

Medieval Valencian Acculturation

Francisco Gimeno-Menéndez
University Of Alicante

Summary

Acculturation has been the empirical foundation of the anthropological history of humanity, and has integrated into the history of language, society, and culture. Acculturation referred to all cultural events resulting from the acquisition, modification, or reinterpretation of a culture, particularly the reception and assimilation of cultural elements specific to one social group by another. The term acculturation became widely accepted among American anthropologists in the late 19th century to refer to the changes that occurred when social groups with different cultural traditions merged. Among the languages of pre-Roman Hispania, Iberian was the best documented, and it allowed for a phonological system of the textual material of the inscriptions. This culture had been the product of the arrival of new social groups (probably of North African origin) in the Neolithic period along the entire Mediterranean coast from southern France to the south of the Iberian Peninsula. In the first millennium BC, it was impacted by a Pheno-Punic-Greek acculturation, produced by the knowledge of new technical advances on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, as well as by repeated contact with individuals from there who possessed a more advanced culture. At the beginning of the Christian conquest (1232), when describing the ancient kingdom of València, R. I. Burns (1977) defined it as a Crusader kingdom. A minority of Christians imposed themselves on an entirely Islamic country. This dualism between a dominant Christian minority from outside and a dominated, indigenous Muslim majority lasted for a long time. The question of the expulsion of the Moriscos (raised in the 16th century and decided at the beginning of the 17th century) had been around for some time, and it could be said that it had begun with the repopulation of the kingdom itself and because of economic interests (creation of territorial lordships), as well as demographic deficiencies (lack of Christian settlers) had allowed the Muslim (Mudéjar) presence in a socio-religious climate of mutual tolerance.

Keywords: *Acculturation, Anthropological history, Iberian acculturation, Roman acculturation, Islamic acculturation, Catalan-Aragones acculturation, Furs de València.*

Date of Submission: 05-09-2025

Date of Acceptance: 15-09-2025

I. Introduction

The entry of anthropology into medieval history was one of the most significant historiographical developments in the last third of the last century. Indeed (since 1970), there was an enrichment of perspectives and a deepening of knowledge about the configuration of society, and especially its behavior in relation to the occupied territory. J. A. García de Cortázar (1985) proposed starting from the conception of society and space as elements of a system, whose evolution occurred through the complexity of its social organization. He established the close connection between the formulas of economic reproduction and the structures of domination and social cohesion, as well as the system of values (see J. A. García de Cortázar, 1973).

The introduction of anthropology (and medieval history) into the history of language came later and could be dated to the end of the last century. F. Gimeno (1988, 1990: 138-44) showed that sociolinguistics was born from an anthropological commitment that ultimately considered linguistics as a chapter of social and cultural anthropology (and the psychology of knowledge). General sociolinguistics, as an extension and revision of institutional disciplines (linguistics, sociology, and anthropology), integrated a *sociology of language* and a *strict sociolinguistics*, as well as the *ethnography of communication* (see C. A. Ferguson, 1959; J. A. Fishman, 1971; D. Hymes, 1971, 1974; F. Gimeno, 2019: 182-96).

Studies on language contact and culture contact in Europe did not enjoy widespread coordination, although the precursors were European (W. Leopold, E. Haugen and U. Weinreich). U. Weinreich (1953: 37-40) commented that for some anthropologists, language contact was nothing more than an aspect of culture contact, and language transfer was a facet of social diffusion and acculturation. However, despite the increase in anthropological interest in problems of contact, particularly in the United States of America after the First World War, studies on language contact and culture contact did not enjoy widespread coordination, nor was the relationship between the two fields of study properly defined.

The most interesting problem in language transfer was the interaction of social and cultural factors that promoted or impeded such transfer. Anthropologists investigating acculturation were forced to include 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 language transfer and were truly within the scope of culture.

II. Acculturation

Within the broad sociocultural framework of languages in contact, U. Weinreich (1953: 236-43) described language substitution as the displacement of the habitual use of one language by that of another. Language substitution, which involved changes in the social and cultural functions of a language, had to be distinguished from language change, which considered the process of transformation in the structure of the language over time, space, society and situation (see F. Gimeno and M. V. Gimeno, 2003: 24-64, 101-35).

Regarding its main purpose, the *History of Humanity. Cultural and Scientific Development* (I,7-9), sponsored by UNESCO (1963), alluded in the "Preface" to the need to overcome traditional approaches to the study of history that attributed decisive importance to political, economic, and military factors. A history was needed that sought to appreciate the significance of events, and took the positions adopted by various cultures as its starting points and reference system. The perspective opened by each culture on the universal in the human being was a projection of the humanity of that culture in its own particular circumstances.

Acculturation has been the empirical foundation of the anthropological history of humanity, and has been integrated into the history of languages, societies and cultures. The hypothesis of the history of humanity as a succession of acculturations was more appropriate to linguistic, social, and cultural facts and to the continuity of history itself. There was no linguistic change without languages in contact, and both the history of linguistic change and linguistic substitution were part of acculturation, based on social and cultural diffusion. It was not, therefore, merely a linguistic issue, but also a social and cultural one. The primary principle of the history of linguistic change and linguistic substitution was the acculturation of social groups, with social and cultural interbreeding.

Our working hypothesis has been that within the anthropological history of the Hispanic Romances there was a linguistic and cultural continuity, based on the successive and diverse historical acculturations (Indo-European, Basque-Iberian, Pheno-Punic-Greek, Roman, Christian, Germanic, Visigothic, Byzantine, Islamic, Catalan-Aragonese, medieval Castilian, medieval Valencian, Castilian and Anglo-Saxon), with the linguistic and cultural transfers that implied the social and cultural mixing of these groups, and the adaptation to a new sociocultural context (see F. Gimeno, 2025a, 2025b, 2025c, 2025d, 2025e).

During the second half of the last century, major contributions to historical linguistics were accumulated, which were far from being recognized by historians of languages. These contributions have represented major achievements and technical applications in the face of decontextualized purposes and hitherto inexplicable events. The only viable solution was the intrinsic relationship between language, society, and culture. Acculturation has been the empirical foundation of the anthropological history of humanity and has been integrated into the history of languages, societies, and cultures (see F. Gimeno, 2024a, 2024b, 2024d).

The association between structure and homogeneity was a false assumption, since linguistic structure included the orderly differentiation of social groups and registers, through rules governing variation within the speech community. Moreover, a "structured heterogeneity" of language was proposed, and maternal dominance implied the control of such heterogeneous structures (see U. Weinreich, W. Labov and M.I. Herzog, 1968: 187-8; F. Gimeno, 1990: 79-87).

Variation and change were distinct dimensions of linguistic evolution, and ongoing variation and linguistic change should never be confused. If all change involved ongoing variation, not all variation involved change. Indeed, linguistic change based on the discontinuous interaction of parents and children simplified the issue to one of generational variation, but the parents' grammar was the first component of the child's primary grammar, ensuring acculturation and continuity of family transmission.

Acculturation referred to all cultural events resulting from the acquisition, modification, or reinterpretation of a culture, particularly the reception and assimilation of cultural elements specific to one social group by another, with adaptation to a new sociocultural context. The term *acculturation* became widely accepted among American anthropologists in the late 19th century to refer to the changes that occurred when social groups with different cultural traditions came together, and there was no distinction between whether it should be applied to the results or the processes of cultural change.

Acculturation, then, encompassed those events resulting from direct and continuous contact between social groups with different cultures, with the corresponding changes and reinterpretations in the original culture of one or both groups. The terms "acceptance," "adaptation," and "reaction" referred to the assimilation of cultural elements and their reinterpretation within new groups, as well as the rejection of these elements. Gradually, the term *transculturation* has become less common compared to the more common acculturation. While the latter

had been used to refer to the change of only one or both poles of contact, in the case of transculturation, it has generally been used in relation to a single society or group.

Anthropological research into the history of language proposed the deduction of linguistic variables and the social and cultural factors of the past and verified them empirically in the present. Historical sociolinguistics faced the need to materialize the most plausible working hypotheses on the historical, sociological, and cultural reconstruction of the processes of oral formation and written standardization of Romance languages, based on empirical principles for a grammatical theory of linguistic change. In accordance with these foundations, it has gone beyond the descriptive contributions of historical pragmatics, based on the functionalist analysis of stable discursive traditions of written texts (see B. Frank and J. Hartmann, 1997; D. Jacob and J. Kabatek, 2001; F. Gimeno, 1988, 1995).

The autonomous version of linguistic change advocated by the Neogrammarians was unacceptable in our time, and the phonological rules of historical-comparative linguistics were simplifications of linguistic change. This was especially true when we considered the geographical and social differentiation of language, within its own "structured heterogeneity," and variability as part of the communicative competence of the various generational and social groups that coexisted within the speech community. Only in this way was it possible for the social history of language to become a true reality, with the necessary complementarity between homogeneity and heterogeneity. Moreover, both linguistic change and the ongoing change were neither mechanical nor merely phonologically determined.

Innovations were ongoing linguistic variations and changes that could only be fully and completely understood and explained in relation to social and cultural factors, rather than in relation to linguistic characteristics for their social and cultural justification. Languages were excellent instruments of expression and communication for the cognitive development of social groups within a speech community. Linguistic change was never a problem, nor even a complex issue of oral or written traditions, but a process in which the successive generational change of different social groups and diverse cultures was directly involved, and the analysis and delimitation of the complex relationships between linguistic variables and social and cultural factors, as well as the historical, sociological, cultural and legal determinants of the various Romance-speaking communities, was essential (see B. Malmberg, 1966: 207-22; H. López Morales, 1989, 2006, 2013; F. Gimeno, 1995: 27-53, 2019: 343-51).

Faced with a partial diachrony of the various linguistic levels (and even, descriptively, of all of them) of the Romance languages, we must now assume an anthropological history of the communicative competences of successive generations and social groups within the various Romance-speaking communities. Visigothic Spain was one of the last and most valuable manifestations of ancient culture. Isidore of Seville laid the foundations of medieval culture and was the bridge that united Antiquity with the Middle Ages, although we must always bear in mind Jerome's masterful legacy in the cultural transmission of the millennia-long history of monasteries, codices, and copyists.

