiential and scientific texts. These men, too, were keen to exhibit their knowledge of their source documents and basis for their creations anchored in the authorities of the past. The texts this discourse community produced were sponsored and commissioned by King Alfonso X himself, thereby endowing the works with additional authority. The topics of these works demonstrate shared concerns and values that Alfonso wanted to emphasize as he sought to provide his primary audience of noblemen with appropriate models of behavior and knowledge. The topics and values they promoted were supported by the lexical choices of the Alfonsine coalition, including terms chosen to illustrate this coalition *cobarde*, *ligero* and *lisonjar*. While Ibero-Romance had existing terms to refer to certain aspects of a coward, it lacked a single term to designate a individual whose lack of valor was not to be imitated, thus the borrowing model's inclusion of the semantic content and relationship of a borrowing to terms already in use in the adopting language is useful to understanding the use of *cobarde* in Ibero-Romance. In turn, the coalition concept helps us to understand how this term came to have many more tokens in the Alfonsine coalition, given their shared goal of teaching their audience and promoting the actions of the ideal knight and subject. Other loanwords spread through this discourse community

that similarly reinforce the group's common interest are seen in the Appendix, such as *desdén* 'disdain', *esgremir* 'to fence' and *truhán* 'rogue, knave'.

The aspects of the integrated model that proposed here offer additional avenues of research, starting first with further investigation of individual lexemes here. While there are 84 lexemes in the investigation's Appendix, due to limitations of space and, in some cases, sufficient data, we have discussed in detail only 15 terms. One obvious area of future research is to examine in additional detail the diffusion of these terms, like ecclesiastic terms *capiscol* and *chantre*. The data analyzed for the present study are inconclusive, but suggestive. Perhaps additional data will confirm that the tokens of *chantre* in Leonese texts are due to the fact that there were indeed more clerics from what is today northern France who settled in León as the notarial documents from this region indicate. It is also interesting to note the number of military and political Gallicisms that were also borrowed by English speakers, including battle, dart, coward and lineage. Given the military conquest and occupation of England by the Normans starting in the eleventh century has some parallels with the types of social network connections and contacts we see in Iberia, an investigation of these English terms using the borrowing model proposed here may shed additional light on this aspect of the lexical development of English.

The distribution of synonyms is particularly relevant to borrowing studies because one question that arises is why terms that have synonyms in the recipient language are adopted. Through the investigation of the social and historical context of the time and place, as indicated in the proposed model, we better understand the integration of

Gallicisms in Ibero-Romance that had native terms that were partially synonymous, as in *batalla*, borrowed first through military and political social networks, or *cobarde*, a term spread through the Alfonsine coalition. This aspect of the integrated borrowing model can be further developed for each of the Gallicisms of the present study that had indigenous (partial) synonyms beyond the terms used as illustrations in this study, such as *cuita* and *enojar*.

Similarly, there is additional evidence to be discovered by studying in more detail the possibility of multiple coalitions at work in the scriptorium of Alfonso X. The discourse coalition construct as studied by Fitzmaurice (2000, 2010) looked at a very specific period (four years) and periodical (*The Spectator*), while the period of textual production by the collaborators of Alfonso X covers over thirty years and numerous types of texts (see chapter four). While there are clear similarities in terms of discoursal expectations, shared goals and other features of a coalition as the study has revealed, it is likely that there are sub-coalitions, so to speak, within the larger community of Alfonsine collaborators. Among other questions are what effect does of the type of writing have on the demonstration of shared coalition features (e.g., legal, scientific, etc.)? What can we learn about the nature of the discourse coalitions of the period by investigating further the individuals known to have participated in the production of the Alfonsine texts? Although the works produced in this period are well-studied, what can the discourse coalition approach tell us about features of thirteenth-century texts like extreme apocope. Purely phonological explanations fail to account for why the phenomenon lasted longer in the erudite works of the thirteenth century, as Lapesa (1975), Harris-Northall (1991:37) and

Tuten (2003:160-173) have noted. Lapesa (1951, 1975) suggested that extreme apocope was influenced by the presence of Gallic immigrants along the Camino de Santiago, but his explanation does not line up with the chronology, given the period of direct influence was in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, as the study here has noted. Rather than view the existence of extreme apocope in learned works of the thirteenth-century as direct borrowing, the coalition concept as described here is one possible factor. The fact that the phenomenon is seen in this period primarily in erudite texts suggests that it may have been a discursive marker that other coalition members recognized and employed. This is in an intriguing avenue of future study.

Another area of research suggested by the model is to continue expanding the corpus of texts in which Gallicisms are found. Many manuscripts that would be valuable in the study of lexical change and variation are not found in the large electronic databases like CORDE and thus not easily searched. For reasons of keeping this project to a manageable size, this investigation is based on the information accessible in CORDE, but with the recognition that many twelfth- and thirteenth-century texts are unedited and that the list of 84 Gallicisms is not conclusive. Even as more lexical data are made available, the model offers an adaptable approach to study the effects of language contact, either direct or indirect, as seen in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Iberia.

Just as the larger sociocultural context of Gallo-Romance speakers in contact with those of Ibero-Romance helps us to understand the patterns of diffusion and the semantic fields likely to be sources of loanwords, the model enhances our understanding of other situations of contact that resulted in borrowing. Ibero-Romance of the twelfth and

thirteenth centuries was clearly influenced by Gallo-Romance, but contact between speakers of Arabic and those of Ibero-Romance was another key source of lexical borrowings in the development of the lexicon of Ibero-Romance. What can the model described here reveal about the adoption and spread of *arabismos*? Does the evidence suggest similar effects of population movement and communication routes that affected the spread of Gallicisms in the data on the patterns of diffusion of *arabismos*? What semantic fields saw the greatest borrowing and why?

Given that we have demonstrated the utility of the integrated borrowing model as applied to the lexical situation of the Iberian Peninsula of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, there are various possibilities for areas of future research. One is to apply the model to subsequent periods of borrowing in Spanish. For example, the recent study of the Gallicisms in the Spanish of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by Varela Merino (2009) is impressive in its scope, but does not include detailed information on the linguistic and social factors that affected the adoption and spread of the borrowings. Were they borrowed via personal or indirect contacts? What role did frequency and semantics play in their use? Are there discernible patterns of use, depending on the types of texts in which the loanwords appear?

The lexicon of a language is continually evolving, thus another possible area of future research suggested by the study of linguistic and social factors related to loanwords is to examine those Gallicisms that disappeared from the lexicon and the circumstances that affected both their adoption and subsequent loss. What can we learn from studying the a loanword like *honta* ʽshame'? This *galicismo* is found in various

thirteenth-century texts such as the *Libro de Alexandre*, but disappears by the end of the fifteenth century. The analysis of terms in light of the model used here will provide a new perspective on the circumstances that led to lexical losses of borrowings and semantic changes that loanwords underwent over time.

This investigation has argued throughout that a language contact phenomenon like borrowing requires an approach that views the loanwords in question as linguistic signs that join and therefore affect a larger lexical system, but also views these terms in light of the people who used them. Languages only come into contact through their users, thus the study of borrowing necessitates an examination of the relationships between and among these language users. What the model proposes is an effective integration of those factors and what the evidence gathered has demonstrated is that its application to the data available on the loanwords from Gallo-Romance in the Ibero-Romance of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries sheds light on the linguistic situation in existence in this period that resulted in the adoption and spread of the 84 Gallicisms studied here.

Appendix: List of twelfth- and thirteenth-century Gallicisms

Below is the alphabetical list of all *galicismos* studied as part of this project, based on the terms identified by Colón (1967a, 1967b), Lapesa (1980) and Pottier (1967) that are still in use in the modern language and for which CORDE provides information. Each lexeme includes its etymology that the above scholars as well as Corominas and Pascual (1980-1991) provide. Each lexeme also demonstrates its token count as well as the number of texts in which a form of the term appears, followed by the relevant network of adoption and diffusion, based on the evidence gathered, including text types and points of origin in which tokens are found. The names of the networks are abbreviated as follows: Alfonsine (ALF), commercial (COM), ecclesiastic (ECC), military and political (MIL), and *mester de clerecía* (MC). Finally, an example in context is provided for each loanword.

While the study includes a token count for each lemma in CORDE, as already noted, this study does not include a statistical analysis of type or token frequency (see Bybee and Hopper 2001 for an overview on frequency effects on language change). A loanword with tokens in a variety of text types indicates widespread diffusion into multiple registers of Ibero-Romance. The numbers provided below are meant to give an indication of the term's degree of diffusion into Ibero-Romance, but due to the limitations of the CORDE database there is no empirical study of frequency. This is due to the fact that there is no overall word count by century such that the appearance of the forms in question could be compared with the number of words used in texts of that century.

Additionally, with well-known works like the *mester de clerecía* texts, CORDE has only one edition for each. As noted previously, one important example is the *Libro de Alexandre*, which has a complex manuscript history, with slightly different versions of the same basic work. This can affect the number of forms and tokens of the Gallicisms studied here. Due to the size of the project, I have chosen to base the raw frequency numbers on CORDE. Finally, the model detailed here has a greater emphasis on the social or external factors involved in the adoption and diffusion of Gallicisms of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, rather than linguistic or internal factors like frequency. Therefore, an in-depth study of frequency is an area for future study for borrowing, given the findings of Bybee (2006) and others (see Bod 1998; Phillips 2001; Pierrehumbert 2001) that frequency of structures affects cognitive representation.

In terms of patterns of spelling, there is a discernible regional orthography in only a few cases, as in *batalla*, where *bataílla*/*bataylla* are the preferred spellings in Navarra versus *batalla* elsewhere. Additionally, with the texts of produced by the royal chancery as well as the Alfonsine scriptorium, the names of the composers and collaborators are known in some cases (e.g. *Libro de la açafeha*) while anonymous in others (e.g. *General Estoria*). This impedes analysis of the geographical distribution of the different orthographic variants it is in many cases not known who worked on these texts and therefore where they were from or were trained. For most terms, there is simply not enough data to justify this additional level of analysis, so for this reason it is not included in the present study.

