

Review: On the Language of Upper Aragon (1258-1495): A Review Article

Reviewed Work(s):

Documentos lingüísticos del Alto Aragón

by T. Navarro Tomás

Review by: Louis Cooper

Source: *Hispanic Review*, Vol. 28, No. 3 (Jul., 1960), pp. 262-275

Published by: University of Pennsylvania Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/470753>

Accessed: 20-02-2023 10:58 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

University of Pennsylvania Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Hispanic Review*

ON THE LANGUAGE OF UPPER ARAGON (1258-1495):
A REVIEW ARTICLE*

The 150 documents which make up this slender book were intended originally to be Volume II of a collection entitled, *Documentos lingüísticos de España*, the first volume of which, *Reino de Castilla*, by R. Menéndez Pidal, was published in Madrid in 1919 by the Centro de Estudios Históricos. Volume III of this series, which was to be *Reino de León*, has never appeared in print.

The Aragonese documents here published had an unfortunate history, with a relatively happy ending. An edition which had actually been printed by the Imprenta Hernando in Madrid was completely destroyed in the bombardment of the capital city during the Spanish Civil War. Only a single copy was saved, and it was this copy from which an offset edition was prepared. Also lost during the same war were materials collected by Navarro Tomás for sections on the Reino de Navarra, Bajo Aragón and the diocese of Segorbe, as well as a rough draft of some chapters on the phonology and morphology of mediaeval Aragonese, a study which was to accompany the documents.

All these documents were located originally in various ecclesiastical and municipal archives in the province of Huesca. Navarro Tomás in his brief Introduction indicates their provenience:

"De los ciento cincuenta documentos conservados, sesenta y dos corresponden a los fondos del Archivo Histórico Nacional, Madrid, y de manera principal a las extensas colecciones monásticas de Santa Cruz de Jaca, San Juan de la Peña, Montearagón, Summo Portu y San Victorián. Los restantes fueron recogidos en los archivos municipales y episcopales de Huesca y Jaca y en una excursión por diversos pueblos del Pirineo desde el valle de Ansó a las riberas del Cinca" (p. vi.).

The documents were written by more than 70 persons, mostly notaries, in some 50 different towns, villages, and hamlets of Upper Aragon. Although the greater part of this collection is made up of formal notarial texts, there are about a dozen consisting of private notes and records of accounts. In general, most of the texts follow a stereotyped pattern and have to do with payment of taxes, disposition of properties by donation, sale, leasing, exchange, transmission etc., together with testaments, certification of judicial sentences, contractual arrangements, claims and complaints. There are a number, however, which have some real human interest.

Chronologically, the distribution of these 150 documents within the period covered (1258-1495) is such as to provide excellent coverage.

* T. Navarro Tomás. *Documentos lingüísticos del Alto Aragón*. Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, 1957: ix + 231 pages.

Most of the years are represented by some document, in many cases there being two or more documents for a given year. Where there is a spread between successive documents, the average is two or three years, occasionally five to six years, except for the last seven documents, between which the spread is larger. In the analyses which follow, I frequently cite a document by number without giving its date. In such cases, to enable the reader to assign an approximate date to a document, I offer the following figures: documents 1–25 (1258–1273), documents 26–50 (1273–1280), documents 51–75 (1281–1299), documents 76–100 (1300–1321), documents 101–125 (1325–1369), documents 126–144 (1370–1445), documents 145–150 (1464–1495).

The physical appearance of the book is attractive, the type face clear and pleasing, and the printing job excellent. The arrangement of the documents on the page and the format, in general, are precisely those of the *Documentos de Castilla* mentioned above.

It will be noted that, in comparison with Castile, the use of the vernacular for the preparation of notarial documents is first evident rather late in Upper Aragon. As Navarro Tomás points out in his Introduction, Latin was used for this purpose until the middle of the thirteenth century, and in the case of Jaca, where Catalan replaced Latin after about 1250, Aragonese was not used until the beginning of the fourteenth century.

Navarro Tomás offers no general remarks on the method of transcription which he used. In the resolution of abbreviations and in supplying letters or words not in the manuscript, he follows conventional practice. The fact that all place names, without exception, have a capital letter suggests that Professor Navarro does not retain the original capitalization. It is evident, on the other hand, that he has tried to preserve the separation of words such as it is in the manuscript. Words having a close syntactic relation may be written together: *quelotra part, njntoliendo, eatodo, enlafin, aquelestado, sieneruargo (sin embargo), enlestado, quentdedes (que ent dedes)*; or they may be separated arbitrarily: *de reyτος, in fer marero, ena quellyas, de redades (de heredades), e por tagner, en piorado, de parten*.

