

UC Berkeley

Other Recent Work

Title

The Language of the Mozarabic jarchas

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3k12c3w9>

Author

Craddock, Jerry R

Publication Date

2011-02-28

Jerry R. Craddock

The Language of the Mozarabic *jarchas*

This essay was composed in 1980 for a miscellany that failed to materialize. Though outdated, it is reproduced here in the belief that the observations it contains may be of some use to scholars who cultivate the field of Hispano-Arabic language and literature.

February 28, 2011

The Language of the Mozarabic harġas*

Only in an attenuated and indirect sense can this paper be said to deal with the Romance speech of Medieval Mozarabs. Its actual subject is a 20th century dialect, the language Orientalists and Romanists have used to reconstruct the text of the harġas. To what extent this sometimes bizarre and frequently fanciful parlance corresponds to anything Andalusian bards may have in fact sung or set to paper is almost sure to remain a mystery forever. Without further ado, I shall analyze briefly two samples of what I henceforth label Modern Academic Mozarabic (= MAM) in an effort to illustrate some peculiarities of the dialect at issue. For the moment, the manuscript readings on which the two samples are based will be ignored.

First I have chosen Garcia Gomez' 'definitive' version (1975:16) of the third harġa in his anthology, GG (García Gómez 1975 [1965]) §III, SS (Sola-solé 1973) §XLVI, H (Heger 1960) §24:¹

iYa fātin, a-fātin!

Os ŷ entrād

Kand' ō ŷilós kēded.

I translate, following García Gómez: 'Oh seducer, oh seducer! / Enter here / when the jealous one sleeps.' The last two verses purport to be entirely Romance, yet any resemblance this text may bear to an actual Romance dialect seems accidental. The reflexive pronoun os 'you', a second plural form used here as an honorific singular, is a modern Castilian combinatory variant of vos, the only form imaginable in a Medieval text before the 15th century. The word order is utterly implausible for an imperative construction in any period or dialect of Hispano-Romance. The temporal conjunction kand' seems to reflect a reduction of /kw/- to /k/- before stressed /á/, typical of Gallo-Romance, but unknown, or extremely rare, in Hispano-Romance (see Menéndez-Pidal 1956:82). If o represents the definite article, the dialect of the hargã would seem to be of a western (Galician-Portuguese) type, but the noun it modifies allegedly is Old Provençal gilos (variant of gelos).² If the o is the final vowel of the conjunction as in García Gomez' earlier reconstruction (1975:99), then the absence of the definite article is surprising. The verb kēded with its typical third singular suffix -/d/ seems appropriate enough, except that the meaning attributed to it is rather speculative. The overall impression left with the reader is that of an anachronistic multidialectal

pastiche whose chances of having been concocted in any century but our own seem nonexistent.

The second specimen I take from Sola-Solé (1973:127; = GG §VI, SS §XIII, H §27):³

Al-sa'amu mio ḥālī / borqe ḥālī qad bāri
ke farey ya ūmmi / fāniqī bad lebare.

In English, after Sola-Solé, this would be 'Death is my state, / because my state (is) desperate./ what will I do, oh my mother? / He who pampers me is going to leave.' In this instance, the Romance forms themselves are not hopelessly implausible, though I harbor serious reservations about mio 'my' (cf. Menéndez-Pidal 1956: 82) and the meaning assigned to lebare, normally 'to carry'. Very hard to accept, on the other hand, is the sort of bilingual composition Sola-Solé presupposes. One would experience no difficulty in admitting the presence of a phrase or formula like ke farayo 'what shall I do' in an Arabic harġa, or yā habībī 'oh my friend' in a Mozarabic harġa, but, from an esthetic standpoint, is it genuinely conceivable that Andalusian minstrels would have scrambled forms of no poetic import like mio and borqe into Arabic verses for the pure pleasure of chanting macarronic gobbledygook, or, if they had, could the wise and learned al-Mālaqī, supposed author of the muwaššaha containing the harġa under discussion, reasonably be

expected to have taken such delight in this atrocious doggerel that he adopted it as the metrical model of his elegant panegyric? In all fairness, one should refrain from attributing such lapses of good taste either to the cultivated poet or the illiterate minstrel.⁴ The text as given above is no more than a 20th century scholarly nightmare.

If one turns from the current harġa reconstructions to the manuscript readings that were their sometimes distant inspiration, he instantly feels relieved of any compulsion to take the former seriously. The harġas have come down to modern times in two literal forms: Hebrew and Arabic. With a few exceptions, a brief perusal of the extant manuscript readings, as reported in Sola-Solé 1973, will convince even a Panglossian textual critic that he is dealing with one of the most sublimely corrupt textual traditions known to modern scholarship. What has gone wrong in the transmission of the texts can be demonstrated quite convincingly by analyzing, though it may seem paradoxical, a harġa that has reached us in almost perfect condition, in a late 13th-century Hebrew muwaššaha (GG §XXXVIII, SS §XL, H §16). The Hebrew manuscript presents a text that transliterates as follows:

ky fr·yw ·w ky šyr·d dmyby

hbyby

nwn tytwlgš dmyby.

With vowels, punctuation and translation we have:

ke farayo aw ke šerad de mibe,

habībī?

non te twelgaš de mibe.⁵

'What will I do or what will become of me,/my friend? / Don't take yourself from me.' Every paleographic, phonological, grammatical, semantic and metrical detail is in place, all in all an excellent specimen of genuine Medieval Mozarabic. Thematically and esthetically it could stand as a model of the genre, possessing the naive charm of the Galician cantigas d'amigo and the Castilian villancicos.