The qualitative and autonomous descriptions of linguistic change in the Latin compilation of early medieval Riojan glossaries prevented us from seeing and understanding the social multilingualism of hybrid manuscripts (as well as the implicit normalization of Romances languages). This was achieved through the regulation of multiple linguistic variables and factors (social and cultural), as well as the surface variants of the texts.

In this sense, synchronic monolingual description techniques were insufficient and inadequate in themselves for the analysis of linguistic variation in these manuscripts, and the study of the sociological, cultural and legal changes that determined the written standardization of the romances. Only in this way have we revised the hypotheses of historical dialectology and diachronic functionalism that prevailed throughout the last century, and we offer new research on the anthropological history of the formation of Hispanic Romance languages (see F. Gimeno, 2013, 2019, 2024c).

The term "substratum" designated the supposed latent influence of the defeated native languages on the victorious languages and was accepted (in one way or another) by various linguists, even from the beginning of the 19th century (see I. Iordan, 1932: 20-1). Regarding the assumption of linguistic strata, B. E. Vidos (1956: 203) offered the reference that, deep down, substratum, superstratum and adstratum were nothing more than metaphorical expressions to indicate the linguistic influences of the defeated, victorious and cohabiting peoples, respectively. On the other hand, when he summarized that the action of the superstratum in Gaul confirmed and reinforced the action of the substrata, the historian P. Wolff (1971) did not realize that the duality of the victorious/defeated people offered the same result (linguistic transfers), and that this meant that the conflict did not matter, since it was unrelated to linguistic change.

Outside the sociocultural framework of language contact, U. Weinreich (1953: 4) reevaluated (based on the words of E. Haugen) that theories constructed on the influence of languages remained suspended in the air,

since what was said about substrata and superstrata should continue to be considered stratospheric, unless we found it empirically in the behavior of different social groups. The assumption of strata confusingly simplified the facts of linguistic and cultural transfer in social situations of language contact and represented a first very superficial and pre-scientific manifestation of a grammatical theory of linguistic change, based on the contributions of social multilingualism.

Linguists have therefore overcome the obsolete assumption of linguistic strata, authentic catch-alls and simple imitations of the bilingual chapter and accepted the proposal of historical sociolinguistics on the general configuration of linguistic change,

According to R. Pérez *et al.* (1980: 67-113), the ancient kingdom of València did not yet exist until the reign of Jaume I. Its roots began in a time when there was no awareness of what *València* would later become, although its beginnings dated back to the Middle Ages. The ancient human contribution that came from outside was ethnically and culturally very similar to that of the people who lived here, which strengthened the local population rather than changing it.

The earliest settlers are believed to have lived there 40,000 years ago, and to have been of Neanderthal ethnicity, while their culture (in archaeological terminology) was *Musterià*. They lived in caves, were hunters, and most likely gatherers. Of their remains, only a fragment of a skull has survived, found in *Cova Negra* (*Xàtiva*), one of the few known sites from this period, along with the *Salt* (*Alcoi*) and *Cochino* (*Villena*) caves.

The next twenty millennia saw the development of the Upper Paleolithic culture, a period of still troglodytic life, in which the cave served as both a dwelling and a tomb. The material culture was more evolved, flint pieces (points, knives, and others) were the result of more refined and elaborate craftsmanship. This was also the time when figurative art appeared, painted or engraved on stone plaques, slabs of not too large dimensions, which were then ritually broken after being painted with an animal figure. The most important collection was found in the *Cova del Parpalló* (*Gandia*) (see M. Hernández, 1985; J. F. Domene, 2023: 46-56).

The people who lived here since prehistory (Iberians, Ibero-Romans, Romans, Visigoths, and Muslims) were the human base of the land's settlers, coming generation after generation from pre-Roman times, and the heirs of the primitive inhabitants of our community, with the amalgamation of the natives. The transcendental importance of the break in continuity represented by the scarce medieval repopulation that came with the host of King Jaume I, and the resettlers of the subsequent Moorish expulsion in the 17th century, provided the key to the centuries of the formation of the Kingdom of València.

At the beginning of the year 1000 BC, there were developments that changed the course of history, with the arrival of Greek and Phoenician influence and the founding of colonies and markets. These were, therefore, a series of new developments in material culture that were gradually accepted by the Iberians (probably named after the Ebro River), and which gave rise to the creation of the great Andalusian culture of Tartessos. This Orientalizing culture permeated the local populations of Upper Andalusia, and a wide range of influences reached these southern lands.

Likewise, the presence of Indo-Europeans in Catalonia and Aragón (which expanded toward the Castilian plateau) was also evident in some of our new material culture. The last influences were the Greeks from Marseille, who had established a group of colonies or merchants in the Gulf of *Roses*, and from which some items arrived here. Facing the coast and very close to *Cap de la Nau*, the Carthaginian colony of *Eivissa*, was the largest center for the distribution of goods in the western Mediterranean and formed part of the spectrum of influences and the process of cultural creation.

The fact that we find mainly isolated settlements, well fortified with walls and often inaccessible mountain locations, suggests a warrior society. The presence of paintings depicting tournaments and chivalric scenes on vases from *Lliria* provides further confirmation. There were also sanctuaries in caves and, in some cases, high on mountains, as in the case of *Serreta d'Alcoi*, where a fertility goddess was worshipped.

III. Iberian Acculturation

The earliest period of Iberian culture (from the end of the 5th century to the middle of the 3rd century BC) offered an artistic wealth (great sculptures, such as the *Dama d'Elx* and the rest: those of *l'Alcudia*; monuments reused in the necropolis of *Corral de Saus*, and many others). All this great art was destroyed throughout the first half of the 3rd century and was related to the pressure of the Carthaginian generals of the Amical Barca dynasty. In fact, the Barcids were much more concerned with the Andalusian and Murcian world, where they extracted silver and other metals and founded their cities: *Akra Leuka* (in the Linares area) and *Car Hadasha* (Cartagena). The warrior contacts with our community must have been raids more than anything else and evidently left no cultural impact.

Among the languages of pre-Roman Hispania, Iberian was the best documented, and it allowed for a phonological system of the textual material of the inscriptions (see A. Tovar, 1962). This culture had been the product of the arrival of new social groups (probably of North African origin) in the Neolithic period along the entire Mediterranean coast from southern France to the south of the Iberian Peninsula. In the first millennium BC, it was impacted by a Pheno-Punic-Greek acculturation, produced by the knowledge of new technical advances on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, as well as by repeated contact with individuals from there who possessed a more advanced culture (on the sociocultural origin of the oral record of languages, see Ch. F. Hockett, 1958; R. Jakobson, 1970; F. Gimeno, 2023).

In fact, Iberian appears only exceptionally with Latin characters, and only the inscriptions from eastern Lusitania and Galicia occupy an exceptional position, to which (according to H. Schuchardt) could perhaps be assigned some exceptional place between Celtic and Iberian. As for the writing itself, not only was it not completely harmonious, but neither did the language it contained seem to be. Unfortunately, there is no bilingual inscription of any length that would give us the key to the enigma. The scant Iberian material known was conscientiously and methodically assembled in the work of E. Hübner (*Monumenta linguae ibericae*, Berlin, 1893).

Despite the scarcity of these materials and the enormous difficulties presented by the etymology of the names of places and rivers, as well as the reading and interpretation of the aforementioned inscriptions and legends, the sagacity and science of various philologists (among whom G. de Humboldt, Luchaire and, above all, H. Schuchardt stood out) provided weighty arguments in favor of the kinship of Iberian, and in particular of one of its branches of Aquitanian with Basque.

The Iberian inscriptions were attributed to the Celts, Hebrews, Phoenicians, Carthaginians, Greeks, Visigoths, and direct ancestors of the Basques, and of all these hypotheses, the latter seemed the most serious. G. de Humboldt was the one who presented the Iberian-Basque hypothesis on a scientific basis. Although modern criticism has believed it could definitively discard Humboldt's hypothesis, a large part of his comparisons and analogies have been confirmed by subsequent research. Thus, for example, this thesis was subsequently masterfully supported by H. Schuchardt in *Die Iberische Deklination* (Vienna, 1907).

Initially, "Iberia" designated a specific area of the Mediterranean or South Atlantic strip of the Spanish coast, a name given to it by Greek writers, and very soon this name was extended to the entire coast. Later, this name included the inland territory until it came to designate the entire peninsula, and it was a geographical designation. This concept was adopted by the Romans, when they called the entire Iberian Peninsula or its inhabitants "Hispania" and "Hispanic", respectively. Regarding the possible Punic origin of the name Hispania, R. Lapesa (1942/1981: 15) recorded that in Phoenician it meant 'land of rabbits'.

From an archaeological reconstruction, L. Abad (1987: 172-80) suggested some clearly differentiating elements of Iberian culture: complex habitats, developed urban planning, the existence of large religious and funerary sculpture, the use of the wheel, early knowledge of writing, and the use of currency in the last centuries of independent existence. Iberian culture arose because of the impact on the native populations of small nuclei of eastern groups, traditionally identified with the Phoenicians and Greeks, although these names included people of very diverse origins, who arrived on the coasts of the Iberian Peninsula from the second millennium onwards. Their degree of influence varied greatly along the different coasts of the peninsula, and if we add to this the fact that the cultural development of the various Hispanic peoples was also different, it should not be surprising that neither the degree nor the process of Iberian acculturation was homogeneous throughout the Iberian area.

Although we can identify the Iberians as indigenous people who inhabited the Mediterranean coasts, without forgetting that a large part of southeastern France was Iberized early on, Iberian culture also spread inland and assimilated peoples who at first could not be considered Iberian, such as those of the Ebro Valley or the Meseta. Iberian culture, therefore, did not represent an ethnic unity, but rather a cultural one, so it was not surprising that originally non-Iberian peoples (such as those in the interior of the peninsula) became culturally Iberized over the centuries, although there were regional and local differences specific to Iberian culture.