Occasionally, Navarro Tomás calls attention to irregularities in the manuscript. In a number of cases unnoted by the editor, however, the notary apparently failed to write the cedilla on the *c* of *fianca* 57.34 (document 57, line 34), 66.21, 66.25, 67.13, 67.38, *endrecando* 146.4, *comiencan* 149.21. Other textual irregularities, apparently overlooked, are either less obvious or might well merit at least a *sic*: *enadop* 21.22 (for *ñados* ?), *feesen* 32.30 (probably error for *fuessen*), *quarstals* 41.25 (*quartals*), *es* 67.21 (*se*), *des* 71.19 (*dos*), *etcara* 76.59 (*encara*), *deyan* 84.24 (for *devian* ?), *vergueça* 98.20, *pedado* 128.19 (*vedado*), *seyta* 146.48 (*feyta*), *feyer* 148.27 (*seyer*).

Of existing Aragonese texts, legal, literary or notarial, none is more markedly dialectical than these of Navarro Tomás, nor does any text or collection combine the qualities of this collection. It is at once highly reliable and discriminating, limited to Upper Aragon and covering in time two and one-half centuries, and in space a large number of places within a single province.

This collection is, indeed, a dialectologist's delight. Known Aragonese traits which in many other texts are present only in diluted form, as it were, are here found in concentration. This book, therefore, not only makes it possible to help complete the history of the Aragonese dialect in the mediaeval period, but also to corroborate, reject or to revise opinions currently held about some aspects of the dialect.

In what follows, I treat some features of the dialect which may be considered either the most interesting or which offer some problem, and on which the documents of Navarro Tomás seem to shed some light.

ORTHOGRAPHY

Palatal 'l. I find ten different ways in which the palatal *l* may be represented in these documents. They are, in decreasing order, on the basis of the number of documents in which each appears: *ll* (103), *yll* (49), *lly* (40), *l* (28), *li* (23), *lli* (9), *ly* (9), *yl* (6), *ill* (5), *lh* (1). Here is an example of each: *muller, eylla, mellyoria, aquelo, alienar, fillios, vasalyos, conseyladament, despuillamos, batalha*. Of these spellings, the first three are clearly dominant. The spellings *yll* and *lly* are in competition with *ll* and also with each other, but *yll* appears for the first time in 1260 and disappears after 1370, whereas *lly* appears in 1273 and is noted in document 147, year 1473. The spelling *lly*, moreover, unlike *yll*, makes a forceful appearance and maintains itself vigorously, as judged by its frequent predominance, in any given document, over other spellings, including *ll*. Note particularly the following documents: 25, 49, 50, 104, 112, 119, 128, 129, 130, 131, 139, 141, 142.

A single *l* for palatal *l* was common in old Aragonese (XI and XII centuries; see Pidal, *Origenes*) and appears frequently here, roughly in 30 documents, and exemplified by: *ali* (frequent), *celero, vila, capelan, muler, castiello, bielos*, etc.

The spelling *li*, save in rare exceptions, occurs only once in each of the 23 documents I have noted it. Of the spellings *lli* and *ly*, the latter is the more prominent with respect to absolute number of times it is used, but it is a spelling which appears late (1341), whereas the dates of *lli* are 1274–1420. The dates of *yl* are intermediate (1299–1351), whereas those of *ill*, an exclusively early spelling, are 1260–1274. The early disappearance of *ill* in view of the vitality of *yll* is surprising, but suggests that the spelling must have had a strange or foreign look while that with

y, either preceding or following *ll*, did not. In the case of *ill*, it may be significant to point out that except for document 2 (1260), the other four documents in which this spelling appears (6, 9, 12, 28) are all by the same notary, the spontaneity of whose language is especially striking. Finally, I find two unexpected instances, both in the same document, of *lh*: *batalha* 132.2, *molher* 132.6. This document, interestingly enough, is of indeterminate origin and date. Navarro Tomás places these tentatively as Huesca, late fourteenth century.

The spellings *lg* and *gl*, common in old Aragonese of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, have left no trace in these documents.

If a single *l* is often used to represent a double *ll*, the reverse is also true, though in only about half as many documents. Examples: *Olliva* 4.2 (but *Oliva* 4.5 and 4.9), *hortalles*, *cassalles*, *solldos*, *ciello*, *pallaura*, etc.

