

The Diphtong /ay/ - /ey/ in Toledan Mozarabic

Autor(en): **Craddock, Jerry R.**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Vox Romanica**

Band (Jahr): **47 (1988)**

PDF erstellt am: **27.04.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-37122>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

The Diphthong /ay/ - /ey/ in Toledan Mozarabic

Galmés' treatment of Toledan Mozarabic (1983: 43–116; repr. with additions from Galmés 1977), based primarily on the Arabic documents published by González Palencia 1926–30 (= *MT*)¹ is widely recognized as definitive. Yet I have come to the conclusion (see my forthcoming review of Galmés 1983) that the research devoted to the project was flawed on two levels: the data were taken exclusively from often deficient secondary sources and in addition Galmés frequently misinterpreted and misrepresented them, such as they were. The purpose of this article is to subject to a rigorous analysis Galmés' principal conclusions concerning the outcomes of the proto-Hispano-Romance diphthong /ay/ in Toledan Mozarabic, to wit, that /ay/ became /ey/ and that the occasional monophthongization of the latter (/ey/ > /e/) evident in the documents printed in *MT*, rather than betokening Castilian morpho-lexical influence, also occurred independently within Toledan Mozarabic.

Galmés' evidence is presented in three clusters of forms: (1) a list of 36 items in which the diphthong /ay/ - /ey/ can be deduced as underlying the grapheme *yā'* [y]; (2) a list of five items in which the diphthong /ay/ - /ey/ is supposedly signaled in an explicit fashion in the sources; and (3) a list of 11 items that according to Galmés demonstrate the tendency of the diphthong /ay/ - /ey/ to monophthongize to /e/ within Toledan Mozarabic².

Galmés begins his discussion by noting that in the Arabic writing system, without explicit vowelizing /ay/ cannot be distinguished from /ī/. In fact the only fully unambiguous written representation of /ay/ requires a *sukūn* (symbol signaling the absence of a vowel) over the *yā'* as well as a *fatha* (= /a/) over the preceding consonant, otherwise it could be read as a syllable-initial consonant in the sequences /ya/, /yi/ or /yu/. I note, by way of illustration, the family name [*dys*] (*MT*, doc. no. 1028.13, 14, 16, 18; AHN 3055/7.9, 11, 12) = *Díaz* or *Díez*, that is, with vowelizing we would have [*diyas*]. There is a

¹ Galmés did not verify the readings in *MT* against the originals, housed in the Archivo Histórico Nacional, Madrid (= AHN), Sección Clero. In what follows I attempt to identify each form cited in microfilms of the documents, acquired with the kind assistance of Maxim Kerkhof, Catholic University, Nijmegen, who also provided a list of the current shelf numbers. The latter are indicated as follows: 3055/7.9 = *carpeta* 3055, doc. 7, line 9. I indicate all readings of the originals that differ from those printed in *MT*.

² Following Galmés I place transliterations in square brackets but do not include any symbol not actually present in the texts. With regard to individual letters, I represent 'alif as [ʾ] and word-final hamza as [h]. The *tā' marbūṭa*, which differs from the hamza only in the presence to two superscript dots, is recorded as [a]. In the documents I have surveyed, the difference between hamza and *tā' marbūṭa* is often not marked; the appearance of the latter in *MT* frequently constitutes tacit editorial intervention. It is also important to note that a great deal of the manuscript vowelizing was ignored by the editor of *MT*.