This hargā is also extant in an early 12th century Arabic muwaššaha, transliterated by Stern (apud Heger) as follows (the plusses represent indeterminate scribal strokes):

kmrny ·wkr srd byb

hb+b

++m +tl?? dm +b.

Sola-Solé seems to have had better success in reading the manuscript:

lmrny ·w krš dbyb

hbyb

sm·bt d+ dmyb.

A more eloquent example of scribal disfigurement would be hard to imagine. Stern's perspicacity in having recognized it as the same harğa deserves admiration. The essential point to observe is that without divine guidance it would be impossible to arrive at what the other manuscript reveals to have been the original text. Now a great many harğas, in particular those preserved in a single manuscript, are in no better condition; consequently, any claims for successful decipherment must be greeted with polite but firm skepticism.

The case is, then, that a portion, perhaps a large one, of the harğa manuscripts are at present hopelessly obscure and will remain so unless new and more reliable textual witnesses are someday uncovered. The most sensible course in such a situation is to publish the original manuscript readings with all their faults together with the most plausible interpretations, a task so well accomplished by Heger 1960, and to turn one's attention to more fruitful endeavors such as the publication of Hispano-Arabic harğas (thus Monroe and Swiatlo 1977). However, just as nature abhors a vacuum, so it is that certain scholarly imaginations naturally expand to fill all the spaces left blank in Heger's scrupulously modest presentation, a circumstance that explains the rise of modern academic

Mozarabic. The chief sources for this artificial language, as the reader will have surmised, are García Gómez 1975 [1965] and Sola-Solé 1973.⁶ Both authors succumbed to the fatal temptation of trying to solve the unsolvable with, I believe, uniformly lamentable results. It is, to begin with, worse than useless to invent hypothetical readings for the entire harg̃a corpus, since the first thing the curious reader wishes to know is exactly what harg̃as and fragments of harg̃as can in fact be deciphered beyond any reasonable doubt. Clearly the very act of reconstructing them in toto tends to obliterate the dividing line between the known and the conjectural. Furthermore, neither reconstructionist seems to have been at all aware of the only goal that reconstruction could rationally pursue: a general and perhaps somewhat vague plausibility. The fact that their imaginary harg̃as abound in implausible constructs attests to just how audacious and unwise their ambition has been.

In what follows, I wish to outline as best I can the main shortcomings that have made of Modern Academic Mozarabic a singularly repellent jargon. For this purpose, I will describe briefly some vital aspects of my two sources. García Gómez' work has become the standard treatise on the subject. Its principal virtue lies in his

version of the Arabic muwaššahāt that contain the harġas, with attractive verse calques in Spanish on facing pages, so that the reader is able to appreciate the nature and function of the harġa as a poetic genre. Its chief defect involves a no doubt innocent, but nonetheless quite strange, deception. The edition was designed with the layman, as well as the specialist, in view. The author had himself provided the original transcriptions in his ground-breaking article of 1952, and these had been taken up in Heger 1960. García Gómez therefore saw fit to append his often amended reconstructions of the harġas to the Arabic text of the muwaššahāt rather than the original, and all too frequently incomprehensible, versions extant in the manuscripts. On the pages containing the verse calques, the reconstructed texts are merely voweled, while the notes accompanying each text translate the harġa into modern Spanish and expound on certain salient textual problems. In most cases, the manuscript readings are not provided. The average reader cannot fail to carry off the entirely erroneous impression that the harġas have been almost completely elucidated. I suspect the most outstanding victim of this unwitting deception has been García Gómez himself; otherwise, I doubt he could have written the following: "Si un día pudo decirse que el texto de las jarchas de la serie hebrea estaba

mejor conservado y descifrado que el de las jarchas de la serie árabe, creo que hoy la situación ha cambiado y que los problemas textuales de las primeras son por lo menos tantos como los de las segundas..." (1975:411). While the harġas written in Hebrew characters likewise bristle with textual cruxes, it is nevertheless the case that with few exceptions the harġas with genuinely secure texts have been transmitted in the Hebrew muwaššahāt.⁷

Sola-Solé's 1973 effort is to some extent complementary to García Gómez 1965. The former does not edit the muwaššahāt themselves, but translates them literally, thus assisting those whose Arabic is rudimentary to struggle through the original texts. His most useful contribution is the exhaustive textual apparatus that accompanies each harġa where he gathers together full accounts of all manuscript readings, many of which were either unknown to Heger 1960 or have appeared since his monograph was published. Sola-Solé's principal failing stems from a theoretical premise which I am most reluctant to accept. By and large, his reconstructions of the harġas however much improved in certain details over those of García Gómez, seem decidedly inferior from an esthetic point of view, and at times attain a level of incoherence that leaves this writer dumbfounded. This latter phenomenon is a

consequence, as far as I am able to judge, of his belief that "el lenguaje de las harǧas, producto de una simbiosis cultural, no debió de ser absolutamente correcto, sobre todo en su sintaxis" (Sola-Solé 1973:284). This claim requires very close scrutiny; stated baldly, it amounts to saying that either the learned Andalusian muwaššaha poets or the popular bards that inspired them didn't know what they were about. Yet the only evidence for this alleged incompetence are Sola-Solé's reconstructions themselves. As of 1978, we know only that two groups of people have intervened with a heavy hand in the texts of the harǧas: the scribes and the 20th century scholars. They have demonstrably possessed both motive and opportunity for the brutal attacks that have left the harǧas in such a shambles. It seems at once presumptuous and unjust to charge the original poets with the crimes that have been committed.

