Bernardo de Aldrete and the Morisco Problem: A Study in Early Modern Spanish Language Ideology

KATHRYN A. WOOLARD

Anthropology, University of California, San Diego

INTRODUCTION TO THE QUESTION

In 1606, Bernardo José de Aldrete,[1] Spanish cleric and humanist antiquarian, published the first history of the Spanish language, *On the origin and beginnings of the Castilian language or Romance, which is used in Spain today*.[2] Aldrete argued that Castilian—also known at the time as Romance and now commonly known as Spanish—had been derived from Latin over centuries of use, with the Visigoths playing a key role in creating the linguistic change.[3]

Classical origins and kinship to "The Ancients" were by Aldrete's time commonplace claims with which Renaissance humanists elevated their own societies (Maravall 1966:502–503).[4] Moreover, over one hundred years earlier humanist grammarians such as the eminent Antonio de Nebrija had taken it for granted that Spanish was descended from Latin. Yet in his prologue, Aldrete claimed his was a "work, without doubt full of difficulty and exposed to great danger." Although this assertion may have conformed to generic convention, it proved prophetic. Aldrete had cause to complain repeatedly in the following years about the suffering the book brought him, and to regret that he had ever published it or his other book on the topic: "I only wish that neither the first nor

Acknowledgments. The National Endowment for the Humanities and the Spencer Foundation supported background research for this article, which was first drafted at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences. Although all views here are solely my responsibility, I am very grateful to those institutions for facilitating the work. The present version benefits from discussion at CASBS; the Departments of Spanish and Portuguese, Anthropology, and Linguistics of Stanford University; the Department of Anthropology at UCSD; the CLIC workshop at UCLA; and the Workshop on Language, Colonialism, and Nationalism of the Center for Language, Society, and Thought at the University of Michigan. For various forms of help, I thank Sorin Antohi, Vincent Barletta, Sara Berry, Lucia Binotti, Jan Blommaert, Jaime Concha, Roy D'Andrade, Joe Errington, Carol Gluck, Jane Hill, Miyako Inoue, Judy Irvine, Mike Johnson, Webb Keane, Jitka Malecková, Bruce Mannheim, Jorge Mariscal, Oriol Pi-Sunyer, Mary Louise Pratt, Joel Robbins, Ann Stoler, Anna Tsing, and Bernard Vincent. Ron Surtz generously saved me from myriad linguistic and interpretive mistakes of earlier versions but is not responsible for new ones I have introduced. Most importantly, I owe to Jim Amelang and especially to Katie Harris any grasp I have of the historical circumstances I discuss here, but none of the lapses that remain.

0010-4175/02/446–480 $9.50 © 2002 Society for Comparative Study of Society and History

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the second book had ever appeared . . . for they have caused me such harm . . ." (Martínez Ruiz 1970:487–88; see also Aldrete 1614:269–70).

Trying to understand the turmoil that followed publication of Aldrete's book, I have been led through a detective story of civic and national rivalries, of struggles within the Catholic Church, of ambitious careers at the royal court, buried treasures, miracles and forgeries, religious intolerance and ethnic extirpation. In this article I argue that in order to understand the social significance of Aldrete's work, we need to appreciate the complicated ties it had to religious conflict and to a growing ideology of racial difference in early modern Spain.

Specifically, I situate Aldrete's work in relation to the endgame of the Christian conquest, or Reconquest, of the Iberian Peninsula. The impetus for Aldrete's book came from the final struggle between "Old Christian" Spaniards and "New Christians" of Islamic origin in a unified Catholic Spanish state. I hope to show that Aldrete's text takes on new meaning when read in relation to this peninsular context.

Aldrete's work offers us a case in the study of the moral and political dimensions of language ideologies, that is, cultural construals of the intersection of language and human beings in a social world (Woolard 1998; see also Blommaert 1999; Kroskrity 2000; Schieffelin et al. 1998 for recent anthropological work on this topic). Language ideologies are of broad interest because they are never about language alone. They also delimit peoples, define their natures, order their relations, and channel their movements through the world.

Not only the general outlines, but also the details of cultural conceptualizations of language are significant in such processes. Social and political effects derive not just from the familiar fact that dominant languages are superimposed on societies, but also from the forms and functions attributed to such superimposed languages; not just from the institution of a language policy but from the specific arguments for it; not just from the general lineages claimed for languages but from the genetic markers alleged to be discernible in them. This perspective urges that in analyzing the social meaning of Aldrete's work, we attend not only to his main thesis—the Latin origins of Castilian—but equally to the vision of language and society constructed through his supporting arguments.

ALDRETE THE OBJECTIVE PROTO-SCIENTIST, ALDRETE THE IMPERIAL APOLOGIST?

Although Aldrete rarely merits even a footnote in non-Spanish histories of linguistics, he has been admired by some philologists and linguists for his innovative methods.[5] He was not the first to see Romance as descended from Latin, but he was the first to show systematically when and how it happened (Nieto Jiménez 1972:107). Aldrete made his argument in part through common methods of his times, such as citation of authorities and induction from parallel cases. However, the dominant etymological strategy of Aldrete's era was to pick

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

isolated words to clinch almost any argument, particularly about glorious national origins. In what Eco (1995:96) calls "etymological wishful thinking," use of apparent philological parallels to prove blood relationships was not only an accepted scientific method in the seventeenth century, but almost "a philologist's game" (Allen 1949a:8).[6]

Aldrete generally resisted this inclination, and instead developed systematic comparisons of sound patterns showing analogous mutations in series of words across languages (Wagner cited in Nieto Jiménez 1972:51). For his systematicity and apparent objectivity, some philologists honor Aldrete as a "humanist committed to historical truth" (Mondéjar Cumpián 1992:463). Amado Alonso described him as a "powerful scientific mind" who anticipated comparative historical grammar and the phonetic laws of nineteenth-century linguistics (Alonso 1938:105).

Guillermo Guitarte (1986) has cautioned that despite Aldrete's clear contributions, it is a mistake to see disinterested modern science in his work.[7] For Guitarte, Aldrete's objective was indeed to demonstrate Latin linguistic origins, but his larger purpose was to help Spanish become a language of high culture. He sees Aldrete proudly invoking the imperial dimensions of his nation in service of this project.

Walter Mignolo (1995) has extended Guitarte's critique and cast Aldrete's enterprise in a harsher light for a wider audience. He reads Aldrete's linguistic work not just as drawing on, but as forming part of the imperial project in the Americas. Framing Aldrete entirely in the American colonial context, Mignolo sketches him as a patent apologist for Castilian domination over indigenous peoples, "interested in supporting his linguistic thesis and indirectly justifying colonial expansion" (1995:32). He characterizes Aldrete as concerned that the Spanish language "was not spreading as fast as he would have liked," in the Americas, and as critical of his peers for not being sufficiently active in teaching it to Amerindians (ibid.:32–33). In Mignolo's view, a claim to Latin origins was a claim to the legacy of the Roman Empire in order to glorify and legitimate Spanish conquests.[8]

Aldrete's linguistic contributions in themselves deserve more attention than they have received in modern histories of linguistics. At the same time, it is useful to attempt to identify, as Mignolo does, the social and political freight of an elite theory. However, the appropriate social and political context for such an analysis is not always obvious. In Aldrete's case, I will argue, the relevant context of his theory is not only or even principally the Americas. We find key aspects of its contemporary significance within the immediate Iberian social, political, and intellectual context.

In the socio-cultural analysis of an imperial era such as that of early modern Spain, it is tempting to read scholarly products as transparently displaying a will to political domination (in what we might call a "left-functionalist" reading). However, as Marshall Sahlins has written, such functionalism too often purges

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cultural forms of their specific properties and differences (1999:406–7). In a sympathetic critique of the New Historicism in literary studies, Gerald Graff (1989:174) has asserted that it is an "essentializing" mistake to imagine that an idea "has its political coloration *in itself* " instead of acquiring that coloration from the way it operates in a particular social conjuncture. This echoes Hymes' earlier observation that the meaning of a scholarly position—such as Aldrete's thesis of Latin origins—is interdependent with models that compete for ascendancy in that conjuncture. Hymes cautioned that our social and political explanations of intellectual currents must not settle for apparent surfaces, but must seek actual historical connections (1974:25). This is not to say that intellectual fields are impervious to external social forces. As Bourdieu has put it, they refract these forces rather than transmitting them directly. "Only by exposing the specific logic of this refraction can we understand what it is all about, although it is certainly tempting to tie this logic directly to the forces of power in the social world" (Bourdieu 1989:215–16). All of these theorists agree on the need for careful groundwork to uncover rather than assume the politics of a given text in its own period.

Indeed, as Mignolo writes, " . . . it is not necessary to prove Aldrete right or wrong, since understanding the game he was playing, the social forces nourishing it, and the complicity between knowledge, human interests, and locus of enunciation" is what is relevant (1995:37). Despite the aptness of this agenda, much of the situated social analysis of Aldrete's book remains to be done. It is just that task that I pursue here, framing Aldrete's work in an immediate social context and within the intertextual linkages of knowledge and interest out of which it grew, and then reading the structures of his argument as refractions of that context.

ALDRETE IN POLEMICAL CONTEXT

Considerable furor was raised in Spain by the publication of *Origin*, a fact that would be surprising were the book an apologia for Spanish hegemony. Rather than being simply the expression of an ascendant ideology of empire, Aldrete's book was just one side of a controversy. In his introduction, Aldrete protested that

> . . . my intention and spirit is not to offend anyone . . . I write against nobody, I contradict no one, nor do I oppose anybody, I am only trying to speak my opinion with truth. It would be worse than discourteous for anyone to assert the contrary. Because I esteem and revere everyone, and sacred things even more, and on account of these, this [work] has passed many years in silence, and it would still be buried in oblivion, if I did not finally feel obligated to make it public (1606:4).

As suggested by the turn beyond generic convention that this disclaimer takes as it builds, Aldrete had indeed written against others, even a particular other (who, as we will see, recognized himself as the target). Aldrete's principal antagonist was one Gregorio López Madera. Although they never mention

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

each other by name in writing, Aldrete's work can be understood fully only if its relation to Madera's thesis is recognized (Bahner 1966:103; Mondéjar Cumpián 1992:465).

Aldrete's text emerged at an intersection of tensions concerning not the American colonial empire but rather the increasingly bitter confrontation of Christendom with the remnants of Islam on the peninsula. A series of discoveries in formerly Islamic Granada set off a controversy into which López Madera entered energetically and Aldrete more reluctantly with his linguistic contribution. Although some philologists (see especially Alarcos 1934; Binotti 1995; Mondéjar Cumpián 1992, 1993) have discussed the well-documented events in Granada that triggered Aldrete's linguistic study, there has been no effort to read his theory of language in light of them, as it has been read with regard to developments in the New World.

In what follows, I will situate Aldrete's thesis in relation to Madera's. Then I will locate the origins of their linguistic debate in the historical environment that I propose is essential to an adequate appreciation of the socio-political implications of Aldrete's position. Only after an extended historical excursus do I return to a reading of Aldrete's linguistic thesis, identifying in its logic a refraction of the struggle between Old Christians and New Christians of Islamic origin.

ALDRETE VS. MADERA

What view opposed Aldrete's? It was the theory that Castilian was the primordial language of Spain, established on the peninsula well before the advent of Latin.[9] Castilian was held to be one of the seventy-two languages created in the confusion at Babel, brought to Spain by Tubal, grandson of Noah.[10] The publication of *Origin* brought vitriolic attacks from this position. Aldrete felt compelled to publish a more explicit defense of himself and his theory in 1614 (*Varias Antigüedades*). One historian argues that this second book, in its explicit disclaimers, its polite dedication, even its iconography, shows that Aldrete had "struck a dangerous blow" with his first, and had had "the enormity of his offence made plain to him" (Kendrick 1960:81).