Palatal 'n'. Like the palatal *l*, its counterpart the palatal *n*, is represented in a considerable variety of ways, but the distribution of these is only very roughly parallel to that of the *l*. Here are the statistics on the basis of the number of documents in which each spelling occurs; following each number, I give range in years: *nn* 86 (1262–1495), *ny* 60 (1268–1495), *yn* 48 (1263–1370), *n* 19 (1258–1329), *gn*¹ 15 (1266–1361), *ygn* 12 (1260–1317), *gny* 11 (1275–1349), *ni* 6 (1274–1435). The figures just given, however, present a misleading picture unless they are properly interpreted. Several remarks are in order: with reference to *nn* and *ny*, both spellings have about the same range in years, but the former appears more frequently before 1321 (document 100), and the latter is very much more predominant after this date. Expressed more precisely, before 1321, *nn* is found in 69 documents and *ny* in only 24. After 1321, however, an almost reverse proportion is observed: 14 *nn* as against 36 *ny*. Moreover, in the later documents, not only is the *ny* spelling used overwhelmingly, but many of the infrequent cases of *nn* are found in the word *anno* which may be considered a learned spelling.

In addition to the eight ways of writing palatal *n* already listed, I find ten other spellings, all of which, however, are rare, occurring in only one, two or three documents. Because they are so unusual, I list them all: *NYN*, *senyor* 107 (6 cases), *Penynalenque* 115.4, *senynal* 51.42; *NNY*, *sennyor* 75.9, *dannynos* 147.12; *NNI*, *enpenniendo* 91.16; *NGN*, *singnal* 106.37; *PYN*, *jupyño* 115.52; *Ñ*, *doña* 10.11, *año* 118.7, *señor* 150.3; *IGN*, *seignor* 12.46, 12.52, *leignas* 28.139, *seignoriuo* 28.146, *seignor* 49.6; *GYN*, *sigynal* 84.37; *YNY*, *juynyno* 101.20; *YGN*, *seygnal* 103.26; *YNI*, *seynior* 67.22, 67.24.

¹ In this count I exclude the words *signo* and *signal* which occur (in about 75 per cent of the documents) in a stereotyped phrase at the close of each text. I treat these and other variants of these later in a separate paragraph. Words included here are *vigna*, *empignado*, *portagner*, etc.

At the close of most of the documents, there is a stereotyped phrase in which the notary indicates that he has placed his *signum*. The latter is usually rendered in Spanish by the learned words *signo* or *signal*. In about one-fifth of the cases, however, the forms show popular development. Those occurring more often are: *sinnal* (used by three different notaries), *seynal* (used by five notaries), *signyal* (used by four notaries). Others, which appear in only one document, are: *senynal*, *senal*, *seygnal*, *sigynal*, *senyal*, *sengnal*, and *synal* (in two documents).

PHONOLOGY

ö > *ue*, *ua*, *uo*, *o*. Stressed Latin short *o* regularly gives *ue* as in Castilian but frequently *ua* also, and rarely *uo*. This last diphthong I have encountered only in the place name *Uosca* (3 cases in 2 documents, one dated 1258, the other 1270). In earlier centuries, *uo* is occasionally found in the Latin documents of Aragon, but in the Romance period, if one can judge by the texts of Navarro Tomás, it seems idle to speak any longer of *uo* as an Aragonese characteristic.

The variant *ua* is fairly abundant, but chiefly in a few common words: *buana* (18 documents), *uastro* (15), *afruanta* (14). Besides these, there are more than a score of words which appear in only one or two documents: *abueltas*, *buanament*, *bermiylluala*, *fuant*, *fuara*, *fuarza*, *huast*, *huauos*, *juaves*, *luago*, *luanga*, *mualas*, *muarto*, *muastran*, *muastras*, *puade*, *puant*, *puarta*, *quantra* (also in verb *quantra decir*), *suagra*, *sualdos*, *sualta*, *vualta*. The word *fruyto* 59.18 is the only case of a *ua* before a yod, but there is some doubt about the reading in the manuscript. With respect to proper names (both personal and geographic), there are quite a few examples: *Guarga*, *Anguas*, *Puerta*, *Arahuast*, *Puartholas*, *Barluanga*, *Buara*, *Muartos*, *Cristuauual*, etc.

In some cases, the *o* does not diphthongize: *soltas*, *font*, *ortos*, *joves*, *corda*, *nouo*, *grosos*. These are exceptional. More frequent are *conto*, *affronta*, *soldos*.

Huesca (also written *Uosca*, *Osca*, *Uasca*) merits special consideration. *Uosca* occurs in two documents, and the dates of first and last appearance are 1258–1270; *Osca* (26 documents) with dates 1264–1307; *Uasca* (11) 1268–1321; *Uesca* (26) 1272–1373. It is interesting to note that the earlier a given form appears, the sooner it is regarded as archaic and hence no longer used. So that the order of obsolescence is: *Uosca*, *Osca*, *Uasca*. It may be significant, moreover, that *Uesca* is the latest to appear (1272). Prior to this date, there are eight documents in which this place name occurs at least once (often several times), and in none of these is it *Uesca*. Even after *Uesca* is introduced, it takes half a century to rout *Uasca* completely.