Throughout the 6th century BC, the crisis of the Tartessian culture (because of Tyree's submission to the Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar II in 573) was manifested archaeologically in a series of sites that showed a continuous evolution, and in almost all of them important changes took place between strata dating from shortly before the year 600. From then on, the evolution of Iberian culture was different in each of the regions, now subject to new external influences, mainly Greek, but without forgetting (albeit at a more advanced stage) the Punic influence. In Andalusia, the Iberian result was the development of the earlier Tartessian culture, but this was not so clear in the rest of the Iberian area.

The Iberian world was composed of a mosaic of peoples (Turdetani, Bastani, Contestani, Oretani, Edetani, Ilercavoni, Lacetani, Ilergeti, etc.). Between the 5th and 3rd centuries BC, the period of apogee of this culture, known as the "First Iberian Period," materialized. Cities were built and inhabited, sculpture was developed, trade and wealth increased, and a significant level of development was achieved. An emblematic

reference of Iberian sculpture and art was the "Dama d'Elx," whose face had the features and majestic perfection of the severe Greek goddesses, in the first half of the 5th century BC.

Regarding Iberian writing, L. Abad (1987: 216-23) offered a brief account of the strange nature of this alphabet, which had already attracted the attention of scholars in the 16th century and was one of the clearest indications of the high level of development of the Iberians. Thus, Estrabon pointed out that the Turdetani were the most cultured of the Iberians and had written laws and a "grammar" that were many years old. It was evident that to establish the value of each of the symbols, it was necessary to first turn to the bilingual coins, since they presented one legend in Iberian characters and another in Latin characters, with the same meaning.

In the cosmopolitan world of the East, J. de Hoz (1996: 195) alluded to the existence of various social groups, including Phoenician merchants who were fully competent in several forms of writing, and knew their own alphabet and the Cypriot and Neoluwian syllabaries, both with their series of vowel syllabograms, and in particular the first with the vowel signs <a, e, i, o, u>, the same ones that we found in Greek and in some Paleo-Hispanic scripts. The Greeks did not invent vowel signs, but the adapters of the Phoenician alphabet to other languages were able to combine the consonant signs of the former with vowel signs, arising from the reinterpretation of the Phoenician laryngeal signs, and at the same time the concept of vowel sign (common in their cultural sphere), when they found it convenient to explicitly indicate the values of the vowels (on the origin and development of Paleo-Hispanic scripts, see J. de Hoz, 1996: 201-3).

In the non-Indo-European and Indo-European elements within pre-Roman history, J. A. Correa (2004) explained that inscriptions were known in Pheno-Punic, Greek, Iberian, Celtiberian and Lusitanian, in addition to an unidentified language that was ascribed to the Tartessian-Turdetanian world. The first two languages were clearly of extra-peninsular origin, and it could be argued that they did not go beyond the status of colonial varieties, which was clear in the case of Greek, but much less so in that of Pheno-Punic. The four remaining languages were called Paleo-Hispanic varieties, although two of them (Celtiberian and Lusitanian) being Indo-European ultimately had an extra-peninsular origin.

The Iberians used three different graphic systems, without any satisfactory explanation for this multiplicity of uses: two semi-syllabaries of Hispanic creation (the Levantine and the southeastern, also called southern) and an alphabet of a very simple adaptation of Greek (the Greco-Iberian).

The Levantine semi syllabary (late 5th-late 1st century BC) was documented from southern France to the city of Murcia, but its own territory ended at the Júcar River, where further south it clearly retreated towards the coast, and coexisted with the other two graphic systems. Most of the inscriptions were written in this semi syllabary, which consisted of thirteen alphabetic signs and fifteen syllabic ones. Among the former were the five vowels and eight continuous ones (silbilant, nasal, vibrant and lateral), and among the latter were the following occlusives with a vowel, without distinction of point of articulation: **ba be bi bo bu; ta te ti to tu; ka ke ki ko ku** (no graphic distinction in dental and velar occlusives between voiceless and voiced).

The southeastern semi syllabary (4th century BC–first third of the 1st century AD) was used from the Júcar River, far from the coast, and extended throughout the southeast. It has not yet been fully deciphered, and the number of known inscriptions written in it was low. Despite the chronological data currently available, for historical and geographical reasons it has been considered the origin of the Levantine semi syllabary. Although there was little evidence, the Greco-Iberian alphabet had the advantage that all its signs were alphabet, which was more indicative of the catalog of its phonemes. It was used reliably in the 4th century BC, in a very restricted area of the provinces of Alicante and Murcia: a quadrilateral whose angles corresponded to Alcoy and Campello in Alicante, and Jumilla and Mula in Murcia (plus a lead found in Sagunto). Two semi syllabaries were also used within this area.

Iberian had five vowel phonemes, /a e i o u/, for which there was no evidence of a possible distinction in quantity. Although it was not easy to demonstrate, some features of the Romance languages were ultimately related to pre-Roman languages, and in this case, it should be considered that the Penta vocalic system of Castilian was like to Basque and Iberian. While in the past it could not be proven that there was a genetic relationship between Iberian and Basque, Basque-Iberians have now been confirmed, since there was undoubtedly a certain similarity in the phonological system, among other features, and that both languages shared anthroponymic elements (see F. Gimeno, 2019: 87-113).

IV. Roman And Christian Acculturation

The contact of the Iberians with a civilization different from their own began a long process of acculturation that led (already in the Christian era) to a complete Romanization, if not of the ruling classes. The initial contacts were undoubtedly of a military nature, and were the scene of battles and the passage of armies: in the 2nd century BC, those of Sucron and Urbicua, and in 138 BC the transfer of Roman veterans from the war against Viriathus, during which a city was established on a river island in the Turia, which would later become *Colonia Valentia*, although its colonial status is not certain from the date of its foundation.

The other transfer of veterans, after their discharge, was made with two legions on the Iberian city of Alcudia d'Elx, which from then on would be called *Colonia Iulia Illici Augusta*, already in the second half of the 1st century BC. Both foundations meant a division of the land around, following a square grid network (*centuriatio*), of which there are still good examples in the layout of the irrigation ditches of the *Horta Nord* and in the roads and palm groves around Alcudia.

Regarding the Romans and the acculturations (Roman and Christian, see F. Gimeno, 2024c), very few came (two or three deductions of graduates) who formed the root of the two colonies (*València* and *Elx*), and the group of merchants who settled on the coast, and who were not only Italian, but oriental and not only from *Greece* and *Syria-Palestine*). Regarding Visigoths, it could be doubted that there were more than two hundred, and that they settled throughout the community as political positions. With respect to the Byzantines, they left even less evidence. And when the Islamic "invasion" occurred, the exhaustion of the army and the pacts made it unnecessary for the people to settle, which only had a little force half a century later.

Since the 1st century BC, there were still episodes of war in the ancient kingdom of *València*. When Octavian Augustus came to power and brought peace to the Roman world, the Romanization of the country began with great force. Until that time, the Valencian lands (belonging to the *Prouintia Hispaniae Citerioris*) were still divided by Latin geographers into three large tribal territories: *Ilercavònia* in the north, *Edetània* in the center, and *Contestània* from the Xúquer the Segura or beyond. These names were toponyms of the Iberian groups, but they did not allow us to establish their reality as they did for such older circumscriptions.

From then on, the flow of nominations for municipalities and other types of cities began. The Roman world knew of no legal entity outside of the city or town and its surroundings. Each city enjoyed a legal status, rich in privileges, the most important of which was administrative and legal equality with the city of Rome. Even within the city, whether under Latin or Roman law, not all inhabitants enjoyed the same civil rights, and apart from slaves, who had none, there were people who did not enjoy citizenship equal to that of others. Obtaining the status of Roman citizens was, in the later stages of the Republic and early stages of the Empire, a privilege and a reward (sometimes purchased at a high price by the local ruling classes).

The acquisition of this status, skillfully managed by Roman authorities, was one of the keys to the progressive acculturation of the wealthy Iberian classes: the change in dress and the adoption of classical Latin instead of their own language were phenomena that the ancient kingdom of *València* would see repeated in later times. A mosaic from Alcudia (with the representation of a city wall and the Romanized names of two notable Iberian figures), dating from the late 1st century BC, could be the paradigm of this rise of the local ruling class.

The status of the popular classes must have remained unchanged. It was a very clear archaeological fact that cities were growing at the beginning of the first century AD, but there was very little information about the situation in the countryside (in the *uillae rusticae*), because the Iberian settlements not forced by the construction of new cities did not generally present archaeological objects after the first half of the 1st century BC, which indicated that they were abandoned in favor of Roman installations, and the Iberian settlements did not last much longer.

At the end of the 1st century AD, a notable group of towns enjoyed important legal status: *Valentia* and *Colonia Iulia Illici Augusta* had the highest status, that of a colony. Municipalities under Roman law, with privileges almost equivalent to those of the colony were *Saguntum* and *Bisgargis* (probably *Forcall*), and municipalities under Latin law with slightly less prestige were *Edeta* (*Lliria*), *Lucentum* (*Alacant*) and *Saetabis Augusta* (*Xàtiva*). *Dianium* (*Dénia*) had less status as a stipendiary city, which had to pay the salary of the garrison that Rome imposed on it. A little later it would obtain the rank of municipality, while those cities of unknown ancient name probably obtained them, such as *Tossal de Manises* (*Alacant*), the city that was under the old town of *Vila Joiosa*, and some others.

This situation of the cities, parallel to the importance of their governing communities, explained the Roman-Valencian boom of the 2nd century AD. It was a very short boom, but it is the only period from which any monuments have been preserved: the theatre and circus of *Sagunt*, monumental tombs of *Daimús* and *Vila Joiosa*.

By the mid-third century, excavations revealed traces of fires and significant destruction in cities. This was evidence of the great economic and social crisis that Western Rome suffered, which was further exacerbated by the barbarian invasions, which were poorly or completely controlled by urban militias and legions, withdrawn from their borders due to internal strife.