The most powerful proponent of the theory of Primordial Castilian was Gregorio López Madera, a jurist who, at the time Aldrete published, served the King as an *alcalde de Casa y Corte* in Madrid.[11] Son of a royal court physician, Madera was trained in civil and canon law and had been sent to Granada to embark on what would become a brilliant career.[12] He published his ideas about the language within more sweeping essays in 1595 and again in 1601 while a prosecutor in the chancery court in Granada. Soon after, his star rose at the royal court and he attained various positions of substantial authority and prestige. He reiterated his linguistic theory in a third publication in 1625, in which he rebutted Aldrete's arguments point by explicit point.

In his several works López Madera argued that "our Castilian is the true lan-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

guage of our ancestors" (1595, cited in Nieto Jiménez 1972:145); moreover, "our language now" is the same as that of 1500 years earlier (1601:68v). He asserted that Castilian had not been formed from the corruption of Latin, but rather had always been a distinct language (1625:106). The first Spaniards "never lost their language" despite centuries of subjection to Roman conquest, Madera concluded (1625:100).

Eclectic and often anti-humanist in his theoretical orientation (Pelorson 1980:324), López Madera held the classical view that change from an originary perfection could only be decay (Read 1977, 1978). He was scandalized that anyone would assert that the Castilian language derived from any form of corruption "as the scholar who raised the doubt, unworthy son of his fatherland, so unworthily called it, for solely through his imagination he wanted to deny to it its own language, which is so much a part of the honor of a nation" (López Madera 1601:70).

Madera's position was seconded by some of the most distinguished grammarians of the time. One of them, Bartolomé Ximénez Patón, wrote that he was convinced by Madera's "most learned" argument that the Spanish language was originally that of Spain, and that he had erred in believing it to be corrupted Latin. Ximénez Patón admitted that, "I have read Doctor Aldrete on the Castilian language, and many others of his opinion, but I confess that, since I saw that of Doctor Madera, it pleased me so much that I have not been able to give it up, and it could well be that at work here is the pious affection that I owe my country, because I look with enthusiasm on all things that speak in its favor" (quoted in Viñaza 1978:273).

As this quote shows, what might look like Spanish chauvinism in Aldrete's work today was not so apparent to his contemporaries, who saw more glory in Primordial Castilian (see also Binotti 1995). For Ximénez Patón, as for Madera, not Latin origins but rather divine creation at Babel dignified the Castilian language and thus spoke in favor of Spain. The respected humanist Pedro de Valencia also recognized that the theory of Primordial Castilian was a way to wave the Spanish flag. Unlike Ximénez Patón, however, he was critical of and embarrassed by the primordialist theory. Valencia wrote that he feared what it would lead other Europeans to think of Spain: "They will say that we are guilty of being so fond of praise and idle boasting about our nation that we gladly accept any piece of flattery no matter how obvious and absurd it might be" (cited in Gómez Canseco 1993:181–82).

Recognizing his position as the target of Aldrete's books, Madera counterattacked in 1625:

> The habit of contradicting (to show erudition) has moved one author who wrote after my works to impugn this excellence of our nation and language, wanting to prove that the Castilian that we speak is corrupted Latin, and not ancient and our own. And even though in the opening of the work he says that he does not write out of rivalry with anyone, . . . he shows clearly that everything he says is contrary to that which I wrote. . . .

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[T]his is so significant for the excellence of Spain, that a response seems necessary to me. . . . I write almost forced by the necessity of defending something that is so important for Spain, and for our Religion: that author, voluntarily writes . . . against the honor of his nation (1625:100r–v).

In Madera's closing volley, he charged that, " . . . even though that same author follows with a very erudite second book, his arguments are so weak . . . that I do not see how they oblige him to impugn a thing so true and so honorable for Spain as the conservation of its ancient language. . . . [M]y intention has been to defend in all ways the excellences of our Spain . . . My desire [is] the honor of the nation, which has always been so dear to me" (1625:109v).

It is not Aldrete, then, but rather López Madera who wraps his views in the flag, as he attacks an apparently vulnerable Aldrete as a traitor. López Madera's shrill indignation and ad-hominem attacks, the commentary of patriotic grammarians as well as of skeptics such as Pedro de Valencia, and Aldrete's own bitter regrets all suggest that it is anachronistic to interpret Aldrete simply as an apologist for Spanish empire. Although the debate sometimes reads like a parody of familiar scholarly squabbles, an adequate anthropology of language needs to take the controversy seriously.

Neither position was the novel creation of these antagonists. Intellectual histories show us the European origins and familiarity of many of the ideas involved in the debate, from pride in Latin origins to Babelian beginnings to antediluvian ancestors (On Aldrete, see especially Johnston 1978; on López Madera, see Binotti 1995).[13] My purpose here is different. This article is not concerned with the origins of these ideas, but with the specifically Spanish elaboration of such commonplaces, the way they were brought to bear in a particular society undergoing rapid social change. Fitting its period, this is a baroque tale, which we will take up now.

THE ORIGINS OF THE ORIGINS DEBATE

The story begins in 1588 in Granada. Laborers demolishing the minaret of the city's main mosque to construct a Catholic cathedral on its site uncovered a lead box in the ruins.[14] Inside the box were an image of the Virgin Mary, a piece of cloth, a bone, and a parchment. The parchment was written in Arabic and Castilian (with an additional Latin inscription), a significant fact that will trigger the linguistic debate. According to the parchment, the cloth was part of the handkerchief with which the Virgin had dried her eyes at the Crucifixion, the bone was Saint Stephen's, and the text was a prophecy from St. John. The prophecy, it said, had been translated from Hebrew into Castilian fifteen centuries earlier by St. Cecilio, who added a commentary in Arabic and then had it hidden.

A series of even more startling discoveries began in 1595 on a hill above Granada, which came to be known as the Sacromonte (Holy Mountain). Treasure hunters found lead plaques inscribed in Latin that told of the martyrdom

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

on this hill of St. Cecilio, his brother St. Tesifon, and other Christian disciples, in the first-century reign of Nero. Remains were soon unearthed nearby, as were a number of lead books (*libros plúmbeos*, or *plomos*) inscribed mostly in idiosyncratic Arabic letters. All contained sayings of the Virgin Mary and Saints Peter and James, written down by Cecilio and Tesifon. The two were identified in the writings as Arab brothers who had been converted to Christianity by Jesus himself and then had come to Spain as disciples of St. James (Harris 1999:947). Devout Granadans had already believed Cecilio to be the first bishop of Granada, but there had been no evidence until now.

These astonishing discoveries caused excitement in all of Granada and much of Spain. Even those who doubted their authenticity acknowledged their impact. The humanist scholar and chaplain to Philip II, Benito Arias Montano, was skeptical, but he diplomatically wrote to the Archbishop of Granada that the discovery was "the most serious business, the greatest that the world faces today and possibly in many centuries" (quoted in Royo Campos 1960:5).

The status of emerging early modern European states was measured in part by the antiquity of their Christianity. Each political entity tried to maintain its place by tracing its origin to the Apostles (Sotomayor 1996:xxxii). Moreover, veneration of saints and their bodies was encouraged by the Tridentine Church (Harris 2000:241). For these reasons, Granada's Christians had been chagrined that they had no saints' relics, and had begged the Holy See to give them one from the catacombs. But Pius IV responded that Granada should look to its own mountains for the blood of martyrs (Royo Campos 1960:28–29).

And there on Sacromonte the martyrs conveniently appeared. The discoveries allowed what had been the unsubstantiated legend of St. Cecilio to be transformed into documented history, tracing for Granada an unbroken Christian tradition from the time of the apostles (Harris 2000:127–28). The implications went beyond Granada's interests, to those of Spain. The lead books provided evidence for the Spanish mission of the country's patron, St. James, which had been derogated in Rome. They thus established that Christianity had come to Spain before it came to France and England (Sotomayor 1996:xxxii).

Papal theologians had great reservations about the authenticity of the findings, as did many clerics within Spain. Archbishop Castro of Granada, although a tireless defender of the discoveries, commissioned the compilation of a list of doubts that grew to fifty-five items. However, in the religious environment of the era, skepticism about miracles was dangerous, and doubters often prefaced their criticisms with protestations of faith in the judgment of the Church (ibid.: xxxiv).

Archbishop Castro was authorized to hold a hearing to determine the authenticity of the relics, although judgment of the documents was reserved to the Pope. Among the worthies convened to hear the case in 1600 was Gregorio López Madera. The council unanimously found the relics to be genuine, to the jubilation of Granada. Not until 1682, nearly one hundred years after the first discovery, were the *plomos* officially condemned as heretical forgeries.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ORIGINS OF THE PARCHMENT: THE RACIALIZATION OF THE MORISCOS

Some observers suspected from the beginning that the texts had been forged and planted by local Moriscos, descendants of Muslims converted to Christianity after the Reconquest.[15] This explanation was detailed in a nineteenth-century study, and since then historians have conventionally held that the documents were written by the very same Morisco leaders who were later called upon by Archbishop Castro to help translate them from the supposedly ancient Arabic.[16]

Why would Moriscos fabricate these Christian texts and relics? The Sacromonte texts are thought to have been a desperate attempt to redeem Granada's Moriscos by rewriting their history. At the time the parchment and *plomos* were discovered, Moriscos were in an extremely difficult position. Counter-Reformation Spain was increasingly intolerant of them, since many were known and all were suspected to be infidels and apostates. Moreover, Spaniards feared that Andalusian and Valencian Moriscos were plotting with the Turks for another Islamic invasion.[17] Anxieties about territorial security and personal safety of Christian Spaniards, as much as about religious offenses, brought repeated calls for extermination or expulsion of Moriscos from Spain. Granadan Moriscos were particularly demoralized, since their community had been decimated and dispersed after the 1568–1570 revolt of Alpujarras in the mountain strongholds of Granada.

The last remnant of Islamic Spain, Granada had originally surrendered to Ferdinand and Isabella in 1492 on terms that protected religious and cultural as well as property and some political rights for Muslims. But the liberal terms of Granada's surrender were quickly and progressively violated. As a universalistic Christian state coalesced, the social margins traditionally reserved for *mudéjares* (Muslims allowed to remain in Christian territories) narrowed to the vanishing point (Cohen 1994).

Ultimately those of Islamic origin were constituted as an alien people that had to be extirpated from a territorially defined Christian and Spanish interior (Root 1988; Shell 1991). This ideological construction was achieved through three overlapping phases, whose focus progressed from religion, to culture, to genealogy. I will sketch these briefly, because the view of humanity and cultural practices that they constitute will be central when we return to the linguistic debate.

The first archbishop of Reconquest Granada, Hernando de Talavera, supported sustained missionary work and the use of Arabic to achieve the voluntary conversion of Muslims (Domínguez Ortiz 1996:378; Garrad 1953:215). Talavera's policy of patience was superseded in 1499 by mass conversion under threat of expulsion. The baptism policy precipitated rebellion in Granada, followed by further forced conversions (Domínguez Ortiz and Vincent 1997:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

19; Harris 2000:23). In 1502, a royal edict imposed forced conversion to Christianity on all Muslims, not only in Andalusia but throughout Castile, at the threat of exile. By 1526, the Crown of Aragon had also ordered conversion, and in theory there were no Muslims left on Spanish soil (Domínguez Ortiz and Vincent 1997:25).