In some cases, the phonological shape of a term makes it clear that it is a loanword, that is the expected central Ibero-Romance development is not seen (e.g., *asaz* < AD SATIS demonstrates a word-final affricate, while the expected central Ibero-Romance form would have been **assades*). In addition to the existence of the form in a Gallo-Romance variety (Old Occitan) and the fact that its shape points to a Gallic origin, social factors also support its inclusion on the list of *galicismos*, as the evidence presented in chapter four suggests.

In other cases, the determination has to be made based on a combination of all of the linguistic and social factors related to the term in question. This analysis in light of all of the factors of the integrated model the study has proposed has led to the words listed in the Appendix. So while a term like *bel* or *maestre* could be a native development based on their phonological shape, the combination of factors points to their being loanwords.

1. adobar *v* ‘to prepare; to repair’ < OFr. adober ‘to knight’ < Frankish *dubban ‘to push’, ‘to hit’
(274 / 83) MIL

adobado, adobe, adobo, adopar

Et si por uentura cayese paret o uiga o canales, que los sennores lo fagan **adobar**; & todo lo al reteiiar & tablar que lo faga Johannes Mathe.
(Castilla, 1200)

2. albergar *v* ‘to shelter’ < OOc. albergar < OFr. arbergar < OFr. habergier < Germanic or Gothic *haribergôn or *haribairgo
(298 / 47) ECC

albergada, albergar, albergaria, albergo, albergue, alberguería, alberguería, aluergada, aluergar, aluerguería, alvergar, alverge

don Andres, fiio de Garci Lopez conf.; don Pedro de la **albergaria** conf.; Pedro Zomozano conf.; Dominicus Pelaz, presbiter conf.; don Assensio presbiter conf.
(León 1235)

3. ardid *adj* ‘brave, daring, intrepid’ < OCat. ardit and OFr. hardi < Frankish *hardjan ‘to harden’
(161 / 29) ALF

ardid, ardido, ardidez, ardideza, ardiment, ardimente, ardimento, ardit, faldrido, fardido, hardiment, hardit, jardid, jardido, jardit

& non sabien qual era la sapiencia & qual la uertud & la ardidez. & el atreuimiento en tal corpezuelo como aquel.
(*General Estoria* IV, ca. 1280)

4. asaz *adv* ‘very; quite’ < OOc. assatz < AD SATIS
(391 / 46) MC

asaç, assaç, asaz, assaz, assatz

Fue en pocos de años la casa arreada,
de lavor, de ganados, **asaz** bien aguisada,
ya trobavan en ella los mesquinos posada;
por él fue, Deo gracias, la eglesia sagrada.
(*Vida de Santo Domingo*, ca.1236)

5. baile[56] *nm* 'magistrate, judge' < Oc. baile ' judge' < BAJULUS 'porter'
(283 / 14) MIL

baile, baille, bailía, bayle, baylle, baylia, baylía, bayllia

Et uinnador o **baille** que sea de conceyllo deue descobrir en cuya uinna es el daynno, et el seinnor que cobre lo suyo, et el conceyllo su coto; et tales **bailes** deun meter el alcalde et el conceillo et assi deuen iurar los **bayles**.

(*Fueros de la Novenera*, ca. 1150)

6. baldón *nm* 'insult, affront' < OFr. bandon < Frankish bann 'jurisdiction, command'
(11 / 8) MC

abaldonar, baldon, baldón, baldonadamientre, baldonar

Era esti burgés de muy grand corazón,
por sobir en grand precio fazié grand missïón;
espendié sos averes, dávalos en **baldón**,
quiquier que li pidiesse él non dizrié de non.

(*Milagros de Nuestra Señora*, ca. 1246-1252)

7. batalla *nf* 'battle' < OOc. batalha < BATTUALIA 'skirmish'
(3116 / 60) MIL

bataia, batala, batalia, bataílla, batala, batalia, batalla, bataylla, batayla, batallero, batallador, batallant, batalloso

En aquella **batalla** fo perdido el rei Rodrigo, e no lo troboron ni muerto ni biuo

(*Liber Regum*, 1194-1211)

8. batel *nm* 'boat' < OFr. batel < OEngl. bât
(41 / 14) ALF

batel, bateles, batelles

E por fazer su semeiança de recebir bien & onrada mientre a ponpeyo en su uenida. & quel plazie mucho con el; mandoles que subiessen en un **batel** & saliessen a el dentro a la mar o uinie en su naue.

(*Estoria de España* I, ca. 1270)

9. brebaje *nm* 'beverage' < OFr. beverage < BĬBĔRE
(10 / 5) COM

---

[56] Word limited to regional use in both the period of study as well as Modern Spanish.

bebraie, bebraje, beurage, bevrage, vrebaje *nm*

Enpero, si aqueill **beurage** non fuere dado de los seynnores moradores d'aqueillos logares, aqueillos pastores podrán dont quisiere dar agoa ad aqueill su guanado
(*Vidal Mayor*, ca. 1250)

10. bel *adj* 'beautiful' < OOc. bel < BELLUS
(59 / 20) MC

bel, beldad, beldat, beltad, beltat

Fallo en vn **bel** canpo la gente de su natura
que tenje cada σepultorio de suso su escriptura
do jaçie σoterrada la gente de su natura
que diçje cadavno quj fuera σu mestura
(*Libro de Alexandre* P[57] 313a-d, ca. 1225)

11. bloca *nf* 'metal decoration on a shield' < OFr. boucle < BUCCULA, diminutive of BUCCA 'cheek'
(7 / 6) MIL

bocla, bloca

Et que non pongades en escudo nenguna **bocla** sinon de cobre dorada o argentada o pintada.
(Castilla, 1252)

12. calonge *nm* 'canon' < OOc. canonge < Late Latin CANONICUS
(92 / 47) ECC

calonge, calongia, canonge, canongia, canonie

Sobre esto pendraron e moujeron pleito, e fueron ante don Diago; & iugo don Diago que eitassen sortes los **canonges**, e a equi cadisse la suert, che iurasse sobre la quatuor euangelia que non aujen derectura sobre a chel molino de moleo auer ninguno; e cadio la suert de la jura a don Adam el **calonge**
(Castilla, 1199)

[57] As we have noted earlier, the ms P dates from the fifteenth century and features more characteristics of Aragonese, while ms O is a fourteenth century copy with Leonese features. Where the two differ, we cite the ms that demonstrates the term in question, but we will date them the same.

13. canciller *nm* ‘chancellor’ < OFr. chancelier < CANCELLARIUS ‘caretaker’, ‘scribe’
(388 / 199) ECC

canceler, cançeler, cançeller, chanceler, chanceller, chançeller, chancelleria, chançelleria, chanciller, chançiller

Regnante el rey don Fernando cum su mulier donna Iuanna et con su madre donna Berengella, reynas en Castilla et en Leon; mayordomo mayor Roy Goncalvez; merino mayor en Castilla don Martin Goncalvez de Milancas et merino mayor en Leon don Garci Royz Camota; **chanceler** del rey en Castilla et en Leon don Iohan obispo de Burgos, obispo de Palencia don Tello, obispo de Camora don Petro Bueno.
(Castilla, 1242)

14. capellán *nm* ‘chaplain’ < OOc. capelan < CAPELLANUS
(379 / 242) ECC

capeillan, capelan, capelán, capelano, capellan, capellán, capellano, capeyllan

El **capellan** de conçeio seal dado por gualardon de su seruiçio, un moro, et al notario otroquesi, siel la hueste fueren. Ca ni el **capellan** ni el notario no deuen auer ninguna cosa dela hueste, si non fueren alla.
(*Fuero de Zorita de los Canes*, ca. 1218-1250)

15. capiscol *nm* ‘cantor, precentor’ < OOc. capiscol < CAPUT SCHOLAE
(20 / 18) ECC

capischol, capiscol

Facta carta mense iulii, era M.a CC.a XLVII.a, regnante rege Aldefonso cum uxore sua regina Alienor Burgis & in Toleto & in Chastella & in omni regno suo. Unde sunt testes: archidiaconus Matheus; el **capiscol** Gonzaluo Martinet; maestro Melendo, el sacristano; Martinus Andree; Diago Carro; Iohan de Gamonar; Iohan Escriuano; maestro Rodrigo; Peidro Francho, el alcalde; Ferrant Martinez; Iohan Yaguez; Mathe de las Canales. Helias scripsit.
(Castilla, 1209)

16. capitel *nm* ‘capital’ < OFr. chapitel or OOc. capitel < CAPĬTĔLLUM
(15 / 12) ECC

capitel, chapitel

Item mando a mío sennor el bispo don Martín Fernández porque lo axé leal escontra mí e porque me gardó que non fos morrer a León, de sobrel Ródano, el mío vasso de plata dorado de **chapiteles**. (León, 1274)

17. cascabel *nm* ‘bell’ < OOc. cascavel < diminutive of *CASCABUS’ ‘cowbell’
(25 / 14) COM

cascauel, cascavel

E que non trayades **cascaveles** en ninguna cosa sinon en sonages o en aves o en coberturas pora bofordar e que non fagades sennales en las coberturas con **cascaveles**
(Castilla, 1252)

18. cebellina *nf* ‘sable’ < Fr. zibeline < OFr. sebelin < Rus. sobolj and Germ. zobel
(4 / 3) COM

cembelina, cembellina

De la **cembelina**, II dineros.
(*Fuero de Sepúlveda*, 1295)

19. chantre *nm* ‘cantor, precentor’ < Fr. chantre < CANTOR
(100 / 66) ECC

chantre

Testes de canonigos: el **chantre** Maestre Pasqual, el dayan Pedro Arias, maestrescuela Iohan Arias, don Velasco, Martin de San Çalvador, don Felipe, Gonçalvo Pelaiz, Iohan Iohannis, Garcia Martinez, Petro de San Polo, don Wilelmo, Dominico Martin Petit, don Garcia capelan.
(Salamanca, 1232)