Allowing ungrammaticality in the reconstruction of the harǧas would be akin to allowing randomness in the reconstruction of sound change. One would immediately find himself bereft of any theoretical justification for attempting the reconstruction in the first place. Either one sets out guided by a principle of regular sound change, rather, in the case at hand, by the assumption of a coherent text subject to scribal corruption, or one had better turn to a more profitable pursuit.⁸

The only goal harĝa reconstruction can pursue is, as I suggested above, plausibility. Therefore, just as one must reject Sola-Solé's assumption of ungrammaticality, so too must he demur at García Gómez' inclination (1975:197) to sacrifice script and grammar in favor of the meaning. What is required, if the reader will pardon a statement of the obvious, is the harmonious congruence of meaning, grammar, sound, script, and, last but not least, meter. The sacrifice of any particular strand in this seamless fabric of poetic discourse almost certainly condemns even the best-intentioned reconstructions to futility. The first requirement of the scholar who undertakes harĝa reconstruction should be an unwillingness to propose solutions for the insoluble, that is, a willingness to confess his ignorance freely and without embarrassment in the usual three-dot form. The fundamental premise the reconstructionist should honor at all times is that the only truly useful conjectures are those whose plausibility, once they are advanced, is so overpowering that it would defy common sense to oppose them.

In order to achieve the plausibility that constitutes the sole justification for reconstruction, certain practical guidelines should be observed. With regard to his primary sources, the reconstructionist will have to rely on the metrical conventions of the harĝas,

the information available on Mozarabic, and the nature of the Arabic and Hebrew writing systems. In the last strophe of the muwaššaha, the poet characteristically strives to link the harġa's theme to that of the muwaššaha, so that the former's content can be guessed at even when the text itself is unrecoverable. The metrical structure of the harġa is reflected in the muwaššaha, whose text in almost all cases has passed through the rigors of transmission in a far better state of palaeographic preservation. Consequently, the number of syllables in each verse, the rimes, and perhaps even the stress patterns can be read off from the ^{text}~~the~~ of the muwaššaha (see García Gómez 1972:3.225-266).

As for the Mozarabic dialect, there exist two excellent recent accounts of its phonology and morphology, Galmés de Fuentes 1977 [1978] and Griffin 1958:202-337. Hispano-Arabic has been subjected to a thorough-going analysis in Corriente 1977.⁹ The general purport, the metrical form and the language of the harġas are, therefore, more or less known quantities. That they should nevertheless pose so many apparently hopeless dilemmas is one of scholarship's bitter ironies.

The fundamental problem, the source of all the reconstructionist's difficulties, are the Arabic and Hebrew scripts, in particular the former. Whole series of Arabic consonants are differentiated solely by diacritical points which can be easily transposed or omitted,

to wit: b - t - t̄ - n - y (the last two have distinctive shapes in word-final position); ḡ - h - h̄; d - d̄; r - z; s - š; s̄ - d̄; t - z; ʿ - ḡ; f - q; and, in word-final position, h - a (i.e., tā marbūṭa). Moreover, certain basic shapes are so similar as to be confused with great facility; without attempting to be exhaustive, I will mention the cases that crop up most frequently: r - w - d, d̄; l - k in word-initial position; initial and medial ʿ, ḡ - f, q - m, all involving slightly different configurations of small loops; word-final n and y.

The situation with regard to the Hebrew script is not quite so grave, but remains bad enough. The following characters have shapes so similar as to invite confusion: r - d, g - n, y - w, k - f, s and word-final m, to mention only the most frequent instances.

These two already precarious systems were used to record a Romance phonology containing alien sounds and sequences of sounds. Mozarabic most likely possessed the following phonemes foreign to Classical Arabic: /p/, /v/ (or /β/), /^ts/, /^dz/, /s̄/, /z̄/, /č/, /λ/, /ɲ/, /e/ and /o/. In Hispano-Arabic works where some consistency in the representation of Romance forms had been achieved, the following Mozarabic-Arabic equivalences were adopted: /v/ = b (collapsed with Moz. /b/), /^ts/ = s̄, /^dz/ = z̄, /s̄/ =

š (thus confused with Moz. /š/); the šadda, or sign of doubling, was used to represent /p/, i.e. Arabic bb = Moz. /p/, while Arabic čč = Moz. /č/; y became a marker of palatality in ly = Moz. /λ/, ny = Moz. /ŋ/; the Mozarabic vowels /e/ and /o/ were normally identified with Arabic ā and ū, resp. It is virtually certain that Mozarabic had not confused the geminate lateral /ll/ and nasal /nn/ with /λ/ and /ŋ/, resp., as the former regularly bear a šadda to distinguish them from Moz. /l/ and /n/. The lucidity of these correlations was endangered by other graphic conventions of Classical Arabic. Since the short vowels were indicated only in certain sacred or poetic texts, there existed a powerful inclination to ignore completely the Mozarabic vowels, if we are to judge by the hargā manuscripts; the other chief monuments of Mozarabic that are now extant, however, show rather careful vowelings. Classical Arabic admitted no consonant clusters in word-initial position, hence the šadda never occurred there. Scribes tended to carry this over into their representation of Mozarabic, so that the contrasts between /p/ and /b/, /č/ and /č̣/, etc., are rarely indicated at the beginning of words. In any case, the šadda, like the short vowels, was usually omitted from the ordinary sort of text; very few ever turn up in the hargā manuscripts.