The struggle between Christians and Muslims did not end with forced baptism. Rather, it moved to other cultural terrain, as "Old Christians" concluded that the mass conversions of Muslims as "New Christians" had, unsurprisingly, failed. Indeed, *taqiyya*, mere superficial conformity to the rituals of a religion imposed on a subjugated community, was permitted in Islam, and there is little doubt that many Moriscos remained only nominally converted (Domínguez Ortiz 1994:231; Kamen 1997:220–25). By 1511, Morisco cultural practices of language, writing, bathing, and dress were coming to be viewed as signs of Islamic identity and therefore of heresy, and were brought under the scrutiny of Spanish officials (Domínguez Ortiz and Vincent 1997:21).

In 1526, the Emperor Charles V prohibited an exhaustive catalog of Arab cultural practices, including foodways, music, bathing, circumcision, Arabic names, and oral and written Arabic language use. Although the Emperor was persuaded to postpone the prohibitions for forty years, Domínguez Ortiz and Vincent see this as a turning point for the definition of Islamic identity on Spanish soil. Now considered Muslim were not just those who failed to embrace the Christian religion, but those who preserved the most minor ancestral custom and thus revealed their origin: "At first it was the Infidel who was rejected; now it would be simply the Other" (1997:22).

The sun set on the reprieve under Philip II, as political and economic tensions were rising between the Old Christian and Morisco communities. Strict cultural prohibitions were reinstated in Granada in 1567, and Arabic music and clothing, face-covering, bathing, Arabic names, and speaking, reading, and writing Arabic all became illegal. Linguistic prohibitions were to take full effect at the end of three years, but all books in Arabic were to be handed over for scrutiny immediately (Domínguez Ortiz and Vincent 1997:268–72; Lea 1901: 228–29).

The ability to read Arabic had come to be taken as heretical. For example, a Belgian humanist who traveled to Seville in 1539 to clarify questions of Arabic grammar reported that the Morisco physician he sought out steadfastly refused to help him. The medical doctor insisted that as a true Christian he was afraid to give any sign of his origins by showing knowledge of Arabic, since this would compromise his good reputation and invite punishment (García Ballester 1984 cited in Candau Chacón 1997:167–68). Another educated Morisco reported that he panicked when he was summoned by Archbishop Castro of Granada to help translate the Sacromonte *plomos*. He wrote in his memoir that he thought, "How shall I save myself, as the Christians kill and burn everyone on whom they find an Arabic book or about whom they know he reads Ara-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

bic?" (trans. in Al-Hajarī 1997:73). The possession of Arabic texts by those who could not read them (illiteracy in Arabic being common among Spanish Moriscos) was also treated as proof of heresy, since these could be Islamic talismans.[18]

When the cultural prohibitions were renewed, appeals were lodged. Don Francisco Núñez Muley, an elderly leader of the Granada Moriscos and former page to Archbishop Talavera, had earlier interceded successfully with King Ferdinand and had represented the community's gratitude to Charles V for suspending the prohibitions of 1526. He thus seemed the perfect representative to plead the Morisco case.

In the memorial he presented, Núñez Muley argued that the consequences of these prohibitions would be dire. He pointed out the harm that would come to Moriscos if contracts and land titles were destroyed simply because they were in Arabic. He further argued that the forbidden practices were regional rather than religious. Diversity of dress and other customs was accepted among Christian Europeans, and it was only Morisco customs that were singled out as unacceptable. The Arabic language was unobjectionable in principle, said Núñez Muley: "Language does not bear on Muslim doctrine, either for or against" (Garrad 1953:221). In any case, although almost all Moriscos wished to learn Castilian, few teachers were available. It would be nearly impossible for the elderly to learn it in their remaining years, asserted the aged Núñez Muley. In a summary representation, the contemporary historian Mármol Carvajal reported that Núñez Muley cried, "How can people be deprived of their natural tongue, in which they were born and raised?" (García-Arenal 1975:55). Nevertheless, the prohibitions were instituted over such objections, and in response the Morisco rebellion soon arose in the Alpujarras mountains.[19]

One aristocratic member of the King's forces who witnessed the revolt depicted a rebel leader, Hernando de Válor, "el Zaguer," rousing the Morisco community with an impassioned speech on its oppression:

> Embraced by neither God nor men, treated as Moors among the Christians, only to be disdained; and as Christians among the Moors, only to be disbelieved, unaided, and excluded from human life and conversation. They tell us not to speak our own language. But we do not understand Castilian; in what language can we communicate our thoughts, request or give things, if we are not allowed the conversation of men? Even animals are not forbidden to hear human voices! Who denies that a man who speaks Castilian can follow the law of the Prophet, and one who speaks the Morisco language the law of Jesus? . . . They order us to give up our clothing and to dress in the Castilian style; but they dress among themselves the Germans in one way, the French in another, the Greeks in another, friars in yet another, boys however they want, old people to their own taste. Every nation, every profession, every estate has its own style of dress and they are all Christians; but we are Moors, because we dress in Morisco style, as if we carried our religion in our clothing and not in our hearts . . . (Hurtado de Mendoza (1984:19–21).

After the rebellion was put down in 1570, most of the Morisco population of Granada was removed and dispersed throughout areas of Spain that did not have

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

substantial Morisco populations. Granada lost as many as 120,000 to death and expulsion, with devastating consequences for agriculture and the economy (Kamen 1991:172–74).

Religious, cultural and linguistic traces of Islamic origin were now nearly fully established as intolerable, but the construction of difference as damning did not stop there. It continued into the domain of genealogy, where a non-Christian ancestor was deemed to taint bloodlines irredeemably. Old Christian fears about Moriscos meshed with a simultaneously evolving institutional policy of racialization, the policy of *limpieza de sangre* (purity of blood).[20] Racialization is an increasingly ambiguous term that has been used in various senses in recent years, and I will not enter here into discussion of the merits of extended uses (see Balibar 1991). By racialization, I mean very specifically the growth of an explicit ideology that locates significant social difference in characteristics viewed as natural, essential, and ineradicable because biologically given. These characteristics were biologized in the Spanish case as based in "blood" (*sangre*), and became the basis for exclusion from positions of social honor and power.[21]

Statutes of *limpieza de sangre* had originated in the mid-fifteenth century in Toledo and had been developing in various institutions throughout Spain since then. They excluded from public and religious offices any individual who could be shown to have an ancestor who had been Jewish, Islamic, or penanced by the Inquisition.[22] This doctrine of hereditary taint was originally aimed mostly at Jewish converts (*conversos*), whose power in the royal court and clerical orders was coveted by Old Christians. But the same progression of exclusion from religion to genealogy was also applied to Moriscos.

There were protests against these statutes of purity, including from the Church and the Inquisition (see Kamen 1997; Poole 1999). Most of this protest was in the interest of nobles, whose extensive genealogical records made them most vulnerable to the statutes. But some of the concern focused on the 'Morisco problem.'

Critics of *limpieza* recognized that the statutes only perpetuated the Morisco problem and even the very existence of Moriscos themselves. They saw that exclusion from social responsibilities and honors on the basis of blood purity militated against the Christianization of the population, and could lead disgruntled Moriscos to support further Muslim invasions (Kamen 1991:254–55; Domínguez Ortiz 1962:53; cf. Cardaillac 1983; Révah 1971). One important commentator argued that treating mixed bloodlines as tainted encouraged not just the maintenance of the non-Christian population but even its greater increase relative to Christians (Sicroff 1979:238–39).

THE DEBATE OVER THE EXPULSION OF THE MORISCOS

By the opening of the seventeenth century, it seemed incontrovertible to almost all Old Christian participants on any side of the Morisco question that non-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Christian people could not be tolerated on Spanish soil in the long term. The infidel had come to be constructed as dangerous to state and personal security as well as inherently contaminating to Christian society. But was the correct solution to the widely recognized Morisco problem continued evangelization, expulsion, confiscation of children from Morisco parents, castration, extermination . . . ? The alternatives were interminably mooted; policy decisions were made and unmade.

A few voices argued that conversion had not even been given a serious try. Pedro de Valencia, royal chronicler, Christian humanist, and outspoken opponent of the Sacromonte parchment and *plomos*, was also one of the most vociferous opponents of expulsion and other final measures. In a memorandum of January 1606, Valencia rejected the attempt to marginalize Moriscos and to push them off Spanish territory as not-Spanish: "All of these Moriscos, in both their natural constitution and therefore in their wit, disposition, and spirit are Spaniards, like the rest of the inhabitants of Spain, for they have been born and raised here for nearly nine hundred years" (Valencia 1997:78–81).[23]

Valencia's recommendation was to disperse Morisco communities throughout Spain and then convert them through patient missionary work. Integration would be slow and difficult but, in his judgment, it was the only just, effective and feasible way to solve the acknowledged problem (Gómez Canseco 1993: 236). (See Márquez Villanueva 1998, Galmés de Fuentes 1993, and Vincent n.d. for controversy over how to evaluate the humaneness of Valencia's stance.)

Valencia saw with acuity the effects of social pressure and group cohesion on the Morisco problem, writing: "The difficulty now lies in the fact that the Moriscos form their own community, and they have as the theatre of their honor and approval only the small circle of their own nation" (Valencia 1997:119).

To resolve this problem, Valencia advocated miscegenation, a bonding of the Morisco with the Christian population through freely and fully accepted intermarriage (ibid.:132). He opposed *limpieza de sangre* and insisted that offspring of mixed marriages be accepted not as "New Christians," but as equals and as completely without taint: "If the pure lineages keep becoming stained and these stains have to be indelible forever, of course [the problem] will continue" (ibid.).

Valencia's arguments were given short shrift. The strongest voices argued that conversion had failed not because missionary efforts were inadequate but because Moriscos had proved inassimilable. What Gómez Dávila wrote to the King of this "intrinsic pestilence" is only one example: "Just as when a human body has an illness in a foot, leg or arm, the entire body must be purged, so also is it necessary to purge all of Spain of this bad seed . . . To think that preaching can remedy the damage is to think the impossible" (Boronat y Barrachina 1992:64–65). Biological accounts indicted the whole community, including children: "they have the infected root within their guts" (quoted in Cardaillac 1983:14). As one exasperated missionary wrote, "Terrible are the mute and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

silent arguments that make the blood cry out within the veins. After we preach to them, these wretches respond, 'My father—Moor; myself—Moor'" (cited in Domínguez Ortiz 1962:44).[24]

The controversy over the Morisco problem came to a head in the same years as the struggles over the authenticity of the *plomos* and the linguistic conflict between Aldrete and López Madera. After years of debate, under Philip III policy suddenly tipped in favor of expulsion. The first royal order for the expulsion of the Moriscos finally came in 1609. It gave as justification the safety and security of the realm and its subjects, as well as the cessation of heresy and apostasy, and the honor and glory of God (Boronat y Barrachina 1992:190–93). Expulsions were carried out through 1614.[25] Estimates vary, but conservatively about 275,000 Moriscos were marched to the coasts carrying what belongings they could (Cardaillac and Dedieu 1990:26, based on Lapeyre 1959). They were shipped out to North Africa, where not all survived.[26]

THE SACROMONTE FORGERIES AS PROPOSED SOLUTION

The troubled prelude to expulsion described above was the context in which the Granada parchment and *plomos* were forged and planted, in what may have been a last-ditch attempt to save the Morisco community. The texts put forward a version of Granada's history that aimed to redeem the Moriscos by tracing the city's roots to Arab Christian apostles and martyrs, who thus became the oldest Christians in Spain. Moreover, the doctrinal content of the books syncretized Islam and Christianity, and gave Arabic people a leading role in Christian redemption. Here is a particularly poignant example from the books of the attempt to rehabilitate the Arabs' reputation. Peter asks the Virgin Mary,

> "Tell us how God will manifest the victory of his rightful law, and by whose hand . . . "
>
> Mary: "God will give his law and make it manifest by the hand of the most excellent peoples among his creatures in the lineage of Adam in that time."
>
> And Peter said: "What people are these, Our Lady?"
>
> And she said: "The Arabs and their language."
>
> Said Peter: "The Arabs and their language?"
>
> Said [Mary]: "The Arabs and their language, and I tell you that the Arabs are one of the most excellent peoples, and their language is one of the most excellent languages. God chose them to assist his law in the final days, after they had been his greatest enemies . . . But (in those final days) the Arabs and their language return to God and his rightful law, and to his glorious Gospel . . . " (Hagerty 1980:122–24).