20. cobarde *adj* ‘cowardly, timid, fearful’ < OFr couard or OOc. coart < coe < CAUDA ‘tail'
(88 / 20) ALF

cobarde, couarde, couardia, covarde, covardo

[L]a ondeçima que sea firme en las cosas que deue fazer & que non sea **couarde** nin medroso de flaca alma & que aya el coraçon muy firme. & que ame caualleria. & lidiar batallas.
(*Poridat de poridades*, 1250)

21. coraje *nm* ‘courage’, ‘ire’ < OFr. corage < OFr. quor, cuer, coer < COR, CORDIS ‘heart (both anatomical and metaphorical)’
(13 / 5) MC

corage, coraje

Enuiol Espanna: offereçer uassallage
enuiaronle parias: un poco de linnage
que auie d esta manera: el rey grant **corage**
tomoles poca renda: ca fazien omenage
(*Libro de Alexandre* O 2357a-d, ca. 1225)

22. cuita *nf* 'trouble, worry, grief, sorrow' < OOc. coitar < *COCTARE
(945 / 184) MIL

acoitar, acuitar, coita, coyta, cueta, cueita, cueyta, cuita, cuitar, cuytar

Ie se per aventura vir el convento que no lo pode dar por **coita** ie por tempestat non io demanden, ie ela nuestra eredat fique sana ie quita, ne vendan ne empeñen.
(León, 1227)

23. dama *nf* 'lady' < Fr. dame < DŎMĬNA
(3 / 3) MIL

dama

Connosçuda cosa sea a todos los omnes que son cumo a los que son por uenir, que yo don Johan Symon, el fijo de don Symon, de mi buena uoluntad, sin entredicho ninguno, uendo & robro a uos dona Sancha, abbadessa del monesterio de Burgos qual diçen sancta Maria la Real, & a todo uuestro conuiento toda quanta heredad fue de don Symon mio padre, quel cayo por fuert de sue madre **dama** Jullana en Arcos, en mont i en ual i en fuent, solares poblados & por poblar
(Castilla, 1226)

24. danza *nf* 'dance' < OFr. dancier < unknown
(19 / 14) ALF

dança, dançar

E de si fizo uenir estrumentos de muchas maneras & tanner los antel Rey & fazer **danças** & quirolas.
(*Gran Conquista de Ultramar*, 1293)

25. dardo *nm* 'dart' < OFr. dard < Frankish *darod
(129 / 43) MIL

dardo

El peon, otrosy, que lança & **dardo** o porra non leuare non prenda nada.
(*Fuero de Úbeda*, ca. 1251-1285)

26. deán *nm* 'dean' < OFr. deiien < DECANUS
(451 / 192) ECC

dayan, dayán, dean, deán

Est es el yuicio che dio el archipreste don Diago de Frias & domnus Iohanis el carpentero, hermano del **dean** de Burgos, por mandado del rey don Alfonso de Chastiella, de los molinos de Sancta Maria
(Castilla, 1209)

27. deleite *nm* 'delight, pleasure' < Oc. deleitar < DELECTARE
(89 / 19) MC

delect, delecte, deleit, deleite, delectare, deleitar, deleycte, deleyt, deleyte, deleyto, deleytar

Andauan en sus buscas: en un rico logar
fallo los sus palaçios: do el solie morar
tal era su costumbre: ally solie folgar
la sazon que querie: su cuerpo **deleytar**
(Libro de Alexandre O 1955a-d, ca. 1225)

28. derranchar *v* 'to stand out, move out of line, be rash' < OFr. desrangier 'step out of line' < Frankish HRĬNG

(17 / 6) ALF

derranche, derrange, derranchar, derraniar, derranjar, derranchadamente, derranchadamientre

Et por ende dezimos que el que en tal lugar **derranjare** que ffaze aleue conesçida Et ssi ffuere rrico omne pierda Amor del Rey & quanto troxiere en aquella hueste & ssea echado del rregno Et esto dezimos por que podrien tantos yr con el que ffarie la hueste derraniar & podrie sseer que sse perderie y tal omne por que el Rey rreçeberie grant danno & que sse enbargarie todo ssu ffecho.
(*Espéculo*, ca. 1255)

29. desdén *nm* 'disdain, contempt' < OOc. desdenh or OCat. desdeny < deriv. of DEDĬGNARI 'to disdain

(102 / 25) ALF

desden, desdén, desdeyn, desdennar, desdeñar

La otra manera en que deue el Rey sseer onrrado es esta que quando ssu rrazon dixiere que ge la oyan bien ffasta en cabo. & que paren bien mjentes en lo que dixiere que non ge lo destoruen njn ge lo enbarguen de njnguna guisa njn ge lo tornen a escarnjo njn a **desden** por ffecho njn por ssemeiante njn por otra manera qual quier.
(*Espéculo*, ca. 1255)

30. desmayar *v* ‘to falter, lose heart’ < OFr. esmaiier ‘to disturb’, ‘to frighten’ ‘to dismay’ < *EXMAGARE ‘to take away strength, forces ’
(114 / 19) MC

desmayo, desmayar

Dario por esso todo: non quiso **desmayar**
el uno que meior pudo: encobrio su pesar
dixo rafez se suele: la uentura camiar
ca por uarones suelen: tales cosas passar
(*Libro de Alexandre* O 782a-d, ca. 1225)

31. doncel *nm* ‘young nobleman, squire, page’ < DOMINICILLUS, -UM ‘young lord’
(67 / 14) ALF

doncel, donçel, donzel

El **donzel** que fue atreuudo en tomar se con edippo & uaraiar con ell & llamar le sin padre & sin madre; conturuiol el coraçon & metiol en grant cuedado & ouo muy grant tristeza & grant pesar por quel dixieran como non era fijo del rey Polibio.
(*General Estoria* II, ca. 1275)

32. duque *nm* ‘duke’ < Fr. duc ‘duke’ < DUX, DUCIS ‘leader’
(266 / 22) MIL

duc, duque

Testigos quj uieron & oieron esta cosa: Gonçaluo Pedrez, el **duc**
(Castilla, 1223)

33. emplear *v* ‘to use, employ’ < Old French *empleiier* < IMPLICARE ‘involve, complicate’, ‘dedicate someone to an activity’
(24 / 14) MC

emplear, enplear, enpleyar

Fueron ellos sue vía sos logares veer,
Millán vendió la bestia, no la qiso tener;
fue luego **empleado** en pobres el aver,
en coxos e en mancos qe lo avién mester.
(*Vida de Santa Millán*, ca. 1230)

34. enojar *v* ‘to anger, upset, bother’ < Old Occitan *enojar* ‘to bore, to irritate, to bother’ < *INODIARE ‘inspire horror or disgust’
(204 / 42) MC

enoiar, enoio, enogo, enojar, enojo, enoyar, enoyo

Grand serié la materia por en ambos fablar,
serié grand reguncerio, podriévos **enojar**;
tornemos en Laurencio la su passión contar,
a lo que prometiemos pensemos de tornar.
(*Martirio de San Lorenzo*, before 1264)

35. escote *nm* ‘portion of an expense shared by a group’ < OFr. escot < Frankish SKOT
(17 / 8) COM

escotar, escote

[L]a quoal cosa ha loguar en las otras cosas uezinables, en quoales se quiere **escotes**, es assaber que aqueillos qui usan d’aqueillas cosas por las quoales tales escotes se fazen, escoten en aqueillas mismas cosas
(*Vidal Mayor*, ca. 1250)

36. esgremir *v* ‘to fence’ < OFr. escremir < Frankish *skermjan
(5 / 3) ALF

esgremir, esgremidor, esgrimir, esgrimidor

E los otros que se ffazen de pie. son assi como **esgremir**. luchar. correr. saltar. echar piedra o dardo. ferir la pellota. & otros iuegos de muchas naturas en que usan los omnes los miembros porque sean por ello mas rezios & recibam alegria
(*Libro de ajedrez, dados y tablas*, 1283)

37. folía *nf* ‘folly, act of insanity’ OOc. folia, fol < FŎLLIS ‘bag, sack’, ‘empty head’
(77 / 16) MC

fol, folia, folía, follia, follía

Tan bien sopo la duenya su cosa aguisar,
que sabìa a su amo la ganançia tornar;
rayendo & gabando con el su buen catar,
sópose, maguer ninya, de **follía** quitar.
(*Libro de Apolonio*, ca. 1240)

38. fraile *nm* ‘monk, friar’ < Oc. fraire ‘brother’ < FRATER
(484 / 145) ECC

fraile, frayle, fraire, ffrayre, frayre, freyle, freyre

damos aqueste dado por fuero, por redemption de los captiuos & por redemir los, e i por propria salut del ospital de los captiuos, el coal don Tello Periç e don Pero Gutierriç dieron a Dios et alos **freyres** de la caualleria de Sanctiague.
(Castilla, 1184)

39. garzón *nm* ‘young man; youth of ill repute’ < OFr. garçon ‘porter’ < possibly Frankish *WRAKJO
(31 / 13) MC

garçon, garçón, garçonear, garçonia, garçonía, garzón

Fazién otro escarnio essa gent’ renegada:
vendávanli los ojos, que non vidiese nada;
dávanli los **garzones** quisque su pescuzada,
dizién: “Adruna, Christo, quí te dio la colpada.”
(*El duelo de la Virgen*, ca. 1236)

40. garnacha *nf* ‘cloak’ < OOc. ga(r)nacha < probable GAUNACA ‘furry cloak’
(25 / 19) COM

garnacha

Mando ela mia **garnacha** a un clerigo que carte por mia alma qual uiren por bien estos que ffican en mia manda, e ella mia ssaya ha otro clerigo.
(León, 1244)