The fight against the Vandals, the desire to expand territorial dominions and restore the unity of the Empire, and, undoubtedly, the protection of the eastern merchant communities led to the reconquest of most of the southern and eastern coastal strip of the Iberian Peninsula. In the former kingdom, it probably remained under Byzantine rule as far north as the Júcar River and as far south as the Palancia River, from other sources. The most important reflection of this military dominance was the strengthening of the local inhabitants' awareness of

Romanization and Christianization, an awareness that would be very clearly seen a few decades later when Leovigild conquered the area.

On the other hand, this presence gave rise to an ecclesiastical problem: the Christian episcopal sees depended, through the Metropolitan of Cartagena, on Constantinople. Only two names remain: that of a bishop of *Illici* and another of Valentinus. This problem prevented us from understanding the origin of the sees, which would shed much light on the origin of local Christianity, which was quite late (post-Constantinian in any case) and limited to small, privileged civic circles.

When the Visigothic kingdom of Toledo was created, it was with the ambition of Leovigild, who broke the hypothetical link with the empire and took the purple and imperial insignia. His expansionist obsession clashed twice with the Valencian lands. The conquest of these lands, which had never been Visigothic, by the Toledo kings continued, and by 633, *Illici* had already passed into Visigoth hands, and it could be considered that the expansion of the Visigothic yoke over these lands had ended. It was, therefore, within the second third of the 7th century AD that Visigothic rule began to become general, and it did not last a century.

Everything the documentation tells us referred to the ruling class, and it could be assumed that after an initial period of tension between the Ibero-Romans and the new Visigoth arrivals, peace was made between the dominant communities, based on mutual benefit. And this was made very clear in ecclesiastical action. In 711, the last king of Toledo, Rodrigo, was defeated by an alliance of the sons of the penultimate king, Ubitiza, and a group of North African troops, commanded by Arab generals from Syria, serving the Caliph of Damascus.

In April 713, a son of Musa, Abd Al-Azic, made a pact with the Visigoth Theodomir granting dominion over seven cities in southern València and part of Murcia. The text of the pact clearly indicated the taxes that all inhabitants were to pay per person, and there was a clear distinction: the conditions imposed by Theodomir only referred to the preservation of their privileges, and secondarily to the ruling class. The Arab general's conditions included the ruling class and the remaining population, classified under the common term for servants or slaves.

The Muslims did not settle in the ancient kingdom of València at the time of the conquest, since the pact with Teodomiro served as a defense. P. Guichard (1976) gave the current explanation of the events of the first Muslim centuries, when he proposed the hypothesis of a settlement made up mainly of Berbers, who lived a rural life and had little connection with the great center of political decisions: *Córdoba*. From that city, these lands appeared more as a distant frontier province, little known and often hostile.

The Cid's enrichment, when he put his sword at the service of whoever paid him the most, emptied the purses of the Valencian Muslims, with extremely high taxes imposed on them as "protection money." After the knight's death, his wife and troops withdrew, taking part of the Valencian Mozarabic empire with him. After the city was recaptured for Islam by Mazdalí, the Almoravid governor of *Córdoba*, a series of Almoravid governors followed, most notably Ibn Gània, who ran pirates across the Mediterranean from the port of Denia.

Almohad rule in València continued until Abu Said, who was aided by Jaume I and converted to Christianity. After his departure from the government, a descendant of King Llop, Zaiyan ibn Mardanix, took over, who had to surrender the city to Jaume I after battles (such as that of Anisa) and the siege. The old kingdom broke a long tradition of Islamic rule and acculturation throughout the former kingdom, but it did not disrupt the life of Valencian Muslims, who were to continue (albeit with no small amount of difficulty) until the beginning of the 18th century.

When describing the ancient kingdom of València at the beginning of the Christian conquest, R. I. Burns (1977) used a very accurate metaphor: a kingdom of crusaders. A minority of Christians (as happened in Syria and Palestine after the Crusades) imposed themselves on an entirely Islamic country. This minority was so small that on more than one occasion, government had to be left to local notables, who made pacts with the Crown. However, the predominance of Catalan immigration throughout the 13th and 14th centuries determined the basic linguistic and cultural Catalan nature of the kingdom's ruling superstructure, as well as the gradual affirmation of its legal Valencian status (see A. Ferrando, 1980).

A very paradigmatic case was that of the rays of Crevillent, confirmed in power by King Jaume I, and surprisingly reproduced the work done centuries earlier by the Visigoth Teodomiro. While the former offered himself as a tax collector to the Islamic conqueror, guaranteeing peace and order in the communities in exchange for governing them, now the Christian conqueror had to rely on a notable Muslim who guaranteed him what the Visigoth had promised centuries before.

This dualism between a dominant Christian minority from outside and a dominated, indigenous Muslim majority lasted for a long time. It's true that the kings protected the flight of many Muslims to other lands that were theirs. But who can doubt that these clemency measures reached only distinguished elements of the ruling class? The rest of the population was expelled from their homes, dispossessed of their property, confined to Moorish settlements, neither near nor far from the cities that had been theirs, and became servile labor for the lords who gradually arrived.

V. Catalan-Aragones Acculturation

Furs of València, granted by King Jaume I, was drafted, the birth certificate of the ancient kingdom was established. It set forth "the boundaries of the kingdom and the city of València." The political disintegration of the ancient kingdom of València into Muslim crews coincided with the beginning of the preliminary process of the Christian conquest. While the first movements were carried out by frontier knights (exclusively Aragonese), who on their own initiative made incursions into the highlands of Castellón, the unexpected success of Balasc de Alagó in Ares and Morella at the end of 1232 forced Jaume I (until then occupied with Majorca) to take an interest in the possible war events taking place there and even to lead them (see G. Colón and A. García, 1970/1990).

The meeting of *Alcanyís* at the beginning of 1232, which brought together the king, the Master of the Hospital, Hugo de Fulcalquier and Balasc de Alagó, marked the first official planning of the conquest, which was planned in three stages. The first, after the transfer of the rights acquired by Balasc de Alagó, focused on completing the military expansion of the Castelló region: the capture of *Borriana* (1233), *Peníscola*, *Xivert*, *Cervera*, *Polpís*, *Castelló*, *Borriol*, *the Coves de Vinromà*, *Vilaframés*, etc., excluding some isolated nuclei in the *serra d'Espadà*.

The convocation of the Cortes to the Catalans and Aragonese in *Montsó* in 1236 and the granting of the Bull of the Crusade by Pope Gregory IX in 1237 initiated the second phase, which aimed to capture the city of *València* (1238) and the Valencian plain up to the area around the Xúquer River. Finally, after a truce with the Muslims, which the king took advantage of to launch the new kingdom, in 1243-45, Jaume I put an end to the conquest up to the limits (Biar to the south), which the previous treaties with Castile of Tudilén and Cazola had imposed on him, ratified again in Almirra (1244).

The conquest of the new Valencian kingdom, apart from its military activity, was characterized above all by the speed with which it was carried out and by the limited population influx, despite the spiritual blessings granted by the crusade and the materials provided by the king to encourage the combatants. Occupation therefore prevailed over true repopulation, which was only implemented in places acquired by force and involved the replacement of Muslim settlers with Christians. In general, the disproportion between the Christian and Muslim elements prevailed (in 1272 the kingdom's population was estimated at 30,000 Christians and 200,000 Muslims).

The settlement of the few new Christian settlers was personally supervised by the king himself and was divided into two clear guidelines. In the major urban and strategic centers, the individual repartimiento system was used, which assigned each occupant a house, an orchard, a vineyard, and a yoke. This gave rise to a type of rural property: repopulation of royal lands near the coast with elements coming mainly from the Principality (1,018 Catalan houses compared to 597 Aragonese, as apparently indicated in the *Llibre del Repartiment* (or perhaps with a higher proportion of Aragonese). It should be noted that this was merely a first wave of settlers, susceptible to subsequent ratifications or modifications.

Furthermore, the lack of settlers to apply this method to the entire country, in addition to the commitments made to the Muslim leaders (specifically, non-expulsion), forced the king to cede most of the rural land (generally) to the conquering lords. Thus, the seigniorial repopulation of this land, with the Aragonese dominating the native population of Muslim vassals, was contrary to the original distribution with its continental latifundia.

Therefore, a series of factors that began in the very days of the conquest shaped a large part of the history of the medieval kingdom, characterized by demographics that revealed a triple influence of the Christian elements still in the Catalan-Aragonese minority, compared to a large Muslim mass vassal of that minority, as well as a powerful Semitic minority that lived on the fringes of political change.

Furthermore, due to the economy, predominantly extensive continental agriculture, followed by coastal horticultural crops, which were soon marketed abroad with the creation of the *Consolat de Mar* in 1238. And by law, with the application of different settlement charters, which was a real battleground, because the problem went beyond legal channels and took on a clear political tone.

The rapidity and low demographic influx had a notable influence on the subsequent historical process, as did the chronology of the conquest. The existence of the first stage of conquest (the Castellón period), carried out mainly by the Aragonese nobility, meant that initially the repopulation of these lands was the responsibility of the knights of the Aragonese frontier, who, both inland and on the coast, limited themselves to granting population charters under the Zaragoza or Aragonese charters. These charters were characterized by a privileged administrative and penal system, and above all by the broad granting of ownership of the places to be populated, together with a series of tax exemptions, such as tax, the toll, etc., which implied a regime of notable franchise (see A. M. Barrero and M. L. Alonso, 1989).

But the king soon realized that the alleged Aragonese monopoly on the conquest of València (implicitly accepted to offset the Catalan monopoly on Majorca) would diminish much of his power. Consequently, he

reacted against this and was favored by the incorporation of the city of València, by capitulation, a move that allowed him to integrate it into the royal patrimony and removed it from the jurisdiction of the Aragonese lordship.

In 1240 the king promulgated the *Costum de València*, with the intention of applying it to the entire kingdom, and in 1261 (translated from Latin into Catalan) it was included in the drafting of the *Furs de València*, made by order of the first courts of the kingdom. At the territorial level, the *furs of València* competed with Aragonese legislation. The application of one or the other legislative code, before and after 1240, was eloquent: of the 23 population charters granted between 1233 and 1240, 16 were under the jurisdiction of Zaragoza, 6 according to the customs of Lleida and one according to Muslim law, all in the Castellón area.