As Hagerty points out, the *plomos* had very different meanings to the Old Christians than to the New. For Moriscos, what was important was the discovery that Cecilio, the patron saint of Granada, was an Arab. Old Christians, in contrast, overlooked the news that their first bishop had been of Arab origins, as well as the books' suggestions about the stellar character of Arabs. For them, the simple existence of the parchment and *plomos* allowed the portrayal of the city's original, true character as Christian, repressed through centuries of Islamic rule (Harris 2000:127–28). As the last realm to fall to the Catholic Mon-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

archs Ferdinand and Isabella, Granada had been a Christian city for less than a century, and its Moorish history presented problems for the newly-established "Old Christian" civic elite (Harris 2000:74). Granada's "only role in the national epic of the 'Reconquest' was that of the enemy" (ibid.:78). The Sacromonte discoveries became part of a larger program to Christianize Islamic Granada and to push Moriscos entirely outside the narrative of Granadine tradition (ibid.:126).

THE ROLE OF LANGUAGE IN THE SACROMONTE POLEMICS

Such were the civic and national-religious projects constructed by Old Christians around what is now understood to be a Morisco fabrication. Unfortunately, the parchment and books themselves posed inconveniences for these projects. The basic challenges were linguistic: how had Arabic come to be used in Spain six hundred years before the Muslim invasion? Even more awkwardly, how could Castilian appear in texts from the first century, if as a corruption of Latin it did not exist until well after the arrival of the Visigoths in the fifth century? If the linguistic facts could not be reconciled, then the parchment and *plomos* were false, and so were the coveted relics (Alarcos 1934:210). This was the immediate motivation for the discussion of the origins of Castilian.

Among those who were skeptical about the *plomos* was Pedro de Valencia, who concluded dryly, "It cannot be denied that whoever wrote the parchment knew how to speak Castilian as it is spoken today. It remains for its defenders either to prove with similar certainty that it was also spoken in the time of Nero, or else to resort to miracle and revelation, which is how anything can be proved" (cited in Gómez Canseco 1993:181).[27]

López Madera took Valencia's first route. To prove the authenticity of the prized parchment (which would glorify the city where he was starting his career), he insisted that Castilian was already spoken in the time of the apostles and St. Cecilio. In his *Discursos* (1601) in defense of the Sacromonte discoveries, he addressed directly the doubts that had been compiled about the parchment and *plomos*. The objection he considered to have the most force was indeed the linguistic one: that St. Cecilio's translation of St John's prophecy "is written in our vulgar Castilian, just like that spoken today" (1601:8v–9r). In response he elaborated the theory of Primordial Castilian: "what we find in the language of the prophecy is the most certain, the truest, and at the same time one of the most honorable things that we could ask for our nation, the antiquity of its language," (ibid.:75r) which " . . . we can say is the same as that of one thousand, one thousand and five hundred, years ago" (ibid.:70v).

Aldrete's approach was the second one mentioned by his fellow humanist Pedro de Valencia, to whom Aldrete had been introduced by his mentor (Rubio Lapaz 1993:233). As devout as Madera, Aldrete did not question the authenticity of the Sacromonte parchment and books. In fact, he often served as Archbishop Castro's representative in their defense in Madrid. However, to the Arch-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

bishop's displeasure, Aldrete also insisted that the Castilian in which the parchment was written was *not* spoken at the time when St. Cecilio wrote it. Rather, it was a miracle that the parchment was written in modern Castilian, a language not yet born: "The way that before there was a Castilian language it could be written in the Parchment was through the miraculous gift of tongues" (1614:326). St. Cecilio had the gifts both of prophecy and of tongues and so was able to divine the language that would be spoken 1500 years later, when the parchment would be needed and therefore revealed: "Thus the Romance of the Parchment is from the time in which God saw fit to reveal it, and not from the earlier time when St. Cecilio wrote it, because in so many centuries there has been a great change in the language of Spain as in all those of the world, and so it was prophetic to write it at that time" (1614:303).

There have been doubts whether Aldrete sincerely believed in this miracle, or was a "pusillanimous spirit" knuckling under to pressures from the Archbishop and fear of accusations of heresy in an intellectually dangerous time (Mondéjar Cumpián 1992:470).[28] Although Aldrete steered clear of explicit commentary on the Sacromonte documents in *Origin*, he was drawn into more direct combat on that topic by the attacks that followed publication. Some sixteen chapters of his second book, *Varias Antigüedades* (1614), were devoted to explicit commentary and defense of his views on Sacromonte and its linguistic implications.

In some ways, language was incidental to the matters of ethno-religious, civic, and national history at the heart of this event, an annoying obstacle to documentary proof. However, the language debate became important in its own right, and Aldrete's advance in linguistic thought was substantial. Moreover, at the same time as it took on its own life, the language debate also epitomized the questions and visions of society that were at stake in the Christian-Morisco controversy. What is the basis of national and civic glory? What is the essential expression of the nature of a nation? What is the relationship of dominator and dominated? Is coexistence possible? The most fundamental question was: what is the truth about human difference? All of these questions are addressed throughout Aldrete's and López Madera's work, just as they are throughout the many tracts on the Moriscos. There are many echoes of answers given in the Morisco debate in Aldrete's own text. With the frame of the Christian-Morisco struggle established, and with these questions in mind, we can now return to the linguistic controversy itself.

IDEOLOGIES OF LANGUAGE IN LÓPEZ MADERA AND ALDRETE

In this section, I will first briefly schematize some of the central themes of López Madera's and Aldrete's arguments, and position their ideas in relation to each other. Then I will summarize their contrasting ideologies of language and bring these to bear on the social questions posed above.

Both López Madera and Aldrete can seem strikingly modern and sociolin-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

guistically astute, as well as credulous or inclined to sophistry. Both leave holes in their arguments barely papered over. López Madera is driven to invent a prehistoric conquest of Rome by Spaniards in order to account for the problematic similarity of Castilian to Latin. Aldrete, in turn, overlooks the fact that the event which he proposes as central in the development of Castilian, the Visigothic reign, contradicts his principal dictum that the "conquered take on the language of the conquerors."[29]

Aldrete and López Madera share a number of fundamental tenets of language ideology. For example, neither of them questions that languages are distinct, have clear boundaries, and can be uniquely identified. Nor do they question that people can be said to have a language, and to have this relation of ownership or identity with only one language, although López Madera's version of this is much stronger.

López Madera and Aldrete also share an absolute conviction in the rightness of Christianity. In this sense both were very much of their time. As Peter Burke writes: "The true 'infrastructure,' for the seventeenth-century mind, is not economy or society; not even politics or law: it is God" (1969:104). In its linguistic reflex, this Christian belief was expressed in the divine ordination of language. However, although Aldrete and López Madera shared this providentialist view of language, they had very different models of its workings. López Madera, as has already been shown, traced Castilian directly to God as its creator at Babel. Aldrete's schema gave a less direct role to God's intervention in human cultural and linguistic affairs. So, although Aldrete believed that it was God's design that Latin spread around the world to facilitate communication and thus the preaching of Christianity (1614:3–5), he thought that the Roman Empire and Latin language had to develop through human efforts in order for that design to be fulfilled. Aldrete was impressed not by the origin of language nor the glorious high culture carried in a language like Latin, but rather by the language's "finality," its destiny in God's purpose (Nieto Jiménez 1972:47).

In what follows, I focus not on the underlying shared ideological territory, but rather on several themes around which Aldrete and López Madera are directly opposed. Each theme recurs explicitly and frequently in their works, and most are central to the arguments that they build.

Theme 1: Locus of Language

Given that the antagonists disagree about the origins of their language, we might ask where they locate language itself. What is it that makes a language a language: distinct, integral, and identifiable?

For López Madera, the essential heart of a language lies not in its vocabulary but in its distinctive patterns of combining words (*dialecto*) and of using them, "which is what each language can say is its own" (1601:66v).[30] "To differentiate between one language and another, we should not consider the sound of a word, but its distinct quality (*propriedad*); not its diction, but its force and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

meaning" argues Madera (ibid.:66r). "Do they think that a language consists of whether you say 'hijo' or 'fijo', in saying 'ca' or 'que'? No, of course not, for that changes every day, with the language still staying the same, and after twenty years we have left behind some words and taken up others" (ibid.:69r).

Madera argues that different languages are defined by "manners of speaking" (*maneras de decir*, *phrasis*, ibid.:67r), by the interconnections among words, and the figures formed from them (*la travazon y figura*, 1625:105v).[31] For Madera, these "manners of speaking" are the substance that gives a language existence, the "old clothing" on which can be sewn remnants taken from other languages (1601:57v, 70v).[32] By manners of speaking, López Madera generally means idioms and deep structural tropes, which are hard to specify in dictionaries, grammar books, and instruction manuals. He stresses the incommensurability of languages, locating their essences in aspects that he finds especially resistant to translation. These ineffable differences in manners of speaking and in idioms are what make it difficult for speakers to acquire a second language or to translate a book, even from Latin to Romance or from Greek to Latin (ibid.:67r–v).

Aldrete directly opposes López Madera on the locus of language, explicitly rejecting the claim that ways of speaking are its core. He writes with flat certainty that,

> . . . the principal parts of a language are the words and the grammar . . . To these can be added manners of speaking, which affect the language's character and perfection, because these are without a doubt diverse, and different in each language. But they are not the principal part of which it is composed. Without doubt, the first two elements are, because if either of those is lacking, it is a different language. . . . This does not happen if the manner of speaking is lacking . . . (1606:188).

All aspects of language are susceptible to change, but Aldrete argues that manners of speaking (*modos de decir, el estilo*) move as rapidly as fashions in clothing (1606:178). He points out that there are varying regional manners of speaking in Spain—for example in Old Castile vs. New Castile vs. Andalusia—but that they are all considered the same language. Ways of speaking a language are as diverse as the places where it is spoken, but (in direct contradiction of Madera) Aldrete holds these to be "accidental" rather than the defining substance of a language (1606:191–92, 196).

Theme 2: Honor in Antiquity vs. Perfectibility

As already has been shown, López Madera held antiquity to be the prime source of nobility and honor in a language: "What we find in the language of the prophecy is one of the most honorable things we could ask for our nation, which is the antiquity of its language" (1601:75r). Moreover, for Madera it is not only an honorable nature but any distinct nature at all that is established by antiquity. He writes that the only real languages, those with substance in an Aristotelian sense, are those originally created by God: "It would be truly absurd to grant

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

substance to a language that did not have its origins as one of the seventy-two languages of the division [at Babel]" (1601:70v). All other languages are merely contingent derivatives of these.