È > *ie*, *ia*. As in the case of *o*, stressed short *e* in Aragonese diph-

thongizes in more than one way: *ie* and *ia*. The former, however, is overwhelmingly the rule. Words with *ia* do not appear in more than a dozen and a half documents, in years ranging from 1268–1344, after which I note no instances. It is interesting, however, that *Canbriellya* 142.21 (year 1441) was first clearly written *Canbriallya*, and then changed by the scribe. The variant *ia* is found in more than a score of words. Because of the relative rarity of this diphthong, I give all the cases I noted. Common nouns: *bian* 46.28, 64.6, 64.8, *bianes* 39.16, 39.33, *capialla* 12.39, *çarta* 99.4, *diatz* (many cases in document 28 in numerals like *diatz e seten*), *diaz* 112.22, 112.23, *faciando* 62.21, *fiasta* 46.10, *fondamiantos* 99.14, *manifiasta* 40.1, *manteniando* 12.38, *mylloramiantos* 64.16, *mylloramiandç* 99.13, *niata* 40.12, *nouiambre* 20.43, 37.22, *ouiasse* 32.10, *pertiniandç* 99.13, *piadra* 99.13, *reçebiaron* 67.49, *setiambre* 39.37, 46.10, *sianpre* 62.4, *sosteniando* 12.39, *teniant lugar* 67.57, *tianpo* 39.15; 62.6, 26, 30; 101.4, 10. There is one case of an atonic *ie* (coming from an original *IĒ* in Latin) becoming *ia* possibly by analogy, or by assimilation to a following *a*: *alianar* 64.14. Proper nouns: *Quiçenjalla* 40.9, *Pero Nabilalla* 46.24, *Torreçialla* 64.9, *Canbriallya* 142.21 (cf. above).

Preservation of intervocalic p, t, k. In mediaeval Aragonese, as contrasted with Castilian, one of the striking features is the number of words which retain the unvoiced occlusive in intervocalic position. Within the dialect itself, however, these words represent only a drop in the bucket. Preservation is seen in infrequent words like *ciudadanos*, *ciutat*, *sabato*, *populata* (for *poblada*), *lecos* (in the phrase *clerigos & lecos*), *capanna* 64.8 (but *cabanna* 7 cases), *entratas*, *exitas*, *moneta*, *paretes*, *vites*, etc. Other words may be solitary instances: *secunt* (document 57), *sequir* (22), *trico* (17), *njcuna* (17), *locar* (8), and some others.²

As we noted in the preceding paragraph, Aragonese, although showing a popular tendency toward preservation of the intervocalic *p, t, k*, follows the Castilian, as a rule, in the direction of sonorization. There are even a number of instances in which voicing takes place where modern Castilian has an unvoiced consonant: *çabatero* 97.23, but *çapataria* 48.15, *certefigados* 103.7, *roba* 139 (several cases), but *ropa* 140.6, 9 (by the same notary), *publigo* (dozens of cases), *habidantes* 124.14, 131.12, *habidant* 131.8 (perhaps the only cases), *trebudo* (very frequent), *cridos* (gritos), *cridó*, *cridando* (all in 145). Such differences with Castilian may perhaps be explained as due, in some cases, to hypercorrection, and in other cases, to the fact that modern Castilian has sometimes replaced an original popular (voiced) form by a learned (unvoiced) form. Note also the following cases of occlusive plus *r* or *l*: *lebroso* (in at least 6 documents), *la glerecia* 110, *sagristan* (numerous cases), also *sagristia* and *sagrament*.

² Observations with respect to this feature are intended to be merely suggestive, since my notes are representative rather than exhaustive.

On the other hand, a voiced consonant becomes voiceless by hypercorrection in *estaplesco* 97.4, *estaplimos* 96.28, and in *oblicamos* 103.25. Catalan influence may be responsible for forms like *jutgamos* and *jutgando*, as well as for *colpes* 145.22, 44.

I note *esplungas* (SPELUNCA) 112.30 which may be the only example of *nk* > *ng* in the book.

NS > s. Assimilation is the rule: *mesura*, *mesurasen*, *mostrades*, *mester*, *recossirando*, *respusso*, *Costantin*, *cossegyr*, *constituydo*, *costupne*, *traslat*, etc., although the form with *n* may also be found among some of these: *monstro*, *consiradas*, *translat*, etc. Also, there are some isolated cases in which the *ns* is preserved: *defension*, *reponsero*, *encenseros*, *despensa*, and the frequently appearing *conssello*.

This tendency toward assimilation is also seen in the case of *rs*: *persona* (in at least four documents), *personalment* (at least two documents), *doso* 93.8 and numerous examples of *yuso* (DEORSUM) and *suso* (SURSUM).

