Formation Processes of Hispanic Romances

Francisco Gimeno-Menéndez
University Of Alicante

Summary
The recent publication of the latin texts on the Glosas Emilianenses and Silenses of San Millán de la Cogolla necessarily justifies this review of their contribution to the analysis of the processes of formation of Hispanic Romances and their contribution to the model of linguistic changes. At the beginning of the second century, the creation of a clergy made up of the bishop, priests and deacons accumulated privileges and functions. From the middle of the 3rd century and especially from the year 313 onwards, a growing number of Christian faithful sought in monasticism a way to fulfill their desire for perfection. In principle, the monk was the person who retired from the world to advance in spiritual life. The first known manifestations of Christian monasticism date from the end of the 3rd century and the eastern Mediterranean, and from its beginnings and throughout its history it presented three modalities: anchoriteism, laura and the cenobitic community. Tradition linked San Millán de Suso with the place where Emiliano exercised his hermitism, whose biography was traced by Braulio of Zaragoza, around the years 635-640. This biography was what provoked unusual interest in him, and confirmed that there were his followers in the middle of the 7th century. In the year 923, King Sancho Garcés I of Pamplona, with the help of Ordoño II of León, definitively occupied the squares of Nájera and Viguera, and with them the rest of the smaller nuclei and their respective lands. The Navarrese proceeded to dominate said territory and reorganize it, with the presence of leading cadres and repopulators from the kingdom of Pamplona. The Emilianenses Glosses were written in the middle of the 10th century (year 950), and the Silenses Glosses were copied and expanded shortly after (second half of the 10th century) in La Rioja.

Keywords: *Anthropological history, Christian monasticism, Etymologies, Linguistic change, Acculturation.*

I. INTRODUCTION

In the anthropological history of the Hispanic romances there was a linguistic and cultural continuity, depending on the successive and diverse historical acculturations (Indo-European, Iberian, Fenopunic-Greek, Roman, Christian, Germanic, Visigothic and Islamic), with the assimilation of cultural elements and adaptation to a new sociocultural context. Since approximately 1970, the panorama of concern for space in the historiography relating to the Crown of Castile began to change. The entry of anthropology into history was one of the most significant historiographical data, and there was a deepening of the knowledge of the configuration of society, and especially its behaviors in relation to the land occupied. The interest of geographers and economists in regional fact and analysis was strengthened in the field of medievalism by the appearance of a series of notable French theses, based on a framework of this type (G. Fourquin, R. Fossier, P. Toubert, P. Bonnassie and G. Bois). The central idea of ecosystem and the key concept of acculturation were used by some Spanish historians, in order to show a new perspective of the implications that the social organization of space had during the Middle Ages in the Crown of Castile, and to offer a new interpretation of the behavior of Spanish-Christian society (see J. A. García de Cortázar, 1985; F. Gimeno, 1995).

On the other hand, studies on linguistic and cultural contact in Europe did not enjoy broad coordination, although the precursors were European (W. Leopold, E. Haugen and U. Weinreich), nor had the relationship between linguistic and cultural contact been properly defined. Anthropologists who investigated acculturation were pressed to include empirical linguistic evidence as indications of the overall process of acculturation, while linguists needed the help of anthropology to describe and analyze those factors that governed linguistic transfer, and were within of the field of culture. The sociocultural history of a bilingual speaking community involved the contact of different social groups and different languages, with the linguistic and cultural transfers that implied the social and cultural mixing of said groups.

1.1. At the beginning of the second century, J. A. García de Cortázar (2012: 13-56) alluded to the creation of a clergy made up of the bishop, the priests and the deacons, who accumulated privileges and functions. From the middle of the 3rd century and especially from the year 313 onwards, a growing number of Christian faithful sought

---

in monasticism a way to fulfill their desire for perfection. In principle, the monk was the person who retired from the world to advance in spiritual life. The first known manifestations of Christian monasticism date from the end of the 3rd century and the eastern Mediterranean, and from its beginnings and throughout its history it presented three modalities: anchoriteism or hermitism, *laura* and the cenobitic community. The first modality was the individual of the anchorite, who in the most absolute solitude dedicated his life to prayer, manual work and penance. The second type of laura constituted a kind of colony of hermits who broke their absolute solitude only at certain times on Saturday and Sunday, when they met in the church, located in the center of the colony of hermitages, for the purpose to perform common prayer and celebrate the Eucharist. The third modality of monasticism was the cenobitic, which required life in common.

These eastern monastic experiences soon became known and spread rapidly throughout the West. The two features that marked the differences between Eastern and Western monasticism were the interpretation of the ascetic exercise and the social projection of the monk. Indeed, the monks of the West accepted the Eastern models, but softened their practices a century before la Regla Benedict definitively imprinted that character. Furthermore, Western monasticism was characterized by the greater social projection of the monks, and decidedly opted for cenobitism, although it left hardly any traces of laura, and provided few examples of anchoriteism. The cult of saints, with pilgrimages to their graves, allowed the bishops to provide a different meaning to those pagan practices, while at the same time Christianizing the burial rites and the consideration of the deceased.

Starting in the year 313, the definitive visibility of Christianity caused the church-institution to definitively gain ground over the church-community, during the 4th-6th centuries. In those three hundred years, the most relevant features of history were three: the continuity of the clerical structure, the strengthening of the monarchical episcopate and the strengthening of the primacy of the bishop of Rome. The progressive affirmation of a more ritual religion recognized by the State caused the differences between clergy and laity to become increasingly evident. The first maintained the previous structure in two orders: the upper one of the priests and deacons, and the lower one of the subdeacons, exorcists, ostiaries and readers. In both cases, it was an urban clergy. For the formation of the former, some bishops had small centers, where they acquired knowledge of the rudiments of pastoral and liturgical skills, as well as those of the administration of parish finances and the organization of charitable institutions. This urban image was truncated in the rural order, where the spread of Christianity progressed slowly. Private churches in the large domains of large Christian landowners began to dominate the landscape until the 11th century.

Furthermore, the transcendental legacy of Jerome (347-420), disciple of the Greek grammarian Donatus and autor of the *Vulgata* (commissioned by Pope Damasus), should be highlighted, with the revision on the ancient Greek translation of the *Vetus Latina,* based on the translation of the Hebrew text of the Bible. On the threshold of the Middle Ages, his figure as a philologist and historien (as well as a hermit and cenobite) came to summarize what was going to be the history of cultural transmission for the next thousand years: a history of monasteries and codices, texts and copystes, who translated, revised and built a universe, in which written standardization permanently maintained a leading rol (see J. A. García de Cortázar, 2116; F. Gimeno, 2019: 166-77).

II. PRE-ROMAN HISPANIA

The Romanization of the northern half of the Iberian Peninsula began in the Ebro basin, along which the Romans traced the main commercial routes that linked the capital of Tarragona, on the Mediterranean coast, with the interior of the country. Parallel to this early Romanization, the various native languages began to fade to the benefit of Latin. Roman cultural influence increased from T. Sempronius Gracchus, the founder of Gracchurris (today Alfaro), in 184 BC, until the dismemberment of the Empire due to the push of the Germanic peoples. La Rioja was probably the region in the north of the Peninsula most affected by an older and faster Romanization. The ancient onomastics of this area do not offer Basque names, but Latin ones. Regarding the relations between Basque and Latin, throughout antiquity and the Middle Ages, we must admit that, in the stage of the Romanization of northern Hispania, many Latin words used by Roman colonists and legionaries passed to the Basque language. Later, others, already evolved, were taken from the Romance languages spoken in the territories adjacent to the Basque Country (see S. Segura and J. M. Etxebarria, 1996: 11-2).

Regarding the languages of pre-Roman Hispania, R. Lapesa (1942/1981: 20-47) alluded to the fact that in the time of Augustus the Greek geographer Estrabón stated that among the natives of the Hispanic peninsula there was a diversity of languages. This assertion was fully corroborated by the studies carried out in the last century on the inscriptions on tombstones and ancient coins. At the dawn of historical times, people with a common language that survives in today's Basque language were established on both sides of the Pyrenees. The culture of the Iberians of probably North African origin extended along the Levante coast and neighboring regions, perhaps as a remnant of a broader previous domain, and it was to them that the peninsula owed the name Iberia, given to it by Greek writers. The Iberian writing now offered few difficulties for its reading, thanks to the fact that M. Gómez-Moreno discovered in it a combination of syllabic signs, like those of the graphic systems

(Cretan and Cypriot), signs representative of separate phonemes, such as that of the Phoenician and Greek alphabets. While the Basque region preserved its language, the rest of the peninsula accepted Latin as its own language, forgetting its primitive languages, but we find pre-Roman linguistic transfers both in Spanish phonology and in Spanish morphology and lexicon of pre-Roman origin (see F. Gimeno, 2019: 87-166).

2.1. Furthermore, regarding the influence of Basque on the romances, M. T. Echenique (2004) offered various considerations on the Basque-Romanesque contact, since Basque as a pre-Roman language was the only Paleo-Hispanic language that survived the Romanization of the Iberian Peninsula. Firstly, it coexisted with Latin (from which it received numerous lexical transfers, as well as other syntactic ones), and then with the Romance languages (mainly with Riojan, Aragonese, Navarrese, Occitan-Gascon and later with French), in whose contacts the transfers that the romances influenced on Basque were undoubtedly of greater effect than the other way around, without the substitution of the Basque language being implied, within a situation of broad diglossia (see F. Gimeno and M. V. Gimeno, 2003: 31- 48).

Likewise, regarding the process of oral formation of Rioja vocalism, said author explained that it came from Basque-Latin bilingualism and the formation of the proto-Romance variants. In fact, this process was inseparable from the close proximity and contact with the reality of Basque, and at the beginning of the 10th century the entire west of the province of Logroño (from the Najerilla River) spoke Basque and Riojan, just as it was well known that even in the 13th century, Basque was spoken in the Ojacastro Valley. Furthermore, in the middle of the 10th century the Basque glosses of the *Glosas Emilianenses* assumed that in a place near San Millán de la Cogolla coexisted (in addition to Basque and Riojan) the medieval Latin, the Occitan, the Gascon, the Hebrew and the Mozarabic of the immigrants from the south. Basque-Romanesque contact occurred, therefore, in a multicultural context of social multilingualism, less linked to the Latin-Roman tradition.

In the reconstruction of Basque it had been possible to see a system of five oral vowels with three degrees of opening, without any vestige of the opposition of quantity. Rioja vocalism (as well as Aragonese and Asturian, which presented a system identical to that of Basque) had, therefore, its origin in the Basque-Romance bilingualism of the different social groups, within the Basque-speaking community, and not in the vocalism of the Hispanic Latin of the Pyrenean area and Hispanic surroundings. Furthermore, these Riojan-speaking groups consolidated the Romance diphthongization of the two open stressed vowels of colloquial Latin (*e* and *o*), although this diphthongization existed in other Romance languages, but in none of them did the diphthongs completely replace the two open vowels (see M. T. Echenique, 1983, 2013).

III. PROCESSES OF ORAL FORMATION

Like geolectal differentiation, the authentic process of oral formation of the Romance languages was objectively gradual and cumulative, and we should never assume a last speech community of medieval Latin, nor a first speech community of any Romance variety (see H. Lüdtke , 2005: 566; F. Gimeno, 2004a), but rather a linguistic and cultural continuity, based on successive and diverse historical acculturations. Nor should we assume a last Basque speaking community, nor a first monolingual oral Latin speaking community (classical and late), but rather disparate sociolinguistic situations in the process of formation of romances (see F. Gimeno, 2019: 54-71). There were not strictly, therefore, origins of French, Occitan, Italian or Spanish, since we were limited to the appearance of the texts from the second half of the 8th century, and not to the processes of oral formation of the romances from the first half of the 8th century. The origin, present and near future of languages are multilingual and multicultural. Languages are social and cultural products, and the only viable solution was the analysis of the intrinsic relationship between language, society and culture (see F. Gimeno, 2023a, 2023b, 2023c).

3.1. Based on the polarization of the vocabulary and the morphological and syntactic split, H. Lüdtke (1968: 247-57) characterized the social situation from the time of Augustus to that of Charlemagne as diglossia. It manifested the incipient separation of Latin between the colloquial register and the standard variety, and the increasing distance between both varieties. With the Carolingian cultural reform (in favor of a clear differentiation between Romance and medieval Latin and the written fixation of Western romances) the previous diglossia disappeared, and a new bilingual situation was created, characterized by Latin/Romance dualism.

This occurred first in France, the Spanish Marches and northern Italy, and then in imitation of the first in other Romanesque countries. However, the written normalization of Western romances was after the time of such materialization in the neighboring Celtic and Germanic varieties, which began with Gothic in the 4th century, and was supported by the fact that in the speaking communities Non-Romanesque, the written fixation of the different varieties represented an important means for the expression of high culture. And in imitation of their neighbors, the different Romance social groups decided to consider the possibility of written standardization of their new varieties.