Aldrete once again rejects López Madera's position outright. "I do not know for what reason or cause there should have been change in all languages, and only Spain has maintained its language exactly the same from its ancient beginnings," he grumbles (1614:302). In the prologue to *Origin*, Aldrete argues the point head-on:

> . . . I cannot refrain from responding to those who feel that I do harm to our language by attributing to it a beginning that is more modern than the population of Spain by the ancient Tubal. They hold that anything else is unworthy of Spanish greatness, which they claim for their side, and they persuade themselves that everything else is not honorable and should not be written. Such trappings and adornments of antiquity do not beautify or honor the language, which has its own riches and luster, and those are not imaginary. . . . [T]he abundance of words, sweetness together with gravity, elegance accompanied by ease, and other similar ornaments are what honor and give value and esteem to a language. If these are lacking, no matter what the antiquity, it will not be worthy . . .

Aldrete goes on to make clear that these honorable qualities are not inherent in a language. Rather, they are developed through cultivation by its users (although he does imply that the fundamental mettle of the language gives greater potential to what can be developed). His expressed hope for his work is that once he has identified Castilian's origins, others will apply their talents to raising its style and will recognize what could be made of the language through art and diligence (1606:5).

Theme 3: Linguistic Consequences of Conquest

The central point of explicit disagreement between the two authors concerns the linguistic consequences of political conquest. Each sees a nearly inevitable outcome, but for López Madera that outcome is maintenance of an indigenous language, while for Aldrete it is shift by a conquered population to the conquerors' language.

Madera writes forcefully, "People would lose their lives before they lose their language . . . " (1601:68v).

> No nation in the world has ever lost its language, unless it has been completely destroyed. And a foreign language has never been introduced into a province unless it has been conquered by the transmigration of another entire nation. Then the one that is bigger and more populous succeeds in keeping its language. . . . because by other means, only through conquering the government and domination, the language does not change (ibid.:58v).

For Aldrete, in stark contrast, "The conquered take on the language of the conquerors, surrendering [their own] along with their arms and persons . . . " (1606:138). This "law of conquest" is key to Aldrete's overall thesis. He needs it in order to insist that whatever languages were spoken on the peninsula before the Roman conquest were then displaced: "The Spaniards, defeated and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

surrendered, had to give up their own language, and take on that of the conquerors" (ibid.). But he has to find his conclusive evidence for this proposition in other conquests, and we will see below what he makes of these.

Despite his rather brutal general principle, Aldrete emphasizes the importance of social relations in determining language choice. He elaborates on this theme, pointing out the significance of both miscegenation and of shared systems of social honor and responsibility in creating linguistic unity: "After the war, the trade, friendship, kinship and marriages in which the Romans joined with those of the provinces where they lived, that they made them part of their honors and responsibilities, that they extended to them the privileges of their city, made them all one together, and made Latin the language most used in the world" (1606:58).

Theme 3a: Lessons of Specific Conquests

Given their difference of opinion on the general consequences of conquest, how do López Madera and Aldrete depict the linguistic consequences of specific conquests, and particularly those in recent Spanish experience? They disagree once again, not so much because they see different situations but because they look at the same phenomena with a different focus. For Aldrete, the question is whether a second language is acquired; for López Madera, the pressing question is often whether the first language is given up.

The Americas: López Madera argues that if Spanish is spoken most in the Indies, it is not because the indigenes abandoned their languages, but because almost all the population was now Spaniards who had come with their wives, children, and households, almost "consuming" the natives (1601:58v).

On the subject of the Antilles, Aldrete observes that "the language of everyone is Castilian. The Indians that are left have completely lost their own language" (1606:146). This is not necessarily a direct contrast to López Madera, since Aldrete agrees that the indigenous population was decimated in the Antilles. However, he also writes of the New World more generally:

> I have been told by people who have lived there many years that the Indians who interact with Spaniards, which is almost all of them in our provinces, know how to speak Romance more or less well, depending on how hard they try, and all the rest understand it. Some Indian leaders pronounce it as well as our own, and so do all those who are of the Spanish race, by whatever route; they speak as in Castile. Although the Indians commonly know and understand Castilian, they use it little, because of their fondness for their own language, since no one makes them speak the foreign one, and some take it as a point of honor not to speak it. Embarrassment and fear of speaking poorly keep many of the Indians from using Castilian (1606:145–46).

Rather than expressing criticism or distress over failures to teach Spanish adequately, as Mignolo suggests, Aldrete asserts that he has no doubt that if Spain continues to govern the Americas, then "in a very short time all will speak Castilian, without diligence on our part" (1606:146). (And thus must the Iberians have learned Latin, he argues (ibid.))

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Moriscos: On the more immediate case of the Moriscos, the two authors have even more acutely discrepant views. López Madera's pithy dictum that "a people will lose their lives before they lose their language" was in fact exemplified for him by the revolt of the Moriscos in the Alpujarras in 1568: " . . . as we saw in the rebellion in this kingdom of Granada" (1601:68v). "In our days, we have seen the rebellion that follows from wanting to take a language away from even a nation so scant, so subjugated, as the few Moriscos that have remained in this kingdom of Granada" (1601:58v).

Madera repeats this point in his later work: The Moriscos "never could be made to give up their language, even if they learned Castilian. Even though they were punished by judges, and without need of it for their livelihood or everyday exchange, they always made sure to keep their language" (1625:106v).[33]

Aldrete's views are nuanced but contrast clearly:

> . . . after the Christian rulers recovered Spain, those Moors who were subdued and remained living apart with little exchange or communication with Christians kept their Arabic language without learning ours. But those who truly embraced our faith and intermarried with Old Christians lost it. Those who after the rebellion of 1569 were dispersed throughout Castile and Andalusia and mixed with other inhabitants took on our language and do not speak any other in public, nor do they dare. . . . The same is true in Aragon; those who do not know particular speakers cannot tell them from the natives. In the kingdom of Valencia because they live by themselves, they retain the Arabic language. The reason why they have applied themselves so little to our language is very clear. It is the aversion that they have toward us, which is almost natural to them, and I will not say more about that, but I believe that they will lose this in time. Add to their will the fact that they are excluded from honors and public responsibilities, and they do not seek to intermarry with Castilians or have affection for them. All of which ended in the [Roman] provinces . . . the Religion was one, everyone was admitted to honors and offices . . . with which it seems that of necessity, those of the provinces became fond of the Romans and their language (1606:86).

Aldrete draws on the example of the negative and positive responses of Moriscos under different circumstances, as well as the positive case of the Roman provinces, to argue that social marginalization, endogamy and ritual exclusion—characteristics of the *limpieza de sangre* policy—exacerbate linguistic and cultural difference. In contrast, he holds that social inclusion and shared responsibility lead to willing assimilation, affection, and loyalty.

Theme 4: Mastery of Second Language

Finally, both authors have views that touch not just on whether the conquered do learn the conquerors' language, but on whether a non-indigenous or second language *can* be fully learned. Since for López Madera the essence and uniqueness of a language are almost ineffable, it is not surprising that in his view second-language learners can rarely get it right. When López Madera comments on second-language proficiency at all, it is usually on interference from the first language (although, in attacking evidence offered by Aldrete, he does acknowledge specific cases in which a learned language could be spoken with

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

elegance, at least by outstanding individuals (1625:108v)). He writes of telltale linguistic traits as diagnostic of ethnic identity:

> When we hear someone say '*hermoso muger*' or '*el calle*' . . . we know the speaker is Basque. And another who says . . . '*yo querer servir,*' we know it is a Morisco (1601:66v–67r).[34]

> We can tell the natural language of a person, speaking in a foreign language just as if he were speaking his own (ibid. 68v).

In his conviction of the difficulty of mastering a non-native phonology, López Madera verges onto biological determinism:

> Much [of the difference between languages] also consists of pronunciation. Because the nature that arranges everything to its purpose exists in languages, too, such that in each nation it forms the vocal instruments to accommodate the language they speak. So that some have the teeth low . . . and others high, some have the lips sagging, and others tight, some the tongue slim and agile, others heavy and thick, and because of this, foreigners who speak Castilian well cannot pronounce it well, and the reverse is true for us with them (1601:66v).

Once again—and by now, predictably—Aldrete's view is in clear opposition. Under the right circumstances, a second language can be acquired perfectly, making different ethnolinguistic origins undetectable. On the case of the Americas, he says, as we have seen, that "Some of the Indian leaders pronounce it as well as our own." Similarly, for the Moriscos, "The children and grandchildren [of those Moriscos who were dispersed throughout Castile and Andalusia after the rebellion of 1569] . . . speak Castilian so well, as well as the best . . . even if some of the most hardened others have not given up their Arabic. The same is true in Aragon; those who do not know particular speakers cannot tell them from the natives " (1606:86).

Aldrete reiterates the point in his second book: "The Moriscos who came to Cordoba did not know any other language than their own . . . their sons . . . learned [our language] from us in school, and they spoke it as well as those of our own who speak it best. I have listened to them with curiosity on occasion, and I found them speaking adages and witticisms, achieving hidden and extraordinary things much better than many natives; so much that I was astonished, since I never thought they could reach so far" (1614:71).

SUMMARY: CONTRASTING LINGUISTIC IDEOLOGIES

What I have constructed in the last section is, of course, more than an inventory of disparate sociolinguistic themes. I would argue that they add up to two very different visions of difference—cultural and linguistic—and society. Summing up the contrasts emerging from these details of argumentation most succinctly, the key concepts in Aldrete's vision of humanity and culture are "mutability and perfectibility" while in Madera's "origins and essences" are central. Painting in the thematic outline now with some broad strokes, we can contrast these visions.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Aldrete: Mutability and Perfectibility

For Aldrete, languages change, and people's relationship to any given language is changeable. People capitulate culturally under conquest. In conditions of contact, they alter their language the way they alter their customary dress. There can be practices that make us different from each other (such as manners of speaking), but they are not necessarily of substance or essence. Moreover, cultivation is possible. Crude forms of language, like early Spanish, can be cultivated and applied to higher purposes, such as Christian doctrine. Similarly, people can be cultivated; children can assimilate perfectly. If people are not only dominated, but also given time, motivation, and most importantly, social integration through kinship, responsibilities and honors, they will learn and be loyal to other ways—in religion, language, and culture.

Aldrete himself explicates the importance of his vision of language to his vision of society, identifying language as the primary human trait (1614:89).[35] Following Pliny and St. Augustine, he holds that without a language in common, there is no advantage in two humans' joining company, and thus "a man will more gladly be with his dog than with a foreigner" (1606:57). But with a common language, nations can be united in friendship and love as fully as by blood (1614:128).

López Madera: Origins and Essences

For López Madera, in contrast, genealogy is essential (in both senses of the word: defining and necessary). Origins establish the essence, the true nature of things, including peoples and languages.[36] Nobility of languages and of people derives from antiquity and therefore is not something that can be cultivated or acquired. There is a general tendency to stasis: "each thing tries to conserve the characteristics of its kind" (1601:68v); "according to the laws of nature, change in things cannot be presumed" (1625:100v). "All nations always try to conserve not only that which is natural, such as their language, but also the accidental, such as customs and ceremonies" (1625:100v). Such unique characteristics are ineffable and ultimately incommunicable anyway, and thus true assimilation is not possible in human society. People do not give up these traits unless they are completely destroyed.[37]

CONNECTING THE DOTS? SOCIAL CONFLICT AND LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES

It would be inappropriate to try to link a particular position on the origins of Castilian, or even on the authenticity of the Sacromonte discoveries that triggered the language debate, directly to a particular position on the Morisco question. A complex intellectual field intervened between the linguistic ideas and the social conflicts, and so we cannot simply connect the dots from one to the other.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Many supporters of the Sacromonte cause did oppose expulsion of the Moriscos, as the authors of the forgeries might have hoped. Archbishop Pedro de Castro, indefatigable defender of the Sacromonte *plomos*, twice wrote to the King to plead for clemency for innocent Moriscos (including one of the probable authors, Miguel de Luna) (see Domínguez Ortíz and Vincent 1997:281–82). Enemies of the parchment and *plomos*, however, could also be enemies of expulsion, as was true of Pedro de Valencia. And we will see shortly that an ardent defender of the Sacromonte cause could be a partisan of expulsion.