41. granja *nf* ‘farm’ < Fr. grange *nf* < *GRANICA *adj* < GRANUM *nm* ‘grain’
(13 / 11) ECC

grancha, grania, granja

Mando vos que guardedes e que defendades al mio monesterio de Fitero e a sus **granjas** e a sus vassallos e a todas sus cosas, en guisa que non reçiban tuerto nin fuerça nin demas de omnes de Navarra nin de otros ningunos nin de vos mismos
(Castilla, 1270)

42. gris *adj* 'grey' < OOc. gris < Germanic *GRIS 'grey'
(6 / 6) COM

grisa

E assacaron otrossí las muchas maneras de peñas **grisas** e veras, blancas e otras con que afortaleciessen los paños e se vistiessen más apuestamente e a mayor pro.
(*General Estoria* I, ca. 1275)

43. hereje *adj* 'heretical' < OOc. eretge < HAERĔTĬCUS
(203 / 41) ECC

erege, eregia, eregía, ereie, ereje, erejía, herege, heregia, heregía hereie, hereje

Todo omme que clamare a otro periurado. o gaho. o nombre uedado. peche. i. morabetino quil dixiere **herege**. o cornudo. peche. x. maravedis si prouadol fuere. si no salues con ij. bezinos.
(*Fuero de Brihuega*, 1242)

44. homenaje *nm* 'homage, tribute' < OOc. omenatge 'homage, tribute' < ome 'sense of vassal' *HOMĬNATICUS
(310 / 74) MIL

homenage, homenaje, omenage, omenaje, omenaie

E mandamos a don Johan de Avoin e a Pedro Eanes, su fijo, e a cada uno dellos, que entreguen a vos, o a quien vos mandardes, todos los castiellos del Algarve de que nos fizieron **omenage** por razon de la sobredicha ayuda e de las posturas que eran entre nos e vos e vuestros fijos por razon del Algarve
(Castilla, 1267)

45. hostal *nm* 'guesthouse, inn' < OOc. ostal 'guesthouse, inn' < HOSPĬTALE 'guest room'
(89 / 29) COM

hostalage, hostalaie, hostelage, hostalero, ostal, ostalage, ostalaie, ostalajes, ostelage, ostalero

Coñocida cosa seya a los que son e serán que yo don Domingo, filio de dona Justa de

Arrojo, concamio la mio terra que es carrera de Ledigus, de prima pars Rodrigo Gonzálvet, de la segunda Pedro Martínet el Fardido, de la tercera terra del **Hostal**. Esta terra concamio yo con don García el **hostalero** de Sant Fagund por un cornejal de la ferrén del **hostal** que es en Media Villa

(Castilla, 1232)

46. jengibre *nm* ‘ginger’ < OOc. gingibre < ZINGĬBER, -IBĚRIS
(63 / 13) COM

Regaliz nin çumac nin flor de cardon nin **gengibre** nin girofle nin canela nin espic nin cardemoni nin çafran njn nuez de yxarca nin nuez moscada njn citoal nin almastic nin garengal nin soli nin açucar nin nengun letuario confido nin nenguna especia, si no es pebre o comino, otra non deue dar peaie.

(*Aranceles de aduanas*, Cantabria, 1295)

gengibre, gingibre

47. jornada *nf* ‘day’s journey; working day’ < Oc. jornada < jorn < DIURNUS ‘daylight hours’
(142 / 25) MIL

iornada, jornada

Et las carreras seran tales, al cavallero .iiii. soldos de pepiones cada dia et al peon .ii. soldos; et estos dias sean tantos quantas **jornadas** oviere del logar dont viene el querelloso fata o yo fuere, de ida e de venida.

(Castilla, 1252)

48. joya *nf* ‘jewel, gem’ < OFr. joyau (pl.) < OFr. joel < *JOCALIS
(48 / 18) COM

joya, ioya

La tercera heredat deue lexar a sos fillos en que partan los muebles. & el marido muerto deuen seer partidos entre la madre & sos fillos. en esta manera. que la madre deue auer sos uestidos. & sos **ioyas**.

(*Fueros de Aragón*, 1247)

49. laido *adj* ‘ugly’, ‘ignominious’ < OOc. lait, -da < Frankish *LAID
(31 / 14) ALF

laido, laideza, laydo, layda, laydeza

Et si pora uentura se aiuntaren & fizieren fijos, el sennor del sieruo deue auer el sieruo & sus fijos por sieruos; & si el sieruo fuere muy **laydo** o muy uil & la mugier fuere otra tal, el sennor del sieruo deue dar tanto a la mugier libre quanto ualier el sieruo

(*Fuero Juzgo*, ca. 1250-1260)

50. ligero *adj* ‘light, swift, agile; easy; of little weight or importance’< OFr. léger < *LEVIARIUS ‘light’ ‘swift’
(696 / 51) ALF

liger, ligera, ligero, ligerament, ligeramente, ligeramiente, ligeramientre, ligereza, lijera
Mas Mars & Saturno uerifican la muerte. & la fazen uenir ayna. si fueren significadores en esta cosa. & mayor mient Mars. porque es liuiano & **ligero**. & toda muerte subitana & ayna fecha.

(*Judizios de las estrellas*, 1254-1270)

51. linaje *nm* ‘lineage’ < OOc. linhatge or OCat. llinyatge < derived from LINĔA ‘line’, ‘thread’
(2652 / 259) MIL

linage, linaie, linaje, linnage, liñage, linnaie, llinnage

E nos el abat don Cebrian & todo el conuent de la Uid, por amor de Dios & por amor de uos don Pedro & por el pro che uos & uuestro **linaie** fiziestes en la casa de la Uid & seredes, otorgamos esto todo che a qui es escripto. E si algun onne de **linaie** de don Pedro o de otro, esto che aqui es puesto quisiere chebrantar, sea maleito & descomulgado & con Iudas traidor en infierno, & peche .ccc. marchos de plata al rej de la tierra

(Castilla, 1214)

52. lisonjar *v* ‘to praise’, ‘to flatter’ < OOc. lauzenjar < Late Latin LAUDEMIUM, deriv. of LAUDARE
(65 / 21) ALF

lesongear, lesongea, lessonia, lisongear, lisonja, lissonja, loseniar, losenia, losenja, losenjar, lossenia

nin por miedo nin por **lesonja** de señor nin de amigo nin de otro omne ninguno nin de su grado, ca todas estas cosas que vos avemos contadas solién aorar los omnes por yerros de muchas maneras que cuedavan en sos coraçones en razón de Dios.

(*General Estoria* I, ca. 1275)

53. maestre *nm* ‘master (title)’ < OOc. maestre < MAGĬSTER
(2230 / 420) ECC

maestre, mestre

Isti fuerunt presentes et viderunt quando dominus Arnaldus misit decanum, in loco capituli, in illas domos, et decanus eiecit eum foras, el dean, el chantre, Petro Estevan, Iohannes Cardenal, don Vicent, Migad Iohannes ts., Petro Pelaez, Dominico Nuno, Dominico Tierno, Iohannes **maestre** et suo filio Dominico Iohannes.

(León, 1190)

54. malla *nf* 'chainmail' < Fr. maille < MACŬLA
(8 / 7) MIL

malla, maylla, mailla, mailladura

Pues quando frago Salomon la casa, **maylla** ni segur ni nulla ferramienta no y fue oyuda * en la casa del Criador.

(*La Fazienda de Ultramar*, ca. 1200)

55. manjar *nm* 'food' < OOc. OCat. *manjar* 'to eat' < MANDICARE, a variant of MANDUCARE 'to chew'
(106 / 25) ALF

maniar, manjar

Non quieras seer tragon en todo **maniar** nin te sueltes sobre toda uianda. ca en muchos comeres uerna la enfermedad. & llegarse a la glotonia fasta la colera.

(*General Estoria* IV, ca. 1280)

56. mástel, mástil *nm* 'mast, supporting post' (through influence of *árbol*) < maste < OFr. maste < Frankish mast
(16 / 7) ALF

mast, mastel

Et quando se parte de somo del **mastel** de la naue sera dicho arcofilax.

(*General Estoria* V, ca. 1284)

57. mecha *nf* 'wick' < OFr. mèche < *MECCA
(11 / 6) ALF

mecha

E si no, sofúmenlas con lana que aya color de lilio cárdeno e que sea untada con azeyt, o tomen de la sal pedres e muélanlo e métanlo en una **mecha** de lana, e después métangela por el fondón

(*Libro de los animales que cazan*, 1250)

58. mensaje *nm* 'message, messenger' < OOc. *messatge* OFr. *message* 'message' < derived from *mes* 'mensajero' < MISSUS
(340 / 50) MIL

mensage, mensagero, mensageria, mensagería, mensaie, mensaiero, mensaieria, mensaje, mensajero, mensajería, menssage, menssageria, menssagero, menssaie, menssaieria, menssaje, mesage, mesageria, mesagería, mesaiero, messaie, messaieria, message, messageria, messagería, messagero

Si alguno delos andadores el **mensage** de conceio, o del iuez, o delos alcaldes mal metiere en todo el termino, peche V marauedis alos alcaldes et al querelloso.
(*Fuero de Zorita de los Canes*, ca. 1218-1250)

59. merchante *nm* 'merchant' < OFr. marcheant, marchedant < *MERCATANTE
(98 / 32) COM

merchan, merchant, merchante, merchandia, merchandía

Qui presentes fuerunt: don Aparicio, clerigo de Caruayossa. Pedro Cibrianez, custurero. Don Martino, **merchan** de la madera del Mercadiello.
(León, 1259)

60. mesón *nm* 'house', 'inn' < Fr. maison 'house' < MANSIO, -ŌNIS
(11 / 10) ECC

meson, mesón

Et esta heredad assi la damos que det della el decimo cada anno alos fraires, & por atal pleto que depues de suos dial que la heredad qual quela trobaren los fraires, con suas semnadas & con sos baruechos, & con ganado silo ouiere, que todo sea dela **meson** deSalua terra. (Castilla, 1203)