Various Arabic characters are left over after all the Mozarabic

sounds have been accounted for. Consequently, certain more or less free alternations arose, so that Arabic s as well as s = Moz. /^ts/, Arabic d, d and d = Moz. /d/, while word-initially at least, Arabic t and t = Moz. /t/, and Arabic q and k = Moz. /k/.¹⁰

Analogous complications exist in the Hebrew script. The most notable differences are that in the absence of diacritical points g is used to represent Moz. /ǧ/, /č/ and /g/, while p = Moz. /p/ and /f/. Arabic h is merged with Hebrew k.

Despite the wide margin of insecurity that the foregoing account makes evident, both alphabets can be successfully used to represent Romance speech, as the existence of Aljamiado and Judeo-Spanish literature demonstrates. The great disappointment one experiences with the hargas is that there are not even the vestiges of a moderately regular system such as appears in the Vocabulista (Schiaparelli 1871) or the anonymous Sevillian botanist (Asín Palacios 1943), texts contemporaneous with the flowering of the muwaššahāt. Imagine the latitude an interpreter possesses, when one and the same stroke can be read as p, b, v, t, n or y by assuming no more than a misplaced dot. It should by now be apparent how little control over the possible reconstructions can be derived from the manuscript readings.¹¹

The primary materials, metrics, language and manuscripts, are clearly inadequate to allow convincing decipherment of many hargās. If the reconstructionist nevertheless insists on pursuing the thankless task of positing readings for the many gaps that remain, then he should at least attempt to avoid the most obvious pitfalls of implausibility. In the absence of direct evidence, he must fall back on the indirect evidence marshaled in the major works on Hispano-Romance. He cannot escape the assumption that the hargās reflect an actual language, or rather, two actual languages, that is, coherent linguistic systems with no more than the usual amount of social and geographic variation. Modern academic Mozarabic, however, violates at every turn any reasonable expectations that one could derive from general linguistics or the comparative study of the Hispano-Romance dialects. The grosser implausibilities I have observed fall into five broad categories: (1) anachronism, (2) dialectal eclecticism, (3) wide variation in form, meaning or syntax, (4) chaotic language mixture, and (5) excruciating metrical gymnastics. A full catalogue would be long, depressing and pointless; I intend here to provide only a few exemplary cases as a warning to future reconstructionists, if any such there be.¹²

(1) Anachronisms. García Gómez believes that the hilóš occurring in the verse kom hilóš mē beráy (GG §XXXI, SS §III, H §45), translated as 'como el hiloš me verá' (sic!; the verb bears a first person singular suffix), i.e. 'since the jealous one will see me', is a Castilian (not Mozarabic?) cognate of the alleged Provençalism gilos, already familiar to my readers: "Tocante a la fonética ŷelóš y ŷ[i]lólš reflejan la pronunciación provenzal; pero hilólš es ya la castellana. En efecto, la z griega acaba por dar jota en español..." (1975:344). The Castilian jota /x/ came into general use in the course of the 17th century, the velarized product of earlier /š/ (which in turn had absorbed Medieval /ž/, /ǵ/). Certain regions may have anticipated the development by some decades, but to attribute it to 11th-century Mozarabic taxes even the most generous credulity.¹³

If my readers can imagine a tender Mozarabic damsel saying to her lover šī 'oš báis, yā sídī 'if you go, my lord' (GG §XXI, SS §XII, H §37), then I must concede their imaginative powers are superior to my own. Finding the phrase 'oš báis (= modern Cast. os vais) in an 11th-century harǧa would be like discovering a telephone in the Cid's tomb. One might not know exactly how it got there, but the courts would probably balk at granting his descendants

a share in the patent royalties. Our charming Mozarabic inamorata would have said ši voš ideš, yā sīdī; but alas, that reading contains a syllable too many.¹⁴

Now in the very next verse of the same harġa, Sola-Solé has the young lady addressing the muwaššaha's narrator in this fashion: k(u)ando beniš vos y, rendered as 'cuando (si) [sic!] venís aquí [sic!]', i.e., 'when (if) you come here'. May I be forgiven if I feel myself suddenly transported, upon hearing her words veniš vos, to a Siglo de Oro stage setting, or even further afield to the Argentine pampas? However far back in time one may wish to presuppose the existence of such verb forms, not even the most optimistic estimate will reach 11th-century Andalusia. What our heroine would have said, i.e. benideš voš, likewise adds the accursed extra syllable.

Not all anachronisms look forward in time. Sola-Solé reconstructs a verse as follows: trahirá samāġa 'he will bring something evil' (SS §XVI, GG §XXXII), with the comment "La laringal fricativa ár. hā intentaría marcar probablemente la -h- etimológica..." (1973: 143). Since the -h- of Lat. trahere 'to draw, drag' had not been pronounced in the vernacular since Cicero's time, where, one wearily asks, did our 11th-century Andalusian poet or minstrel receive his training in Romance etymology? The reading trahirá was intended to correct García Gómez' version tu huýda^h 'your flight'; Cast. huida,

as Sola-Solé rightly observes, "sólo se documenta a partir del siglo XV" vis-à-vis its Medieval forebears fo-, fu-ida. I beg to point out, however, that García Gómez' conjecture involves an anachronism of a few piddling centuries, whereas trahirá majestically straddles more than a millennium.

(2) Dialectal eclecticism. In one of the more tortured verses set down in Modern Academic Mozarabic, adūnam' amande 'join yourself to me, lover' (GG §XXXV, SS §XLIII, H §47), amande supposedly represents a present participle of amar 'to love' showing voicing of -nt- > -nd- as in Upper Aragonese. Such a form is implausible because of its very isolation. It will not do to pick and choose individual dialect traits from all over the linguistic map of the Iberian Peninsula. Dialectal traits, like troubles, rarely come singly. If one must assume a Pyrenean shepherd had a hand in the formation of this hargā, then other Upper Aragonese characteristics should be in evidence.