But between 1240 and 1276 (to cite the date of the death of Jaume I), although there were still 15 charters of population under the jurisdiction of Aragón or Zaragoza, the *Furs of València* they were applied to more than 30 localities, and the monarch observed a desire to territorialize the Valencian charter throughout the kingdom, much more favorable to the crown than to the privileged charter of Aragón.

However, as the Valencian code was expanded, there was growing opposition from lords with holdings in the kingdom. Protected by their own charters, which guaranteed them legal, social, and economic dominance, they would even take advantage of the foreign policy of the Catalan-Aragonese crown to try to impose their views.

Thus, if at first, from the promulgation of the *Furs* in 1261, the general abandonment (which meant in València the withdrawal to Quart of the Aragonese Pedro Fernández de Azagra, Ximeno de Urrea, Artal de Luna and many others) did not prosper in front of the closed attitude of Jaume I, the subsequent actions of the great nobility (based in Aragón or established in València), but allied in a league opposed to the royal power (the *Union*), did obtain successes in taking advantage of the delicate situation of Pere the Gran, derived from his intervention in Sicília (1282), followed by the Franco-Pontifical reaction, crystallized in the papal excommunication and in the threat (consummated later) of the Pyrenean invasion.

At this juncture, the king, to avoid dangerous derivations within his kingdoms that could play into the hands of the invaders, gave in to the demands of those compiled in the *Privilegio General*, and extended them to all those who wished to observe the charter of Aragón in the kingdom of València.

And although it is true that shortly afterwards (1283), this time under pressure from the court of València, he ignored the agreements of Zaragoza and gave a period of ten days for all those who lived in lands repopulated outside València and disagreed with him to leave the kingdom. It also happened that a few months later (1284), the king, forced again by nobility, went so far as to promise to Zaragoza to create the position of justice of the kingdom of València to be occupied by an Aragonese knight, a promise which he nevertheless did not keep.

The sons and successors of Pere the Cerimoniós, Alfons the Franc (1285-1291) and Jaume II the Just (1291-1327), followed a similarly fluctuating policy. The former, having inherited the still unresolved problems of Catalan-Aragonese foreign policy, also had to tolerate the powerful Aragonese *Unió*, which openly opposed him. And if first he seemed to affirm the position of the Valencian charters (1286), later he was forced to swear to the privileges of the Aragonese *Unió* and to confirm the charter of Aragón wherever it was accepted by the majority, in a curious attempt at a plebiscite *Avant la letter*.

Jaume II failed (or was unable) to take advantage of the favorable circumstances of the Mediterranean pacification following the Treaty of Anagni of 1295, which meant the normalization of relations with France and the Papacy. The regional problem was therefore postponed, and its resolution would inevitably have to contend with two new, somewhat opposing, realities.

On the one hand, the granting in recent years of numerous population charters to *Fur de València*, materialized mainly around the Segura basin (*Alacant*, *Oriola*) thanks to the interventionism of Jaume II and the subsequent peace of Campillo (1304), which seemed to presage the solution in favor of the Conqueror's code. On the other hand, Jaume II, imbued with the patrimonial concept of the monarchy, in ceding in his will to his youngest son, Pere the Cerimoniós, the enclaves of *Gandia*, *Dénia* and *Xàbia*, as a lordship, only favored (albeit implicitly) the arguments of the embattled noble *Unió* based in Aragon.

Faced with this dualism, his son Alfons the Benigne (1327-1336) adopted an intermediate solution that ultimately favored the nobility. It was true that he promoted the spread of Valencian law through the renunciation of the Aragonese charters, but on such terms that the so-called Alfonsine charters of the courts of 1329-1330 granted such broad graces and prerogatives in the jurisdictional sphere (including the mixed empire) that it was more beneficial to submit to the new charters than to persist in the Aragonese ones. In this way, more of the places chartered to Aragón passed to the new Valencian jurisdiction: *Moixent*, *Alboraia*, *Pardines*, *Jova*, *Almàspera*, *Marcarell*, *Vilamarxant*, *Tírig*, *Alcolea*, *Morella*, *Arenós*, etc.

Thus, the problem, which had begun with a clash of different rights, led to the creation of a significant manorial regime in València. It was further consolidated with the authorization (by Alfons the Benigne) of the possible amortization of royal assets in favor of the nobility (who owned them free from any royal exaction). With the alienations of *Alacant*, *Oriola* and later, the towns of *Xàtiva*, *Alzira*, *Morvedre*, *Morella*, *Borriana* and

Castelló de la Plana, given to the Infante Ferran, Marquis of Tortosa, son of the king and his second wife, Elionor of Castile. These last concessions motivated the well-known reaction of the city of València, led by its juror Guillem de Vinatea, who thanks to his firmness before the king achieved the revocation of the royal decision.

The arbitration of Alfons the Benigne did not solve all the problems, and the true conflict of the Unions broke out in the form of a war in the kingdom of Pere the Cerimoniós, with the use as a pretext of the anti-foral purpose of the king (still without sons) of naming his daughter Constança, to the detriment of his brother Jaume the Urgell, and his half-brothers, Ferran (Marquis of Tortosa) and Joan, children of Elionor of Castile. The reaction of those affected, who began to gather supporters, first in Aragón and then in València, and who came to count on the help of all the enemies of Pere the Cerimoniós, finally crystallized in the revival of the *Unió* Aragonesa and the emergence of a new *Unió*, the Valencian one.

Classical historiography has considered the Valencian *Unió* (identified with the Aragones *Unió*) as a final act of the feudal offensive against the king, defeated by the support offered by the Catalan bourgeoisie to the Cerimoniós. Later, a tendency was to distinguish between the *Unió* of Aragón (with permanent feudal demands) and that of València, a citizen movement of the urban patriciate, opposed to a nobility that could hardly demand more after the favorable arbitration of the Alfonsine charters, but that could still abstain from certain municipal payments and taxes.

However, the alliance of the two unions (the Aragones and the Valencian) of such different signs was merely technical, in the face of the Caesarism of a king so opposed to the Aragones lordly whims and the "constitutional" autonomies of València, in the same way that the militancy of the infants Ferran and Joan in the ranks of this second Union was circumstantially no longer as lords established in València, but as direct heirs to the throne due to the lack of male descendants of Pedro III and any other more accredited pretender after the death of Jaume d Urgell.

The failure of the *Unió* meant the failure of the pre-bourgeois possibilities of the Kingdom of València in the mid-14th century and the even stronger consolidation of the noble cause. While it is true that in the federalist context of the Catalan-Aragones crown, the epidemic incidence (which perhaps affected the principality more) favored the hegemonic transfer of the Principality to the Kingdom of Aragón under the Francophile and dreamer Joan I. It was also true that, without the Valencian weakness after to the repression of the unionist movement, it foreshadowed the alliance of the kingdoms of València and Aragón against the Principality, in the context of the *Compromís de Casp*.

After the death of the later Catalan king Martí l'Humà, the Valencian decision was circumstantially favoured by the double policy initiated by Ferran de Antequera, who during the interregnum (1410-1412) combined armed pressure around of Morella with the skillful diplomacy of his agent Diego Fernández de Vadillo towards the Valencian merchants.

And without having to resort to pendulum movements that, following the triumph of the Pere the Cerimoniós over the adjective *Unió* noble would have led the kingdom of València to the renewed feudal offensive in Casp, this would explain (following the same historical line) the Valencian vote of 1412 (with Vicent Ferrer ahead) in favour of Ferran de Antequera, and would better understand the rectifications of the approach that he experienced the such a debated and mythologised Valencian 15th century.

Currently, there is a tendency to qualify the Valencian expansion of the 15th century, based on more feudal structures than those of the Principality, and they benefited precisely from the crisis of the Late Middle Ages of this one. Among other reasons, the relative feudal stability of the countryside, cultivated by Muslim vassals who could not argue the religious equality of Christianity as did the redemptions in their claims, and the favorable repercussions of the crisis of the Principality of the 15th century, which caused the emigration of people and the money towards the capital of the Turia, and were the most outstanding causes that fertilized the Valencian economy.

Considering the circumstantial nature of these expansionary factors, there is a tendency today to downplay the exceptional nature of 15th-century València, given the unusual stability (for the period) of prices and wages, the apotheosis of medieval literature and civil Gothic art, the granting of numerous loans to kings to finance foreign ventures, and the fact that, compared with previous and subsequent events, the bucolic course of 15th-century València offers a positive outcome. Clearly, the 15th-century Valencian peace contrasted with the civil wars in the Principality and of Castile (see L. Alpera, 1969; J. Colomina, 1985, 2013, A. Mas, 1993, 2006; J. Millan, 2013; F. Gimeno, 2025f).

VI. Islamic Acculturation

According to J.M. Nadal and M. Prats (1982: 205-31), the Valencian Mozarabic people prior to the conquest of Jaume I were not expelled after the Muslim invasion, and the majority of the population remained more or less the same as before. Part of this population must have accepted the Muslim religion (called Muladi Muslims), while another part remained faithful to Christianity (called Mozarabs).

The new toponymy reflected the presence of Mozarabic nuclei in the kingdom of València, Mallorca and Catalonia that indicated the existence of Christian religious practices, and therefore of Mozarabic ones: *Alcanissia* and *La Canèssia* in *Alacant*, *Alquenènsia* in *València*, *Ses Canessies* in *Menorca*, derive from the word KANISA which has the meaning of 'Christian church'.

However, we do not know the qualitative and quantitative importance of the Mozarabs or the history of these groups. In order to establish this importance, we would need to know the impact of Christianity between 313 and 711 in the areas occupied by the Arabs from this second date onwards. According to E. Llobregat (1977: 130-1), Christianity before 711 was merely the religion of a privileged and urban minority, as opposed to the generally held view of a peninsula that was fully Christianized after the officialization of Christianity in the Roman Empire (313) (see M. de Epalza and E. Llobregat, 1982).

Everything seemed to indicate that Valencian and Majorcan Mozarabic did not suddenly disappear after 711, although we do not know the pace and intensity of Islamic acculturation, even though the history of Mozarabic acquired a special importance that directly affected the identity of the current speech of the Kingdom of València. Initially, there were two completely opposing positions.