The connections between the Morisco question and the linguistic controversy are even more indirect or refracted. Both Aldrete and López Madera had to be aware of the suspicion that Moriscos were the authors of the Sacromonte documents, but neither gives any indication that in discussing the linguistic question they meant to weigh in on Morisco policy. Nonetheless, the status of the Moriscos was publicly and nearly interminably debated by their fellow clergy, jurists, and statesmen in the years of their textual encounters. Colleagues such as Pedro de Valencia went on record in both the linguistic and the Morisco debates. Moreover, we have seen that both authors comment directly on Morisco assimilation and relations to Christian Spaniards, and we will see further that López Madera took an active role in resolving the Morisco problem. For all these reasons, we can ask how the linguistic views of Aldrete and López Madera might be understood in relation to the pressing social question of the Moriscos.

If we look not at the conclusions of the controversy on language origins (Latin vs. Babel), but at the contrasting logics of language that were developed within that debate, there is a striking consistency with the images of human difference that entered into the Morisco debate. We see vividly the truth of Raymond Williams' assertion that "a definition of language is always, implicitly or explicitly, a definition of human beings in the world" (1977:21). Madera's claims about the essential and ineradicable nature of linguistic difference fit well with the pessimism about cultural difference and the emerging racial conception seen in the *limpieza* policies, and in the advocacy for expulsion. Aldrete's vision of the mutability of humans and human relations, in contrast, echoed the moral opposition to expulsion and its hopes for true conversion of the Moriscos.

Scholars have found no answer to the question of why Aldrete finally "felt obligated," as he says, to make his book public when he did. The cautious antiquarian appears to have taken no public position on the Morisco controversy itself, and I do not want to argue that he intended his linguistic work as a coded contribution to the political debate.[38] Aldrete's arguments did not necessarily derive from concern for Moriscos, but they nonetheless applied to them. Within his linguistic enterprise, Aldrete delineated a vision of cultural and linguistic allegiances as mutable, and of conquered populations as highly assimilable and not essentially different. His book provided detailed arguments for,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as well as positive evidence of, the successful social and cultural integration of dominated others in general, and Moriscos in particular. As Colonge (1969–1970:238) has observed, passages throughout Aldrete's first book offered implicit optimistic support for continued efforts to convert Moriscos rather than for desperate final measures.

There are some close resemblances in Aldrete's ideas to arguments and solutions proposed by Pedro de Valencia, with whom Aldrete corresponded.[39] Like Valencia, Aldrete developed a case for miscegenation and against policies such as *limpieza de sangre*. In his discussion of Morisco examples, Aldrete showed the negative effects on assimilation that came from denying a group positions of responsibility and honor (as did the *limpieza* statutes), and from lack of kin ties. Drawing on the Roman conquest of Iberia as well as positive Morisco examples, Aldrete repeatedly pointed out that intermarriage, kinship, and social inclusion changed cultural practices and created unity, new affections, and allegiances. In the interpretive habit of his day, Aldrete's recurrent descriptions of the assimilative effects of Roman civic universalism could be read—and arguably were likely to be read—as providing lessons for the contemporary Spanish state (see Guitarte 1986:135).[40]

Aldrete's position on human difference is a familiar one of Renaissance universalism, a fact that Guitarte has recognized well: "For Aldrete the natural reaction to the human diversity revealed by geographical discovery is assimilation; the recognition of the humanity of new peoples lay in the effort to make them into Spaniards, through conversion. . . . Aldrete's is not an attitude of respect of 'cultural diversity,' but neither is it an attitude of racial superiority" (1986:148).

In contrast to Aldrete's optimistic universalism, López Madera's particularistic vision of national essences denies the possibility of assimilation. We recall the Morisco rebel leader El Zaguer's impassioned question, "Who denies that a man of the Castilian language can follow the law of the Prophet, and that a man of the Morisco language can follow the law of Jesus?" I would answer that López Madera did. His representation of the ineradicable nature of cultural difference fit well with its increasing racialization on the peninsula. Faced with the practical problem of Moriscos in Spain, the particularism that López Madera developed in his linguistic thesis pointed explicitly toward the destruction or expulsion of the inassimilable. And that is exactly what López Madera in fact actively participated in, as an agent of the state.

For Madera, unlike Aldrete, we have direct evidence of a stance on the Morisco question. López Madera clinched his public reputation and his career at the royal court by expelling Moriscos. In 1608 he was sent by the king to investigate the Morisco community of Hornachos, which was known as a center of resistance, a hotbed of alleged murders of Christian travelers and bribery of officials. López Madera became famous for quickly hanging nearly a dozen town leaders, dispatching 170 more to the galleys, and scourging others. Re-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

nowned for his diligence and severity, he returned to expel the inhabitants and was then named to a *junta* overseeing the completion of expulsion throughout Spain.[41] A play was written about his heroic exploits at Hornachos, and the literary light Francisco de Quevedo praised Madera's industry, talent and virtue in overseeing the expulsions (1968:749). In the 1625 edition of his book on the *Excellencies of the monarchy* (in which he lambasted Aldrete), López Madera lauded the "greatness of the work" that King Philip III undertook in expelling all the remnants of the Moors. He mentions with pride that on the King's orders he took an important part in the "danger, care, and work" of expulsion (54r).

To be sure, Aldrete as well as López Madera accepted unquestioningly the rightness of messianic Spanish imperialism. As Cardaillac suggests, both the dominant "discourse of exclusion" expressed in the expulsion and in Madera's work, on the one hand, and the universalistic response of humanists like Valencia or Aldrete on the other, share a common underlying attitude. They both refuse to recognize ultimately "the right to difference." With Cardaillac, we can ask if the impulse to make the other identical to ourselves is not an equally or even more treacherous form of exclusion (Cardaillac 1983:22; see also Vincent n.d.).[42] Egregious acts of empire indeed followed from the universalistic vision of humanity as mutable and perfectible, as is only too well known and documented in myriad studies of colonialism and its legacies.

Nonetheless, there is not simply colonialism; there are colonialisms (Thomas 1994:8). Different visions of empire, such of those of Aldrete in contrast to López Madera, have been consequential in different ways. These differences can matter deeply to people's lives. The Moriscos' tormented experience and desperate attempts to remain in Spain testify vividly to the significance of contrasting social visions that, to a modern audience, might look similarly oppressive. Such significantly different visions of humanity, of nation, and of empire are articulated in apparently arcane and even absurd linguistic debates, such as that between Aldrete and López Madera. This is no doubt one reason why these debates provoke such furor, in our time as well as Aldrete's.

NOTES

1. Sometimes spelled "Alderete;" b.1560 Malaga, d.1641 Cordoba. (See Mondéjar Cumpián 1974 for discussion of the confusion over these dates and places.)

2. Henceforth "*Origin*." Translations are my own, unless otherwise noted.

3. Throughout this paper, "Castilian" and "Spanish" will be used interchangeably to refer to the language in question.

4. On Aldrete from this perspective, see Johnston (1978), Nieto Jiménez (1972), Read (1977).

5. See Abad Nestor (1986), Bahner (1966, 1986), Binotti (2000), Gauger (1967), Molina Redondo (1968), Mondéjar Cumpián (1974, 1992, 1993), Nieto Jiménez (1972), Pozuelo Yvancos (1986), Ward (1993), Wunderli and Braselmann (1980); cf. Guitarte (1986) and Johnston (1978) for alternate views.

6. See also Burke (1969), Dubois (1970), Rothstein (1990) for discussion of the etymological tactic.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

7. We can recognize, however, that human sciences are rooted in interested social positions, so Aldrete may be seen as simultaneously scientific and interested. See Gal and Woolard (2001) for examples of the way that one side of a politically fraught linguistic debate can later come to be defined as objective science.

8. In a recent article, Binotti echoes aspects of Mignolo's view of Aldrete's apparent linguistic imperialism. For example, she reads Aldrete as "lamenting" the fact that Amerindians did not speak Castilian more often, and as implying that use of Amerindian languages in evangelization was a weakness on the part of the Spanish crown (2000:274–75). Such evaluative stances are discoverable in the text only through inferences that may not be fully warranted. However, Binotti nicely observes a greater complexity and innovation in Aldrete's work than Mignolo has recognized. She identifies in Aldrete's admiration of Nahuatl and Quechua imperial language policies a widened appreciation of human languages and a challenge to the prevailing hierarchy of civilized and barbaric languages (ibid.:277–78).

9. This theory is generally called "castellano primitivo" in Spanish commentary. I translate this as "Primordial Castilian" because the English "primitive" suggests the early language was believed to be crude and undeveloped, which is not at all the view defended by López Madera, to be discussed below.

10. On the seventy-two languages of Babel, see Weigand (1942). On the Tubal story and national origin myths more generally, see Allen (1949b), Bahner (1966), Caro Baroja (1992), Eco (1995), Estévez Sola (1990, 1993), Grafton (1990), Lida de Malkiel (1970), Rubio Lapaz (1993), Tate (1954), Tovar (1980), and Viñaza (1978:39).

11. This honored post was as a judge with prosecutorial powers for the capital and royal court. For López Madera as for many others, it was a step toward a position of even greater power in the Council of Castile; see Fayard (1979).

12. On Madera's ideas and exploits, see Alarcos (1934), Bahner (1966), Bermejo Cabrero (1999), Binotti (1992, 1995), Dios (1997), Fayard (1979), Lea (1901:182), Martínez Torres and García Ballesteros (1998), and Pelorson (1972, 1980). I refer to him variously as "Madera" and "López Madera," following the custom of these modern commentators as well as Madera's Spanish contemporaries (for example Ximénez Patón, cited later in this article, and Quevedo 1968:512).

13. Johnston is too dismissive, I believe, of that which is original in Aldrete's text. Binotti (1995) carefully traces antecedents and influences in Madera's work, particularly in the tradition of "laudes Hispaniae." At the same time she rescues Madera's views from the ridicule to which they have been subjected in modern commentary, and she argues innovatively that Madera established new ground that was necessary for Aldrete's own intellectual breakthrough.

14. For details of these events, see C. Alonso (1979), Cabanelas Rodríguez (1965), Caro Baroja (1992), Godoy Alcántara (1868), Hagerty (1980), Harris, (1999, 2000), Kendrick (1960), Menéndez y Pelayo (1928), and Royo Campos (1960). Among contemporary sources now available in print, see Antolínez (1996) and Cueva (1993).

15. For the history of the Moriscos, I have relied especially on Bunes (1983), Candau Chacón (1997), Cardaillac (1979, 1983, 1990), Caro Baroja (1976), Carrasco-Urgoiti (1976), Domínguez Ortiz (1962, 1963–1964, 1994, 1996), Domínguez Ortiz and Vincent (1997), Garcia-Arenal (1975), Garrad (1965), Gutiérrez Nieto (1996), Kamen (1997), Ladero Quesada (1978), Lea (1901), Márquez Villanueva (1998), Monroe (1970), and Reglà (1974).