Corominas' protest (1953:145) that the Castilian development pl- > ll- /λ/ cannot be assumed for Mozarabic has fallen on deaf ears. It is not impossible, merely implausible, that Mozarabic should have shared this but not other Castilian tendencies. When one observes that MAM lyorāre (GG §VI) rests on a manuscript

reading l'r (H. §27) and liyorār (sic!; GG §XXIX) on 'lfr'r (H. §43), then it becomes apparent that García Gómez might just as well have stuck in plorāre (or polorār if another syllable is wanted) if for no other reason than to placate nit-picking philologists.¹⁵

(3) Wide variation in form, meaning or syntax. This is a catch-all classification meant to embrace those instances where Modern Academic Mozarabic seems not to behave like any ordinary language on the synchronic, or descriptive, plane. I will take up here only one pervasive difficulty. The known Medieval Peninsular dialects adhere with striking regularity to a general rule of unstressed pronoun placement vis-à-vis the main verb in a sentence or clause. Whenever the main verb begins a sentence or clause, the unstressed pronouns follow it enclitically, even when an auxiliary verb is present. Otherwise, the unstressed pronouns precede the verb proclitically. Old Spanish illustrations would include: vanse 'they go'/'no's van 'they don't go', comerlo emos 'we will eat it'/'más tarde lo combremos 'we will eat it later', ganadas las an 'they have won them'/'que las han ganadas 'that they have won them'. In verse, one simply substitutes 'verse or hemistich' for the phrase 'sentence or clause' to obtain the operative rule. It is not my

intention to claim that this rule knew no exceptions, but only that the assumption of frequent and radical departures from it in a Medieval Hispanic dialect would be implausible. Readings such as su mēlēsīm no dad-lo 'he doesn't give his medicine' (GG §XXXVII) beside suo al-asī me dar-lo 'to give me his medicine' (SS §VI) or obridarā-se-lē, nōn, mew mōrīrē 'he will not forget, no, my dying' (GG §XXXIII) do strain, however, the rhetorical capabilities of the adjective implausible. García Gómez, apropos of another violation, ke huyōme 'that fled from me' (GG §XXXV) dismisses the whole problem in these words: "no creo que haya de tener ideas a priori" (1975:376). Just why the assumption of a modest degree of linguistic coherence strikes him as more aprioristic than the assumption of, say, absolutely regular, indeed exceptionless, metrical conventions in the hargās, I cannot divine.

(4) Chaotic language mixture. There now exists an important sub-discipline of linguistics devoted to the phenomenon called "code-switching", the use of two languages in the same discourse. The most useful fact that has come to light is that code-switching obeys certain rather strict grammatical limitations, in other words, that it produces anything but a chaotic speech mixture (see Pfaff 1979). The findings

of students engaged in the analysis of Chicano-English bilingualism could be used as one yardstick to measure the plausibility of reconstructions involving the mingling of Arabic and Romance forms in a single verse. Whatever may come of that, I find it difficult to give credence to one extreme type of language mixture posited for modern academic Mozarabic: ar.â-yo 'I will see' (SS §XXV) where the subject pronoun yo, whose resemblance to modern Castilian yo causes this writer no little perplexity (see Marcos Marín 1970), allegedly adheres to a Classical Arabic verb (1sg. imperf.). García Gómez does it the other way around in adūnū-nī 'join yourself to me' (GG §XXXII); the supposititious Romance verb adunar(e) 'to join' appears outfitted with an Arabic imperative suffix (-ū-) and pronominal object (-nī). Note that in each case the verbs themselves have not undergone any assimilation to the morphological structure of the other language. Sola-Solé's ar.â-yo has been plausibly read as Romance in the verse a rayo de mañana 'at the (first) streak of dawn' (GG §XVII). The difficulties Sola-Solé perceives (1973:181) in that construction pale into insignificance alongside those posed by his own creation. He denounces (1973:143) García Gómez' adūnū-nī as a "caso único de hibridismo", yet it would appear that the same charge can be leveled against ar.â-yo. As it stands, Modern Academic Mozarabic is full

of unique cases of just about everything, so the point is not very telling.

(5) Metrical gymnastics. Metrical regularity, such as has been established for the hargās, does not in itself constitute a sufficient justification for drastic textual emendation or wildly adventuresome textual reconstruction. The hargās reconstructed in Modern Academic Mozarabic show a suspiciously high proportion of enjambment and hyperbaton, but I pass over that problem. The one metrical feat that simply baffles me involves what I have to call, though fully aware of the contradiction in terms, consonantal dieresis. The Mozarabic descendant of Lat. oculōs 'eyes' is read as trisyllabic on at least two occasions by my sources, GG §II (weliyoš) = SS §XXII (olīoš) and GG §XXIX, as dissyllabic in GG §18 (welyoš) = SS §I (olios). The most likely phonological shape for Mozarabic 'eyes' was an irremediably dissyllabic /wéloš/, a form that matches very nicely Leonese /wéyos/ and Aragonese /wélos/; Sola-Solé's transcription of the word is too conservative by half. The reader will recall that Arabic ly was consistently employed to render Moz. /λ/, a single palato-lateral articulation. The question is how, in the name of all the Muses, did our Andalusian poets or minstrels manage to discover a vowel

in that single consonant? Is one to assume that it was the concrete written form ly of the sound that suggested to versifiers the possibility of decomposing /λ/ into /li/? Is such a procedure conceivable in illiterate minstrels? If not, must one believe that it was a license invented by the poets of the muwaššahāt? Or is it rather, as seems likely, a modern stratagem to achieve a syllable count? Even more astonishing is the case of tetrasyllabic daniyōšo (GG §XXII) or danīošo (SS §XXIX) 'harmful' since the base word contained /nn/ and not /n/ (< Lat. damnōsus), hence would not even have been spelled with ny.