MB > m. This is the regular Aragonese development, which occurs only in the following examples, of which there are many cases: *camiomos*, *camjamos*, *camio* (noun), *entramos*, *amas*. The only exceptions are, curiously enough, in the second and in the last document: *cambio* 2.2, 2.12 which vacillates with *camjo*; and *cambiado* 150.27 in which Castilian influence is to be expected. An isolated exception is *palombar* 15.13. Possibly it is worth while to point out that both *cambio* and *palombar* occur in texts prepared in Montearagón.

ND > nn. This takes place in two cases only: *spuenna* 16.9, 16.11, but *espuendas* 104.71, and *espondaleros* (without exception), at least 11 cases in 8 documents.

A + x > ax. The only cases I noted are: *madaxa* 138.20 and 138.21.

M'N > mpn. Do these documents throw any light on the epenthetic *p*? There appear to be almost as many cases without the *p* as with it. Examples without *p*: *costumnado*, *costumne*, *femna* (even *femenas* and *femanas*, one case each), *custumado*. The forms with *p* (*costumpnoron*, *nompne*, *adempna*, *costumpnado*, *fempna*, etc.) often have the preceding nasal (*m* or *n*) missing: *acostupnado*, *costupne* (even *costubnado* 72.8), *dopna*, *Adepna*, *nopnado*, *nopne*, *arapne* and one case of *opnes* (*omnes*) 112.3. The words with inserted *p* are limited to the aforementioned ones, with their derivatives and variant spellings. The group *mn* or *mpn* is replaced, with rare exceptions, by the Castilian forms beginning with 1363 (document 124): *nombre*, *aranbre*, *acostumbra*, *fambre*, etc.

There has been some question as to the phonetic value, if any, of epenthetic *p*; and if it had phonetic value, when did it cease to have and become merely a graphic symbol? Without presuming to answer any

of these questions, let me make some observations from what I find in this collection of documents: 1) There are some clear cases where the *p* may be assumed to have no phonetic value: *jupyno* (*junio*) 115.52; *transumpto* 139.27 (but *trasunto* 139.25). This last example, although not a case of epenthesis, is of interest since it offers an excellent instance of the learned and popular development of this word. In *transumpto*, note also the preservation of *n* in the group *ns*. 2) There seems to be confusion between *n* and *m* before *b* or *p*, for there are many cases of *n* where *m* should be written: *tienpo*, *sienpre*, *ensemble*, etc. I suppose it must be assumed that this *n* was really pronounced *m*. 3) Since we find several ways of writing the same word, with or without *p*, and with or without nasal, this could suggest either some difference in pronunciation between speakers or merely confusion in the writing, or both. Note the following variations: *costupne*, *costumne*, *costunpnado*, *acostumpnado*, even *costumado*. 4) It is disconcerting, for example, to find a word like *opnes* (a unique instance) 112.3, and in the same document *omnes* and *onmes*.

MORPHOLOGY AND SYNTAX

Inde. Manuel Alvar in *El dialecto aragonés* (Madrid, 1953), p. 296, says: "En la edad media, *ende* es la forma más frecuente; las apócope *end* y *ent* son raras; tampoco abundan mucho *en* y *de*; *ne* tiene 'cierta extensión.'" In the light of the distribution of this particle in the documents of Navarro Tomás, this statement will have to be radically modified. Here are the results (in descending order, by number of documents, not cases) of a fairly complete tabulation: *en* 46 cases in 30 documents, *ne* 11 cases in 9 documents, *ende* 12 cases in 7 documents, *ent* 13 cases in 6 documents, *'nde*, *'nd* 7 cases in 6 documents, *end* 5 cases in 5 documents, *in* one case only. One can see that except for *en* and *in*, the other variants occur roughly with about the same frequency.

Ren, res. *Ren* is about three times as frequent as *res*: 14 cases in 12 documents as against 4 cases in 4 documents. The relative infrequency of this negative particle may suggest that its use in Aragonese is not typical. There is no case of any derivative of the Latin PUNCTUM (*pont*, *pon*) used as a negative.

Diphthongization of 'e' in ĒST, ĒRAM, etc. In Aragonese, both modern and mediaeval, it is common to find that the *e* of Latin *ES*, *EST*, *ERAM*, *ERAS*, *ERAT* diphthongizes. This is a well established Aragonese trait, but contrary to what may be supposed, these documents seem to show that the non-diphthongized forms, *es*, *era*, *eran* are somewhat preferred over the forms with diphthong, *yes*, *ye*, *yera*, etc. This is observed even in the earliest documents of this collection. In fact, in the first nine documents, each of which has at least one instance of the forms in question, there are 12 cases without diphthong and only one with diphthong.