The decision of the Council of Tours (813), that sermons had to be orally translated into the vernacular (romance or not), led to the creation of written samples in these varieties as well, and gradually developed an incipient

literature in the French or Occitan variety. which were the oldest romance varieties. During the 11th and 12th centuries, medieval Latin was not only the official language, but also the highest-ranking literary variety, in the same way as Greek in the Eastern Roman Empire, or Arabic and Hebrew in the Iberian Peninsula. Among these traditionally recognized languages and the other Romance languages, the *langue d'oïl* and *langue d'oc* reached a kind of intermediate position at the end of the 11th century and, above all, during the 12th century. In particular, at the end of the 11th century, the same northern location and the different degree of Romanization of the lands of the "oïl" language allowed the appearance of the epic poem of the *Chanson de Roland*, while troubadour poetry emerged in Occitan.

However, the processes of oral formation and written normalization of the romances were determined by the broad temporal, geographical and social context of the Romance speaking communities, based on the influence of the history of Roman law, as well as the important contribution of Jerome to the history of textual transmission, with the appearance of glosses and glossaries. Oral formation and written standardization emerged in the Gallo-Romanesque-French contact in northern Gaul. The first written standardization of the romances was therefore brought forward a few centuries until the second half of the 8th century.

Subsequently, through a pragmatic-descriptive approach to the texts, H. Lüdtke (2005) offered us an encyclopedic compendium on the formation of romances, which included the various lines of research that followed one another in the field of Romance linguistics. He even mentioned the term variation, and integrated the contribution from historical sociolinguistics. Furthermore, he had provided us with notable contributions on linguistic change (among others) and some considerations on Catalan, as well as some rectifications about the historical position of Spanish on a supposed close unity of the Luso-Hispanic complex (in comparison with the great dispersion observable within the central and northwestern Romanesque), from some particularisms (lexical, phonic, semantic and syntactic) based on diachronic functionalism (see H. Lüdtke , 1996a, 1996b, 1996c, 1998).

Linguistic communication (observed in speech acts) constituted the only manifestation of language that was given to us empirically, and the study of linguistic change would be feasible, following the pragmatic performance of countless speech acts of the speaker. The universal and ineluctable linguistic change would rather result from the variation and choice carried out by the speaker at each moment of his performance. This choice would concern him precisely in two different stages of the speech act: when he chooses meanings, and when he begins to manifest them through signifiers, with the regulation of the corresponding phonic output. The processes of linguistic change thus generated would, therefore, be of two types, in accordance with the planes of the language (semantic / lexical / syntactic and phonic).

However, faced with descriptive, qualitative and autonomous hypotheses of linguistic change, we had to assume that the syntactic, semantic or phonological change implied a grammatical change in the communicative competencies of the successive generational and social groups of the speech community, to through the reorganization of the vernacular. Those assumptions about the formation of romances prevented us from understanding and explaining the anthropological, sociological and legal coordinates of the social multilingualism of hybrid manuscripts. The grammars of the different social groups of the speech community (vernacular and standard, depending on the use domains) and the very concept of 'speech community' (and not the idiolect) were the fundamental objective of sociolinguistic research (see U. Weinreich , W. Labov and M. I. Herzog, 1968: 187-8; J. A. Fishman, 1971: 237-58; W. Labov, 2001: 71-2; F. Gimeno, 2008a: 255-60).

3.2. Regarding the origin of the romances, H. Lausberg (1956/1962, I: 51-94) wrote that it was a phenomenon due, on the one hand, to the relaxation of the external ties of the Roman Empire and the weakening of its cultural vitality, and on the other, to the new formation of "national" speech communities (emerged later), which independently assimilated and vivified the ancient cultural tradition. An in-depth study of the romances discovered numerous pre-Roman elements, which had infiltrated and amalgamated with the respective romances throughout history. Not only in terms of the impressive influence on the lexicon, but there were also various influences to be reckoned with on the phonology and syntax of the romances, although we hardly knew more than the name of most of the pre-Roman varieties, and it was difficult to determine the time when they disappeared.

In the 1st century BC. all the pre-Roman languages were still alive (with the exception of the Mediterranean varieties in Italy). It is possible that Gaulish had been preserved longer than any other language (in some parts of Switzerland perhaps until the 5th century). The pre-Roman languages that had been preserved to the present in their peripheral strongholds of Romania were: Basque in the western Pyrenean area and the Basque Country, Albanian in Albania and Greek in the southern extremities of Calabria (Bova next to Reggio) and Apulia (next to Otranto). In the Roman Empire as a whole, the following elements played a decisive role in Romanization: the Roman administration, the military garrisons (in connection with them, the granting of the right of citizenship to provincial graduates), the Roman culture of the centers urban areas and schools (especially in Spain and Gaul), commercial exchange and rural colonization. The acceptance of Latin by the inhabitants of the provinces was a process that developed without coercion of any kind, and only represented the linguistic impact of the political, commercial and cultural penetration of the empire. Nor was there a conscious will on the part of the inhabitants of the provinces to preserve their mother

tongue, except in the aforementioned conservative strongholds. However, linguistic conservation and substitution implied a linguistic awareness and attitude (positive or negative, respectively) (see F. Gimeno, 2016a).

Medieval Latin had a fundamental characteristic: it was a written (and on certain occasions even oral) register, when generally what was spoken was not Latin. It was, therefore, a language learned in monastic and episcopal schools, from the moment when the mother tongue of the different social groups was no longer Latin, but a different variety. It was not easy to determine when medieval Latin stopped being a vernacular variety of communication in the West (for some, the 6th or 7th century, and for others at the very beginning of the 8th century). The linguistic consciousness of Romance arose in the Gallo-Romanesque-French contact in the kingdom of the Franks, starting in the first half of the 8th century, and was fostered by the bilingual Gallo-Romanesque-French consciousness of a multicultural Romanesque-Germanic community, less linked to the Latin-Roman tradition. In general, linguistic awareness was less clear and resolved in the Romance context than in the Germanic one, due to the lesser differentiation between medieval Latin and the Romances. The Romanesque world emerged from Gallo-Romanesque-French contact in northern Gaul.

3.3. The real reason for the transition from the relative unity of colloquial Latin to the plurality of neo-Latin varieties, according to C. Tagliavini (1949/1969: 363-4), was in the concomitant influence of the three factors adduced by several authors (G. Gröber, C. Merlo and W. von Wartburg):
a) the chronological discrepancy of the colonization of the various *provinciae* or regions;
b) the difference of pre-Roman languages, and
c) the divergent influences exerted over the centuries by peoples who overlapped the different social groups of the Romance-speaking communities.

There were multiple, therefore, the causes of the formation of romances and their progressive differentiation. As the links of unity weakened with the collapse of the Western Roman Empire, faced with the push of the Germanic peoples, we would witness a struggle between the old centripetal force and new centrifugal forces, and the new neo-Latin world would emerge. The reconstruction of the oral register (considerably different from the written one) of the various romances in the period of origins was sometimes impossible. Even when we can determine with sufficient accuracy the oldest testimonies of each of the romances, we had to necessarily limit ourselves to the examination of the written documents, which were always after the formation of the romances as vernacular. After the fall of the Western Roman Empire, Latin became the official language of the Christian church , and continued to be written and spoken (more the former than the latter). The literary models were always the classic ones, and the greatest effort for medieval writers was to manage a language that was no longer spoken (at least, in the domain of family use).

Later, J. Herman (1975/1997: 137-47) opined that the end of the history of Latin ended with the 7th century and the first decades of the 8th century. In the course of the first half of the 8th century, the structural changes of the language produced in Gaul a communicative rupture between the mother tongue used by everyone and the Latin inherited from the texts. However, this date would not necessarily be common to all Romanized territories, and would depend on the particularities of the evolution of the linguistic system in the different regions. So, for example, in Italy, the first evidence of a conscious differentiation between the regional language and the written practice of Latin came only from the second half of the 10th century. The differences in the date of the origin of the romances would be due to factors that were still determined. Thus it was likely that the early and radical character of certain evolutions in the variety of ancient Gaul (e.g., the widespread drop of vowels in final syllables — except *a* — that occurred in Gallo-Romanesque between the 7th and 8th centuries) contributed to accelerate the transition in this region. The mechanism of the evolution of Latin towards the Romance stage and the interaction of "external" and "internal" factors were very far from being revealed, and from being described with the desirable precision and rigor.

Likewise, the internal diversity (geographical, social and situational) of the Latin of the various regions of the empire could already be argued in imperial times. There were very solid reasons to suppose that Latin, since the time of the empire, had regional varieties, which mainly affected pronunciation and perhaps certain morphological elements, and in the later periods of its evolution it even had dialects. In a way, the different Romance varieties represented the medieval dialects of Latin: there was no solution of continuity. Just as there are no rigid geographical boundaries between particular languages, the chronological boundaries between successive phases of the language were a fiction of our minds, and there were— as among the best characterized geolects — intermediate or transitional varieties (see R. Penny, 2000: 45-56; F. Gimeno and E. Martínez Olmos, 2010). The process of transformation from Latin to Romance was related, therefore, to the linguistic diversification of Romania (due to the various historical, sociological, cultural and legal circumstances) and to the slow and continuous process of linguistic and social variation.

3.4. Regarding the origin of the romances, J. J. de Bustos Tovar (2004a: 258-68) believed that it would be a macroprocess that would lead to the dismemberment of Latin, as a result of the evolutionary interaction that affected all the components of the original system. There were two phenomena that decisively intervened in the initiation of changes that took centuries to complete. The first was the emergence of Christianity, which brought

a new conception of the world in all its breadth. The second was the invasion of the Germanic peoples, who (although already Romanized for the most part) destroyed the political and cultural unity of the Roman world and gave rise to large population movements and new territorial divisions, as well as an impoverishment of the classic culture. However, Roman culture survived as a model until well into the 7th century, and the use of Latin as the only language of communication. Strictly speaking, the proto-romances were the set of evolutionary tendencies, the existence of which had to be assumed to explain their generalization at the time of their origins, in the different peninsular romances, until the 8th century.

In the evolution of languages there would be, according to this author, two types of causes: internal and external. The first derived from the fact that the language was a system open to a tendency towards restructuring, with the production of a dynamic of change that had not yet reached a stable equilibrium. So, for example, it occurred when the Latin velar consonants, in contact with a palatal vowel, began an articulatory displacement until a new correlation beam was configured, based on palatality and not on velarity. Social and cultural factors (that favored the disappearance of a language and its substitution by others derived from it) were always related to major historical crises, since these caused ruptures in the internal cohesion of all the elements that determined social unity, political and cultural.

All in all, the distinction between "internal" and "external" factors was one of the most discussed issues of the diachronic functionalist theory of the last century (see F. Gimeno, 1995: 39-53), despite the fact that said functionalism recognized that the formation of the various romances, from the same Latin diasystem, questioned the past simplification of hypotheses based only on linguistic systems (see A. Quilis, 1976). Among the limitations of said functionalism were, on the one hand, the marginalization of anthropological, sociological and legal history, with the impact on the determinism of the diasystem (which implied an inadmissible opposition between linguistic structure and cultural tradition), and on the other, the perception that the results of the contact of some romances had not produced important modifications of the phonological and syntactic structure (under the influence of social factors), without realizing that it was a limitation of their objectives and methodology.

One of the general principles of the study of linguistic change, according to U. Weinreich , W. Labov and M. I. Herzog (1968: 188), was that linguistic, social and cultural factors were directly related in the process of linguistic change, and the explanations those who limited themselves to tone or other elements were wrong, since they had to take into account the regularities observed in empirical studies on linguistic behavior and the dimensions of social multilingualism. In other words, there was no linguistic change without ongoing variation (although all variation did not imply change) and without social and cultural variation, without linguistic components, nor historical, sociological, cultural and legal determinants of the various speech communities. The relationship between linguistic, social and cultural factors was revealed in the phonological transfer of the Iberian and Basque pentavocalic system in Castilian, and in the biblical transfer of the syntactic calque of the Semitic word order, in the process of oral formation of the romances.

3.5. In fact, despite neo-idealist prejudices, B. Terracini (1951) proposed in the conflicts of languages and cultures the substitution of Gaul by the Latin of the Roman Empire, through the coordinates of maximum cultural fusion, minimum awareness of substitution and maximum original similarity of the two languages in contact. In the linguistic conflict, the moment of social cohesion that was materialized in the language played a decisive role. Any form of linguistic substitution resulted from the fusion of two linguistic systems and two cultural traditions, and therefore had to be studied from the perspective of social bilingualism. Now, for this bilingualism to cause linguistic substitution, two conditions had to be met:
a) An effective mixture of groups of people speaking two different languages, although the relative entity of both groups was not a decisive factor, and
b) A difference in prestige, based on the fact that one of the groups considered the other as the bearer of a superior form of culture.