61. monje *nm* 'monk' < OOc. monge < V. Lat. MONĬCUS < MONĂCHUS
(531 / 180) ECC

monge, monie, monje

Mas uos compliendo las conuenientias deuant ditas, ningun abbat ni **monge** de Yrach non aya poder de toller uos las deuant ditas heredades
(Navarra, 1231)

62. orgullo *nm* 'pride' < Cat. orgull < Frankish *ŬRGOLI 'excellence'
(91 / 42) ALF

argullo, argulloso, orgullo, orgullia, orgullía, orgullosa, orgullosamientre, orgulloso

Esta a tal uertud que el que la trae consigo fazel seer atreuudo & **orgulloso**; & uencedor de batallas & de lides.
(*Lapidario*, 1250)

63. parlar *v* ‘to speak’ < Oc. parlar < PARABOLARI
(4 / 2) ALF

parlar, parlamento

E dize mas vergilio que mucho deuen escusar los prinçipes cantos desonestos & degarconia njn gestos de malas mugeres njn **parlamentos** disolutos & mal conpuestos
(*Castigos*, 1293)

64. peaje *nm* ‘toll’ < Oc. peage **<** *PEDATICUM
(72 / 13) COM

peage, peagear, peaie, peaje

Et qui ua por el camino dreito nin fué demandado del peagero, et non dió el peage et traye cosas de que deue | **peagear**, es assaber si lieua oro o plata o otra moneda, seda o çafrán, pimienta o otras espetias, quito es el mercadero pagando la trentena part, et otrosí, si lieua otras mercadvras, pagando el **peage** doble, quito es el mercadero.
(*Vidal Mayor,* 1250)

65. pelitre *nm* ‘variety of white flower whose root in powder form has medicinal or insecticidal uses’ < OOc. pelitre < PYRĔTHRUM
(20 / 3) COM

pelitre

E quando ouieren menester de camiar lo que tienen, conuiene que les fagan tragar quanto un auellana d’açúcar o de miel de panares; e si con esto non pudieren camiar, tráyanles el paladar con poluos de pebre luengo, o de **pelitre**, o de habarraz, mezclados con açúcar; e non ge lo trayan mucho, ca echarién quanto touiessen dentro en los cuerpos
(*Libro de los animales que cazan*, 1250)

66. pitanza *nf* ‘daily ration’ < OFr. pitance < Late Latin pietantia < deriv. of *pietare < PIETAS
(101 / 47) ECC

pitança, pitancia, pitançia, pitanza

Empeçól’ a lidiar muy denodadament’,
qebrantar las adarves por llegar a la gent’,
darlis mala **pitança**, non sabroso present’,
qual merecié tal pueblo tan desobedïent’.
(*Vida de San Millán*, ca. 1230)

67. portaje *nm* ‘toll’ < OOc. portage < PORTATICUM
(13 / 10) COM

portage, portaje

Omne ninguno non robe mercadero ni romero. si nuyll ome robare mercadero qui **portage** done al rey. o a romeo los otros lauradores deuen peytar el cabdal & amigadura o nouena.
(*Fuero General de Navarra*, ca. 1250-1300)

68. prez *nm* ‘honor, glory’ < OOc pretz ‘valor’ < PRĔTĬUM
(296 / 46) MC

preç, prez, despreç, desprez

Non recuden las cosas todas a un logar,
deve aver el omne grand seso en lidiar;
si non, podra aina un grand yerro tomar,
podrie todo el grand **prez** por y lo astragar.
(*Poema de Fernán González*, ca. 1250)

69. preste *nm* ‘priest’ < OFr. prestre < PRESBYTER
(469 / 159) ECC

arciprest, arcipreste, arçiprest, arçipreste, prest, preste, prestre

et han de dezir cadanno todos los clerigos **prestes** del cabillo de Avila sendas missas
(Castilla, 1259)

70. ribaldo *nm* ‘rascal, scoundrel, knave’ < OFr. ribalt, derived from riber ‘to frolic’
(147 / 3) ALF

ribaldo, rivaldo

Después que fué ssu omne, commo era grant **ribaldo** traidor, nunca le tovo fé nin verdat. Ante pensava commo levaría della los paños.
(*Otas de Roma*, ca. 1300-1325)

71. rima *nf* ‘consonance, rhyme; poem’ < OOc rima < rim < RHYTHMU
(10 / 7) MC

rima, rimado

Los nomnes son revueltos, graves de acordar,
no los podemos todos en **rimas** acoplar,
más vos quiero la cosa planamientre contar,
qe prender grand trabajo e el corso damnar.
(*Vida de San Millán*, ca. 1230)

72. ruiseñor *nm* ‘nightingale’ < OOc. rossinhol < *LUSCINIOLUS, diminutive of LUSCINIA
(8 / 7) MC

roseñor, rossinnol, rosseñoles, roseñor, rossinol, royssennol, rreyseñor, rruyseñores
Et la Jnfannt Philomena diz que mayor mientre en **royssennol**. aue que mora en las seluas & en las matas. & que da a entender por y de cuemo fue Philomena. (*General Estoria* II, ca. 1275)

73. solaz *nm* ‘comfort, relief, rest, relaxation, solace’ < OOc. solatz ‘pleasure’ < SOLACIUM ‘comfort’
(232 / 34) MC

solaç, solaçar, solatz, solaz, solazar

Semejar m’yé, señores, si a todos vos plaz,
el antiguo cordero que fincasse en paz;
tornemos al nüevo, todo nuestro **solaz**,
ca todo el provecho a nós en Él nos yaz.
(*Del sacrificio de la misa*, ca. 1228-1246)

74. sones[58] *nm* ‘sounds, tones, melodies’ < OOc son < SŎNU
(39 / 15) MC

sones, sonos

Pero han y muchas e todas muy bonjellas
cadavno a su puerta tres o quatro çestillas

---

[58] The nature of CORDE’s search function means that the distinction between homonyms *son* (3rd pers. pl of *ser* 'to be') and the noun must be counted manually by reading each example. Thus the singular form *son* was not counted given the thousands of tokens of the verb.

quando empieçan sus **sones** a fer las aueçillas
las madres a los fijos olujdarien por ellas
(*Libro de Alexandre* P 1478a-d, ca. 1225)

75. tacha *nf* 'stain, defect' < OFr. tache < *TACCA 'stain, blemish'
(102 / 19) MC

tacha, taga, tagia

Dízeli: «Hosta pura, sancta, non manzellada»,
ca fue tal Jhesu Christo: no l fallecïó nada,
puro fue sin pecado, sancto, cosa provada,
nin tacha nin manziella no fue en Él fallada.
(*Del sacrificio de la misa*, ca. 1228)

76. trobar[1] *v* 'to find' **trobar**[2] 'to sing, to compose' < OOc. trobar 'to find' <
*TROPARE, a variant of CONTROPARE 'to speak figuratively'

trobar[1]
MIL (98 / 32)

trobar, trovar, trouo, trobador

é se el testamento fur **trobado** verdadero, non aya nengunt juizio sobre el testamento
(León, 1250)
trobar[2]
(9 / 6) ALF

Era muy sabidor de caçar toda caça; otrosí de jugar tablas e ascaques e otros juegos
buenos de muchas maneras e pagándose de omnes cantadores e sabiéndolo él ffazer; et
otrosí pagándose de omnes de corte que ssabían bien de **trobar** e cantar, e de joglares que
ssopiesen bien tocar estrumentos;
(*Setenario*, ca. 1272-1284)

77. truhán *nm* 'rogue, knave' < OFr. truant < Gaulish *trugant < Irish trogan 'unhappy,
miserable'
(25 / 4) ALF

trufán, trufanes, truffanes, truhán, trufería

e a los lisonjeros que a la verdad niegan sus derechos; * e a los **truhanes** e juglares e
alvardanes * en sus tienpos e logares conbenientes fazer alguna graçia e merçed, porque
devido es al prínçipe de entremeter a sus cordiales pensamientos algund entremitimiento
de plazer.

(*Libro de los doce sabios*, ca. 1237)

78. ufana[59] *nf* 'arrogance, vanity' < OOc. ufana *nf* 'arrogance, conceit', 'ostentation' < possibly Germanic ufjô, ufjôn *nf* 'excess'
(21 / 10) ALF

ufana, ufanía, hufana, huffana, ufanero, ufano, uffanero

& fallo a sos enemigos que uinien con grant orgullo. & con grant **hufana** assi que non dennaua sus azes ordenar & enbaratosse con ellos.
(*Gran Conquista de Ultramar*, 1293)

79. usaje *nm* 'use, custom' < OOc. usatge or OFr. usage < USUS
(18 / 6) ALF

usage, usaje

Vinieron al logar do era la mugier e adobo Sanpson grant comer. Fyzo prendio com era **usage**, e levo consigo .xxx. conpanneros e dixoles Sampson: "Adevinadme una razon estos .vii. dias, e darvos é .xxx. pares de vestiduras, e sinon, datmelas vos a my".
(*La Fazienda de Ultramar*, ca. 1200)

80. vasallaje *nm* 'vassalage, fealty' < OOc. vassallatge < deriv. VASSALUM
(20 / 10) MIL

vasalage, vasallage, vasallaie, vasallaje, vassallage, vassallaje

Enbiaronle de Marruecos vn yelmo natural
en el yelmo escripto **vasallage** leal
que el rey Alixandre non cobdiçiaua al
σinon el σeñorio con poca de σeñal
(*Libro de Alexandre* P 2483a-d, ca. 1225)

81. vergel *nm* 'orchard', 'garden, green place' < OOc. vergier < VIRIDARIUM
(27 / 16) MC

uergel, vergel

Grado a la Gloriosa, que es de gracia plena,
fuera só de lazerio, essido só de pena;
caí en dulz **vergel**, cerca de dulz colmena,

---

[59] In Modern Spanish, *ufano/a* is an adjective 'vain, arrogant', based on the more common *lozano*. The derived noun form is *ufanía*.

do nuncua veré mengua de yantar nin de cena.
(*Milagros de Nuestra Señora*, ca. 1246-1252)