Nor can I detect any evolution or trend from the first document to the last. In some documents the form without diphthong is used exclusively, the most striking example being number 28, with 23 cases of *es*. In other documents, notably 27 and 76, *yes* is used exclusively, with 7 and 8 cases respectively. Out of about 85 documents in which there are two or more instances of the verb in question, I note vacillation between the two types in only 23 documents. This suggests that there is a tendency for the notary to prefer the one or the other rather than mix them. Even in the documents where there is vacillation, the tendency is to prefer one form over the other. An extreme example is document 113 with 11 *yes*, 1 *yera*, 2 *yeran* and 2 *es*. In one document (16), there is vacillation between three forms *hye*, *yes*, and *es*, all used in the same way.

Some students of Aragonese may be surprised to find that these documents contain so few cases of *ye* (3 sg.). I have found only 13 instances, distributed over 8 documents ranging from 1-104 (1258-1329). It may be interesting that one document (73) contains 5 of these *ye*, which compete, moreover, with 4 *yes*: *El primer campo ye en le ribera* (line 27); *el tercer campo . . . yes a Lascoba* (line 31).

I note only one instance of *yes* (2 sg.) 133.7, and in the same line *yeras*; also a solitary instance of *ys* (3 sg.) 120.31. In the imperfect, *era* occurs about twice as often as *yera*, and *eran* slightly more often than *yeran*. I find only one instance of *yerades* (2 pl.) 85.17.

Imperfect in -b-. According to data collected by Kuhn (1933) and more recently by Alvar (1951), imperfections in *b* (*comeba*, *reiba*) for the *-er* and *-ir* conjugations, are heard in a large part of Upper Aragon. As far as the mediaeval period is concerned, Alvar offers only a single example, that of *eua* (*había*) occurring in the anonymous Aragonese poem *Razón de Amor* (early thirteenth century). Given this scarcity, the six cases I have noted in the book of Navarro Tomás are especially welcome: *requeríua* 87.10, *exiuan* 87.26, *obediua* 93.19, *feua* (*hacia*) 130.36, *feuan* 130.67, *menoniuan* 142.62 in the sentence, *Item, yes condicion que si por ventura las ouellyas, por guerra o por mortaldat se menoniuan, que menonescan pora todos. . . .*

Whether this *b* is etymological or analogical in origin has been a matter of controversy. The problem is studied by M. Alvar in an article ("El imperfecto *iba* en español," *Homenaje a Krüger*, I, 41-45) in which he concludes, virtually on the basis of one case (*eua*), that either position is possible. If we examine the cases that have been cited in the preceding paragraph, it will be noted that the first one does not appear until document 87, that is, not until the rather late year of 1306. This fact would incline one to favor the analogical theory as the correct one. At the same time, it must be remembered that the use of the imperfect tense is infrequently called for in the type of text our collection provides,

so that the total number of imperfects of any kind would be small. Hence the late appearance of *b* loses some of its force as an argument for the analogical origin. However, even if we do not utilize this argument at all, a good case can still be made for the analogy position on the strength of two of the instances cited, *feua* and *feuan*: *fe* (3 sg. present) occurring in these texts, must itself be due to analogy with *femos* and *feites* (FAC'TIS), and *feua* would seem to be analogical with *-ar* verbs since it cannot be expected to come from FACĒBAT. This argument, moreover, is not necessarily in contradiction with the early appearance of an etymologically derived *eua* < (HAB)ĒBAT, since the verb HABERE is quite exceptional in its development. In other words, *eua* can be etymological, and *requeriua*, *exiua*, *feua* etc. can be analogical.

Perfect in -oron and -on. With respect to the verb conjugations, of considerable interest is the present perfect indicative. As early as 1909, Navarro Tomás, using at least some of the documents included in his new book, made an excellent study of the perfect tense of verbs in *-ar* in old Aragonese (*Revue de Dialectologie Romane*, I [1909], 110–121). He finds that the ending *-oron* “es el vulgarismo más frecuente en escrituras y textos aragoneses” (p. 113). This is clearly seen in these documents which may be classed as “literary” texts prepared as official documents, with the exception, however, of the last fifteen of them. The latter consist of private or personal miscellaneous notes the language of which is, as may be expected, less deliberate than in the case of formal texts. It is only in these more personal writings that the *-oron* ending abounds. In the others, there are merely scattered cases of *-oron*, the earliest (*atorgoron*) occurring in 1268. The rarity of this ending in these public texts can be accounted for, in part, by the fact that the notary made a conscious effort to exclude *-oron*. Navarro Tomás points out that in two cases, *demandaron* 102.37 and *atorgamos* 122.8, the notary had at first written *demandoron* and *atorgomos* and then changed these.