On the one hand, there were those who argued that the current speech of the Kingdom of València was the Catalan language brought here by the Catalans after the conquest of 1238. On the other, there were those who argued that modern Valencian was nothing more than a continuation of Mozarabic (and therefore of the native Latin). However, both positions agreed on the systematic identity between Islamic and Christian acculturation: the Muladíes would have quickly adopted the Arabic language, and the Mozarabs would have continued using the native Romance language, which is precisely why it is called Mozarabic.

For reasons related to language shifts and for historical reasons, the Berbers who settled in the Valencian Country did not become Arabized until much later than 711, while the Muwallads became Arabized more rapidly. It seemed clear, therefore, that accepting the identification of Islamic and Christian acculturation would be sufficient for the study of the history of the Mozarabic group and for a solution regarding the origin of modern Valencian.

Based on various events that occurred between 711 and 1238, M. Sanchis Guarner (1956, 1972) proposed the almost total disappearance of the Mozarabic nuclei of València. Firstly, the Almoravid invasion (1086), which led to a true Africanization of the country, a wave of fanaticism and intolerance, in which the scapegoats were above all the Mozarabs. The fall of València under this new power was provisionally between 1092 and 1094, and definitively in 1102, which caused a large emigration of Mozarabs to Castile. Secondly, the attack by Alfonso the Batallador, King of Aragón, carried out in 1125 with the help of the Mozarabs, led, at the time of his withdrawal, to a mass flight of Mozarabs who went to repopulate the newly conquered Aragonese lands.

With this second emigration of Mozarabs, which was massive (about 10,000 families), the Christian population of València must have been greatly reduced, and the city became more Arab than ever, although the Valencian Mozarabs would have retained their Romance speech, to a greater or lesser degree, until their integration into the states of Jaume I. The only widespread language among the Moriscos (Arabs who were baptized after the conquest) between the years 1238 and 1609 was Arabic, and from this it has obviously been inferred that Arabic must have also been the language they spoke before 1238. P. Guichard (1976) studied the impact of the Arab invasion on the native (majority) population, and considered that the anthropological structure of the country was greatly modified to suggest that Islamic acculturation must also have been very strong, although slow.

The linguistic situation of the kingdom of València and Majorca during the first half of the 13th century, when it was still impossible for Catalan to have had a significant impact on the country, and a glance at the *Llibre dels feits* of King Jaume I was enough to show this, that the Arabs of Majorca and the ancient kingdom of València spoke Arabic, and that the language constantly constituted an impediment to the relationship between the Catalan conquerors and the conquered native population. It seemed clear, therefore, that in the first quarter of the 13th century the Muslims needed an interpreter (*trujaman*) to communicate with the conquerors, and that the latter had a clear awareness of what the *Algaravia* spoken by the Muslims was.

The Muslims living in the Kingdom of València between 1238 and 1609, unlike those living in Aragón or Castile, spoke exclusively Arabic. It was difficult to believe that before the time of the conquest in 1238, when Arabic was the dominant language, the Muslims of València could speak Romance (Mozarabic), and that after 1238, when Catalan was the dominant language, they had to abandon their native language to adopt Arabic.

It was therefore difficult to believe in the continuity of Mozarabic in the current language of the Kingdom of València (see J. Domingues, 1995). The changes that took place in the Arab Kingdom of València during the 11th century, with the beginning of economic activity and urban life, allowed us to affirm that it was very likely that the secondary urban centers played an important role in the process of Islamic acculturation.

J. M. del Estal (1995) chose the period of seventeen years (1291-1308), between the end of the 13th century and the beginning of the 14th century, to analyze the outstanding diplomatic activity carried out by the Chancellery of the Crown of Aragón with the Hispanic chancelleries of Castile, Portugal, Mallorca and the Nasrid kingdom of Granada, as well as with the African ones of Egypt, Tunis, Tremissèn and Morocco, mainly oriented towards the conquest of the Castilian kingdom of Murcia by Jaume II, and the consequent incorporation of this kingdom into his crown, with the corresponding provision of a new peculiar legislation, framed fundamentally in the *Furs Valencians* and in other (few) Castilian Alfonsine regional provisions precedents.

During these years, among the languages chosen by the Crown Chancellery, Arabic, Castilian-Aragonese, Latin, and Catalan stood out in the intense diplomatic activity, gradually increasing in importance. However, some texts were not ruled out, mainly treaties or peace agreements with other sovereigns, which were composed by both signatories in the language of each chancellery (Arabic, Portuguese, Castilian, and Catalan), in cases where Aragón stipulated such a treaty with the monarchs of Egypt, Tunis, Tremissèn, Morocco, and Granada, or Portugal, Castile, and the Kingdom of Majorca. In these treaties, the language used predominantly by the Crown of Aragón was Castilian-Aragonese, and Catalan on rare occasions (see B. Montoya, 1986, 2013).

C. Barceló (1995) suggested that (after the conquest of the Iberian Peninsula by the Arabs) a large part of the Christian population converted to Islam and learned Arabic at the same time. The situation in the ancient kingdom of València in the 13th century was that the entire population was monolingual in Arabic, although there was very little documentation in Arabic from the 13th century. There was more extensive documentation from the 14th and 15th centuries, and much more extensive documentation from the 16th and 17th centuries (more than 100 documents). There is no Romance syntax or morphology, nor are there many words with a Latin etymology that could be found in glossaries or in documentation prior to the conquest, not only from València but from the entire Iberian Peninsula. When the Church began, from 1525 onwards, to realise that it was necessary to speak Arabic to achieve conversion, priests, preachers and other Christians in charge of catechism who spoke Arabic came to the towns.

The question of the expulsion of the Moriscos (raised in the 16th century and decided at the beginning of the 17th) had been around for some time, and it could be said that it had begun with the repopulation of the kingdom itself which, due to economic interests (creation of territorial lordships) and demographic deficiencies (lack of Christian settlers), had allowed the Muslim (Mudejar) presence in a socio-religious climate of mutual tolerance, confirmed even legally in the series of population charters granted under Muslim law, in one of the most Islamized centres of the country: the *Serra de l'Espadà*.

Religious tolerance gave way to intolerance, not only toward the Muslim population. The forced conversion of the Mudejars of Granada in 1502 was an event that shook the Valencian Muslims. And when Rome recognized the sacramental validity of those acts in 1525, the Mudejars, suddenly converted into Moriscos (New Christians), raised the need for true conversion and evangelization (1525-1570) with the *Espadà* uprising of 1526. This need had been postponed from that moment on by Turkish and Barbarian pressure in the Mediterranean, combined with the uprising in the Alpujarras of Granada (1568).

The reason of state was thus joined with the cultural to demand greater effectiveness in preaching, already in the time of Philip II, with aspects of repression (1570-1609) on a population that still lived in mountainous or dry areas (outside the irrigated regions of *Gandia*), and grew at a much more vertiginous rate than among the old Christians, as well as threatening in the near future to engulf the dominant population.

For this reason, the great Valencian nobility, of which the private Lerma (titled Marquis of Dénia) could have been the spokesman in the court of Philip III, agreed to the expulsion (1609), not without complaints that brought him as compensation the immediate requisition of the property of the expelled Moriscos, including their estates, and then the dismissal of most of the economic commitments made with the rentier bourgeoisie.

Indeed, the consequences of the expulsion seemed to justify this interpretation, because aside from the catastrophic effects that resulted from it in general terms: demographic voids due to the exodus of more than 170,000 people; agrarian crises that affected the three main products (sugar cane, rice, and wheat); the billion inflations; and the failure of the *Taula de Canvi* in 1613.

It was true that the expulsion greatly benefited the landed nobility in the long run. This was evident in the land consolidation that resulted from the permission to requisition Morisco property (which rounded out the pre-existing latifundia), the imposition of drastic population charters on the new settlers, which reinforced the prevailing feudalism in the countryside, and the 50 percent reduction in the monetary investments that the rentier bourgeoisie had directed toward agriculture.

Through Moorish farmers or noble owners of large plots of land, the mortgage nature of which could have threatened the stability of the manor. The reduction, made at the request of the "disconsolate" nobility, who, having lost their vassals (their workforce), argued that they could not pay their creditors, ruined the already battered urban middle classes, expelling them from all their rentier positions.

VII. Conclusions

1. Acculturation has been the empirical foundation of the anthropological history of humanity, and has been integrated into the history of languages, societies, and cultures. Acculturation has been used to describe all cultural events resulting from the acquisition, modification, or reinterpretation of a culture, particularly the reception and assimilation of cultural elements specific to one social group by another, with adaptation to a new sociocultural context. The term acculturation became widely accepted among American anthropologists in the late 19th century, referring to the changes that occurred when social groups with different cultural traditions merged. The entry of anthropology into history was one of the most significant historiographical developments, and there was a deepening of the understanding of the configuration of society, and especially of its behavior in relation to the territory occupied.

2. The hypothesis of the history of humanity as a succession of acculturations was more appropriate to the linguistic, social, and cultural facts, and to the continuity of history itself. Our main working hypothesis was that within the anthropological history of the Hispanic Romances there was a linguistic and cultural continuity, based on the successive and diverse historical acculturations (Indo-European, Basque-Iberian, Pheno-Punic-Greek, Roman, Christian, Germanic, Visigothic, Byzantine, Islamic, Catalan-Aragonese, medieval Castilian, medieval Valencian, Castilian, and Anglo-Saxon), with the linguistic and cultural transfers that implied the social and cultural interbreeding of these groups, and the adaptation to a new sociocultural context. Our specific working hypothesis is confirmed once again.

3. Among the languages of pre-Roman Hispania, Iberian was the best documented, and allowed for a phonological system of the textual material of the inscriptions. This culture had been the product of the arrival of new social groups (probably of North African origin) in the Neolithic period along the entire Mediterranean coast from southern France to the south of the Iberian Peninsula. In the first millennium BC, it was impacted by a Pheno-Punic-Greek acculturation, produced by the knowledge of new technical advances on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, as well as by repeated contact with individuals from there who possessed a more advanced culture.