82. viaje *nm* ‘trip, journey’ < OOc. or OCat. *viatge* ‘journey, trip’ < VIATĬCUM
(13 / 9) MIL

uiage, viage, viaje

& fuesse luego el Romero querrellar al alcall julgo quel jurasse sobre su **viage** quanto auya menos & que gelo diesse. Et ouo apechar los dineros gil buhon quantos el Romero tomo sobre su **viage**.
(*Fuero de Burgos*, ca. 1290)

83. vianda *nf* ‘provisions, supplies’ < Fr. *viande* ‘food’ < *VIVĔNDA ‘household goods’
(692 / 59) MIL

uianda, vianda, vjanda

Et entontz es dito el seynor desemparar a su omne quoando lo ita de su casa el li tueille su **vianda** et nin recibe su seruitio d’eill.
(*Vidal Mayor*, ca. 1250)

84. vihuela *nf* ‘vihuela, stringed instrument similar to a guitar’ < OOc. viola < uncertain origin, possibly onomatopoetic
(22 / 8) MC

vihuela, vihuella, viola, violero, viuela

Et seyendo en somo de la torre echaua sus pedrezuellas de somo della a fondon & yendo dando de canto en canto fazien son cuemo de farpa o de **viuela**. & auie ella ende grant sabor.
(*General Estoria* II, ca. 1275)

Bibliography

Aguadé Nieto, Santiago. 1994. Las universidades y la formación intelectual del clero castellano en la Edad Media. In Santiago Aguadé Nieto (ed.), *Universidad, cultura y sociedad en la Edad Media*, 159-206. Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá de Henares.

Alarcos Llorach, Emilio. 1992. La lengua de las obras de Berceo. In Isabel Uría Maqua (ed.), *Gonzalo de Berceo: Obra completa*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe/Gobierno de La Rioja. 13-27.

Alvar, Manuel (ed.) 1967. *Enciclopedia lingüística hispánica,* 2 vols. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Alvar, Manuel 1970-72. *Vida de Santa María Egipcíaca: Estudios, vocabulario, edición de los textos* (2 vols.) Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Ancos, Pablo. 2012. *Transmisión y recepción primarias de la poesía del mester de clerecía*. Valencia: Universitat de València.

Barcala Muñoz, Andrés. 1985. Las universidades españolas durante la Edad Media. *Anuario de estudios medievales* 15:83-126.

Barraqué, Jean-Pierre. 2001. Béarn et Aragón aux XIe et XIIe siècles. In Philippe Sénac (ed.), *Aquitaine - Espagne (VIIIe - XIIIe siècle)*, 175-188. Poitiers: Université de Poitiers.

Bergs, Alexander T. 2000. Social networks in pre-1500 Britain: Problems, prospects, examples. *European Journal of English Studies* 4:239-252.

Bergs, Alexander T. 2005. *Social networks and historical sociolinguistics: Studies in morphosyntactic variation in the Paston Letters* (1421-1503). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bishko, Charles. 1961. *Spanish and Portuguese Monastic History 600-1300* http://libro.uca.edu/monastic/monastic8.htm. (January 23, 2014).

Bishko, Charles. 1980. Fernando I and the Origins of the Leonese-Castilian Alliance with Cluny. *Studies in Medieval Spanish Frontier History*. http://libro.uca.edu/frontier/spanfrontier.htm. (January 23, 2014).

Bod, Rens. 1998. *Beyond grammar: An experienced-based theory of language.* Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Boissevain, Jeremy. 1974. *Friends of friends: Networks, manipulators and coalitions*. New York: St. Martin's.

Bornelh, Giraut de. Solatz, joi e jantar. http://www.trobar.org/troubadours/giraut_de_bornelh/poem63.php. (October 30, 2013).

Bornelh, Giraut de. S'anc jorn agui joi ni solatz. http://www.trobar.org/troubadours/giraut_de_bornelh/poem76.php. (October 30, 2013).

Bravo Lozano, Millán. 1989. *Guía del peregrino medieval: Codex Calixtinus*. Santiago: Centro de Estudios del Camino de Santiago.

Britain, David. 2002. Space and Spatial Diffusion. In J. K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill, and Natalie Schilling-Estes (eds.), *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, 603-637. Oxford: Blackwell.

Brunot, Ferdinand. 1928. *Les mots témoins de l'histoire*. Paris: Firmin-Didot.

Burns, Robert I. (ed.) 1990. *Emperor of culture: Alfonso X the Learned of Castile and his thirteenth-century renaissance*. Philadelphia:University of Pennsylvania.

Bybee, Joan and Paul Hopper (eds.) 2001. *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bybee, Joan. 2006. From usage to grammar: The mind's response to repetition. *Language* 82:711-733.

Bybee, Joan. 2010. *Language, usage and cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Calvet, Louis-Jean. 2005. *Lingüística y colonialismo: Breve tratado de glotofagia*, trans. by Luciano Padilla López. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura y Economía.

Cañas, Jesús (ed.) 1988. *Libro de Alexandre*. Madrid: Cátedra.

Cárdenas, Anthony J. 1990. Alfonso's scriptorium and chancery: Role of the prologue in bonding the *translatio studii* to the *translatio potestatis*. In Robert I. Burns (ed.), *Emperor of culture: Alfonso X the Learned of Castile and his thirteenth-century renaissance,* 90-108, 232-239. Philadelphia:University of Pennsylvania.

Casas Rigall, Jesús. 2007. *Libro de Alexandre.* Madrid: Castalia.

Catalán, Diego. 1997. *De la silva textual al taller historiográfico alfonsí*. Madrid: Fundación Ramón Menéndez Pidal.

Chambers, J.K., Peter Trudgill, and Natalie Schilling-Estes (eds.) 2002. *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Chesley, Paula and R. Harald Baayen. 2010. Predicting new words from newer words: Lexical borrowings in French. *Linguistics* 48:1343-1374.

Clyne, Michael G. 1967. *Transference and triggering: Observations on the language assimilation of German-speaking migrants in Australia*. The Hague: Nijhoff.

Colón, Germán. 1967a. Occitanismos. In Manuel Alvar (ed.), *Enciclopedia lingüística hispánica* 2, 153-192. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Colón, Germán. 1967b. Catalanismos. In Manuel Alvar (ed.), *Enciclopedia lingüística hispánica* 2, 193-238. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Conde-Silvestre, Juan Camilo. 2012. The role of social networks and mobility in diachronic sociolinguistics. In Juan Manuel Hernández-Campoy and Juan Camilo Conde-Silvestre (eds.) *Handbook of historical sociolinguistics*, 332-352. Oxford: Blackwell.

Corominas, Joan and José Antonio Pascual. 1980-91. *Diccionario crítico y etimológico castellano e hispánico*, 6 vols. Madrid: Gredos.

Craddock, Jerry R. 1986. El *Setenario*: última e inconclusa refundición alfonsina de la *primera partida*. *Anuario de historia del derecho español* 56:441-466.

De Forest, J. B. 1916. Old French Borrowed Words in the Old Spanish of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries. *Romanic Review* 7:369-413.

Défourneaux, Marcelin. 1949. *Les français en Espagne aux XIème et XIIIème siècles*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

De la Iglesia Duarte, José Ignacio (ed.) 1994. *IV Semana de Estudios Medievales: Nájera, 2 a 6 de agosto, 1993*. Nájera: Instituto de Estudios Riojanos.

Deyermond, Alan. 1980. *Historia y crítica de la literatura española 1: Edad Media*. Barcelona: Editorial Crítica.

Dutton, Brian. 1973. French influences in the Spanish *Mester de Clerecía*. In Brian Dutton, J. Woodrow Hassell, Jr. and John E. Keller (eds.), *Medieval studies in*

honor of Robert White Linker by his friends and colleagues, 73-93. Valencia: Castalia.

Dutton, Brian (ed.) 1992. *Vida de San Millán de la Cogolla*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.

Dworkin, Steven N. 2002. Pérdida e integración léxicas: *Aína* vs. *rápido* en el español premoderno. In Bernhard Pöll and Franz Rainer (eds.), *Vocabula et vocabularia: études de lexicologie et de (meta-)lexicographie romanes en l'honneur du 60e anniversaire de Dieter Messner,* 109-118. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Dworkin, Steven N. 2005. Language history and lexical change. *Iberromania* 62:59-70.

Dworkin, Steven N. 2012. The impact of Gallo-Romance on the Spanish lexicon. *A history of the Spanish lexicon: A linguistic perspective,* 118-138. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Edwards, Kathleen. 1967. *The English secular cathedrals in the Middle Ages*. Manchester: University of Manchester Press.

Fernández Ordóñez, Inés. 1999. El taller historiográfico alfonsí. La *Estoria de España* y la *General Estoria* en el marco de las obras promovidas por Alfonso el Sabio. In Jesús Montoya Martínez and Ana Domínguez Rodríguez (eds.), *El Scriptorium alfonsí: de los Libros de Astrología a las "Cantigas de Santa María"*, 105-126. Madrid: Fundación Universidad Complutense.

Fernández Ordóñez, Inés. 2002-2003. De la historigrafía fernandina a la alfonsí. *Alcanate: Revista de estudios alfonsíes* 3:93-134.

Fernández Ordóñez, Inés. 2005. Alfonso X el Sabio en la historia del español. In Rafael Cano Aguilar (ed.), *Historia de la lengua española*, 381-422. Barcelona: Ariel.

Fernández Ordóñez, Inés. 2010. Ordinatio y compilatio en la prosa de Alfonso X el Sabio. In Mónica Castillo Lluch and María López Izquierdo (eds.), *Modelos latinos en el español medieval*, 239-270. Madrid: Iberoamericana.

Fernández Ordóñez, Inés. 2011. La lengua de los documentos del rey: Del latín a las lenguas vernáculas en las cancillerías regias de la Península Ibérica. In Pascual Martínez Sopena and Ana Rodríguez López (eds.), *La construcción medieval de la memoria regia,* 323-361. Valencia: Universitat de València.