further, and crucial, complication: [y] may also represent the mid-front vowel /e/, as pointed out by Galmés (1983:55), treating it as a marginal phenomenon. The second part of the place-name *Villaseca* ‘dry town’, most commonly represented as [š’ka] (also [ska] MT 46.1; AHN 2025/2.2, barely legible in the microfilm), likewise occurs as [šyka] (MT 106.6; apparently no longer extant in AHN). The etymon, Lat. *sicca*, excludes Hispano-Romance descendants bearing the tonic diphthongs /ay/ or /ey/, so any sound basis for assuming unvoveled [y] represents a diphthong, i.e., by routinely “transliterating” it as [y], with a dot representing an indeterminate vowel, is undermined. One is entitled to wonder whether alternations like [b’qa] – [byqa] (MT 743.5; AHN 3005/16.5 [b’qh] – MT 232.2; AHN 3043/3.2 [byqh]) may not be purely graphic, both representing monophthongal *vega* ‘plain’, rather than illustrative of a genuine phonological alternation between *vega* and diphthongal *vaiga* – *veiga*. The same may be said for [b’trh] vs. [bytrh] = *Pedro* (MT 104.3; AHN 3037/15.3 – MT 380bisC.2; AHN 3049/18, too faint to read in the microfilm). Note esp. [b’trs bn bytrh] 459.1 (AHN 3053/2.1) = *Pérez hijo de Pedro*. However, a cognate relationship of [bytrh] to the uncommon variant OCast. *Peidro* is no doubt possible, as duly observed by Galmés (1983: 105). Now there can be no objection to interpreting instances of [y] as /ay/ – /ey/ when comparative evidence suggests such a course; but to force such interpretations on the *transliterations* is to violate the principle that analysis should be rigorously distinguished from attestation. The fact is that no single form quoted in the main list of 36 items containing /ay/ – /ey/ constitutes *direct*, as opposed to *inferential*, evidence for either diphthong.

The second, short list (Galmés 1983: 59) of five items that allegedly occur with full vowelings should logically have been considered first, as it presents the sole direct evidence for /ay/ – /ey/. Of the five, only two stand up to scrutiny: [rabuštayruh] (MT 63.2; 3035/15.1 [rabuštayruh]) = Cast. *repostero* ‘steward’ is overtly voweled, though the *sukūn* printed over the [y] represents an editorial intervention (likewise note the mistransliteration of [š] as [s]³; and [tabrayrwlh] ‘mistletoe’ (Asín 1943: 155 [§ 303.5] – verified in a microfiche of the MS, Col. Gayangos XL, Academia de la Historia, Madrid, f.288v5). The latter is specifically attributed by the anonymous Sevillean botanist to the Romance vernacular of Toledo. Galmés incomprehensibly represents it as “[t.p.rayrwla’]” despite the fact that the first two syllables are clearly voweled, with *sukūns* over the [b] and the [y] as well. Galmés was apparently influenced by Asín who interpreted the form as *taparairola* on the basis of an etymological association with Arag., Cat. *tápara* ‘caper’. Of the other three, “[radayru^h]” ‘plow’ is a misreading of [’aradyrh] 1062.4 (AHN 3056/4.4) while the supposed vowels of “[mayšōn]” = Cast. *mesón* ‘inn’, but with the apparent more general meaning of ‘dwelling’ in Toledan Moz-

³ Cf. also [rbštyrh] 548.14, 3056/19.16; [rbštyrh] 898.1, 3036/14.1 [ra-] or [rubuštayrh], as well as [’rbšt’rh] 702.10, 3067/13.4 [’rbušt’rh] – [’l-] is the Arabic definite article; [rbšt’rh] 960.12, 3063/9.7 [rabuštayruh]. Note how consultation of microfilms of the originals reveals the presence of explicit vowelings that adds considerable grist to the /ay/ – /ey/ mill.

arabic, and “[baygah]” = Cast. *vega* ‘plain’, are provided merely on Simonet’s authority (1888: 325-6, 560). What seems faintly absurd here is not just the trust that Galmés places in Simonet, who, as far as I can judge, routinely inserted interpretative vowelizing in the lemmata of his glossary, but most of all the fact that Simonet’s sole source in both cases are “esc[ritos] moz[árabes] Tol[edanos]”, i.e., the very same documents published in *MT*. Citing Simonet in such instances is totally redundant, yet Galmés frequently lists the entries of the *Glosario de voces ibéricas* as though they constituted independent evidence for Toledan Mozarabic. I am inclined to concede that even two forms may be enough to establish the reality of the diphthong /ay/ - /ey/, but it is essential that the evidence be treated in a more rigorous fashion than Galmés has achieved. Above all, no useful progress can be made unless transliterations are absolutely faithful and rigorously separated from all species of interpretation.