4. From an archaeological reconstruction, some clearly differentiating elements of Iberian culture were complex habitats, developed urban planning, the existence of extensive religious and funerary sculpture, the use of the wheel, early knowledge of writing, and the use of currency in the last centuries of independent existence. Iberian culture emerged as a result of the impact on the native populations of small nuclei of eastern groups, traditionally identified with the Phoenicians and Greeks, although these names included people of very diverse origins, who arrived on the coasts of the Iberian Peninsula from the second millennium onwards. Their degree of influence varied greatly along the different coasts of the peninsula, and if we add to this the fact that the cultural development of the various Hispanic peoples was also different, it should not surprise us that neither the degree nor the process of Iberization were homogeneous throughout the Iberian area.

5. Although we can identify the Iberians as indigenous people who inhabited the Mediterranean coasts, without forgetting that a large part of southeastern France was Iberized early on, Iberian culture also spread inland and came to assimilate peoples who at first could not be considered Iberian, such as those of the Ebro Valley or the Meseta. Iberian culture, therefore, did not represent an ethnic unity, but rather a cultural one, so it was not surprising that originally non-Iberian peoples (such as those in the interior of the peninsula) became culturally Iberized over the centuries, although there were regional and local differences specific to Iberian culture. The Iberian world was composed of a mosaic of peoples (Turdetani, Bastani, Contestani, Oretani, Edetani, Ilercavoni, Lacetani, Ilergeti, etc.).

6. Between the 5th and 3rd centuries BC, the period of apogee of this culture, known as the "first Iberian period", materialized. Cities were built and inhabited, sculpture was manifested, trade and wealth accumulated, and a good level of development was achieved. An emblematic reference of Iberian sculpture and art was the "Dama d'Elx", whose face had the features and majestic perfection of the severe-style Greek goddesses, in the first half of the 5th century BC. All this great art was destroyed throughout the first half of the 3rd century BC, and was related to the pressure of the Carthaginian generals of the Amical Barca dynasty. Regarding Iberian writing, L. Abad offered a brief account of the strange nature of this alphabet, which had already attracted the attention of scholars in the 16th century and was one of the clearest indications of the high level of development of the Iberians. Thus, Estrabon pointed out that the Turdetani were the most cultured of the Iberians and had written laws and a "grammar" that were many years old.

7. The contact of the Iberians with a civilization different from their own began a long process of acculturation that led (well into the Christian era) to a complete Romanization, if not of the ruling classes. The initial contacts were undoubtedly of a military nature, and were the scene of battles and the passage of armies: in the 2nd century BC, those of Sucron and Urbicua, and in 138 BC the transfer of Roman veterans from the war against Viriathus, during which time a city was established on a river island in the Turia, which would later become *Colonia Valentia*, although its colonial status is not certain from the date of its foundation. The other transfer of veterans, after their discharge, was made with two legions on the Iberian city of Alcudia d'Elx, which from then on would be called *Colonia Iulia Illici Augusta*, already in the second half of the 1st century BC.

8. Based on various events that occurred between 711 and 1238, M. Sanchis Guarner proposed the almost total disappearance of the Mozarabic nuclei of València. First, the Almoravid invasion (1086), which led to a true Africanization of the country, a wave of fanaticism and intolerance, in which the scapegoats were primarily the Mozarabs. The fall of València under this new power was provisionally between 1092 and 1094, and definitively in 1102, which led to a large emigration of Mozarabs to Castile. Second, the attack by Alfonso the Batallador, King of Aragón, carried out in 1125 with the help of the Mozarabs, led, at the time of his withdrawal, to a mass flight of Mozarabs who went to repopulate the newly conquered Aragonese lands. With this second emigration of Mozarabs, which was massive (about 10,000 families), the Christian population of València must have been greatly reduced, and the city became more Islamic than ever, although the Valencian Mozarabs would have preserved their Romance language, to a greater or lesser extent, until their integration into the states of Jaume I.

9. The only widespread language among the Moriscos (Arabs who were baptized after the conquest) between the years 1238 and 1609 was Arabic, and from this it has obviously been inferred that Arabic must also have been the language they spoke before 1238. P. Guichard studied the impact of the Arab invasion on the native (majority) population and considered that the anthropological structure of the country was greatly modified to suggest that Islamic acculturation must also have been very strong, although slow. The linguistic situation of the kingdom of València and Mallorca during the first half of the 13th century, and for this a glance at the *Llibre dels feits* of King Jaume I, to realize that the Arabs of Majorca and the Valencian Country spoke Arabic, and that the language constantly constituted an impediment to the relationship between the Catalan conquerors and the conquered native population. It seemed clear, therefore, that in the first quarter of the 13th century the Muslims needed an interpreter (*trujaman*) to communicate with the conquerors, and that the latter had a clear awareness of what the *Algaravia* spoken by the Muslims was.

10. The Muslims living in the Kingdom of València between 1238 and 1609, unlike those living in Aragón or Castile, spoke exclusively Arabic. It was difficult to believe that before the time of the conquest in 1238, when Arabic was the dominant language, the Muslims of València could speak Romance (Mozarabic), and that after 1238, when Catalan was the dominant language, they had to abandon their native language to adopt Arabic. It was therefore difficult to argue for the continuity of Mozarabic in the current language of the Kingdom of València. The changes that took place in the Arab Kingdom of València during the 11th century, with the beginning of economic activity and urban life, allowed us to affirm that secondary urban centers probably played an important role in a process of Islamic acculturation.

11. The question of the expulsion of the Moriscos (raised in the 16th century and decided at the beginning of the 17th) had been around for some time, and it could be said that it had begun with the same repopulation of the kingdom that had allowed the Muslim presence (Mudéjar), due to economic interests (creation of territorial lordships) and demographic deficiencies (lack of Christian settlers), in a socio-religious climate of mutual tolerance, confirmed even legally in the series of population charters granted under Muslim law in one of the most Islamized nuclei of the country: the *Serra d'Espadà*. Religious tolerance gave way to intolerance, not only towards the Muslim population. The forced conversion of the Mudejars of Granada in 1502 was an event that shook the Valencian Muslims. And when Rome recognized the sacramental validity of those acts in 1525, the Mudejars, suddenly converted into Moriscos (New Christians), raised the need for true conversion and evangelization (1525-1570) with the d'Espadà uprising of 1526, which had been postponed from that moment on by Turkish and Barbarian pressure in the Mediterranean, combined with the uprising in the Alpujarras of Granada (1568).

12. Reason of state was thus combined with Christian acculturation to demand greater effectiveness in preaching, already in the time of Philip II, with aspects of repression (1570-1609) on a population that still lived in mountainous or dry areas (outside the irrigated regions of Gandia), and was growing at a much more vertiginous rate than the Old Christians, as well as threatening in the near future to engulf the dominant population. For this reason, the great Valencian nobility, of which the private Lerma (titled Marquis of Dénia) could have been the spokesman in the court of Philip III, agreed to the expulsion (1609), not without regrets that brought him as compensation the immediate requisition of the goods of the expelled Moriscos, including farms and then the dismissal of most of the financial commitments made with the rentier bourgeoisie.

13. Indeed, the consequences of the expulsion seemed to justify this interpretation. Apart from the catastrophic effects that generally resulted from it: demographic voids due to the exodus of more than 170,000 people, agrarian crises that affected the three main products (sugar cane, rice, and wheat), the billion inflations, and the failure of the *Taula de Canvi* in 1613. It was true that the expulsion greatly benefited the territorial nobility in the long run. This was evident in the land consolidation that resulted from the permission to requisition of Morisco property, with the imposition of drastic population charters on the new settlers, which affirmed the prevailing feudalism in the countryside, and in the 50 percent reduction in the monetary investments that the rentier bourgeoisie had directed toward agriculture.