Fernández Valverde, Juan (ed.) 1987. *Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada. Historia de rebus Hispaniae sive Historia gothica*. Turnhout: Brepols.

Ferreira Priegue, Elisa. 1994. Saber viajar: Arte y técnica del viaje en la Edad Media. In José Ignacio de la Iglesia Duarte (ed.), *IV Semana de Estudios Medievales: Nájera, 2-6 de agosto de 1993*, 45-69. Nájera: Instituto de Estudios Riojanos.

Field, Fredric W. 2002. *Linguistic borrowing in bilingual contexts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1964. Language maintenance and linguistic shift as a field of inquiry. *Linguistics* 9:32-70.

Fitzmaurice, Susan. 2000. Coalitions and the investigation of social influence in linguistic history. *European Journal of English Studies* 4:265-276.

Fitzmaurice, Susan. 2010. Coalitions, networks, and discourse communities in Augustan England: The *Spectator* and the early eighteenth-century essay. In Raymond Hickey (ed.), *Eighteenth-Century English: Ideology and Change*, 106-132. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Gacto Fernández, Enrique, Juan Antonio Alejandre García, and José María García Marín. 1997. *Manual básico de historia del derecho: Temas y antología de textos*. Madrid: Laxes.

García de Cortázar, José Ángel. 1994. El Camino de Santiago y la articulación del espacio en Castilla. In Carlos Laliena Corbera (ed.), *El Camino de Santiago y la articulación del espacio hispánico (Actas de las XX Semana de Estudios Medievales de Estella: Estella, 26-30 de julio de 1993)*, 157-183. Pamplona: Gobierno de Navarra.

García de Valdeavellano, Luis. 1969. *Orígenes de la burguesía en la España medieval*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.

García de Valdeavellano, Luis. 1975. *El mercado: Apuntes para su estudio en León y Castilla durante la Edad Media.* Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla.

García Mouton, Pilar. 1979. Los franceses en Aragón (siglos XI-XIII). *Archivo de filología aragonesa*. 26-27:7-98.

Gautier Dalché, Jean. 1979. *Historia urbana de León y Catilla en la Edad Media (siglos IX-XIII).* Madrid: Siglo XXI.

Giles, Howard, Scott A. Reid and Jake Harwood. 2010. Introducing the dynamics of intergroup communication. In Howard Giles, Scott A. Reid and Jake Harwood (eds.), *The dynamics of intergroup communication,* 1-16. New York: Peter Lang.

Gimeno Menéndez, Francisco. 1995. *Sociolingüística histórica (Siglos X-XIII).* Madrid: Visor Libros.

Goddard, Keith A. 1980. Loanwords in Spanish: A reappraisal. *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 57:1-16.

Gómez Capuz, Juan. 1998. *El préstamo lingüístico: Conceptos, problemas y métodos*. Valencia: Universitat de València.

Grande Quejigo, Francisco Javier. 1998. Huellas textuales indirectas sobre la difusión oral de la literatura en el *Libro de Alexandre*. *Anuario de Estudios Filológicos* 21:119-139.

Harris, Martin. 1988a. The Romance languages. In Martin Harris and Nigel Vincent (eds.) *The Romance languages*, 1-25. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harris, Martin. 1988b. French. In Martin Harris and Nigel Vincent (eds.) *The Romance languages*, 209-246. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harris, Roy. 1973. *Synonymy and linguistic analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Harris-Northall, Ray. 1991. Apocope in Alfonsine texts: A case study. In Ray Harris-Northall and Thomas D. Cravens (eds.) *Linguistic Studies in Medieval Spanish*, 29-38. Madison: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies.

Harris-Northall, Ray. 2007. Aspects of official language usage in Castilla and León. In Ivy A. Corfis and Ray Harris-Northall (eds.), *Medieval Iberia: Changing societies and cultures in contact and transition,* 165-174. Woodbridge, UK: Tamesis.

Haugen, Einar. 1950. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language* 26:210-231.

Haugen, Einar. 1953. *The Norwegian language in America: a study in bilingual behavior*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Haugen, Einar. 1972. *The ecology of language*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Hernández-Campoy, Juan Manuel. 2003. Exposure to contact and the geographical adoption of standard features: two complementary approaches. *Language in Society* 32:227-255.

Hernández-Campoy, Juan Manuel and Juan Camilio Conde-Silvestre. 2005. Sociolinguistic and geolinguistic approaches to the historical diffusion of linguistic innovations: Incipient standardization in Late Middle English. *International Journal of English Studies* 5: 101-134.

Hess, Steven. 1966. *Gallicisms in Old Spanish of the 12th and 13th Centuries*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University dissertation.

Hope, T. E. 1963. Loanwords as cultural and lexical symbols. *Archivum linguisticum* 15:29-42.

Hope, T. E. 1971. *Lexical borrowing in the Romance languages* (2 vols.). Oxford: Blackwell.

Hopper, Sarah. 2002. *To be a pilgrim: The medieval pilgrimage experience*. Stroud: Sutton.

Hunt, Noreen. 1967. *Cluny under St. Hugh 1049-1109*. London: Edward Arnold.

Iordan, Iordu. 1970. *An introduction to Romance linguistics: its schools and scholars*, transl. by John Orr, revised by Rebecca Posner. Oxford: Blackwell.

Janda, Richard D. and Briand D. Joseph. 2003. On language, change, and language change. In Brian D. Joseph and Richard D. Janda (eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, 3-180. Oxford: Blackwell.

Kasten, Lloyd. 1990. Alfonso el Sabio and the thirteenth-century Spanish language. In Robert I. Burns (ed.), *Emperor of culture: Alfonso X the Learned of Castile and his thirteenth-century renaissance,* 33-45; 221. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Kasten, Lloyd and Florian J. Cody. 2001. *Tentative dictionary of Medieval Spanish, 2nd ed.* New York: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies.

Kuteva, Tania. 1999. Languages and societies: the 'punctuated equilibrium' model of language development. *Language and Communication* 19:213-228.

Labov, William. 1966. *The social stratification of English in New York City.* Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Labov, William. 1977. On the use of the present to explain the past. In Adam Makkai, Valerie Becker Makkai, and Luigi Heilman (eds.), *Linguistics at the Crossroads*, 226-261. Padova: Liviana.

Labov, William. 1994. *Principles of linguistic change: Internal factors.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Lacarra, José María. 1981. Los franceses en la reconquista y repoblación del valle del Ebro en tiempos de Alfonso el Batallador. *Colonización, parias, repoblación y otros estudios*, 153-168. Zaragoza: Anubar.

Ladero Quesada, Miguel Ángel. 1994. *Las ferias de Castilla, siglos XII-XV*. Madrid: Comité Español de Ciencias Históricas.

Laliena Corbera, Carlos (ed.) 1994. *El Camino de Santiago y la articulación del espacio hispánico*: *Actas de las XX Semana de Estudios Medievales de Estella: Estella, 26-30 de julio de 1993.* Pamplona: Gobierno de Navarra.

Laliena Corbera, Carlos. 1996. *La formación del estado feudal: Aragón y Navarra en la época de Pedro I*. Huesca: Instituto de Estudios Altoaragoneses.

Laliena Corbera, Carlos. 2001. Reliquias, reyes y alianzas: Aquitania y Aragón en la primera mitad del siglo XI. In Gabriel Bianciotto, Éric Palazzo and Philippe Sénac (eds.), *Aquitaine-Espagne (VIIIe-XIIIe siècle)*, 57-68. Poitiers: Université de Poitiers.

Lapeña Paúl, Ana Isabel. 2004. *Sancho Ramírez: Rey de Aragón (¿1064?-1094) y rey de Navarra (1076-1094).* Gijón: Ediciones Trea.

Lapesa, Rafael. 1951. La apócope de la vocal en castellano antiguo: intento de explicación histórica. In *Estudios dedicados a Menéndez Pidal*, Vol. 2, 185-226. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Lapesa, Rafael. 1960. Desarrollo de las lenguas ibero-románicas durante los siglos V al XIII. *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale* 5:573-605.

Lapesa, Rafael. 1981. *Historia de la lengua española*, 9th edn. Madrid: Gredos.

Lapesa, Rafael. 1975. De nuevo sobre la apócope vocálica en castellano medieval. *Nueva revista de filología hispánica* 24:13-23.

Lapesa, Rafael. 1984 (1948). Asturiano y provenzal en el Fuero de Avilés. In *Estudios de historia lingüística española,* 53-122. Madrid: Paraninfo.

Lapesa, Rafael. 1984. *Estudios de historia lingüística española*. Madrid: Paraninfo.

Lappin, Anthony. 2008. *Gonzalo de Berceo: The poet and his verses*. Woodbridge, UK: Tamesis.

Lass, Roger. 1997. *Historical linguistics and language change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lenker, Ursula. 2000. The monasteries of the Benedictine Reform and the 'Winchester School': Model cases of social networks in Anglo-Saxon England? *European Journal of English Studies* 4:225-238.

Lomax, Derek. 1969. The Lateran reforms and Spanish literature. *Iberomania* 1:299-313.

Lyons, John. 1995. *Linguistic semantics: an introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mackey, William F. 1976. *Bilinguisme et contact des langues*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Maíllo Salgado, Felipe. 1998. *Los arabismos del castellano en la Baja Edad Media*. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.

Malkiel, Yakov. 1984. La aversión al monosilabismo en los adjetivos del español antiguo y moderno. *Lingüística española actual* 6:5-28.

Márquez Villanueva, Francisco. 1994. *El concepto cultural alfonsí*. Madrid: Editorial MAPFRE.

Martin, Geoges. 2000. El modelo historiográfico alfonsí y sus antecedentes. In Georges Martin (ed.) *La historia alfonsí: el modelo y sus destinos (siglos XIII-XV)*, 9-40. Madrid: Casa de Velázquez.

Martin, Georges. 2006. De nuevo sobre la fecha del *Setenario*. *E-Spania*. http://e-spania.revues.org/381; DOI: 10.4000/e-spania.381 (January 2, 2013).