The question remains as to whether the diphthong contained a low /a/ or mid /e/ nuclear vowel in Toledan Mozarabic. I am inclined toward the latter alternative in view of the fact that there exists a further representation of the diphthong /ay/ - /ey/ which Galmés failed to observe in this context, to wit [y] as in [lfr’yly] *MT* 193.1 = Cast. *fraile* ‘friar’ ([y] represents an ‘*alif maksūra*’, but in AHN 3004/2.1 [lfr’yly] the final [y] is clearly marked with two dots)⁴. In this same document occur [tlbyra] 193.4 = Cast. *Talavera* (AHN 3004/2.3 [tlbyrh]; the [y] lacks the normative two dots) and [zytwn] 193.5 (3004/2.4), translated as ‘olivos’, i.e., olive trees, which, with standard vowels, would be [zaytūn]. The root of the last form is cognate with that of Cast. *aceite* ‘oil’, *aceituna* ‘olive’. Both forms, then, contain just [y] as the graphic reflex of original, respectively Romance and Arabic, /ay/, which may have become /ey/ in Toledan Mozarabic. Now even though [y], strictly speaking, could likewise correspond to either /ay/ or /ey/, since the Arabic writing system does not distinguish mid from high and low vowels, one may ask why the representation of the stressed nucleus of *fraile* should have provoked a markedly different graphic form if the other words mentioned contained exactly the same diphthong. The use of [y] for /ay/ in this case is explicable if (1) original /ay/ had in fact become /ey/ Toledan Mozarabic and (2) if that dialect, far from being a hermetically sealed linguistic domain as claimed by Galmés (1983:90), was capable of incorporating Castilian loanwords. As an ecclesiastical borrowing from Castilian, the tonic diphthong /ay/ of *fraile* would have called forth, quite naturally within the Arabic graphic system, an ‘*alif*’ for the nuclear vowel, compare [byl’yh] = Cast. *Pelayo*, still within the same document (193.19, 3004/2.23; note [y] as a representation of /e/ in the initial syllable). Consequently, we have here interesting, if indirect, evidence in favor of Galmés’ conclusion (1983:78) that in Toledan Mozarabic the etymological diphthong /ay/ had uniformly become /ey/. Meanwhile, the correspondence [zytwn]—*aceite* stands

⁴ Galmés discusses (1983: 105) the variant “[f.rāy.r.]” i.e., *fraire*, as supposedly exemplifying the sound shifts /tr/ > /dr/ > /yr/. His source *MT* 177.1 has [fr’yr] but [fr’lyr] is the reading of AHN 3003/15.1. However, it seems reasonable to suppose a scribal misspelling of *lām* for ‘*alif*’.

against any facile presumption that /ey/ had further progressed to /e/ in Toledan Mozarabic.