The substitution of a language could be verified through the extinction of its different social groups, or through the exclusion of use in various domains (parliament, preaching, schools...), by the intentional imposition of the new language (see A. Vàrvaro , 1972-1973, 1978). In this sense, it was not unreasonable to assume that the process of formation of the romances was found in the ancient periods of displacement of pre-Roman vernaculars (with social mobility) by Latin, within clear situations of broad diglossia. With the spread and rise of Christianity throughout the ancient Roman world until the 6th century, these relatively stable situations had led (except in the case of Basque, Albanian and Greek) to linguistic conflicts, where the substitution of pre-Roman vernaculars by Latin took place.

In both periods (of extensive diglossia and of linguistic conflict) the corresponding grammatical commitments of interference, code-switching, tracing and borrowing occurred, within a complex process of social and cultural mixing. This hypothesis explained the subsequent survival of pre-Roman features in the process of formation of the romances, which gave rise to the well-known Romanesque theory of the linguistic substrate. This was corroborated by C. Tagliavini (1949/1969: 150), when he mentioned that the romances started from already formed Latin, although (to follow the processes of origin and development of the romances) it was necessary to often

refer to the phases archaic, or to the various substrates on which Latin was superimposed over the course of the centuries and in its historical expansion.

The general and historical model of linguistic substitution in the case of native communities was that of the progressive reduction of the subordinate language in the sociological and legal function: the displacement began with the abandonment of said linguistic variety in the domains of public use and formal (and its restriction to family and informal functions), and ended with its disappearance, when the family transmission of that variety to the children was interrupted. Furthermore, the displacement became gradual in a specific domain of use, so that the recessive variety went through a stage of variable use, before the exclusive use of the expansive variety. Linguistic substitution promoted syntactic and lexical simplification of the recessive variety, code-switching and calques, which responded to general problems of linguistic atrophy. The theory of social identity provided an analysis of the strategies of social change, in order to achieve positive psycholinguistic differentiation, and determined the dynamics of linguistic conservation or substitution (see F. Gimeno, 1985, 1988a, 1988b, 2019:61-70; F. Gimeno and M. V. Gimeno, 2003: 59-64).

3.6. Regarding the peculiar position of French within Western Romania (from the circumstances of the Frankish Germanic invasion), W. von Wartburg (1950: 131-40) claimed to have proven the existence of a Franco-Gallo-Roman bilingualism in the Northern Gaul, from the time of the Merovingian king Clovis (5th century) until at least the 9th century, and in certain regions even later. Within the linguistic and cultural transfers of the Franks and Burgundians in Gaul, total Germanization occurred in the north, and was losing intensity from north to south, where not only was there a numerically smaller invasion and a second less powerful invasion, but also to the fact that neo-Romanization (which already began in the 6th century in bilingual northern Gaul) reached them later and more slowly.

In this mutual relationship, Frankish policy was intentionally oriented from the beginning to create a situation of equality between the Romanesque and Germanic groups, and to attract both peoples in the same proportion to collaboration in the tasks of government. Therefore, a leading group emerged in the country with linguistic and cultural transfers, in which at the beginning the Germanic element still dominated, and it was decisive for the linguistic destiny of northern Gaul, since these transfers were propagated to the population of Gallo-Romans and Franks. Thus, the Franks were the ones who gave Merovingian Latin, north of the Loire, the essential features through which it came to have the first relevant peculiarities that were going to transform it into Old French (and the distinction from Occitan and Ibero-Romanesque), with the later substitution of Germanic (French) in the 10th century. Medieval Latin began to cease to be vernacular from the first half of the 8th century in northern Gaul, and this social situation of strict diglossia was fostered by the Gallo-Romanesque-French contact, less linked to the Latin-Roman tradition.

In his response to the fractionation or unity of late Latin, A. Vàrvaro (1968: 218-22; 1991) stated that the majority of Romance phenomena, with few (although important) exceptions, were always documented in Latin texts. With this extensive collection of data, specialists built a linguistic variety, which was called "familiar Latin", and some even came to think of a colloquial Latin system that could be represented by a grammar. The method of relative chronology applied by G. Straka also had many weak points, and the hypothesis of a period of evolution common to the entire pre-Romanesque or late Latin era was dismantled, just as the antiquity of local innovations and their contemporaneity with quite diffuse innovations became clear. However, the facts proved the differentiation of the colloquial register according to the regions, and consequently the principles of individuation and formation of the various romances would date back to the 2nd century AD, if not earlier. Romanesque fragmentation would be nothing more than the delayed consequence of a profound restructuring of the linguistic and social variables involved in each community. The reconstruction of romance had to introduce social factors, in order to suggest the link from proto-romance to pre-romance (or reality immediately prior, not reconstructed, to the existence of already Romance dialects) (see M. T. Echenique, 2006: 148).

IV. THE *GLOSAS EMILIANENSES* AND THE *GLOSAS SILENSES*

In his latest contribution C. García Turza (2023: 18-27) has highlighted that the ultimate purpose of philology should be the maximum approximation to the correct understanding of the experiences and cognitive acts created by an author, and usually associated by himself with oral or written expressions, which we call texts or discourses. In this aim of a better historical fixation of a text, the anthropological point of view was essential, in order to coherently analyze the *Glosas Emilianenses* and the *Glosas Silenses*. Indeed, the monasteries of San Millán de la Cogolla and Santo Domingo de Silos were distinguished precisely by the exceptional dedication of the monks of their respective desks to the activity of clarifying the meaning and meaning of many of the words, expressions and passages of the Latin texts that (within the important codices of their respective libraries) contained some type of difficulty in understanding.

4.1. With this predisposition on the preliminary historical aspects of San Millán de la Cogollain the Early Middle Ages, C. García Turza and J. García Turza (1997: 99-114) stated that since ancient times La Rioja has been defined by its border or transitional character. In the pre-Roman centuries, it was located on the borders between the Indo-European and non-Indo-European territories: the Celticized Berones lived there in contact with the Autrigones, Várdulos, Caristios and Vascones. After Romanization, this region was included in the Tarraconense province, and in the 6th century (with the campaigns of Leovigildo) it was part of the Duchy of Cantabria, a barely Romanized territory. This transitional character was maintained with the arrival of the Arabs, and lasted during la Edad Media, as has been stated.

Tradition linked San Millán de Suso with the place where Emiliano exercised his hermitism, whose biography was traced by Braulio of Zaragoza, around the years 635-640. Some information about Saint Millán could be extracted from this work: he was born in the year 473 and died on his centenary around 574. This biography was what provoked unusual interest in him, and confirmed that there were his followers in the middle of the 7th century. La Rioja was occupied by Muslims at the beginning of the 8th century, and remained under the control of the Banu Qasi, governors of la Marca Superior, until the first decades of the 10th century. In the year 923, King Sancho Garcés I of Pamplona, with the help of Ordoño II of León, definitively occupied the squares of Nájera and Viguera, and with them the rest of the smaller nuclei and their respective lands. The Navarrese proceeded to dominate said territory and reorganize it, with the presence of leading cadres and repopulators from the kingdom of Pamplona. Its subsequent historical evolution, until 1076 when it became part of the kingdom of Castile, always took place within the framework of the kingdom of Pamplona, although we must not lose sight of the fact that León and especially Castile also had their interests in La Rioja. In this way, while San Millán (a great beneficiary of the border situation) let itself go, and acted for its own benefit by assuming the Castilian ambitions of dominance, the rest of the Rioja monasteries generally gravitated more towards the Pamplona monarchy.

During the early medieval centuries, despite the well-known emigrations and their magnitude, this region was inhabited by a significant number of settlers, as could be seen from the conservation up to the present time of an endless number of toponyms of Latin origin. In the reorganization of the space and the strengthening of Christianity that had subsisted in the villages and fields, the Leonese and Navarrese monarchs set about restoring and strengthening Christian life on the territory, whose fundamental basis was the monasteries. Ordoño II restored the monastery of Santa Coloma, near Nájera, and Sancho Garcés I founded that of San Martín de Albelda. In addition, others were documented in the 10th century: San Cosmes and Sant Damián, along with Viguera, San Millán de la Cogolla, Sant Andrés de Cirueña, etc. Their role was of clear support for the repopulation of the different valleys in which they were located and in their areas of influence, thus, for example, San Martín de Albelda was located in the lower Iregua valley, San Millán in the Cárdenas river valley, etc.

The study of the ethnic or geographical origin of the inhabitants of La Rioja Alta was a topic of interest because this area is a border area, but it posed many complex problems. In the resumption of monastic life in San Millán there must have been some Navarrese contribution, perhaps promoted by the monarchy itself, and a similar contribution could have occurred in Nájera, the habitual residence of the Pamplona monarchs. Likewise, a population with Castilian-Leonese roots was perceived, which coincided with that found in the monasteries of Cardeña and Valpuesta. Through the examination of the onomastics, it could be inferred that there was never an Arab occupation in La Rioja Alta that went beyond military and (in some aspects) political control. However, with the arrival of a large number of Mozarabs from all the territories of Al-Andalus and the Ebro valley, everything was renewed and experienced a moment of splendor and well-being. However, it was difficult to judge the penetration of people arriving from the areas bordering La Rioja. Regarding the Basque language, its influence did not reach the Cárdenas River basin, nor the Najerilla River, so it should not be surprising that in the center of the San Millán domain hardly any Basque elements appeared. On the other hand, in the Tirón and Oja valleys not only were major Basque place names collected, but minor ones also abounded, especially in the Ojacastro valley, where this language was still being spoken in the 13th century.

4.2. After the Muslim occupation of La Rioja, according to these authors, the survival of the Emiliano monastic community from the 8th century onwards was more difficult to demonstrate, although historians not only analyzed the ancient documents, but also the archaeological remains, and never gave up interpreting the facts. The continuity of the monastery until the first decades of the 10th century was one of the issues most extensively discussed by all the researchers who delved into the study of the monastery, but they considered as a first working hypothesis that the Christian influence could have been maintained during the Banu Qasi dominion stage. Some oratories or cave churches that extended along the basins of the Rioja rivers assumed this. Furthermore, it would be difficult to explain the rapidity with which monastic life grew in La Rioja after the reconquest, evident in the examples of the monasteries of San Martín de Albelda, San Millán de la Cogolla or San Prudencio de Monte Laturce. These tests were an indication of the condescension of the Banu Qasi and the role of obligatory intermediary that the Rioja space played between Arab and Christian culture. On the other hand, it should not be forgotten that other monastic centers such as that of San Miguel de Pedroso, San Vicente del Valle or San Félix de Montes de Oca, closely linked to the Emilian monastery,

showed obvious signs of having adapted to different times, and of having maintained a spiritual life throughout the early Middle Ages.

Furthermore, the general aspects that favored the continuity of a heremitic or cenobitic life in San Millán de Suso were several, and there were eminently archaeological arguments, supported by several scholars. M. Gómez Moreno, among others, argued for the possible antiquity of the caves, and the clearly Mozarabic character of the origins of the church of Suso. Other authors supported different arguments to resolve the problem of the continuity of religious life in San Millán. G. Martínez Díaz supported the thesis of the survival of the cult and memory of the saint's tomb between 714 and 923, although there was no reliable proof of the existence of a monastic community on the site during that same period of time. In fact, the first documentary news about the monastery of San Millán de Suso appeared in the 10th century. Thus, for example, codex *1007B* (or *1729*) from the Archivo Histórico de Madrid seemed clearly Emilian, copied by Jimeno in San Millán in the year 933, that is, a decade after La Rioja was reconquered. Much more security was offered by codex *25* of the la Real Academia de la Historia, and a copy of the *Etymologiae* of Isidoro de Sevilla, made by the same scribe in 946. The first mention of an authentic document about San Millán de la Cogolla corresponded to the year 942 (see C. García Turza, 2003b; C. García Turza and J. García Turza, 2000, 2004).

For the most part, the peninsular monasteries promoted to a greater or lesser extent the maintenance of a Latin culture, especially through ritual and religious readings. The royal protection that San Millán enjoyed gave it an aristocratic character, through which the kings of Pamplona or the Castilian count became its benefactors. Consequently, the Emilian friars left the work of the land in the hands of other men, while they dedicated their efforts to intellectual work. This circumstance led to the formation of a library, perhaps not especially rich during the early Middle Ages, but rich enough to correspond to a monastery of the importance of the Emiliano (whose enclosure undoubtedly exceeded that which has been preserved to this day). with monastic-oriented texts and works dedicated to grammatical and philological training, as was the case of the glossaries that exceeded in number what was usual anywhere.