Martínez Díez, Gonzalo. 1995. *Alfonso VIII, Rey de Castilla y Toledo*. Burgos: Editorial La Olmeda.

Martínez García, Luis. 1994. El albergue de los viajeros del hospedaje monástico a la posada urbana. In José Ignacio de la Iglesia Duarte (ed.), *IV Semana de Estudios Medievales: Nájera, el 2 a 6 de agosto de 1993*, 71-87. Nájera: Semana de Estudios Medievales.

Martínez García, Luis. 2000. La hospitalidad y el hospedaje en el Camino de Santiago. In Francisco Javier García Turza (ed.), *El Camino de Santiago y la sociedad medieval: Actas de la reunión científica: Logroño, 12 a 23 de abril, 1999*, 97-110. Logroño: Instituto de Estudios Riojanos.

Martínez Sopena, Pascual, (ed.) 1995. *Antroponimia y sociedad: Sistemas de identificación hispano-cristianos en los siglos IX a XIII.* Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid.

Meillet, Antoine. 1921-1936. *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*. Paris: É Champion.

Menéndez y Pelayo, Marcelino. 1911-1913. *Historia de la poesía castellana de la Edad Media* (vol. 1). Madrid: Victoriano Suárez.

Menéndez Pidal, Gonzalo. 1951. Cómo trabajaron las escuelas alfonsíes. *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica* 5:363-380.

Menéndez Pidal, Ramón. 1919. *Documentos lingüísticos de España, I: Reino de Castilla.* Madrid: Centro de Estudios Históricos.

Milroy, James. 1992. *Linguistic variation and change*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Milroy, James and Lesley Milroy. 1985. Linguistic change, social network and speaker innovation. *Journal of Linguistics* 21:339-384.

Milroy, Lesley. 1987. *Language and Social Networks*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Miruna Ghil, Eliza. 1995. Imagery and vocabulary. In F.R.P. Akehurst and Judith M. Davis (eds.), *A handbook of the troubadours*, 441-466. Berkeley: University of California.

Moxó, Salvador de. 1979. *Repoblación y sociedad en la España cristiana*. Madrid: Rialp.

Müller, Bodo. 1995. *Diccionario del español medieval*, II. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter Heidelberg.

Nevalainen, Terttu. 2000. Mobility, social networks and language change in Early Modern England. *European Journal of English Studies* 4:253-264.

Nevalainen, Terttu and Helena Raumolin-Brunberg. 2003. *Historical sociolinguistics: Language change in Tudor and Stuart England*. London: Longman.

O'Callaghan, Joseph F. 2003. *Reconquest and crusade in medieval Spain*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Peiteu, Guilhen de.
http://www.trobar.org/troubadours/coms_de_peiteu/guilhen_de_peiteu_04.php

http://www.trobar.org/troubadours/coms_de_peiteu/guilhen_de_peiteu_05.php (October 30, 2013).

Penny, Ralph. 2000. *Variation and change in Spanish*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Penny, Ralph. 2002. A history of the Spanish language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pérez Rodríguez, Estrella. 1990. *El* Verbiginale*: Una gramática castellana del siglo XIII (Estudio y edición crítica).* Valladolid: Universidad of Valladolid.

Pharies, David. 2002. *Diccionario etimológico de los sufijos españoles y de otros elementos finales.* Madrid: Gredos.

Phillips, Betty S. 2001. Lexical diffusion, lexical frequency and lexical analysis. In Joan Bybee and Paul Hopper (eds.), *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure,* 123-136. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Pierrehumbert, Janet B. 2001. Exemplar dynamics: Word frequency, lenition and contrast. In Joan Bybee and Paul Hopper (eds.), *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure,* 137-158. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Poplack, Shana, David Sankoff and Chris Miller. 1988. The social correlates and lexical processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation. *Linguistics* 293:47-104.

Porter, James E. 1986. Intertextuality and the discourse community. *Rhetoric Review* 5:34-47.

Pottier, Bernard. 1967. Galicismos. In Manuel Alvar (ed.), *Enciclopedia lingüística hispánica* 2, 127-151. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Pratt, Chris. 1980. *El anglicismo en el español peninsular contemporáneo*. Madrid: Gredos.

Procter, E. S. 1945. Scientific works of the court of Alfonso X of Castille (sic): The king and his collaborators. *Modern Language Review* 40:12-29.

Raumolin-Brunberg, Helena and Terttu Nevalainen. 1997. Social embedding of linguistic changes in Tudor England. In Raymond Hickey and Stanislaw Puppel (eds.), *Language history and linguistic modelling: A festschrift for Jacek Fisiak on his 60th birthday*, 701-717. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Reglero de la Fuente, Carlos. 2008. *Cluny en España: Los prioratos de la provincia y sus redes sociales (1073-ca. 1270)*. León: Centro de Estudios e Investigación San Isidro.

Reglero de la Fuente, Carlos. 2009. Cluny en España. Los prioratos de la provincia y sus redes sociales (1073-ca. 1270). *Bulletin du centre d'études médiévales d'Auxerre, 13.* http://cem.revues.org/11145. (January 23, 2014).

Reilly, Bernard F. 1988. *The kingdom of León-Castilla under King Alfonso VI*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. http://libro.uca.edu/alfonso6/alfonso6.htm. (January 23, 2014).

Rey, Alain, Marianne Tomi, Tristan Hordé and Chantal Tanet (eds.) 2012. *Dictionnaire historique de la langue française*. (3 vols.) Paris: Dictionnaires Le Robert.

Rico, Francisco. 1985. La clerecía del mester. *Hispanic Review* 53:1-23, 127-150.

Ruiz de la Peña Solar, José Ignacio. 1995. La antroponimia como indicador de fenómenos de movilidad geográfica. In Pascual Martínez Sopena (ed.), *Antoponimia y sociedad: Sistemas de identificación hispano-cristianos en los siglos IX a XIII*, 134-154. Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid.

Ruiz de la Peña Solar, José Ignacio. 2000. Las colonizaciones francas en el Camino de Santiago. In Javier García Turza (ed.), *El Camino de Santiago y la sociedad medieval: Actas de la Reunión Científica, Logroño 12-23 abril, 1999*, 135-142. Logroño: Instituto de Estudios Riojanos.

Sánchez Jiménez, Antonio. 2004. Catalan and Occitan troubadours at the court of Alfonso VIII. *La Corónica* 32:101-120.

Santiago-Otero, Horacio (ed.). 1992. *El Camino de Santiago, la hospitalidad monástica y las peregrinaciones*. Salamanca: Junta de Castilla y León.

Shaver-Crandell, Annie and Paula Gerson. 1995. *The pilgrim's guide to Santiago de Compostela: A gazetteer.* London: Harvey Miller.

Smith, Colin. 1983. *The making of the Poema de Mio Cid*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Snow, Joseph T. 1990. Alfonso as troubadour: Fact and the fiction. In Robert I. Burns (ed.), *Emperor of culture: Alfonso X the Learned of Castile and his thirteenth-century renaissance,* 126-140. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Swales, John. 1988. Discourse communities, genres and English as an international language. *World Englishes* 7:211-220.

Thomas, Antoine (ed.) 1888. *Poésies complètes de Bertran de Born publiées dans le texte original, avec une introduction, des notes, un glossaire & des extraits inédits du cartulaire de Dalon.* Toulouse: Privat.

Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid. 2000. Social network analysis and the history of English. *European Journal of English Studies* 4:211-216.

Trudgill, Peter. 1983. *On dialect: Social and geographical perspectives*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Trudgill, Peter. 1986. *Dialects in contact*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Tuten, Donald. 2003. *Koineization in Medieval Spanish*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ullmann, Stephen. 1962. *Semantics: An introduction to the science of meaning*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Uría Maqua, Isabel. 2000. *Panorama crítico del 'mester de clerecía'*. Madrid: Castalia.

Van Hout, Roeland and Pieter Muysken. 1994. Modeling lexical borrowability. *Language variation and change* 6:39-62.

Vaqueiras, Raimbaut de. http://www.trobar.org/troubadours/raimbaut_de_vaqueiras/raimbaut_de_vaqueiras_33.php (October 30, 2013).

Varela Merino, Elena. 2009. *Los galicismos en el español de los siglos XVI y XVII*. 2 vols. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Verger, Jacques. 1992. Patterns. In Hilde de Ridder-Symoens (ed.), *A history of the university in Europe* (Vol. I), 35-74. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Vicente Miguel, Irene. 2009. Aproximación al léxico de los tejidos y la indumentaria en documentos notariales medievales. In Laura Romero Aguilera and Carolina Julià Luna, (eds.), *Tendencias actuales en la investigación diacrónica de la lengua: Actas del VIII Congreso Nacional de la Asociación de Jóvenes Investigadores de Historiografía e Historia de la Lengua Española, Barcelona 2-4 de abril de 2008.* Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona.

Watts, Richard J. 1999. The social construction of Standard English: Grammar writers as a discourse community. In Tony Bex and Richard J. Watts (eds.), *Standard English: The widening debate*, 40-68. London: Routledge.

Weinreich, Uriel. 1968. *Languages in contact*. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.

Weiss, Julian. 2006. *The* Mester de Clerecía*: Intellectuals and ideologies in thirteenth-century Castile*. Woodbridge, UK: Tamesis.

Williams, John. 1988. Cluny and Spain. *Gesta* 27:93-101.

Wright, Roger. 1982. *Late Latin and early Romance in Spain and Carolingian France.* Liverpool: Cairns.

Wright, Roger. 1991. The conceptual distinction between Latin and Romance: Invention or evolution? In Roger Wright (ed.), *Latin and the Romance languages in the early Middle Ages*, 103-113. University Park: Pennsylvania State University.

Wright, Roger. 2000. El Tratado de Cabreros (1206): *Estudio sociofilológico de una reforma ortográfica*. London: Queen Mary and Westfield College.