References

- [1]. Abad, L. (1987), "La Cultura Ibérica", In Suárez, L. Et Al. (Dirs.) (1985-1995), 1/2, 171-253.
- [2]. Alpera, L. (1969), "Conciencia Y Normalización Lingüística En El País Valenciano", In Filología Y Crítica Hispánica (Homenaje Al Prof. Sánchez Escribano), Madrid, 335-45.
- [3]. Ardener, E. Et Al. (Eds.) (1971), *Antropología Social Y Lenguaje*, Buenos Aires, Paidós, 1976.
- [4]. Artola, M. (Dir.) (1973-1976), *Historia De España Alfaguara*, 7 Vols., Madrid, Alianza.
- [5]. Barceló, C. (1995), "La Llengua Dels Sarraïns Valencians", In Colomina, J.(Ed.) (1995), 13-23.
- [6]. Barrero, A. M. And Alonso, M. L. (1989), *Textos De Derecho Local Español En La Edad Media*. Catálogo De Fueros Y Costums Municipales, Madrid, CSIC.
- [7]. Burns, R. I. (1977), "The Language Barrier: The Problems Of Bilingualism And Muslim- Christian Interchange In The Medieval Kingdom Of Valencia", In Vassallo, M (Ed.) (1977), 116-36.
- [8]. Colomina, J. (1985), *L'alacantí. Un Estudi Sobre La Variació Lingüística*, Alacant, Institut J. Gil-Albert.
- [9]. — (2013), "El Dialecte Murcià Com A Resultat Del Contacte Lingüístic Medieval Entre El Castellà Y El Català", In Montoya, B. And Mas, A. (Eds.) (2013), 123-51.
- [10]. — (Ed.) (1995), *Llengües En Contacte Als Regions Of Valencia And Múrcia (Segles XIII-XV)*, 2nd Ed., Alacant, Universitat d'Alacant.
- [11]. Colón, G. Y García, A. (1970/1990), *Furs De València*, 5 Vols., Barcelona, ENC
- [12]. Domene, J. F. (2023), *Historia De Villena*, Alicante, Ayuntamiento De Villena.
- [13]. Domingues, J. (1995), "Entorn Del "Mossàrab" De València", In Colomina, J. (Ed.) (1995), 51-68.
- [14]. Epalza, M. De And Llobregat, E. (1982), "¿Hubo Mozárabes En Tierras Valencianas? Proceso De Islamización Del Levante De La Península Ibérica (Sharq Al-Andalus)", *Revista Del Instituto De Estudios Alicantinos*, 36, 7-31.
- [15]. Estal, J. M. Del (1982), *Conquista Y Anexión De Las Tierras De Alicante, Elche, Orihuela Y Guardamar Al Reino De Valencia Por Jaime II De Aragón (1296-1308)*, Alicante, Caja De Ahorros Provincial.
- [16]. — (1995), "Els Usos Lingüístics De La Cancelleria Aragonesa En Els Anys 1291-1308, Amb Una Referència Especial Als Regnes De València Y De Múrcia" In Colomina, J. (Ed.) (1995), 175-212.
- [17]. —(Coord.) (1985), *Studia Historica In Honorem V. Martínez Morellá*, Alicante, Diputación De Alicante,
- [18]. Ferguson, C. A. (1959), "Diglossia", *Word*, 15, 325-40.
- [19]. Ferrando, A. (1980), *Consciència Idiomàtica I Nacional Dels Valencians*, València, Universitat De València.
- [20]. Fishman, J. A. (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., The Hague, Mouton.
- [21]. Frank, B. And Hartmann, J. (1997), *Inventaire Systématique Des Premiers Documents Des Langues Romanes*, 5 Vols., Tübingen, Narr.
- [22]. García De Cortázar, J. A. (1973), *La Época Medieval*, In Artola, M. (Dir.) (1973-1976), II, 2nd Ed., Madrid, 1974.
- [23]. —(1985), "Del Cantábrico Al Duero", In García De Cortázar, J. A. Et Al. (1985), 43-83.
- [24]. —Et Al. (1985), *Organización Social Del Espacio En La España Medieval*. La Corona De Castilla En Los Siglos VIII A XV, Barcelona, Ariel.
- [25]. Gimeno, F. (1985), "Caracterización Sociolingüística Del Libro De Los Primitivos Privilegios De Alicante De Alfonso X El Sabio", In Estal, J. M. Del (Coord.) (1985), 117-42.
- [26]. —(1988), "Sociolingüística Histórica", *Actes Du Xviie Congrès International De Linguistique Et De Filologie Romanes*, V, Tübingen, M. Niemeyer, 111-20.
- [27]. —(1990), *Dialectología Y Sociolingüística Españolas*, 2nd Ed., Alicante, Universidad De Alicante.
- (1995), *Sociolingüística Histórica (Siglos X-XII)*, Madrid, Visor Libros.
- [28]. —(2013), "Fundamentos Antropológicos Y Sociológicos De Los Protorromances Hispanos, Aemilianense, III, 47-131.
- [29]. —(2019), *Historia Antropológica De Los Romances Hispanos*, San Millán De La Cogolla, Cilengua.
- [30]. —(2023), "The Sociocultural Origin Of The Oral Register Of Languages", *IOSR-JHSS*, 28, 5, 4, 42-54.
- [31]. —(2024a), "Formation Processes Of Hispanic Romances", *IOSR-JHSS*, 29, 2, 10, 39-56.
- [32]. —(2024b), "Sociological And Legal Keys To The Formation Of Hispanic Romances", *I IOSR-JHSS*, 29, 3, 7, 60-79.
- [33]. —(2024c), "Anthropology History Of First Hispanic Romance Text", *IOSR-JHSS*, 29, 5, 7, 11-29.
- (2024d), "Acculturation", *IOSR-JHSS*, 29, 11, 3, 17-32.
- (2025a), "Basque-Iberian Acculturation", *IOSR-JHSS*, 30, 2, 2, 31-45.
- (2025b), "Castilian Acculturation", *IOSR-JHSS*, 30, 3, 5, 46-60.
- (2025c), "Anglo-Saxon Acculturation", *IOSR-JHSS*, 30, 4, 6, 41-57.
- (2025d), "Catalan-Aragones Acculturation", *IOSR-JHSS*, 30, 5, 6, 4-37.
- (2025e), "Medieval Castilian Acculturation", *IOSR-JHSS*, 30, 7, 1, 3851.
- (2025f), *Historia Antropológica De La Frontera Valenciano-Castellana Meridional*, Alicante, Universidad De Alicante.
- [34]. —And Gimeno, M. V. (2003), *El Desplazamiento Lingüístico Del Español Por El Inglés*, Madrid, Cátedra.
- [35]. Guichard, P. (1976), *Al-Andalus. Estructura Antropológica De Una Sociedad Islámica En Occidente*, Barcelona, Barral Ediciones.
- [36]. Hernández, M. (1985), "Del Poblamiento Inicial A La Edad Del Bronce", In Rabanal, M. A. (Coord.) (1985), 35-116.
- [37]. Hockett, C. F. (1958), *Curso De Lingüística Moderna*, 4rd Ed., Buenos Aires, Eudeba, 1971.
- [38]. Hoz, J. De (1996), "El Origen De Las Escrituras Paleohispánicas Quince Años Después", In Villar, F. And d'Encarnação, J. (Eds.) (1996), 171-206.
- [39]. Hymes, D. (1971), "La Sociolingüística Y La Etnografía Del Habla", In Ardener, E. Et Al. (Eds.) (1971), 115-51.
- (1974), *Foundations In Sociolinguistics. An Ethnography Approach*, London, Tavistock.
- [40]. Jacob, D. And Kabatek, J. (2001), "Introducción: Lengua, Texto Y Cambio Lingüístico En La Edad Media Iberorrománica", In Jacob, D. And Kabatek, J. (Eds.) (2001), VII-XVIII.
- [41]. — And Kabatek, J.(Eds.) (2001), *Lengua Medieval Y Traducciones Discursivas En La Península Ibérica: Descripción Gramatical, Pragmática Histórica, Metodología*, Frankfurt Am Main, Vervuert.
- [42]. Jakobson, R. (1970), "Relaciones Entre La Ciencia Del Lenguaje Y Las Otras Ciencias", In Jakobson, R. (1976), 11-82.
- (1976), *Nuevos Ensayos De Lingüística General*, México, Siglo XXI.
- [43]. Lapesa, R. (1942/1981), *Historia De La Lengua Española*, 9th Ed., Madrid, Gredos.
- [44]. Lehmann, W. P. And Malkiel, Y. (Eds.) (1968), *Directions For Historical Linguistics: A Symposium*, Austin, University Of Texas Press.
- [45]. López Morales, H. (1989), *Sociolingüística*, Madrid, Gredos, 3rd Ed., 2004.

- [46]. — (2006), “Sociolingüística Histórica”, *Actas Del VI Congreso Internacional De Historia De La Lengua Española*, III, Madrid, Arco/ Libros, 2385-402.
- (2013), “Los Estudios Sociolingüísticos En Río Piedras”, In Montoya, B. Y Mas, A. (Eds.) (2013), 409-18.
- [47]. Llobregat, E. (1977), *La Primitiva Cristiandad Valenciana*, València.
- [48]. Malmberg, B. (1966), *La Lengua Y El Hombre. Introducción A Los Problemas Generales De La Lingüística*, 2nd Ed., Madrid, Istmo, 1972.
- [49]. Mas, A. (1993), *El Canvi Lingüístic Del Català En L’administració Eclesiàstica d’Elx En l’Edat Moderna*, Alacant, Diputació Provincial.
- (2006), *La Interrupció Lingüística A Guardamar (El Camí Cap A La Substitució)*, Alacant, Universitat d’Alacant.
- [50]. Millan, J. (2013), “La Llengua Catalana A Oriola. Segles XIV-XIX. Testimonis Y Comentaris”, In Montoya, B. And Mas, A. (Eds.) (2013), 285-305.
- [51]. Montoya, B. (1986), *Variació I Desplaçament De Llengües A Elda I A Oriola Durant l’Edat Moderna*, Alacant, Institut d’Estudis “Juan Gil-Albert.
- (2013), “Història Social De La Llengua: Dels Orígens Als Primers Intents De Normativització Del Català”, *Aemilianense*, III, 163-97.
- [52]. — And Mas, A. (Eds.) (2013), *Studia Lingüística In Honorem F. Gimeno*, Alicante, Publicaciones De La Universidad De Alicante.
- [53]. Pérez, R. Et Al. (1980), *País Valencià. Geografia I Història*, València, Arts Gràfiques.
- [54]. Rabanal, M. A. (Coord.) (1985), *Historia De La Provincia De Alicante. Edad Antigua, II*, Murcia, Ediciones Mediterráneo.
- [55]. Sanchis Guarner, M. (1956), “Els Parlars Romànics Anteriors A La Reconquesta De València I Mallorca”, In *Estudios Dedicados A R. Menéndez Pidal*, VI, Madrid, 1956, 151- 86.
- (1972), *La Llengua Dels Valencians*, València.
- [56]. Suárez, L. Et Al. (Dirs.) (1985-1995), *Historia General De España Y América*, 2nd Ed., 19 Vols., Madrid, RIALP.
- [57]. Tovar, A. (1962), “Fonología Del Ibérico”, In *Miscelánea A A. Martinet*, III, La Laguna, 171-81.
- [58]. UNESCO (Patr.) (1963), “Prefacio” In “Prehistoria Y Los Comienzos De La Civilización”, In *Historia De La Humanidad. Desarrollo Cultural Y Científico*, Barcelona, Planeta, 1977, I, 7-10.
- [59]. Vassallo, M (Ed.) (1977), *Contributions To Mediterranean Studies*, Malta University.
- [60]. Villar, F. And d’Encarnação, J. (Eds.) (1996), *La Hispania Prerromana. Actas Del VI Coloquio Sobre Lenguas Y Culturas Prerromanas De La Península Ibérica*, SSalamanca, Universidad De Salamanca.
- [61]. Weinreich, U. (1953), *Languages In Contact. Findings And Problems*, 7th Ed., The Hague, Mouton, 1970. Trad. Cat. *Llengües En Contacte*, Alzira, Bromera, 1996.
- [62]. —, 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.
- [63]. Wolff, P. (1971), *Origen De Las Lenguas Occidentales, 100-1500 D. C.*, Madrid, Guadarrama.