This desk was already functioning regularly in the second quarter of the 10th century, and with a policy of frank expansion of ecclesiastical literature with dense theological and moral content. Furthermore, due to its strategic location and its outstanding cultural development, the area (which included the dependent territories of Cardeña, Silos, San Martín de Albelda and of course San Millán) became a focus of permanent and enriching exchange of texts. In the library, copies from León and Castilian converged with others from Navarre, from the Ebro Valley and from Andalusia, without forgetting the news from beyond the Pyrenees, with the introduction of esmaragdos, glossaries, etc. Relations with the Christian resistance centers of the Pyrenees were equally intense, and explained certain cultural currents that linked La Rioja with the east of the peninsula. The conciliar codex of San Millán reflected the Pyrenean-Catalan influence, which sometimes overlapped or was confused with that la Narbonense or Septimania. Another fundamental aspect in both areas (Catalonia and La Rioja) was the production of lexicographic content, much superior quantitatively and qualitatively to that of the rest of the peninsular territory (see J. García Turza, 2013).

The Camino de Santiago played a prominent role in these cultural relations, and meant a new reality and a substantial cultural change for La Rioja. Between the years 780 and 820, la Iglesia (which had been the institution most affected by Muslim penetration) consolidated its real and theoretical position in the nascent Asturian kingdom. Around the second decade of the 9th century, a circumstance that consolidated the situation of the ecclesiastical hierarchy (and the life of the kingdom itself) was the news of the discovery of the tomb of the apostle Santiago, on a mountain near the newly created headquarters of Iria Flavia. The place (called Compostela) immediately became a destination for pilgrimages, and at the beginning of the 12th century the apostle (whose remains were believed buried there) was erected as a symbol of Christian resistance against Islam. Starting in the 10th century, the Camino de Santiago allowed the monarchs to organize a route (the "French Way") with certain services, although in its origin and rise the Christian church played a considerable role, and was part of the process of renewal of urban life, which all of Western Europe experienced simultaneously. A documented fact was that Godescalco (French bishop of Puy, on his pilgrimage to Compostela in the year 950) stopped at the monastery of Saint Martin of Albelda, in order to obtain a copy of the text *De Virginitate Beatae Mariae* de Ildefonso de Toledo, which allowed us to know the quality of the codices prepared in the desks of the Riojan monasteries, and the bibliographic agreement between the different monastic libraries.

Regarding two centuries of *Mozarabía* in La Rioja, G. Martínez Díez (1993: 29-34) defended the continuity of the cult and memory over the tomb of San Millán, even through the two long centuries of Islamic domination over the region (714-923). The veneration of the saint in the same place where he practiced the hermit life (and where his body was buried) seemed to have suffered no interruption since the saint's death. The Morarabic continuity in La Rioja was proven by the conservation of diplomas written in Riojan monasteries prior to the year 923, in the *Becerro galicano de San Millán*. This was the case of San Miguel de Pedroso, of which the founding letter signed on April 24, 759 had reached us, which went to the archive of San Millán, when the monastery of San Miguel itself was incorporated into the Emilian monastery. Without continuity of religious life in San Miguel de Pedroso under Muslim rule, this diploma would not have been preserved. The frequent ties of military alliance and marriage (sometimes

followed by conversion to Christianity) that the Banu Qasi maintained during the 9th century with the Kings of Pamplona could also contribute, and that in this historical period religious tolerance towards Christians flourished.

About the history of the monastery of Silos in the 10th century, according to this author, we knew nothing, only its probable existence in the year 979, when a small monastery located in Silos appeared in Castilian history, and placed under the dedication of Saint Sebastián and the holy apostles Pedro and Pablo. The document purportedly issued by Fernán González in the year 919 incurred the anachronism of titling him Count of Castile (and marrying Doña Sancha) thirteen years before these events took place. Nor was the diploma of the year 979 that was delivered to Silos from the monastery of Saint Bartolomé, located in a place called Villanueva, free of suspicion, since firstly it declared Ordoño as king, when the reigning monarch was Ramiro, and secondly It was darted to Wednesday, April 6, 979, when that year April 6 fell on a Sunday. In favor of authenticity, there were the following reasons: 1) neither the category of the grantors, nor the content of the endowment gave rise to suspicion of them, and 2) it was addressed to an abbot Belasius (nor a very common name), but that we found an abbot of that name in the year 978 in de founding document of Covarrubias.

4.3. Although linguistic planning was defined as the explicit activity of normalizing a normative spelling, syntax, and dictionary, the implicit reconstruction of written normalization of Hispanic romances allowed us to understand and explain the appearance of the first Romance lexical samples and the first Romanesque texts in the 8th, 9th and 10th centuries, in accordance with the influence of the history of Roman law and the prescriptions of Tours, together with the conservation of the peculiarity of the Hispano-Visigothic tradition. From the second half of the 8th century, the first Romance texts of manuscript documentation and the first examples of Romance glosses could not be seen only as superficial innovations of the scribes, but were inscribed within an implicit process of linguistic planning. Visigothic Spain was one of the last and most valuable manifestations of ancient culture. Isidoro de Sevilla (c. 560-636) laid the foundations of medieval culture and had a direct influence on the "Caroligian Renaissance". By the year 800, the *Etymologies* (20 books) were found in all the culturel centers of Europe, either as imitations, preserved copies or simple references of their presence in libraries (see J. García Turza, 2000).

In general, hybrid samples and texts were observed (or mixed of the two varieties, an acquired family one and a learned school one). These testimonies represented an unquestionable phase of the Latin-romance continuity (within a written normalization of the romances), which were explained from the transfer between the two varieties that intervened in the bilingual competence of the scribe, and to which he had to adhere to to achieve the understanding of the subscribers of the notarial text (such as, for example, sales). It was not, therefore, a question of notaries and scribes ignorant of medieval Latin, as has been written until now, but of different multicultural communities of language contact, less linked to the Latin-Roman tradition. The two manifestations that best defined language contact were the code-switching and the calque, which were characteristics of the written normalization of texts (hybrids and romances), from the second half of the 8th century to the middle of the 12th century (see L. V. Aracil, 1971; J. A. Fishman, 1971, 1973; F. Gimeno, 1995: 39-53, 79-84) .

Despite the early appearance of a linguistic consciousness, and the fact that the classification of the written register and the very delimitation of Latin and Romance were not only a linguistic issue, but also a fact of linguistic consciousness, a first working hypothesis contemplated the delimitation of documents, based on the least and most superficial components. In some cases, they were hybrid texts that presented a Latin syntax and lexicon in the less superficial ones (syntax and semantics), in which romance appeared in the only possible way, that is, with the Romance variation in the most superficial components (specifically, with the morphological substitution or calque of the order of words and the import of Romance morphology and phonology, particularly through graphematic variation and onomastic terms), and we were dealing with Latin texts. In other cases, the hybrid documents presented a Romance syntax and lexicon in the less superficial components, with Latin spelling in the most superficial ones, and we were dealing with Romance texts.

Subsequently, the analysis of the documentation had to be considered through the stripping of the written texts and the isolation of the multiple variables (linguistic, social and cultural) and the superficial variants of the documents, with the probabilistic treatment of the linguistic transfer. Starting from a quantitative paradigm, the study of linguistic, social and cultural factors and the use of a variationist methodology were necessary in the systematic examination of the empirical relationships that could be established between documentary testimonies and the covariation of two or more (sub)systems in the linguistic repertoire of the scribe (and of the speech community), in order to obtain a hypothetical reconstruction of the romances (see W. Labov, 1982: 34-8; S. Romaine , 1982; C. Silva-Corvalán, 1988/2001; H. López Morales, 1989, 2006; F. Gimeno, 1995: 131-71, 2003a, 2004b; F. Gimeno and M. V. Gimeno, 2003: 203-87).

On the other hand, the hypothesis of the history of linguistics as a succession of paradigms was more appropriate to the linguistic facts and to the continuity of history itself, than a replacement of models. One of the most assiduously held principles in historical linguistics has been the theory of the regularity of linguistic change. In the neogrammatical model, phonological change and analogy constituted the two basic components of

linguistic change. Phonological change acted independently of morphological, syntactic and semantic function, and analogy dealt precisely with the relationship between phonological and morphological structure.

In this sense, we could differentiate two interpretations: 1) autonomous version of the assumption of phonological regularity, and 2) grammatical version of linguistic change. The hypothesis of the autonomy of linguistic levels was incompatible with the postgenerative theory of grammatical change, but some European functionalists have not recognized this incompatibility. The syntactic, semantic or phonological change implied a grammatical change in the communicative competences of successive generational and social groups, within the speech community, through the reorganization of the vernacular with the generational relay.

Likewise, there was a double starting strategy in the investigation of linguistic change: a) homogeneity, and b) structured heterogeneity. According to these interpretations that provided us with a double entry into the history of linguistics, there were the following models of linguistic change: a1) neogrammatical; b1) dialectological; a2) functionalist; b2) pragmatic; a3) generative, and b3) sociolinguistic. If all linguistic change implied ongoing variation (although all variation did not imply change), homogeneous models of linguistic change (neogrammatical, functionalist and generative) were unrealistic and inadequate.

From the point of view of the models of linguistic change in the study of the *Glosas Emilianenses* and *Silenses*, the following contributions stood out: a) historical dialectological model of R. Menéndez Pidal (1926/1950); b) diachronic functionalist model of M. C. Díaz y Díaz (1978), E. Alarcos (1982a), C. Hernández (1993a), J. A. Frago (2002) and J. J. de Bustos Tovar (2004b), and c) historical sociolinguistic model of F. Gimeno (1995) and C. García Turza (2003a).

4.4. Furthermore, in 19th century linguistics, H. Arens (1969: 229-76) alluded to the fact that the first three decades constituted the most fruitful and great era for the history of linguistics, and the researcher W. von Humboldt (1767-1835) stood out, who combined extensive and profound linguistic knowledge with high reasoning in which for the first time the border between linguistics and philosophy of language was erased. Language, considered in its real nature, was always something fugitive. Until its normalization through the written register, it was only an incomplete conservation, requiring an attempt to make the neuronal connection sensible in it. It was not a result (*ergon*), but a cultural process of oral formation (*energeia*), and its true definition could only be genetic. Strictly speaking, this was the materialization of the Romance register, from the successive generational change of the different social groups, within the various speech communities.

In the first half of the 20th century, the study of the history of language was very far from the analysis of linguistic variation and variety (in time, space and society), and from the anthropological and sociological considerations of the different social groups of speech communities. Furthermore, the mechanism of the evolution of Visigothic Latin towards the proto-Romance stage and the interaction of linguistic, social and cultural factors were not resolved, nor described with the desirable precision and rigor. In the processes of formation and written normalization of the romances, not only was the internal evolution of Visigothic Latin itself involved, but the displacement of the romances by medieval Latin also appeared involved, which promoted the Carolingian reform.

During the second half of the last century, great contributions had been accumulated to historical linguistics, which were far from being recognized by language historians, but which have meant great successes and technical solutions to hitherto inexplicable events. Thus, for example, linguistic change (ongoing and stable), acculturation, linguistic planning, social function, linguistic substitution, diglossia and linguistic conflict, etc. The process of written normalization of the romances responded to an implicit application of linguistic planning, and our working hypothesis proposed two stages (proto-romance and ancient and medieval) and five periods with disparate and discontinuous social situations (unstable and stable) in the Romanesque West. That is, it comprised a proto-Romance stage (8th century-second half of the 11th century) and two periods (3rd and 5th) of unstable situations with restrictions on the use of the Romance text, compared to another stage (ancient and medieval) (late 11th century-late 15th century) and two periods (2nd and 4th) of stable normalization situations favorable to the use of the Romance text, with the statistical analysis of the process of written normalization of Hispanic romances (see F. Gimeno, 2019: 233- 55, 364-419).

Both the unique glossistic production (glosses and glossaries) and the outstanding contribution to the creation and systematization of the Castilian alphabet were consequences of the constant interest of some monks of San Millán and Silos in clarifying the texts for their own use and, above all, for reveal its meaning to their less prepared brothers. The history of the desks (emilianense and silense) would be valued more correctly taking into account that commendable purpose among the monks of facilitating the understanding of the texts of their respective libraries: codices of biblical, theological, liturgical, humanistic content and, especially, those of spiritual and pastoral formation.

The best contribution to the cartularies and documentary collections was the edition and the codicological and paleographic study of the *Becerro galicano de San Millán de la Cogolla*, carried out by F. García Andreva (2010). The diplomatic distribution in centuries was as follows: 2 diplomas from the 8th century, 2 from the 9th century, 62 from the 10th century, 564 from the 11th century and 161 from the 12th century, with

a total of 791, which included from the year 759 (the oldest) to 1194. Regarding the circumstances that led to the creation of the first cartulary, J. A. García de Cortázar (1969) studied the donations and purchases of their repopulating work made by the Emilian monastery, and revealed that the largest number of their acquisitions were achieved from the first quarter of the 11th century until the end of said century (see F. Gimeno, 2019: 355-69).