Analogous to *-oron* for the *-ar* conjugation, I note isolated cases of *-on* for the *-er* and *-ir* conjugations: *dixon*, *fiçon*, *prison*, *quison* and *mison*. Does this mean that *-on* and *-oron* were not mixed? Perhaps, but this separation of function no longer holds in the more spontaneously written documents I referred to above, for beginning with document 141 (year 1441), we find, on the one hand: *fzioron*, *requirioron*, *dioron*, *fazi-oron*, *stioron*, *metioron*, etc., and *liuron* (also *liuroron*), *coston* (also *costoron*) on the other.

With specific reference to *-oron*, there is no doubt that in this book it represents a “vulgar” rather than a “literary” form, but there may be some question as to whether it was regarded as such in an earlier period. Regarding Romance texts, those prior to 1258 (date of the first document of this collection) are few, and are not helpful for our purpose. There

is, however, one text which has considerable linguistic interest. I refer to my own study (to be published in 1960 by the *Archivo de Filología Aragonesa*) of the "Liber regum" of the *Cronicón villarense* (ca. 1200), in which *-oron* actually predominates over *-aron* in *-ar* verbs. The most striking cases are these: *leuantaron* (1 case), *leuantoron* (4 cases); *mataron* (3 cases), *matoron* (10 cases); *soterraron* (2 cases), *soterroron* (17 cases).

The abundance of *-oron* in a text of the beginning of the thirteenth century suggests that it was already firmly established and must have been in use for some time. An isolated example of *-oron* appears nearly a century and a half earlier in one of the Latin documents of Aragon studied by Menéndez Pidal: *comparoron* 1062 (2 cases). In addition to these, there are two cases of the same verb in the *Cartulario visigótico* (ca. 1082) published by Gili Gaya ("Manifestaciones del romance en documentos oscenses anteriores al siglo XIII," *Homenaje a Menéndez Pidal*, II [1925], 99-119).

The fact, then, that in an early Aragonese text, which must be regarded as "literary," *-oron* predominates over *-aron* argues that, at that time, *-oron* was considered "respectable." By the middle of the thirteenth century, however, judging by this collection of Navarro Tomás and by other texts, *-oron* had lost its respectability and is not acceptable as a "literary" form.

As to the origin of *-oron*, it is usually said to be analogical (with the third singular preterite) rather than etymological. Gili Gaya, however, in the article mentioned above, implies that it is etymological since *a* becomes *o* because of "la atracción de una *u* de la sílaba siguiente . . ." (p. 105). Thus the development would be: *COMPARAVERUNT* > *COMPARARUNT* > *comparoron*, or perhaps *COMPARAV(E)RUNT* > *-AURUNT* > *-oron*. The early appearance of *comparoron*, it seems to me, strengthens the etymological argument. Also the fact that *-oron* is not limited to Aragon but is found in mediaeval Leonese.

Qui, que. The documents of Navarro Tomás, even long before they were published, were used, at least in part, as a basis for research by three investigators that I know of: Navarro Tomás himself, for the article mentioned above, Menéndez Pidal, who cites the *Documentos* in his *Orígenes* as the source of some of his materials, and Alfonso Par, who used the documents to study the relative frequency of *qui* and *que* (in nominative case) in Aragonese (a study comprising the third and last section of an article, "*Qui y que en la península ibérica*," *RFE*, XVI [1929] and XVIII [1931]). I mention this here in order to raise a question with reference to Par's article in which he concludes that *qui* is not used with a feminine antecedent nor with a masculine thing as antecedent. He does, in fact, find 13 such cases but he rejects them all in view of "las reservas de escritura e interpretación que ya formulé" (*RFE*, XVIII [1931], 227).

I merely desire to suggest that Par may not be justified in thus disposing of the exceptions and oversimplifying the history of *qui* and *que*. Par tends somewhat to want to force the data to fit a preconceived conclusion. Again may I refer to the *Liber regum* already mentioned in which I find that, with rare exceptions, *qui* is used exclusively for the nominative case, no matter what the gender of the antecedent may be. Furthermore, when the antecedent is a masculine person, Par finds that *qui* and *que* are used in about the same proportion in the thirteenth century. This should be compared with the *Liber regum* in which *qui* is used exclusively in this case (45 instances).

Declension of indeclinable adjectives. The declension of adjectives having a single gender is frequently cited as Aragonese. Findings in this book would suggest the contrary. I list all the cases I have noted: *firmament* 27.27, 34.40 (but *firmement* 58.34, 76.66, etc.), *fermament* 108.3, *vesiblement* 132.9, *griso* 135.44, 142.32, *grisa* 142.32. With respect to these instances, the following observations are of interest: the two cases of *firmament* just cited occur in documents written by the same notary. *Fermament* is in a document the language of which is virtually Catalan, and, in my opinion, could well have been omitted from this collection; *vesiblement* is in a document of unknown origin. The cases of *griso* and *grisa* are in documents prepared in Jaca, an area where Catalan influence was greater than in Huesca, for example, or in other towns represented in this collection.