16. On these fascinating alleged authors, see Cabanelas Rodríguez (1965), Godoy Alcántara (1868), Monroe (1970:7–16), and Márquez Villanueva (1998). However, Harris (2000) argues that Christian humanists and clergy are likely to have participated in the forgery.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

17. On the Turkish problem, see Hess (1969).

18. See Surtz (1999) for Valencian evidence.

19. For discussions of the economic as well as cultural causes of the rebellion, see references listed in note 15.

20. On *limpieza*, in addition to references given in note 15 see Root (1988), Shell (1991), Hernández Franco (1996), Poole (1999), Révah (1971), and Sicroff (1979).

21. Domínguez Ortiz (1996:395–96) describes this peninsular ideology as "biological racism," which he distinguishes from the "cultural racism" directed against American Indians. Some modern commentators do not treat Spanish *limpieza* as racial because it differs from modern conceptions. The emergent concept of race in early modern Spain should not be expected or assumed to be identical to the more familiar one that has emerged since the nineteenth century. Such an assumption, I think, lies behind Braudel's assertion that Spain was not moved by racism toward Moriscos, but rather by religious and cultural hatred (1976:796). When religion and culture are viewed as indelible, they edge into the realm of race. Moreover, the biological conceptualization of *limpieza* in blood, its categorical application, and the hereditary social consequences are all central features of the social construct of race as I understand it to be usefully applied in social science (see also Révah 1971; Perceval 1997). In any case, race in this setting as in others was a social, not a biological fact. The Morisco population of southern Spain was of highly mixed origins (Gutierrez Nieto 1996:976), if not entirely indigenous (Reglà 1974:25). Those labeled "Arabs" on the peninsula were in fact most often of Berber origins.

22. Prohibitions on descendants of those penanced by the Inquisition were generally limited to children and grandchildren (Sicroff 1979:55).

23. López Madera, who I will show played an active role in the eventual expulsion of Moriscos, also characterized the "Moros" against whom Christian Spain waged war as "Españoles." However, his point in doing so was not to cast them as co-members of a nation sharing fundamental social and personal characteristics, as did Valencia. Rather, Madera thus highlighted the advantage the Moros had of knowing the Spanish territory on which they were fighting, and their greater fierceness as foes because they were defending their own homes (1625:72r). Defeating such a well-positioned enemy added to the glory of victorious Christian Spain.

24. Although I argue that Moriscos were being constructed as a race, I mean this as an emergent rather than fully developed biological ideology. Young children were not necessarily seen as damned by their biological parentage so much as by their early nurture. Concern for the loss of Morisco children as potential Christians was one of the sticking points against expulsion. When the royal order was issued, children under the age of four were exempted from expulsion, if their parents agreed. There were also efforts to abduct the youngest children and raise them as Christians.

25. For historiographical controversy over the explanation of expulsion, see among others Braudel (1976:780–97), Domínguez Ortiz and Vincent (1997), Galmés de Fuentes (1993), Gutiérrez Nieto (1996:976–86), Hess (1968), Márquez Villanueva (1998), Reglà (1974), and Vincent (n.d.).

26. Small numbers of Moriscos were exempted from expulsion because their skills—for example in irrigation technology—were needed to prevent complete economic and agricultural disaster. Aristocracy and clergy also protected some Moriscos who stayed (Domínguez Ortiz and Vincent 1997:177, 283).

27. The acerbic Francisco Quevedo also suggested that the "miracle" solution would be more convincing than the theory of Primordial Castilian. Despite the considerable praise he bestowed upon López Madera elsewhere, Quevedo explicitly characterized his linguistic thesis as "fables and dreams" (Quevedo 1968:513).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

28. See Viñaza (1978:19–20), Kendrick (1960:162), Pérez Bayer (1901:109), and Mondéjar Cumpián (1974:812).

29. To be sure, Aldrete views the Visigoths less as conquerors than as heirs of the Roman Empire. However, his citation of authorities on the question of why the Goths wanted to give up their own language and keep the Roman one is quite strained (1606:151–52).

30. Madera's privileging of syntax over vocabulary is just one of the facets of his work that might be considered "modern" and "scientific" if not overshadowed by what came to be viewed as the absurdity of his central thesis on language origins.

31. See Alarcos (1934) and especially Binotti (1995) for detailed discussion of Madera's uses of some of these various terms.

32. "Substance" in the Aristotelian conception that had general currency in López Madera's time meant that which exists absolutely, in and of itself, with no debt to the "accidental" or contingent (Slaughter 1982:16).

33. This characterization is especially interesting given the many contemporary complaints that Moriscos had lost their ability to read, and in many cases speak, Arabic (e.g., Chejne 1983:19).

34. Madera singles out failure of gender agreement for Basque speakers, and Arabic speakers' failure to inflect the first verb for person and tense.

35. Pagden (1982:70) characterizes this idea as a classical commonplace.

36. The linkage of ideologies of etymology and family genealogy was a familiar tool of early modern European scholars. An original order of language was represented in this view as expressing an original order of the world (Bloch 1983:83). Origins in general were seen not only as eternal but as always present (Harris 2000:127; cf. Rothstein 1990).

37. Madera did believe that religious conversion was possible, although apparently not equally for all groups. He wrote that one of the great excellences of Spain was that it had converted thousands of people in the New World to Christianity, but that the Jews were rightfully expelled because they had proved damnably obstinate (1625:53–54v). In another work he asserted that the Church had admitted more converted Gentiles than Muslims to all its honors, and Jews least of all (1601:45r cited in Binotti 1995:67).

38. In one evaluative aside to the lessons of historical conquests, Aldrete indicted contemporary political practice. This may have been a veiled reference to policies toward Moriscos, but the passage is obscure. It will be given detailed consideration in other work, beyond what is possible here. Briefly, in the passage Aldrete discusses ninth-century Muslim conquerors' reversal of policy toward Spanish Christians, from tolerating them when needed for cultivating the land to "doing away with them completely" (*los acabaron de todo punto*) after recognizing how the population had grown. (Valencia's (1997:138) discussion of ways to "*acabar*" a people like the Moriscos resonates with this phrase.) Aldrete then shifts from his past-tense historical narrative to the present tense (suggested a change in focus to contemporary events) to label such practices as a "diabolic scheme" called "reason of state," which laypeople (*hijos del siglo*) put before the law of God in order to gain advantage (1606:139). Reason of state was invoked to justify reversals of policy toward Moriscos and ultimately the expulsion order (see for example Boronat y Barrachina 1992:129, 185; Reglà 1974:49). However, since "reason of state" was also attributed to aristocratic opponents of expulsion, and the entire negatively charged discussion of reason of state was quite ambiguous in the period, the target of Aldrete's condemnation is not clear. Nonetheless, there are again echoes of Valencia's treatise on the Moriscos, and specifically of his criticism of reason of state as applied to the Moriscos (1997:83, 96–97, 104).

39. Aldrete and Valencia were part of the same general circle of humanist scholars. Despite their apparent difference of opinion on the miracle of Sacromonte, Valencia

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

spoke well of Aldrete in at least one letter (Rubio Lapaz 1993:233–34). Valencia's memorial on expulsion was signed in January 1606 (Gómez Canseco 1993:235), and Aldrete's first book was given its imprimatur in Rome in May 1606. I have no evidence at this time, only questions, on whether there was an exchange of ideas or influence around these works, or on whether Valencia had anything to do with Aldrete's decision to publish when he did.

40. One can speculate that Madera criticized Aldrete so vehemently as a traitor to his nation in part because of the implications his views had for contemporary Spanish policy, as much as for its glorious history.

41. On the Hornachos events, see Vilar (1971:273), Lea (1901:182, 347), and Pelorson (1972). Lea suggests that Madera's deployment in the *juntas* may have been more a consequence of problems arising from court intrigues than a reward for his rigorous service.

42. See Dollimore (1984), Greenblatt (1991), Shell (1991), and Todorov (1984) for similar arguments, and Hamlin (1995) for a response.

REFERENCES

Abad Nestor, Francisco. 1986. Las ideas lingüísticas en la modernidad española: Juan de Valdés, Bernardo de Aldrete, La Academia. In *Homenaje a Pedro Sáinz Rodríguez*, Vol. II. Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 1–23.

Al-Hajari, Ahmad ibn Qāsim. 1997. *Kitāb nāsir al-dīn ʿalāʾl-qawm al-kāfirīn (The supporter of religion against the infidels)*. Trans. P. S. van Koningsveld, Q. Al-Samarrai, G. A. Wiegers. Madrid: CSIC.

Alarcos, E. 1934. Una teoría acerca del origen del castellano. *Boletín de la Real Academia Española* 21:209–28.

Aldrete, Bernardo. 1614. *Varias Antigüedades de España, Africa y otras provincias*. Amberes: Iuan Hasrey.

Aldrete, Bernardo. 1972 [1606]. *Del origen, y principio de la lengua castellana ò romance que oi se usa en España. Ideas lingüísticas de Aldrete*. Edición facsimilar y estudio de Lidio Nieto Jiménez, vols. I and II. Madrid: CSIC.

Allen, Don Cameron. 1949a. Some Theories of the Growth and Origin of Language in Milton's Age. *Philological Quarterly* 28:5–16.

Allen, Don Cameron. 1949b. The Legend of Noah; Renaissance Rationalism in Art, Science, and Letters. *Illinois Studies in Language and Literature* 33, 3–4.

Alonso, Amado. 1938. *Castellano, español, idioma nacional. Historia espiritual de tres nombres.* Buenos Aires: Coni.

Alonso, Carlos. 1979. *Los apócrifos del Sacromonte (Granada); Estudio histórico*. Valladolid: Estudio Agustiniano.

Antolínez de Burgos, Justino. 1996. *Historia Eclesiástica de Granada*, ed. Manuel Sotomayor. Granada: Universidad de Granada.

Bahner, Werner. 1966. *La lingüística española del siglo de oro.* Madrid: Editorial Ciencia Nueva.

Bahner, Werner. 1986. Sprachwandel und Etymologie in der spanischen Sprachwissenschaft des Siglo de oro. In *The History of Linguistics in Spain*, ed. Antonio Quilis and Hans-J. Niederehe. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 95–116.

Balibar, Etienne. 1991. Is There a Neo-racism? In *Race, Nation, Class; Ambiguous Identities*, Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein. London: Verso, 17–28.

Bermejo Cabrero, José Luis. 1999. Estudio preliminar. In *Excelencias de la Monarquía y Reino de España*, G. López Madera. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales, ix–lxi.