This diatribe against some of the more salient implausibilities of modern academic Mozarabic has by now gone on longer than the subject deserves. Having said this much, I now owe it to the reader to show how a difficult text ought to be presented. I take it for granted that, however much fusty charm Modern Academic Mozarabic on occasion exudes, my readers would prefer to know exactly what part of each reconstruction can be considered secure. Consequently, I would first lay out a clear schematic exposition of the manuscript readings, followed by the voweled reconstruction of the readable portions with conjecture reduced to an absolute minimum. Then a commentary would analyze my own and

such previous conjectures as were thought worthy of mention.

My choice is GG §XXI = SS §VII = H §38, extant in two muwaššahāt.¹⁶

Metrical scheme: octosyllabic quatrain, rimes in 1) -ū/ībi,
2) -adi, 3) -ma, 4) -adi.

A. Textual witnesses. Here all data are taken from Sola-Solé; spaces left blank imply that the corresponding reading matches that of the lead text; ∅ signifies omission; + indicates illegible character.

1)	Ibn Labbūn	ya	mṃ	mw	·lhbyb	
	Colin		mama			
	al-Khabbāz	Zayt	+·mm	mr		
	Abd		mam	mrr		
2)	Ibn Labbūn	b+š	·n	mn	trn·dī	
	Colin	tybš		nz	trb·dī	
	al-Khabbāz	Zayt	byšry	∅	∅	trn·d
	Abd	ymšy	∅	∅	ytr·d	

3)	Ibn Labbūn	ġ'r	kfry	y'	mm'
	Colin				
	al-Khabbāz	Zayt	'r		mm'
		Abd	'ny		
4)	Ibn Labbūn	'tn	yġn'l	llš'd	
	Colin	'nn		llš'di	
	al-Khabbāz	Zayt	tn	'n'	'nš'd
		Abd	∅	'm'	'lm'dy

B. Voweled reconstruction.

- 1) ya mamma... al-ḥabībi
- 2) ... tornade
- 3) gar ke farayo, ya mamma
- 4) ... lešade

C. Commentary. The only certain passages in this text are the three formulae, all extremely common in the harġa corpus. 1) GG] dissyllabic me-w before al-ḥabībi is metrically unnecessary; in any case, the use of the possessive seems to clash with the presence of the Arabic definite article. 2) GG] baiš' e no mas tornarade: for verse initial bayše and

tornarad in rime see GG §9, SS §XXXVIII, H §9 (note that one ms. has tornad); non maš would be the expected phonetic forms, while grammatically one might prefer e ya no'sš; SS follows GG except in admitting a present tense (3sg with paragogic e) tornáde with prosodic accent shift. 3) farayo] one could also read gar[r]e ke faray. 4) GG] no un bežyello lexarade? is, with the exception of the last word, entirely speculative.¹⁷

This style of presentation, with a no doubt more developed commentary, would seek to separate strictly what any philologist could accept as legitimate attestations of Medieval Mozarabic from more recent imitations. The only innovation involves a columnar display of the variants, more immediately illustrative of the textual relationships than the traditional form of critical apparatus, and practicable when the textual witnesses are relatively few in number. Since Heger 1960 is now somewhat out of date, I believe it would be worthwhile to reedit the entire corpus along the lines suggested, so that the thick overlay of Modern Academic Mozarabic could be relegated to the critical apparatus of the footnotes, or consigned to a richly deserved oblivion. However, one condition would have to be fulfilled in advance: all extant manuscripts would have to

become available to interested scholars, especially the Ibn Bušrā anthology belonging to the late G.S. Colin. It is unfortunate that a manuscript of such monumental importance to Hispanic letters should not have been published in fascimile more than a quarter century after its importance was realized. Until recently, only one scholar had been vouchsafed the privilege of utilizing a complete photocopy (i.e. García Gómez; see Lévi-Provençal 1954:205). No two palaeographers, however expert, will necessarily read the same codex in the same fashion. When in addition it appears that certain interpreters are much given to adventuresome textual emendation (as shown by Jones 1980), then a fresh look at the manuscript by unbiased eyes becomes an absolute necessity.

Jerry R. Craddock

University of California, Berkeley

PRELIMINARY NOTE

* I owe a particular debt of gratitude to my good friends and colleagues who read drafts of this paper and sent me many valuable observations: Samuel G. Armistead, Arthur Askins, Dru Dougherty, Charles Faulhaber, John Polt and Dorothy Shadi. To the editor of this miscellany, James Monroe, I am indebted for the original inspiration for the project, as well as numerous helpful suggestions.

NOTES 1

¹ For a palaeographic critique of this reconstructed harġa, see Hitchcock 1973:111. On linguistic grounds, I am unable to agree with his generous estimate that García Gómez has produced "a version that seems to be just right" (115). Armistead 1973 corrected os to vos in his reading of this harġa.

² The pros and cons of this controversial Provençalism are debated by Armistead 1973, Hilty 1971ab, Hitchcock 1973:111, Sola-Solé 1968:155f., and note the last-named scholar's remarks anent the harġas concerned (SS §§III, XXVII, XLVI).