'Lo' as definite article. *Lo* may be used as a masculine singular article: *lo dia, lo palacio, lo oficio*. My estimate is that this use of *lo* is not found in more than about 15 documents, and even in these only exceptionally.

Preposition plus 'tu'. After a preposition (*a, de, entre, por, con*), the second person singular pronoun is invariably *tu*. I have noted cases in six documents: 23, 25, 35, 118, 122, 133.

CATALAN TRAITS IN ARAGONESE

-TC, -TZ for -des. (With reference to verbs only.) This spelling (*pagaretç, detç, ayatç, querezç, tiengatz, posiatz*) seems to occur in very few documents. It is most abundant in three texts by the same notary, prepared in Huesca. The overwhelming majority of verbs have -des for the *vosotros* form. After 1277 (document 42), I believe there are only isolated instances of this Catalan type of ending.

Formation of plural. The rule for the formation of the plural is like that of Castilian, but Catalan influence is evident in the dropping of the final unstressed vowel and in other types of syncope: *cabeçals, afrontacions, capellans, quartals, molins, hortals, linçols, als (a los), baldaquins*, etc. in which an *e* or *o* is absent. Some of these also occur in the full form. Other synscopes are: *loas* (alternating with *logares*), *linas (linares)*,

cannamas (*cannamares*), *comprados*, *vendedos*, *procurados* in which *-os* is a syncope for *-ores*. The four last named words are quite exceptional. My impression is, on the basis of the cases occurring in these documents, that this type of plural cannot be considered an Aragonese trait.

Apocope of -o. The Catalan trait which is perhaps the most prevalent in this collection is that of apocope of final *o* in masculine nouns, but even this feature is relatively rare, except for certain almost ubiquitous words like *conuent* (alternating with *conuento*) and *testament*. Except for *testament*, words in *-ment* or *-mient* apocopate only exceptionally: *instrument*, *vestment*, *sagrament*, but *mandamiento*, *atorgamiento*, *obligamiento*, *retinimiento*, etc. The words *traslat* and *cens*, and possibly *termen*, are frequent but the following are not: *marit*, *çellarer*, *engeyn*, *apostolic*, *destin*, *titol*, *argent*, *spitaler*, etc. *Notario* is sometimes written *notari*.

Lur, lures, luer, lueres. The use of *lur* (Eng. 'their') appears to be consistent enough to be regarded as a definite Aragonese characteristic. I have noted instances in 12 documents (32 cases), all before 1300. In three documents there is some vacillation between *lur* and the Castilian form *su* which is used exclusively in these documents after 1300: *con sos entradas & lures exidas*, & *con todos lures dreytos & lures pertinencias* 20.15; similarly in document 33: *lures* (line 33 and 42), *lueres* (line 34, 43, 51), *luer* (line 45), *lur* (line 45 and 46), but *sos* (line 31); finally in document 55: *lur* (line 19, 71) and *lures* (4 cases), but *sus* (line 26). The etymon of this morpheme (ILLORUM) is suggested by the early form *ellur* 3.11, 3.18. Apart from these cases of vacillation mentioned, a spot check shows that before 1300, *so* replaces *lur* in at least one other document: *con sos entradas & con sos exidas & con todos sos dreytos . . . que an . . . las ditas casas* 18.14. This latter case, however, that is, the substitution of *so* for *lur* before 1300 strikes me as being exceptional. If the number of cases of *lur* seems small, in view of my statement that it is the form regularly used before 1300, it must be remembered that a morpheme referring to more than one possessor is only infrequently required in these texts.

This review has sought merely to re-examine some of the features of the Aragonese dialect as manifested in these documents. There is a wealth of material here yet to be studied. So far, I have not mentioned the vocabulary, which offers many special problems. It would be interesting, for example, to determine to what extent there is a correspondence between Aragonese and Catalan and to ascertain the degree of Catalan influence in Upper Aragon. Here are some words to start with: *apres*, *encara*, *ensemble*, *tantost*, *de volenter*, *donca*; *juge*, *vispe*, *privilege*, *canonge*, *peatge*, *pontage*; *frau*, *seu*, *roure*, *uegada*, *paper*; *capleuar*, *trobar*. Note that of these, *encara* and *ensemble* are very widely used in our texts.

A more general study of the vocabulary would also be fruitful, for the range in this volume strikes me as being considerable, although, to be sure, there is a hard core of recurring words and rubber-stamp notarial phrases.

Professor Navarro Tomás is to be very warmly congratulated for having made an enduring contribution to Aragonese dialectology and for having given us a book which is a worthy companion to the *Documentos de Castilla* of Menéndez Pidal.

LOUIS COOPER

West Virginia State College