V. RIOJAN ROMANCE PRAYER

The ultimate goal of the science of philological work should be the complete understanding of the texts not only on the basis of knowledge of the language in which they were written, but also on the basis of familiarity with the material and spiritual culture in the from which those texts had emerged. Even in the application of his method to texts from the past the true meaning of understanding the text had to be identified. The glosses were not the object of interpretation, but of understanding, that is, the recognition of the real meaning of the terms at the time they were written (see C. García turza, 2023: 27-86). Now, within the notable philological and linguistic production of the Emilian monastery, the prayer had to occupy the center of attention and study of proto-Ibero-Romance (although in an indirect way and expressed with a deprecative formula)

In order to analyze the exceptional role that the desk of the monastery of San Millán de la Cogolla played in the provision of documents for the study of the formation processes of Hispanic romances, C. García Turza (2003a) offered an extensive commentary on the gloss from folio 72r of the codex *Em. 60*. The glosses attested to a Rioja variety of the multilingual and multicultural speech community, as well as its linguistic system was one among many of those that constituted the Spanish diasystem. The first written text of the Hispanic romance was the extensive gloss of said folio, which has been edited most of the time with many ecdotal deficiencies, whose paleographic edition was the following: "*Cono aIutorio . <de> nuestr <o> / dueno . dueno christo . dueno / salbatore . qual dueno / get ena honore . equal / duenno tienet . ela / mandatjone . cono / patre cono spiritu sancto / enos sieculos . delosiecu / los . facanos deus omnipotens / tal serbitjo fere . ke / denante ela sua face / gaudioso segamus . Amem*".

It was not exactly a gloss, but a unitary text (culminated with the mandatory acclamation *amem*, ratifying the prayer) that formed a humble deprecatory supplication, surely in daily use in the monastery. It was, therefore, the first testimony of the Romance speech of early medieval Hispania, in which a determined intention was expressed to write the syntax, lexicon and phonology of the oral register, completely independent of ecclesiastical Latin. However, we were not unaware that many of the Emilian and Silense glosses, created or copied in both monasteries, remained without being satisfactorily identified, and for one reason or another we did not fully understand what linguistic forms they were or simply what they meant. Some were only partially understood, and many others had even been misinterpreted. A study with a properly glossological approach had to attend to the level of success of the glossators in their intellectual act of clarifying the glossed word, including the formal expression of each gloss.

5.1. Thus, for example, after *the lo(s) sieculos* there was a period (whose value closest to the current punctuation was that of a comma), and which consequently *facanos* headed with a lowercase initial *f-*. The explanations offered in relation to the phenomena of the text (corresponding to the different linguistic levels) were so many and so different, that it could be said that almost no word was free of serious difficulties when analyzing it, for example, in the phonetic aspect, was the subjunctive with enclitic *facanos* pronounced with aspiration or did it still retain the initial *f-*? However, in the core issue of clarifying the typology to which this pious invocation belonged was where we had to talk about ignorance, rather than about interpretive problems and discrepancies. The three elements that had to be taken into account were: a) the Romance text in its entirety; b) its location on folio 72r, between the end of a homily or talk by Cesáreo de Arlés and the beginning of another by Saint Augustine, and c) the Latin text included on that same page.

An overall vision, according to this author, led us to think that we were not facing two pieces of different nature (as has always been said), but rather a single clause and a unitary text, which made up a religious request or supplication (possibly of habitual use), culminated with the mandatory acclamation *amem*, ratifying the prayer. In effect, this wish closed the pious invocation, in line with the structure of any kind of prayer. Without the slightest hesitation, the interpretation of the text was shown to us (both in its structure and in its wording) as a kind of clean version. The first part began with a capital letter (*Cono...*), and the expression that headed the second part (*facanos*) with an initial lowercase *f-* constituted the best argument, when rejecting the widely accepted bimember interpretation. The nature of this Romance text corresponded rather to that of a unitary prayer and laudatory supplication before omnipotent God, in order to bring to fruition a work or service, through the concrete and special help of Jesus Christ, who with the Father and the Holy Spirit was clothed with glory and power. The main problem that this text contained, then, concerned the textual nature of that first part traditionally considered the doxology, which could be interpreted in two radically different ways.

According to many specialists, it would be an exercise in translation and paraphrase of the Latin petition and a thoughtful amplification, which constituted an example widely used in the elaboration of the texts of the Christian liturgy. According to others, it would rather be a translation determined by the translator's own technical

resources, which integrated several original Romance phrases. However, the doxological sequence did not serve any purpose of translation or exercise in learning Latin, due to the paleographic arguments presented. The unitary text responded to a careful elaboration of the first part of the prayer (well known in the monastic field), in order to be channeled into a type of blessing made by the preacher on the faithful at the end of the sermon, and we were faced with an ecclesiastical ritual formula, and the first relatively extensive testimony of an oral register of Riojan (and the Castilian diasystem), where openly popular and innovative features coexisted, along with others of more restricted and conservative use, as well as Latin imports and calques. In the fourth period of the proto-Romance stage, the *Glosas Emilianenses* (year 950) preceded the *Glosario Em. 46* (year 964), within the diret influence of the *Etymologies* of Isidoro de Sevilla (see C. García Turza and J. García Turza, 1997: 114-34; S. García Larragueta, 1984).

5.2. In order to offer some suggestions to the questions that remained largely unresolved about the Emilian glosses, H. J. Wolf (1991: 43-7) hypothesized regarding the chronology of the glosses that whoever introduced the interlinear glosses wrote them in a very legible on the glossed word, and could let us know (in the case of being in a hurry for space) a chronological order of the corresponding annotations. In this sense, he criticized the first paleographic opinion of M. C. Díaz y Díaz (1978), who had distinguished between syntactic glosses and romance glosses: the former would be prior to the latter. Indeed, this argument was inconsistent, since it did not present similar evidence in favor of its assumption that syntactic annotations (with the inclusion of the sequential system of the cross and letters) had been introduced much earlier. On the contrary, in the qualitative analysis of the "proper" glosses, mostly romances, he verifiet that they were introduced relatively early in the text, before the syntactic annotations of the interrogative and personal pronouns and the sequential system of the cross. and the letters, and apparently only the additions preceded them to complete the text. As a general rule, explanatory additions were the first to be added to the text, and mostly in an interlinear position (that is, superimposed on the text). So we had to assume more than one glossator of Romance glosses, and that most of these glosses were introduced relatively early, and not last, just as it was significant that the letters were missing exclusively in the fol. 72r lines 12-14, that is, between the lines that determined the exceptional romance text. It remained, therefore, to resolve when each of the different annotations was made.

Based on the descriptive analysis provided by the study of six Hispanic Visigothic glossaries from the 10th and 11th centuries (see C. García Turza, 2011), our main working hypothesis had been that the presence and abundance of the proto-Romanesque testimonies from the glossistic tradition and the diplomas that appeared in the Iberian Peninsula had to be understood and explained within the temporal, geographical and social context of a first written normalization of romances (from the first half of the 9th century to the first half of the 11th century). It responded, therefore, to new expectations of expansión of the sociological and legal function of romances. In general, the greatest Romanesque tradition of legal documents revealed the antecedents of the influence of Roman law in determining the sociological and legal function of Hispanic romances, and the connection between Hispanic cultural transmission and the Carolingian Renaissance.

As happened in the majority of written normalizations, it was understandable that behind the romance variants of the *Glosas Emilianenses* and *Glosas Silenses* there was in the multilingual competence of the monks and scribes an implicit planning of the Riojan romance, in which we had to keep in mind the transcendental legacy of Jerome to the cultural and textual transmission of the ancient history of monasteries, codices and copyists, in which written standardization permanently maintained a leading role. Unfortunately, the formulation of working hypotheses was the exception rather than the rule in the history of language. Over and above the general tendency to delay the dating of the Romance glosses, the *Glosas Emilianenses* had to be assigned to the middle of the 10th century, since these glosses preceded the *Glosario Em. 46* (completed around June 13, 964), and both were made in the desk of Suso de San Millán, within the same temporal, geographical and social context.

This date was an irreplaceable guide for the chronological fixation of early medieval texts. Likewise, this context was multilingual (with the coexistence of Basque, Riojan, Mozarabic, Occitan, Hebrew and medieval Latin) and multicultural, on the linguistic border of the Basque-speaking community, less linked to the Latin-Roman tradition. Furthermore, it was convenient to overcome the challenge (pointed out by J. M. Ruiz Asencio, 1993a: 90) that Spanish paleographers had in stablishing reliable scientific criteria, in order to materialize a rigorous dating of the preserved Visigothic manuscripts. He later admitted (J. M. Ruiz Asencio, 2000b: 309) that his opinion was that of a paleographer who could be wrong, and he was correct in recognizing that it was the linguists who had to say the last word. Indeed, the broad analysis of the temporal, geographical and social context was the only valid criterion for dating a text.

5.3. Regarding the writing of codices, J. M. Ruiz Asencio (2007: 272-3) also confessed that paleographers did not yet have a solution to the distinction between originals and copies, and that their writing before an original had to respond to that of the corresponding period. What's more, previously J. M. Mínguez (1977: 12) had already observed that since the beginning of the 20th century, useful criteria have been developed for the dating of

manuscripts, based on attention to the morphology of the letters, but they have provoked marked skepticism about the ability of paleography to rule with complete certainty on the character of many of the scriptures. A clear example of these limitations had been illustrated through the conflicting opinions of prestigious paleographers on writings of undoubted importance for the economic and social history of the Sahagún monastery.

Thus, good results could be expected from the scientific collaboration of researchers in different disciplines. As long as monographs on paleographic characteristics of groups of codices and desks, as well as cultural influences between them, were not available, it would be necessary to stick to the most suitable means, with the necessary contribution from other research subjects. However, the past study of a text was a pure entelechy, since the analysis of the broad temporal, geographical and social context was omitted, without questioning that there would be no text without context. It would be convenient, therefore, for codicologists, paleographers, diplomatists and historians of the romances to agree on the establishment of reliable scientific criteria for the dating of the preserved Visigothic manuscripts. Linguists had to examine the codicological, paleographic and diplomatic arguments, and then offer a historical sociolinguistic analysis, within a certain temporal, geographical and social context.

C. García Turza and J. García Turza (2001) stated that neither the paleographic arguments nor the linguistic reasons given were convincing, due to the provisional nature with which the dates attributed to Visigothic manuscripts had to be accepted, while they did not studies were available on the particularities and evolution of each desk or each group of codices. Furthermore, for the establishment of the different groups of codices, not only strictly graphic criteria were considered, but also textual, miniaturistic, iconographic, etc. criteria, which did not always coincide with each other in terms of trajectory and provenance. In particular, the true Carolingian influence was no consistent in the hand of the glossator of the codex *Em 60*, who represented the abbreviation of *uel* written with *l* divided by a transversal line, since earlier examples were documented (on a slate from the year 642-649) and later, so the traditional ineffectiveness of the strictly historical approach had to be recognized. Both in the case of the famous gloss of fol. 72r of *Em. 60* as in the cases of the two most important glossaries (*Em. 46* and *Em. 31*), the care, skill and professionalism of the copyists had to be highlighted, as well as the regularity and ductus of the writing with any absence of the slightest hesitation in the wording, which allowed us to consider them as clean versions, based on an identical (or almost identical) previous model.

With respect to the *Glosas Silenses*, these authors delimited the circumstances regarding the aforementioned contribution by J. M. Ruiz Asencio (1993a). In the monastery of San Millán la Cogolla the codex *Em. 60* as we know it today and the original or model (text and glosses) of the *Silenses* were glossed. Given the need to provide the renovated monastery of Silos with an ideal bibliographical collection, the monastery of San Millán was requested, among other works, a copy of the manuscript (now lost) that served as a model for the Silos. Finally, the exact place where the required text was written was Suso de San Millán's desk, where there was evidence of a calligraphy school since the year 933. Afrom the historical and linguistic arguments that were given, they concluded that the *Glosas Silenses* (thus like those from *Emilianenses*) had been written in La Rioja.

5.4. The romance that the *Emilianenses and Silenses Glosses* used, according to R. Menéndez Pidal (1926/1950: 381-5), were very similar, and were not of the same type as that of the most romanced notarial documents of the 10th century, but were more similar to that of the Aragonese documents of the 11th century. While the monastic glossators expressed a much more determined intention to write in romance (although not always), the notaries preserved many archaisms. We needed to reach the end of the 12th century to find in some notaries a similar intention of romanticizing that of the glossators of the 10th century, despite the fact that they were the same or similar ecclesiastical notaries, but in different domains of use (ecclesiastic and legal). In fact, a crossed *l* appeared as an abbreviation sign for *uel* in the Emilian gloss of the fol. 69v (line 16) and in the Emilian gloss of fol. 73v (line 16), as well as in the Silense gloss of fol. 317r (line 15). In addition, there was a third Emilian gloss of the fol. 72v (line 3), in which it seemed that the glossator leaned towards the traditional form, that is, *ul* with crossbar.