³ Hitchcock 1973:116f. studies García Gómez' and Corominas' (1953) efforts to unravel this harġa, and the reception their solutions have met with in literary histories.

⁴ García Gómez 1972:3.391 convicts Ben Quzmān of this same pointless language mixing; I suspect it would be preferable to search for an alternative solution.

⁵ I have adopted the ultra-conservative readings farayo and aw < Lat. aut in the belief that if Mozarabic regularly pre-

NOTES 2

served /aw/ it most likely also maintained /ay/ since the development of those two diphthongs in other Peninsular dialects marches along pari passu: Gal.-Ptg. /ow/ - /ey/, Cast. /o/ - /e/. Moz. aw 'or' would have been reinforced, no doubt, by its almost complete formal and semantic coincidence with its Arabic counterpart 'aw. Galmés de Fuentes 1977 [1978]:260-262 argues for /ay/ > /ey/ in Mozarabic. He also makes the point that word-final Lat. -u may have remained /u/ in that dialect (257-260), but farayo would reflect an original Lat. -ō. On the question of diphthongization in Mozarabic, I yield to Menéndez Pidal's arguments (1956:81-84).

⁶ Earlier contributors include Cantera 1957 (note García Gómez' atrabilious reaction [1957]), Borello 1959 (devastatingly reviewed by Heger 1961), and, of course Stern 1953. The former two are not much taken into account nowadays, though Sola-Solé faithfully records their suggestions, while the last-named, more than any of his successors, contented himself with honest three-dot confessions of helplessness.

⁷ For deservedly severe criticism of other aspects of García Gómez' edition, see Armistead 1980 and Jones 1980.

⁸ Those who are willing to entertain the hypothesis that the hargās were macarronic divertissements fail to realize that such a conclusion could be reached only on the basis of securely transmitted texts. The

combination of deliberate ungrammaticality on the part of the poets and massive scribal corruption would so thwart any possible reconstruction as to render the enterprise absolutely pointless. The fact is, of course, that the assumption of ungrammaticality is no more than a flimsy justification for dubious reconstructions.

⁹ Hitchcock has produced a superb guide (1977a) to the literature on the harg̃as, while the finest general introduction to the subject is now Frenk Alatorre 1975. See Armistead 1980 for the latest significant contributions.

¹⁰ Galmés de Fuentes 1977[1975]:274-284 maintains that medial t regularly stood for Moz. /d/, and medial q for Moz. /g/.

¹¹ After what has been said, even a version that "exige solamente añadir vocales al texto primitivo, es decir ningún cambio de letras y ninguna transposición de consonantes" (Hitchcock 1977b:6) will inspire no particular confidence. A glance at the text tradition of those harg̃as extant in more than one manuscript reveals that changes of letters and transpositions of consonants occurred in great abundance. After all, an implausible interpretation based on a plausible reading of the manuscript is no whit better than a plausible interpretation based on an implausible reading of the manuscript. I leave it to Hispano-Arabists to analyze Hitchcock's solution to GG §XXX = SS §V = H §44, but I do have the impression that he may have fallen into the same trap as his predecessors, i.e. he has striven to fill in all the blanks.

Hitchcock 1980 shows himself a good deal more circumspect with regard to Arabic interpretations of obscure hargās, but no less skeptical of the current Mozarabic solutions.

¹² Some readers may have noticed the absence of a heading like "incorrect phonological correspondences", a category which would, in fact, contain by far more material than any other. Betraying the original purpose of this paper, I have avoided delving into the narrower issues of Mozarabic phonology because (1) it is a difficult topic, given the fragmentary state of our knowledge about Mozarabic, (2) it is quite obviously the weakest subject in the phonological training of those who propagate Modern Academic Mozarabic, and (3) it would be a waste of time to study with microscopic care what is to begin with a tissue of absurdities. it ✓

¹³ Hilty 1971a suggests that the h of hilóš "representa el último grado de una j- [y] a punto de desaparecer^r." Just how he came to this rather surprising conclusion remains unclear. I see no reason to be content "con la constatación de que la forma hilóš de mediados del siglo XI puede ser un reflejo español absolutamente normal de zelosus" on no other evidence than Hilty's unsupported speculation about the alleged sound shift /y/- > /h/-, particularly when the *raison d'être* of hilóš in the first place was an elementary blunder in Spanish historical phonology.

¹⁴ Hitchcock 1973:11 criticized García Gómez' version of this harg̃a without questioning either the anachronistic appearance of 'os báis (but see now Hitchcock 1980:488) or the syntax of the following verse: k'ante bešar-os-e (with yet another anachronistic pronoun; see my comments below on pronominal syntax).

¹⁵ Dialect mixture is not uncommon in early Penninsular literary texts. The problem is of a theoretical, rather than practical, nature: how can one reasonably expect to reconstruct such a mixture on the basis of a catastrophically defective manuscript tradition? The reconstructionist is faced with an elementary probabilistic phenomenon. The larger the number of dialect variants admitted into his repertory, the less certain any specific reconstruction can possibly be. Here my argument only touches on what is plausible, not what is possible.

¹⁶ See Hitchcock's comments 1973:115. In all fairness, one should point out that lexar is a perfectly well attested vernacular descendant of Lat. laxāre, later replaced by dexar, perhaps via delexar.