In his discussion (1983: 77) of this last point Galmés makes the claim that none of the forms bearing /e/ (signaled by 'alif [ʿ]) rather than the expected diphthong /ay/-/ey/ (represented by yā [y]) can be Castilian because the words involved show other phonological structures that mark them as specifically Mozarabic. Of the examples provided, *carbonero* 'coal dealer', *ferrero* 'blacksmith', *perdiguero* 'pointer, setter', *lencero* 'linen dealer', *melero* 'honey dealer', *molinera* 'miller's wife', *tabernero* 'inn-keeper', *calderos* 'pots', and *salero* 'salt-cellar', fit Castilian morphophonemic structure perfectly, while the toponym *Peña (A)guilera* 'eagle's cliff' likewise lacks any non-Castilian trait. Only "[q.n.ŷŷēru'] (sic) *qonechēro*" = Cast. *conejero* 'rabbit hunter' contains the ostensibly Mozarabic reflex [ŷŷ] (that is, geminate or doubled *ġim*—a graphy which I would transcribe as [ġġ]) = /č/ as opposed to OCast. /ž/. In the document cited by Galmés (*MT* 956), the word corresponding to *conejeros* appears twice, lines 2 and 4, in the strangely abbreviated form [qnyrs̄] (3054/4.2, 3). Apparently Galmés has simply invented the phonetic context [ŷŷ] at issue. *Conejero* is written [qnlyrh] 355.6 (3048/13.4) alongside the minor variants [qwnlyrh] 362.4 (3048/18.3, possibly [qwnilyrh]) and ['lqnlyr] 458.2 (3052/20.2), spellings which suggest a palatal lateral /l/ as the expected Mozarabic reflex of -c'l- (< Lat. CUNICULUS 'rabbit')⁵. In one instance not cited by Galmés there occurs a feminine [qng̃'ra] in the very same line with ['lqnlyr] 520.2 ("doña María, llamada la Conejera, esposa que fue de don Juan Navarro el Conejero"; AHN 3055/11.1 [qung̃'rah], 2 ['lqnlyr]). What intrigues me here is the co-occurrence of two important graphic traits in the former: (1) there is no *šadda* over the [ġ] so it may represent /ž/; (2) the penult vowel is [ʿ] (presumably = /e/) rather than /y/ (presumably = /ey/). Consequently, this form matches OCast. *conejera* /konežera/ with about as much precision as the Arabic graphic system will allow. In other words, the supposed "contexto fónico más de acuerdo con las normas del mozárabe" that led Galmés to suppose that /ey/ tended to become /e/ in Toledan Mozarabic is not only nonexistent but precisely the contrary seems to be the case: the phonological structure of the form under discussion unequivocally suggests Castilian origin.

To conclude: a strict analysis of the forms printed in *MT* leads to the conclusion that the proto-Hispano-Romance diphthong /ay/ had become /ey/ in Toledan Mozarabic but that there is no reason to suppose that the latter had been monophthongized. Words bearing /e/ rather than /ey/ from original /ay/ are most likely of Castilian provenience.

University of California, Berkeley

Jerry R. Craddock

⁵ The form I called "abbreviated," i.e., [qnyrs̄], might reflect a *yeïsta* pronunciation—/koneyéyro/—of the Mozarabic type /konełéyro/ which presumably corresponds to the spelling [qnlyrh].

References

- ASÍN PALACIOS, MIGUEL. 1943. *Glosario de voces romances registradas por un botánico anónimo hispano-musulmán (siglos XI-XII)*, Madrid y Granada (Escuelas de Estudios Arabes).
- CRADDOCK, JERRY R. Forthcoming. "Review of Galmés 1983". *RPh*.
- GALMÉS DE FUENTES, ÁLVARO. 1977. "El dialecto mozárabe de Toledo," *Al-Andalus*, 42, 183-206, 249-299.
- ID. 1983. *Dialectología mozárabe*. Prólogo de Rafael Lapesa, Madrid (Gredos) (*Biblioteca Románica Hispánica*, 3. *Manuales*, 58).
- GONZÁLEZ PALENCIA, ÁNGEL. 1926-30. *Los mozárabes de Toledo en los siglos XII y XIII*. 4 vols. Madrid (Instituto de Valencia de Don Juan).
- SIMONET, FRANCISCO JAVIER. 1888. *Glosario de voces ibéricas y latinas usadas entre los mozárabes precedido de un estudio sobre el dialecto hispano-mozárabe*. Madrid (Fortanet). Repr. Amsterdam (Oriental Press) 1967.