Furthermore, R. Menéndez Pidal (1926/1950: 1-2) collected the dating of several previous paleographers on the manuscript *Em 60* (P. Ewald, G. Loewe, C. Pérez Pastor and M. Férotin), who attributed it to the 8th, 9th and 10th centuries, but none pointed out the important glosses that the codex carried. M. Gómez Moreno was the first to publish the extensive gloss of the fol. 72r, and gave it the date of the 10th century. While Father Z. García Villada pointed out that the writing of the codex is from the end of the 9th century, but the *Glosas Emilianenses* had the characters of the third period of the Visigothic letter from the end of the 10th century, which recalled the manuscript of the Councils (preserved in El Escorial and made in the year 992). His own opinion about the codex was that it was written between the 9th and 10th centuries, with glosses from the middle of the 10th century, perhaps somewhat earlier than the *Glosas Silenses*, in response to a current of romance. The handwriting of these glosses finished off the tall vertical strokes with a horizontal feature, the lack of which in the Emilianenses could argue for more archaism, or simply more crudeness.

With respect to Riojan, R. Menéndez Pidal (1926/1950: 470-1) pointed out that the *Glosas Emilianenses* contained the first Romance text independent of medieval Latin, along with two glosses in Basque. The Riojan variety was deeply infused with Navarro-Aragonese characters. Thus, for example: a) hesitation in diphthongization, *uamne*,

uemne 'man'; b) palatalization of the romance group *c'l* in *spillo* 'mirror'; c) vocalization of the *ct* group in *muito*, *feito*; d) conservation of initial *g* in *geitat* 'cast'; e) conservation of the consonant groups *pl*, *cl*, *fl*, *aplecare*, *aflarat* 'will find'; f) diphthongization of forms of the verb *ser* 'to be', You *ies*, He *iet*; g) sounding of the *nt* group in *alquandas*; h) conservation of the Romance group *m'n* , *uemne* 'man', and i) conservation of the voiceless intervocalic stop, *ayutorio*, *faca* 'do', *lueco*, *sieculos* 'centuries'.

M. Alvar (1969) in the Rioja dialect alluded to the linguistic and social history of the Rioja monasteries. La Rioja was a transition region, and it was clearly divided into two geographical zones that conditioned its history. The fluctuation of La Rioja towards the center or towards the east of the peninsula was a legacy from Roman and Visigothic times. La Rioja Alta (from Iregua to Logroño) gravitated towards Castilla, and the Camino de Santiago ran through there. La Rioja Baja tended towards Navarre and Aragon, and in which the diocese of Calahorra was suffragan of Zaragoza until 1574, and Alfaro always belonged to the bishopric of Tarazona. In the 9th century, the Najerilla River was the limit of Basque, and the entire west of the province of Logroño did not speak Romance, in whose lands towns and monasteries such as Nájera, Berceo, San Millán de la Cogolla, Valbanera and Santo Domingo de la Calzada (later) would later rise. These facts explained the numerous Basque terms that we found in Rioja documents and in toponymic testimonies. Monasticism was very important in medieval La Rioja, especially in the west of the region, where the monasteries of Albelda, San Millán and Valbanera were centers of cultural irradiation (see J. García Turza, 1990). Without a doubt, San Millán was the most famous of the Rioja monasteries, and its origin dates back to the year 574, in which the hermit San Millán died. The monastery of San Millán de Suso was built on the oratory that he himself had built, and the saint's tomb enjoyed both abundant royal favors and the generosity of all kinds of donors.

The cenobitic flourishing allowed the Riojan monasteries to learn about European cultural currents. In the 10th century, according to this author, the monastery must have had a good library, and in the year 951 it already had a calligraphy school. Part of this library was copied in the monastery itself: Smaragdo's comments on la *Regla* of Saint Benedict, a collection of monastic lives and treatises, a compilation of councils and decrees, a bibliography of religious authors, some ecclesiastical histories and various legal repertoires. In addition, it had the works of any medieval monastery: la *Biblia*, the *Etimologías* of Isidoro de Sevilla, the collations of the holy Fathers, the antiphonary and the "Liber ordinum". As a cultural necessity, the reading of Latin texts led to the writing of the Rioja romance in the *Glosas Emilianenses*. They were notes and clarifications (commonly lexical), with Latin, Romance or Basque equivalents, which were written in the middle of the 10th century, and were added to a manuscript from the end of the 9th century or the beginning of the following century.

However, the last lines of Saint Augustine's sermon (copied first) were no longer translated, but fully amplified in a prayer, which was the first testimony of peninsular romance. Thus, the Rioja dialect presented archaisms of all kinds: in the spellings, in the diphthongization, in the conservation of *-iello*, in the persistence of the decreasing diphthong *ei*, in the apocopes of final *-e* and *-o*, in the reluctance presence of *-t* and *-d* (so, for example, *misot* , *egomed* and *matod*) and in the maintenance of *ll* (*l* with value of *ll*, so, for example, in Valbanera), as well as in morphology (thus, for example, the article (*e*)*ll*a 'la' or the possessive *so*, for both genders).

F. González Ollé (1970 a) tried to give a definitive nature to the Navarrese romance, and to create awareness of its historical reality. Although it was difficult to precisely establish the linguistic modality of the *Glosas Emilianenses*, they can be considered the first manifestation of Navarrese. Although R. Menéndez Pidal stated that "in these Glosas Emilianenses we see the Riojan speech of the 10th century very impregnated with the Navarrese-Aragonese characters", it is evident that the Riojan (sub)dialect could not be barely differentiated from the Navarrese dialect, especially if we take into account that La Rioja still belonged to the Navarrese kings. Now, given that there are hardly any philological studies on medieval Navarrese documentation, the usual way of naming the Romance speech of Navarre was the *Navarro-Aragonese* compound, which was based on its identification (more admitted than in detail proven) with Aragonese.

5.5. The paleographic and codicological analysis of J. M. Ruiz Asencio (1993a) showed a new vision of the *Emilianenses and Silenses Glosses*, since the edition of the two texts and their glosses at the same time allowed a series of novelties, but with serious simplifications and contradictions with respect to the glosses and their dating, within a broad temporal, geographical and social context of written normalization of Hispanic romances. The *Em. 60* was incomplete at the beginning and end, and consisted of 97 pages. It was a codex far from any luxury purpose: small size, ordinary calligraphy, poor quality parchment and absence of the miniatures that had given so much fame to other codices. Furthermore, it was a type of book that was destined to disappear, if it had not been for the fact that in medieval times it entered the good library of San Millán of la Cogolla. The great fame and even the popularity achieved (only disputed by the Beatos miniados series) had come from the presence of abundant romance glosses in the margins and between the lines of some of the folios, which had turned it into a jewel of Spanish culture.

The manuscript of the *Glosas Emilianenses* presented a copyist, glossator and owner of the codex (Munio), although we could not affirm with the data if this was the person who assembled the different parts, through its binding and current unitary appearance. But if it wasn't him, someone would have to do it shortly after his death, since the hand that copied the litanies, would take advantage of the empty spaces to write them. The intervention of the glossator

did not occur throughout the entire codex, but in three different places within it, all with independent themes. As a whole, the manuscript presented archaic writing, perhaps justified by the region in which the monastery was located. There were no doubts regarding the Basque origin of the glossator, and with respect to geographical origin he leaned towards Álava and particularly towards the Ojacastro valley in La Rioja.

As the manuscript exists today, it was made up of the following parts: a) some brief selections by Pascasio de Dumio, Pelayo and Martín de Braga on some lives of saints (fols. 1-28r); b) a brief *Officium of letanies* (fols. 28v-29r and 48v-50r); c) the passion and mass of Saints Cosme and Damián (fols. 29v-48r and 50v-54v), and d) the homily and sermons of Cesáreo de Arlés, but attributed to Saint Agustín (55r-96v). A second hand (also Visigothic) had taken advantage of the spaces left blank, and had introduced the said *Officium of letanies*. It was assumed that the glossator carried out his task in the monastery of San Millán, when the manuscript had the structure that it has preserved today, but it could be that our paleographic estimate was not correct, and that the glossator was prior in time to the introducer of the litanies.

The manuscript of the *Glosas Silenses* differed greatly in all its aspects from the Emilian manuscript, according to said author, since it could be considered a quality piece for which good handwriting was chosen and some ornamentation was added. In the codex two parts were clearly distinguished. The first contained some homilies (called *Toledanas*), taken from works of the holy fathers, for liturgical use (fols. 1-308v), and the second a penitential (fols. 309v-324v). Between both parts appeared the figure of an "arbor consanguinitatis " (fol. 309r), and in the middle of the homilies there were four epistles (fols. 219v-232v). In contrast to the previous dating, J. M. Ruiz Asencio would propose dating it to the last years of the 11th century or even the beginning of the XII. The entire manuscript had been copied by the same hand, since a comparison of the writing in the body of the codex and that used in the margins and interlines for the introduction of the glosses showed that we were dealing with a single copyist. Its ascription to the subsequent situation of linguistic conflict (and fifth period of the proto-Romance stage) of the second half of the 11th century was impossible, since the Gregorian reform censored the revisión of any text from an ecclesiastical register.

However, the undoubted unity that the writing presented in the text and in the glosses was broken in an anomalous way with regard to the abbreviation signs that were used in each of these parts. Furthermore, it was worth noting the importance of the coincidences that already existed between the different abbreviation systems used in texts and glosses of both manuscripts (*Silense* and *Emilianense*), and in the similarities of the content of the two codices, which responded to the needs of preaching and practice of confession, already in the use of the same dialect in the romance glosses of both manuscripts. So he contemplated the hypothesis that the *Silense* was nothing more than a copy of a sister codex (naturally lost) of the *Emilianense*, in which the glossator of the codex *Em 60* had also participated, and he proposed the following recomposition of the history of both manuscripts: a large batch of non-luxury books entered the monastery of San Millán, and at least two of these codices were glossed with abundant notes in Romance and Basque. Since the neighboring monastery of Saint Sebastian of Silos (with which fraternal relations were maintained), did not have some of these works in its library, they had been ordered to be copied in Silos. Thus, the Silos romance glosses would be copied from an Emilian codex lost in the monastery of Silos (see J. M. Ruiz Asencio, 1993b, 2000b).

5.6. In his contribution to the presentation of the basic Latin texts that receibed the *Glosas Emilianenses*, J. C. Martín-Iglesias (2023: 132-5) has stated that these glosses were added to the following six works from sectors A (ff. 1r-28r) and C (ff. 50v-96v) from codex *Em. 60* (executed around the year 900) from San Millán de la Cogolla:

Text I (ff. 1r, 1-28r, 13): Pascasio de Dumio, *Liber Geronticon de octo principalibus uitiis*, edited by J. G. Freire, *A versao latina por Pascásio de Dume dos Apophthegmata Patrum*, vol 1, Coimbra, 1971, pp. 159-333.

Text II (ff. 64r, 14-67r, 14): *Interrogato de nobissimo*, an anonymous pamphlet on the end of times, lacking known sources. Its lexicon suggests a Hispanic origin.

Text III-V (ff. 67v, 1-75v, 12): *III Homiliae Toletanae*: *LXIII* (ff. 67v, 1-70r, 6), *LXIV* (ff. 70r, 7-72r, 14), *LXXX* (ff. 72r, 14-75v, 12). Under the general title of "Incipiunt sermones cotidiani beati Agustini" (f. 67v, 1/2), seven sermons of the so-called *Homiliae Toletanae* were copied into the manuscript (until the end of this manuscript). A collection of homilies attributed to an anonymous author-compiler, in the second half of the 7th century in Visigothic Hispania, and perhaps more specifically in Toledo, hence the descriptive title with they are known.

Text VI (ff. 87r, 3-91r, 2): *Homilia Toletana LXVI*, which takes as a source of inspiration *Sermo 82* of Agustín of Hipona, capp. 10-12.

5.7. In the set of medieval documents, during the approximately five centuries they took into consideration (750-1250), B. Frank and J. Hartmann (1997) proposed that the most frequent descriptive configuration was that of a Romance production dominated by another language. (generally Latin), within which the romances would often enjoy

a quite marginal role, due to the very absence of the documentary tradition. Within many of the texts, the elements of the two languages alternated and were interspersed in such a way that it was difficult to find documents in Romance that did not have any Latin variable, or on the contrary Latin documents exempt from any Romance variable. The simultaneous presence of Romance and non-Romance linguistic elements within the same text frequently and descriptively posed problems regarding the linguistic attribution of the text in its entirety.