¹⁷ The cogency of bežyello can be attacked on morphological grounds. The expected suffix would be -wélo/ rather than -yéllo/ since Moz. /báyžo/ as well as Cast. beso go back to a Latin form bāsiūm whose base ended in a vowel -i- destined to become yod in Vulgar Latin. The complementary distribution of the Old Castilian

NOTES 6

diminutive suffixes -iello/-uelo was discovered by González Ollé 1962:193-197. The basic conditioning factor for -uelo was the original presence of a yod as the last element in the word's stem, even though this yod was subsequently metathesized or absorbed by a preceding palatalized consonant, see my remarks (Craddock 1965: 315-322). Unfortunately, no diminutive of beso seems to be recorded in the Medieval period, though Lat. bāsiolum is extant.

REFERENCES 1

- Armistead, S.G. 1973. "A Mozarabic HARĠA and a Provençal Refrain." *Hispanic Review* 41.416-417.
- 1980. "Concerning a Recent Re-Edition of the HARĠAS." *Hispanic Review* 48.341-346. See García Gómez 1975 [1965].
- Asín Palacios, M. 1943. *Glosario de voces romances registradas por un botánico anónimo hispano-musulmán (siglos XI-XII)*. Madrid/Granada: C.S.I.C.
- Borello, R.A. 1959. *Jaryas andalusíes*. Bahía Blanca: Universidad Nacional del Sur.
- Cantera, F. 1957. *La canción mozárabe*. Santander: Universidad Internacional Menéndez Pelayo.
- Corominas, J. 1953. "Para la interpretación de las jarýas recién halladas (MS. G.S. Colin)." *Al-Andalus* 17.140-148.
- Corriente, F. 1977. *A Grammatical Sketch of the Spanish Arabic Dialect Bundle*. Madrid: Instituto Hispano-Arabe de Cultura.
- Craddock, J. 1965. "A Critique of Recent Studies in Romance Diminutives." *Romance Philology* 19.286-325.
- Frenk Alatorre, M. 1975. *Las jarchas mozárabes y los comienzos de la lírica románica*. México: El Colegio de México.
- Galmés de Fuentes, A. 1977 [1978]. "El dialecto mozárabe de Toledo." *Al-Andalus* 42.183-206, 249-299.
- García Gómez, E. 1952. "Venticuatro jarýas romances en muwaššahas árabes (Ms. G.S. Colin)." *Al-Andalus* 17.57-127.

REFERENCES 2

- 1957. "Las jar̄yas mozárabes y los judíos de Al-Andalus."
Boletín de la Real Academia Española 37.337-394.
- 1972. Todo Ben Quzmān. 3 vols. Madrid: Gredos.
- 1975 [1965]. Las jarchas romances de la serie árabe en su marco.
2d ed. Barcelona: Seix Barral. [1st ed. Madrid: Sociedad de Estudios
y Publicaciones].
- González Ollé, F. 1962. Los sufijos diminutivos en castellano
medieval. Madrid: C.S.I.C. Revista de Filología Española, anejo 75.
- Griffin, D.A. 1958-60. "Los mozarabismos del 'Vocabulista' atribuido
a Ramón Martí." Al-Andalus 23.251-337; 24.85-124, 333-380;
25.93-170.
- Heger, K. 1960. Die bisher veröffentlichten Har̄gas und ihre Deutungen.
Tübingen: Niemeyer. Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, Beiheft
101.
- 1961. Review of Borello 1959. Zeitschrift für romanische
Philologie 77.214-219.
- Hilty, G. 1971a. "Celoso-raq̄ib." Al-Andalus 36.127-144.
- 1971b. "Zelosus im Iberoromanischen." In Sprache und Geschichte,
Festschrift für Harri Meier. Munich: Fink. Pp. 227-252.
- Hitchcock, R. 1973. "Some Doubts about the Reconstruction of the
Kharjas." Bulletin of Hispanic Studies 50.109-119.
- 1977a. The Kharjas: A Critical Bibliography. London: Grant
and Cutler. Research Bibliographies and Checklists, 20.

REFERENCES 3

- . 1977b. "Sobre la 'mamá' en las jarchas." *Journal of Hispanic Philology* 2.1-9.
- . 1980. "The 'Kharjas' as Early Romance Lyrics: a Review." *Modern Language Review* 75.481-491.
- Jones, A. 1980. "Romance Scansion and the MUWAŠŠAHĀT." *Journal of Arabic Literature* 11.36-55.
- Lévi-Provençal, E. 1954. "Quelques observations à propos du déchiffrement des ḥarġas 'mozarabes'." *Arabica* 1.201-208.
- Menéndez Pidal, R. 1956. "Cantos románicos andalusíes." In his *España: eslabón entre la Cristiandad y el Islam*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe. Colección Austral, 1280. Originally publ. *Boletín de la Real Academia Española* 31.187-270 (1951).
- Monroe, J.T. and D. Swiatlo. 1977. "Ninety-three Arabic Ḥarġas in Hebrew Muwaššahs: Their Hispano-Romance Prosody and Thematic Features." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 97.141-163.
- Pfaff, C.W. 1979. "Constraints on Language Mixing: Intrasentential Code-Switching and Borrowing in Spanish/English." *Language* 55.291-318.
- Schiaparelli, C., ed. 1871. *Vocabulista in Arabico*. Florence: Le Monnier.
- Sola-Solé, J.M. 1968. Review of García Gómez 1965. *Hispanic Review* 36.154-156.
- . 1973. *Corpus de poesía mozárabe*. Barcelona: Hispam.
- Stern, S.M. 1953. *Les chansons mozarabes: les vers finaux (kharjas)*

REFERENCES 4

en espagnol dans les muwashshahs arabes et hébreux, édités avec introduction, annotation sommaire et glossaire. Palermo: Manfredi. Università di Palermo, Istituto di Filologia Romanza, Collana di Testi, 1.