One of the most common names for these hybrid documents was "very corrupted or aromanized Latin" (either in the proto-Romance stage or in the ancient stage), which was an imprecise designation of the variety involved, since it was about the mere label of a clear process of linguistic transfer between the two varieties (Romance and medieval Latin, without sometimes forgetting the non-Romance vernacular involved, Basque), which intervened in the multilingual competence of the scribe. Furthermore, it had to be ruled out that the hybrid documents responded to a question of greater or lesser Latin competence of the scribes, whose legal training had been received through trivium in monastic and episcopal schools, and in accordance with the subjection to legal concepts. of cause and consent on the part of the legal subjects of the legal acts

Merovingian Latin and Visigothic Latin were transitional Romance varieties (more and less Latinized) of a long process of written normalization of Hispanic romances, which were alien to the communicative competencies of the successive generations of the different social groups, within the social multilingualism of Romance speaking communities. The texts were hybrids of two varieties, in which the romance was underlying, which already consciously fulfilled the corresponding sociological and legal function, with the substitution of the Latin nominal inflection by the universal case and the syntactic calque of the Semitic word order, as well as with the appearance of glosses and glossaries. The samples and hybrid texts characterized, therefore, the process of written normalization of Hispanic romances, from the second half of the 8th century to the middle of the 12th century, in which the syntactic calque (Latin or romance) and the lexical and phonological importation (Latin or Romance) manifested the bilingual competence of the scribes. Of the 2.347 manuscripts from the years 750-1268 collected by the inventory of B. Frank and J. Hartmann (1977: I, 311-33) only approximately 1,2% (that is, only 30 documents) came from the proto-romance stage (from the second half of the 8th century to the second half of the 11th century). Without a doubt, the extraordinary increase in Romance documents occurred in the ancient and medieval period (from the end of the 11th century to the end of the 13th century).

VI. CONCLUSIONS

1. In the first half of the 20th century, the study of the history of language was very far from the analysis of linguistic variation and variety (in time, space and society) and the different determinants (historical, sociological, cultural and legal) of the various social groups of the speech communities. Furthermore, the mechanism of the evolution of Visigothic Latin towards the proto-Romance stage and the interaction of linguistic, social and cultural factors were not resolved, nor described with the desirable precision and rigor. During the second half of the last century, great contributions had been accumulated to historical linguistics, which were far from being recognized by language historians, but which have meant great successes and technical solutions to hitherto inexplicable events. The reconstruction of the processes of formation and written normalization of romances was generally based on supposed intuitions foreign to the necessary empirical proposals for a theory of linguistic planning.

2. From the point of view of the models of linguistic change in the study of the *Glosses Emilianenses* and *Silenses*, the following contributions stood out: 1) historical dialectological model of R. Menéndez Pidal (1926/1950); b) diachronic functionalist model of M. C. Díaz y Díaz (1978), E. Alarcos (1982a), C. Hernández (1993a), J. A. Frago (2002) and J. J. de Bustos Tovar (2004b), and c) historical sociolinguistic model of F. Gimeno (1995) and C. García Turza (2003a). The homogeneous models of linguistic change (neogrammatical, functionalist and generative) were unrealistic and inadequate, since they did not support the structured heterogeneity of the language, nor the variability as part of the communicative competence of the different generational and social groups that lived together in the speech community. However, a true success of diachronic functionalism was the recognition that the formation of the various romances from the same Latin diasystem questioned the past simplification of hypotheses based solely on linguistic systems, although it was an assumption relegated from its objectives and methodology.

3. The autonomous version of linguistic change advocated by the neogrammarians was inadmissible today, and the phonological rules of historical-comparative linguistics were great simplifications of the anthropological, sociological and legal history of specific peoples and their particular languages. Furthermore, both stable linguistic change and ongoing change were neither mechanical nor just phonologically determined. Faced with a partial diachrony of the various linguistic levels of the romances, we had to assume in our days a post-generative theory of grammatical change, in the communicative competences of the successive generations of the different social groups, within the various speech communities, through of the reorganization of the romance. The qualitative and autonomous descriptions of linguistic change on the Latin compilation of the early medieval Riojan glossaries

prevented us from seeing and understanding the social multilingualism of hybrid manuscripts, as well as the implicit normalization of the romances, through regulating the multiple variables (linguistic, social and cultural) and the superficial variants of the texts. In this sense, the synchronous techniques of monolingual description were insufficient and inadequate by themselves for the analysis of the linguistic variation in these manuscripts, and the study of the social and cultural change that determined the written normalization of the romances.

4. T h e distinction between "internal" and "external" factors was one of the most discussed issues in diachronic functionalist theory of the last century. Among the limitations of said functionalism were found, on the one hand, the marginalization of anthropological, sociological and legal history, with the impact on the determinism of the diasystem. On the other the perception that the results of the contact of some romances do not they would have produced important modifications of the phonological and syntactic structure, under the influence of social factors, without realizing that it was a limitation of their own methodology. One of the general principles of the study of linguistic change was that linguistic, social and cultural factors were directly related in the development of linguistic change, and explanations that were limited to one or other elements were wrong, since they had to take into account the regularities observed in empirical studies on linguistic behavior and the dimensions of social multilingualism. Consequently, there was no linguistic change without ongoing variation (although all variation did not imply change) and without social and cultural variation, without linguistic components, nor historical, sociological, cultural and legal determinants of the various speech communities.

5. The romance glosses of the codex *Em. 60* of the Real Academia de la Historia and those of the *Silense* codex *add. 30853* from the British Library (although Emiliano by origin) were the first samples of Hispanic romances, where the process of written normalization and the first Hispanic testimony of an early linguistic awareness of the new Riojan romance appeared most relevantly, along with Visigothic Latin. The romance glosses responded to revisions and adaptations of the written texts to the temporal, geographical and social context of a written normalization, within an implicit planning of the Rioja romance on the linguistic border of the Basque-speaking community, less linked to the Latin-Roman tradition, because of the historical, sociological, cultural and legal determinants. Within the fourth period of the proto-Romance stage, the *Glosas Emilianenses* (950) preceded the *Glosario Em. 46* (year 964), and both were made at the desk of Suso de San Millán, in the tradition and continuity of the cenobitic life. We had to assume more tan one glossator in the *Glosas Emilianenses*, and they were introduced before the syntactic annotations of the interrogative and personal pronouns and the sequential system of de cross and the letters. Compared to the later and abundant syntactic notes, lexical glosses were a minoritari, of which some were Latin, others Romance and a couple of them Basque, making the glossing monk multilingual and erudite.

6. The *Glosas Silenses* were largely Latin lexemes and phrases and the rest Romance, and almost all of them were in the lateral margins. The proportion of the Romance lexicon was higher than that used in the Emilienses. The comparison of the writing in the body of the codex and that used in the margins and interlines for the introduction of the glosses showed that there was a copyst, and the coincidences that ocurred between the abbreviation systems used in the texts and glosses of both manuscripts (*Silense* and *Emilianense*), as well as in the use of the same Rioja variety in the romance glosses of both manuscripts. The *Glosas Silenses* were copied and expanded in the second half of the 10th century, in La Rioja.

7. The Romance prayer of the ritual text (fol. 72r of the codex *Em. 60*) appeared skillfully in the right margin of the final part of a Latin homily by San Cesáreo de Arlés, and clearly showed the glossator's multilingual communicative competence to reveal the grammar of the Riojan romance of his speech community, within the ecclesiastical register, in which we witnessed the differentiation of two linguistic varieties (medieval Latin and Romance) and their full linguistic awareness. The pragmatic requirement of preaching in Romance thus materialized the composition of a unitary text, with the annexation of a laudatory prayer, which implied a closing operation of the discourse, similar to a rhetorical coda. In said glossa the glossing monk asked for help to God so that everyone could fulfill the obligation of daily work, and enjoy his presence after death.

8. Its linguistic characterization was evident: in the less superficial components, the syntax and semantics were Romance, along with superficial Romance elements (morphological, lexical and phonological), despite the fact that it presented a hybrid character and a certain proximity to Visigothic Latin (with calques syntactic and lexical and with lexical code changes). This configuration of linguistic and cultural transfer represented a clear affiliation to the fourth periodo of the proto-Romance stage of written normalization of romances, and in particular to the mid-10th century (950). In this temporal, geographical and social context of implicit planning, The Latin calques were inscribed within the influence of legacy of Jerome of to the ancient history of cultural transmisión, as well as the *Etymologies* of Isidoro de Sevilla. The *Glosas Silenses* were copied and expanded in the second half of the

10th century, in La Rioja, also within the fourth period of the proto-Romance stage of written normalization of romances (from the first half of the 9th century to the first half of the 11th century).

REFERENCES

Alarcos, E. (1982a), "El español, lengua milenaria", in Alarcos, E. (1982b), 9-79.

—   (1982b), *El español, lengua milenaria (y otros escritos castellanos)*, Valladolid, Ámbito.

Alvar, M. (1969), *El dialecto riojano*, 2nd ed., Madrid, Gredos, 1976.

Ammon, U. *et al.* (eds.) (1987-1988), *Sociolinguistics. An international handbook of the science of language and society*, 2 vols., Berlin, W. de Gruyter.

Blas, J. L. *et al.* (eds.) (2006), *Discurso y sociedad. Contribuciones al estudio de la lengua en contexto social*, Castelló de la Plana, Universitat Jaume I.

Bustos Tovar, J. J. de (2004a), "La escisión latín-romance. El nacimiento de las lenguas romances: el castellano", in Cano, R. (coord.) (2004), 257-90.

—   (2004b), "Las Glosas emilianenses y silenses", en Canio, R. (coord.) (2004), 291-307.

Cano, R. (coord.) (2004), *Historia de la lengua española*, 2nd ed., Barcelona, Ariel, 2013.

Criado de Val, M. (ed.) (2001), *Los orígenes del español y los grandes textos medievales. Mio Cid, Buen Amor y Celestina*, Madrid, CSIC.

Díaz y Díaz, M. C. (1978), *Las primeras glosas hispánicas*, Barcelona, UAB.

—   (2000), "A vueltas con las Glosas", *Actas del Congreso Internacional "El Cid, poema e historia"*, Burgos, Ayuntamiento de Burgos, 29003-5.

Dil, A. S. (ed.) (1972), *Language in sociocultural change. Essays by J. A. Fishman,* Stanford, California, Stanford University Press.

Echenique, M. T. (1983), *Historia lingüística vasco-románica*, 2ª ed., Madrid, Paraninfo, 1987.

—   (2004), "La lengua vasca en la historia lingüística hispánica", in Cano, R. (coord.) (2004), 59-80.

—   (2006), "La emergencia del romance castellano en el conjunto hispánico y románico. Apunte crítico", *Revista de Historia de la Lengua Española*, 1, 145-52.

—   (2013), "Dialectos románicos y dialectos vascos en contacto en la protohistoria hispánica", *Aemilianense*, 3, 23-45.

Fishman, J. A. (1964/1968), "Language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry: Revisited", in Dil, A. S. (ed.) (1972), 76-134.

—   (1971), "The sociology of language: An interdisciplinary social science approach to language in society", in Fishman, J. A. (ed.) (1971), I, 217-404.

—   (ed.) (1971), *Advances in the sociology of language*, 2 vols., La Haya, Mouton.

Frago, J. A. (2002), *Textos y normas. Comentarios lingüísticos*, Madrid, Gredos.

Frank, B. and Hartmann, J. (1997), *Inventaire systématique des premiers documents des langues romanes,* 5 vols., Tübingen, Narr.

García Andreva, F. (2010), *El becerro galicano de San Millán de la Cogolla, Edición y estudio*, San Millán de la Cogolla, Cilengua.

García de Cortázar, J. A. (1969), *El dominio del monasterio de San Millán de la Cogolla (siglos X a XIII). Introducción a la historia rural de Castilla altomedieval*, Salamanca, Universidad de Salamanca.

—   (1985), "Introducción: espacio, sociedad y organización medievales en nuestra tradición historiográfica", in García de Cortázar, J. A. *et al.* (1985), 11-42.

—   (2012), *Historia religiosa del Occidente medieval (años 313-1464),* Madrid, Akal.

—   (2016), "La difusión social de la nueva cosmovisión cristiana en los siglos I al IV", *Aemilianense,* 4: 235-67.

—   *et al.* (1985), *Organización social del espacio en la España medieval. La Corona de Castilla en los siglos VIII a XV,* Barcelona, Ariel.

García Larragueta, S. (1984), *Las glosas emilianenses. Edición y estudio.* Logroño, Instituto de Estudios Riojanos.

García Turza, C. (2003a), "La glosa 89 del *Em. 60*, 'el primer vagido del español", *Estudis Romànics*, 25, 299-310.

— (2003b), *Las glosas del códice albeldense (Biblioteca del Real Monasterio de El Escorial, Ms. D.I.2.), Edición y estudio*, Logroño, Fundación San Millán de la Cogolla.

— (2011), *Los primitivos romances hispánicos. Nuevas aportaciones desde los glosarios visigóticos*, Logroño, Cilengua.

— (2023), "Hacia un proyecto genuinamente filológico", in García Turza, C. (dir.) (2023), 17-86.

— (dir.) (2023), *Las Glosas Emilianenses y Silenses*, Logroño, Cilengua.

— and García Turza, J. (1997), *Fuentes españolas altomedievales. El códice Em. 46 de la Real Academia de la Historia, primer diccionario enciclopédico de la Península Ibérica*, Ed. and estudio, Logroño, RAH and Fundación Caja Rioja.

— and García Turza, J. (2000), "El glosario latino del códice *Em. 24* de la RAH", in *Investigación humanística y científica en La Rioja. Homenaje a J. L Fernández Sevilla y M. Balmaseda*, Logroño, IER, 107-35.

— and García Turza, J. (2001), "La datación y la procedencia de las Glosas emilianenses y silenses: anotaciones críticas a los nuevos planteamientos", in Criado de ValL, M. (ed.) (2001), 33-47.

— and García Turza, J. (2004), *Fuentes españolas altomedievales. El códice Em. 31 de la RAH*, Ed. and estudio, Logroño, FCR.

García Turza, J. (1990), *El monasterio de Valbanera en la Edad Media (siglos XI-XV)*, Madrid, Unión Editorial.

— (2000), "La transmisión cultural hispana y el *Renacimiento Carolingio*", in Iglesia, J. I. (coord.) (2000), 17-38.

— (2013), *El monasterio de San Millán de la Cogolla, una historia de santos, copistas, canteros y monjes*, León, Everest.

Gimeno, F. (1983), "Hacia una sociolingüística histórica", *ELUA*, 1, 181-226.

— (1985), "Caracterización sociolingüística del *Libro de los primitivos privilegios de Alicante de Alfonso X el Sabio*", in *Studia historica in honorem V. Martínez Morellá*. Alicante, Diputación Provincial, 119-42.

— (1988a), "Sociolingüística histórica", *Actas del XVIIIe Congrés International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes*, V, Tübingen, M. Niemeyer, 111-20.

— (1988b), "Aproximación sociolingüística a los orígenes del español", *Actas del I Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española*, II, Madrid, Arco/Libros, 1183-92.

— (1990), *Dialectología y sociolingüística españolas*, 2nd ed., Alicante, Universidad de Alicante, 1993.

— (1995), *Sociolingüística histórica (siglos X-XII),* Madrid, Visor Libros.

— (1998), "La sustitución lingüística de las lenguas prerromanas por el latín", *Actas del IV Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española*. II, Logroño, Universidad de La Rioja, 475-83.

— (2004), "Situaciones sociolingüísticas dispares en el proceso de formación de las lenguas romances", *Aemilianense*, I, 171-223.

— (2006), "Sociolingüística histórica: el proceso de formación de las lenguas románicas", in Blas, J. L. *et al.* (eds.) (2006), 33-80.

— (2008a), "En torno a la comunidad de habla: la elisión de –*s* final", *Actas del VII Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española*, I, Madrid, 255-74.

— (2008b), "El cambio lingüístico estable. La elisión de –*s* final en español", *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana*, VI, 2 (12), 141-55.

— (2013), "Fundamentos antropológicos y sociológicos de los protorromances hispanos", *Aemilianense*, III, 47-131.

—   (2016a), "Historia social de los protorromances hispanos", in Terrado, J. and Sabaté, F. (eds.) (2016), 15-42.

—   (2016b), "Variación y cambio del latín al romance: el calco sintáctico del orden semítico de palabras", *Aemilianense*, IV *(Homenaje al prof. C. García Turza)*, 291-365.

—   (2019), *Historia antropológica de los romances hispanos*, Logroño, Fundación San Millán de la Cogolla.

—   (2023a), "The sociocultural origin of the oral register of languages", *IOSR-JHSS*, 28, 5, 4, 42-54.

—   (2023b), "Present and near future of Spanish", *IOSR-JHSS*, 28, 11, 2, 11-24.

—   (2023c), "The Spanish of the United States of America", *IOSR-JHSS*, 28, 12, 1, 13-29.

—   and García Turza, C. (2010), "La función social de los protorromances hispanos", *Aemilianense*, II, 127-202.

—   and Gimeno, M. V. (2003), *El desplazamiento lingüístico del español por el inglés*, Madrid, Cátedra.

Goebl, H. *et al.* (eds.) (1996/1997), *Contact linguistics. An international handbook of Contemporary Researchy*, 2 vols., Berlin, W. de Gruyter.

González Ollé, F. (1970a), "El romance navarro", *RFE*, LIII, 45-93.

—   (1970b), *Textos lingüísticos navarros*, Pamplona, Diputación Foral.

—   (2004), "Observaciones filológicas al códice emilianense 46 (*Glosario Turza*), con algunas de sus aportaciones a la historia lingüística española", in Lüdtke, J. and Schmitt, C. (eds.) (2004), 13-37.

—   (2005), "Los orígenes (remotos) de la sintaxis románica", en Ríos, L. (coord.) (2005), 627-71.

—   (2016), "Vascones y vascuence: Historia (para romanistas) de una relación", *Revista Iberoamericana de Lingüística*, 11, 35-197.

Herman, J. (1975/1997), *El latín vulgar*, Barcelona, Ariel.

Hernández, C. (1993a), "Las glosas. Interpretación y estudio lingüístico", in Hernández, C. *et al.* (eds.) (1993), 63-82.

—   (1993b), "Notas a las glosas emilianenses y silenses", in Hernández, C. *et al.* (eds.) (1993), 255-90.

—   (2000), "Glosas y glosarios. ¿Consultaron un vocabulario los autores de las emilianenses y silenses?", *Actas del Congreso Internacional "El Cid, poema e historia"*, Burgos, Ayuntamiento de Burgos, 303-7.

—   *et al.* (eds.) (1993), *Las glosas emilianenses y silenses*, ed. crítica y facsímil, Burgos, Ayuntamiento de Burgos.

Iglesia, J. I. (coord.) (2000), *La enseñanza en la Edad Media*, Logroño, Insituto de Edtudios Riojanos.

Jacob, D. and Kabatek, J. (2001), "Introducción: lengua, texto y cambio lingüístico en la Edad Media iberrománica", in Jacob, D. and Kabatek, J. (eds.) (2001), VII-XVIII.

—   (eds.) (2001), *Lengua medieval y tradiciones discursivas en la península ibérica: descripción gramatical, pragmática histórica, metodología*, Frankfurt an Main, Vervuert.

Labov, W. (1972), *Modelos sociolingüísticos*, Madrid, Cátedra, 1983.

—   (1982), "Building on empirical foundations", in Lehmann, W. P. and Malkiel, Y. (eds.) (1982), 17-92.

—   (2001), *Principios del cambio lingüístico, 2, Factores sociales*, 2 vols., Madrid, Gredos, 2006.

—   (2010), *Principles of linguistic change, 3, Cognitive and cultural factors*, Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell

Lapesa, R. (1942/1981), *Historia de la lengua española*, 9th ed., Madrid, Gredos, 2005.

— *et al.* (2003), *Léxico hispánico primitivo (siglos VIII al XII). Versión primera del Glosario del primitivo léxico iberorrománico*, ed. M. Seco, Madrid, Espasa Calpe.

Lausberg, H. (1956/1962), *Lingüística románica*, reimp., 2 vols. Madrid, Gredos, 1970/ 1973.

Lehmann, W. P. and Malkiel, Y. (eds.) (1968), *Directions for historical linguistics: A symposium*, Austin, University of Texas Press.

López Morales, H. (1989), *Sociolingüística*, 3th ed., Madrid, Gredos, 2004.

— (2006), "Sociolingüística histórica", *Actas del VI Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española*, III, Madrid, Arco/Libros, 2385-402.

Lüdtke, H. (1968), *Historia del léxico románico*, Madrid, Gredos, 1974.

— (1996 *a*), "Changement linguistique", in Goebl, H. *et al.* (eds.) (1996/1997), I, 526-40.

— (1996 *b*), "Entre llatí i romànic: amb especial consideració del català", *Actes del X Col.loqui Internacional de Llengua i Literatura Catalanes*, III, Barcelona, Abadia de Montserrat, 57-67.

— (1996 *c*), "Rectificaciones acerca de la posición histórica del español en el marco románico", in Martínez González, A. (ed.) (1996), 49-67.

— (1998), *El cambio lingüístico*, Barcelona, Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona.

— (2005), *Der Ursprung der romanischen Sprachen. Eine Geschichte der sprachlichen Kommunication*, Kiel, Westensee-Verl.

Lüdtke, J. and Schmitt, C. (eds.) (2004), *Historia del léxico español. Enfoques y aplicaciones. Homenaje a Bodo Müller*, Madrid, Iberoamericana.

Malkiel, Y. (1976), "From Romance philology through dialect geography to sociolinguistics", *IJSL*, 9, 59-84.

— (1985), "La última fase (1939-1969) de la labor lingüística de R. Menéndez Pidal", *AL*, 23, 5-68.

Martín-Iglesias, J. C. (2023), "Los textos latinos de base de las Glosas Emilianenses y Silenses: Presentación, edición paleográfico-crítica y traducción", en García Turza, C.. (dir.) (2023), 131- 273.

Martínez Díez, G. (1993), "El condado de Castilla y los monasterios de Santo Domingo de Silos y San Millán de la Cogolla", en Hernández, C. *et al.* (eds.) (1993), 17-39.

Menéndez Pidal, R. (1904/1940), *Manual de gramática histórica española*, 12th ed. Madrid, Espasa-Calpe, 1966.

— (1926/1950), *Orígenes del español. Estado lingüístico de la Península Ibérica hasta el siglo XI*, 8th ed., Madrid, Espasa-Calpe, 1976.

— (1959), "Introducción", in *Enciclopedia Lingüística Hispánica*, I, Madrid, CSIC, XXV-CXXXIX.

— (1965-1966), *Crestomatía del español medieval*, ed. acabada y revisada by R. Lapesa y M. S. de Andrés, 2 vols. I (3th ed., 1982) y II (2nd ed., 1976). Madrid, Gredos.

— (2005), *Historia de la lengua española*, ed. póstuma of D. Catalán, 2 vols., Madrid, Fundación RMP.

Mínguez, J. M. (1976), *Colección diplomática del monasterio de Sahagún (siglos IX y X),* León, Centro de Estudios e Investigación "San Isidoro".

Quilis, A. (1976), *Historia de la lengua española I*, Madrid, UNED.

Romaine, S. (1982), *Socio-historical linguistics. Its status and methodology*, Cambridge, CUP.

— (1987-1988), "Historical Sociolinguistics: Problems of Methodology", in Ammon, U. *et al.* (eds) /1987/1988), II, 1452-69.

Ruiz Asencio, J. M. (1993a), "Hacia una nueva visión de las glosas emilianenses y silenses", in Hernández, C. *et al.* (eds.) (1993), 83-118.

— (1993b), "Las glosas emilianenses y silenses. Transcripción", in Hernández, C. *et al.* ((eds.) (1993), 189-254.

— (2000a), "Escribas y bibliotecas altomedievales hispanos", in Iglesia, J. I. (coord.) (2000), 151-74.

—   (2000b), "Puntualizaciones sobre las glosas", *Actas del Congreso Internacional "El Cid, poema e historia"*, Burgos, Ayuntamiento de Burgos, 309-11.

—   (2007), "Notas sobre la escritura y monogramas regios en la documentación real astur-leonesa", in *Monarquía y sociedad en el reino de León. De Alfonso III a Alfonso VII*, I, León, Centro de Estudios e Investigación "San Isidoro", 265-312.

—   *et al.* (2010), *Los becerros gótico y galicano de Valpuesta. Estudio, edición e índices*, 2 vols., Valladolid, Junta de Castilla y León y RAE.

Segura, S. and Etxebarria, J. M. (1996), *Del latín al euskara*, Bilbao, Universidad de Deusto.

Selig, M. (1993), "Le passage à l'écrit des langues romanes – état de la qüestió", in Selig, M. *et al.* (eds.) (1993), 9-29.

—   (2001), "El problema de la tipología de los textos románicos primitivos", in Jacob, D. y Kabatek, J. (eds.) (2001), 233-48.

—   *et al.* (eds.) (1993), *Le passage à l'écrit des langues romanes*, Tübingen, G Gunter Narr,

Tagliavini, C. (1949/1969), *Orígenes de las lenguas neolatinas. Introducción a la filología romance*, 5th ed., México, Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1973.

Terracini, B. (1951), "Cómo muere una lengua", en *Conflictos de lenguas y de cultura*, Buenos Aires, Imán, 11-42.

Terrado, J. and Sabaté, F. (eds.), (2016), *El naixement de la consciència lingüística a l'Edat Mitjana*, Lleida, Pagès Editors.

Vàrvaro, A. (1968), *Historia, problemas y métodos de la lingüística románica*, Barcelona, Sirmio, 1988.

—   (1982), "Sociolinguistica e linguistica storica", *Actas del XVI CILFR,* I, Palma de Mallorca, Moll, 191-201.

Wartburg, W. von (1950), *La fragmentación lingüística de la Romania*, 2nd ed., Madrid, Gredos, 1971.

Weinreich, U., Labov, W. and Herzog, M. I. (1968), "Empirical foundation for a theory of language change", in Lehmann, W. P. and Malkiel, Y. (eds.) (1968), 95-195.

Wolf, H. J. (1991), *Las glosas emilianenses*, Sevilla, Universidad de Sevilla, 1996.