Binotti, Lucia. 1991. La teoría del "castellano primitivo": El método comparativo a partir de un mito. *Romance Notes* XXXII, 3:221–30.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Binotti, Lucia. 1995. *La teoría del "Castellano Primitivo": Nacionalismo y reflexión lingüística en el Renacimiento español*. Münster: Nodus Publikationen.
Binotti, Lucia. 2000. "La lengua compañera del imperio." Observaciones sobre el desarrollo de un discurso de colonialismo lingüístico en el Renacimiento español. In *Las gramáticas misioneras de tradición hispánica (siglos XVI–XVII)*, ed. Otto Zwartjes. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 259–88.
Bloch, R. Howard. 1983. *Etymologies and Genealogies; A Literary Anthropology of the French Middle Ages*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Blommaert, Jan, ed. 1999. *Language Ideological Debates*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Boronat y Barrachina, Pascual. 1992 [1901]. *Los moriscos españoles y su expulsión*, Vol. II. Granada: Universidad de Granada.
Bourdieu, Pierre. 1989. Flaubert's Point of View. In *Literature and Social Practice*, ed. Philippe Desan, Priscilla Parkhurst Ferguson, and Wendy Griswold. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 211–34.
Braudel, Fernand. 1976 [1949]. *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, Vol. II. New York: Harper & Row.
Bunes, Miguel Angel de. 1983. *Los moriscos en el pensamiento histórico*. Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra.
Burke, Peter. 1969. *The Renaissance Sense of the Past*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
Cabanelas Rodríguez, Darío. 1965. *El morisco granadino Alonso del Castillo*. Granada: Patronato de la Alhambra.
Candau Chacón, Ma. Luisa. 1997. *Los moriscos en el espejo del tiempo*. Huelva: Universidad de Huelva.
Cardaillac, Louis. 1979. *Moriscos y cristianos: Un enfrentamiento polémico (1492–1640)*. Madrid: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
Cardaillac, Louis. 1983. Vision simplificatrice des groupes marginaux par le groupe dominant dans l'Espagne des XVIe et XVIIe siècles. In *Les problèmes de l'exclusion en Espagne (XVIe–XVIIe siècles)*, ed. Augustin Redondo. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 11–22.
Cardaillac, Louis, ed. 1990. *Les Morisques et L'Inquisition*. Paris: Publisud.
Cardaillac, Louis and Jean-Pierre Dedieu. 1990. Introduction a l'histoire des morisques. In *Les Morisques et L'Inquisition*, ed. L. Cardaillac. Paris: Publisud, 11–28.
Caro Baroja, Julio. 1976. *Los Moriscos del Reino de Granada*. Madrid: Ediciones ISTMO.
———. 1992. *Las falsificaciones de la historia*. Barcelona: Seix Barral.
Carrasco-Urgoiti, María Soledad. 1976. *The Moorish Novel; "El Abencerraje" and Pérez de Hita*. Boston: Twayne Publishers.
Chejne, Anwar G. 1983. *Islam and the West: The Moriscos*. Albany, N.Y.: SUNY.
Cohen, Mark R. 1994. *Under Crescent and Cross: The Jews in the Middle Ages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Colonge, C. 1969–1970. Reflets littéraires de la question morisque entre la guerre des Alpujarras et l'expulsion (1571–1610). *Boletín de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona* 33:136–243.
Cueva, Luis de la. 1993 [1603]. *Diálogos de las cosas notables de Granada y lengua española y algunas cosas curiosas*. Edición facsímil. Estudio preliminar de José Mondéjar. Granada: Universidad de Granada.
Dios, Salustiano de. 1997. La doctrina sobre el poder del príncipe en Gregorio López Madera. *Anuario de Historia del Derecho Español* LXVII, 1:309–30.
Dollimore, Jonathan. 1984. *Radical Tragedy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Domínguez Ortiz, Antonio. 1962. Notas para una sociología de los moriscos españoles. *Miscelánea de Estudios Arabes y Hebraicos* XI:39–54.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

———. 1963–1964. Los moriscos granadinos antes de su definitiva expulsión. *Miscelánea de Estudios Arabes y Hebraicos* XII:113–28.
———. 1994. Caro Baroja y los moriscos granadinos. *Cuadernos Hispanoamericanos* 533–34:227–36.
———. 1996. *Los extranjeros en la vida española durante el siglo XVII, y otros articulos*. Seville: Diputación de Sevilla.
Domínguez Ortiz, Antonio, and Bernard Vincent. 1997 [1978]. *Historia de los moriscos; Vida y tragedia de una minoría.* Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
Dubois, Claude-Gilbert. 1970. *Mythe et Langage au Seizième Siècle*: Bordeaux: Ducros.
Eco, Umberto. 1995. *The Search for the Perfect Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Estévez Sola, Juan Antonio. 1990. Aproximación a los orígenes míticos de Hispania. *Habis* 21:139–52.
———. 1993. Algo más sobre los orígenes míticos de Hispania. *Habis* 24:207–17.
Fayard, Janine. 1979. *Les membres du Conseil de Castille a l'époque moderne (1621–1746).* Genève: Librarie Droz.
Gal, Susan and Kathryn A. Woolard. 2001. Constructing Languages and Publics: Authority and Representation. In *Languages and Publics: The Making of Authority*, eds. Susan Gal and Kathryn A. Woolard. Manchester, U.K.: St. Jerome, 1–12.
Galmés de Fuentes, Alvaro. 1993. *Los moriscos (desde su misma orilla).* Madrid: Instituto Egipcio.
García-Arenal, Mercedes. 1975. *Los moriscos*. Madrid: Editora Nacional.
Garrad, K. 1953. The Original Memorial of Don Francisco Núñez Muley. *Atlante* I:198–226.
———. 1965. La Inquisición y los Moriscos Granadinos, 1526–1580. *Bulletin Hispanique* 67:63–77.
Gauger, Hans-Martin. 1967. Bernardo Aldrete (1565–1645): Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte der romanischen Sprachwissenschaft. *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* XVIII:207–48.
Godoy Alcántara, José. 1868. *Historia crítica de los falsos cronicones*. Madrid: M. Rivadeneyra.
Gómez Canseco, Luis. 1993. *El humanismo después de 1600: Pedro de Valencia*. Seville: Universidad de Sevilla.
Graff, Gerald. 1989. Co-optation. In *The New Historicism*, ed. H. Aram Veeser. New York: Routledge, 168–81.
Grafton, Anthony. 1990. *Forgers and Critics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Greenblatt, Stephen. 1991. *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Guitarte, Guillermo L. 1986. La dimensión imperial del español en la obra de Aldrete: Sobre la aparición del español de América en la lingüística hispánica. In *The History of Linguistics in Spain*, eds. A. Quilis and H.-J. Nierderehe. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 129–87.
Gutiérrez Nieto, Juan Ignacio. 1996. Inquisición y culturas marginadas: Conversos, moriscos y gitanos. In *El Siglo del Quijote (1580–1680). Vol. I: Religión, filosofía, ciencia*, Melquíades Andrés Martín et al. Madrid: Espasa, 837–1015.
Hagerty, Miguel José. 1980. *Los libros plúmbeos del Sacromonte*. Madrid: Editora Nacional.
Hamlin, William M. 1995. *The Image of America in Montaigne, Spenser, and Shakespeare*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
Harris, A. Katie. 1999. Forging History: The *Plomos* of Granada in Francisco Bermúdez de Pedraza's *Historia eclesiástica*. *Sixteenth Century Journal* 30:945–66.
———. 2000. Forging Identity: The *Plomos* of the Sacromonte and the Creation of Civic Identity in Early Modern Granada. Ph.D. dissertation. Baltimore: Dept. of History, Johns Hopkins University.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Hernández Franco, Juan. 1996. *Cultura y limpieza de sangre en la España moderna: Puritate sanguinis*. Murcia: Universidad de Murcia.
Hess, Andrew C. 1968. The Moriscos: An Ottoman Fifth Column in Sixteenth-Century Spain. *American Historical Review* LXXIV:1–25.
Hurtado de Mendoza, Diego. 1984 [1578]. *De la guerra de Granada, comentarios por Don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza*. Edited by Manuel Gómez-Moreno. Madrid: La Real Academia de la Historia.
Hymes, Dell. 1974. Introduction: Traditions and Paradigms. In *Studies in the History of Linguistics: Traditions and Paradigms*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Johnston, Mark. 1978. Bernardo Aldrete and Sixteenth Century Historical Linguistics. *Revista de Estudios Hispánicos* 12:441–64.
Kamen, Henry. 1991. *Spain, 1469–1714: A Society of Conflict*. London: Longman.
———. 1997. *The Spanish Inquisition: A Historical Revision*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
Kendrick, T. D. 1960. *St. James in Spain*. London: Methuen.
Kroskrity, P., ed. 2000. *Regimes of Language; Ideologies, Polities, and Identities*. Santa Fe, N.M.: School of American Research.
Ladero Quesada, Miguel Angel. 1978. *España en 1492*. Madrid: Editorial Hernando.
Lapeyre, Henri. 1959. *Géographie de L'Espagne morisque*. Paris: S.E.V.P.E.N.
Lea, Henry Charles. 1901. *The Moriscos of Spain; Their Conversion and Expulsion*. Philadelphia: Lea Bros.
Lida de Malkiel, María Rosa. 1970. Túbal, primer poblador de España. *Abaco* 3:9–48.
López Madera, Gregorio. 1595. *Discurso sobre las láminas, reliquias, y libros que se an descubierto en la ciudad de Granada este año de 1595. Y las reliquias y prophecia que se avia hallado el año passado de 1588*. Granada: Sebastian de Mena.
———. 1601. *Discursos de la certidumbre de las reliquias descubiertas en Granada desde el año de1588 hasta el de 1598*. Granada: Sebastian de Mena.
———. 1625. *Excelencias de la monarquia y reyno de España, en que de nuevo con grande aumento se trata de su origen, antiguedad, sucessiones, preeminencias, y precedencias, nobleza, religion, govierno, perfeccion de sus leyes, valor, y dotrina de sus naturales; grandeza, potencia, y riquezas de sus Reynos, Dignidades y Titulos de sus vassallos, renombres de sus Reyes, y conservacion de su antiquissima lengua hasta aora*. Madrid: Luis Sanchez.
Maravall, José Antonio. 1966. *Antiguos y modernos. La idea de progreso en el desarrollo inicial de una sociedad*. Madrid: Sociedad de Estudios y Publicaciones.
Márquez Villanueva, Francisco. 1998. *El problema morisco (desde otras laderas)*. Madrid: Ediciones Libertarias.
Martínez Ruiz, Juan. 1970. Cartas inéditas de Bernardo J. de Aldrete (1608–1626). *Boletín de la Real Academia Española* 50:77–135, 471–515.
Martínez Torres, José Antonio, García Ballesteros, Enrique. 1998. Gregorio López Madera (1562–1649): Un jurista al servicio de la Corona. *Torre de los Lujanes* 37:163–78.
Menéndez y Pelayo, Marcelino. 1928. *Historia de los Heterodoxos Españoles*, Vol. V. Madrid: Victoriano Suárez.
Mignolo, Walter D. 1995. *The Darker Side of the Renaissance*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Molina Redondo, José Andrés de. 1968. Ideas lingüísticas de Bernardo de Aldrete. *Revista de Filología Española* 51:183–207.
Mondéjar Cumpián, José. 1974. Nuevos datos y documentos para la biografía de Bernardo de Alderete. In *Miscelánea de estudios dedicados al profesor Antonio Marín Ocete*, Vol. II. Granada: Universidad de Granada, 775–829.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

———. 1992. La génesis de una obra (Bernardo J. de Alderete frente a López Madera). In *Estudios de literatura y lingüística españolas. Miscelánea en honor de Luis López Molina*, ed. Irene Andres-Suárez, et al. Lausanne: Sociedad Suiza de Estudios Hispánicos, 457–75.

———. 1993. Estudio preliminar. In Luis de la Cueva, *Diálogos de las cosas notables de Granada y lengua Española y algunas cosas curiosas*. Granada: Universidad de Granada, i–1.

Monroe, James T. 1970. *Islam and the Arabs in Spanish Scholarship (Sixteenth Century to the Present)*. Leiden: E. J.Brill.

Nieto Jimenez, Lidio. 1972. Estudio. In *Del origen, y principio de la lengua castellana ò romance que oi se usa en España. Ideas lingüísticas de Aldrete*. Edición facsimilar y estudio de Lidio Nieto Jiménez, Vol. II. Madrid: CSIC.

Pagden, Anthony. 1982. *The Fall of Natural Man; The American Indian and the Origins of Comparative Ethnology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pelorson, Jean-Marc. 1972. Recherches sur la "comedia" los Moriscos de Hornachos. *Bulletin Hispanique* LXXIV:5–42.

———. 1980. *Les letrados; Juristes castillans sous Philippe III*. Le Puy-en-Velay: Impr. l'Éveil de la Haute-Loire.

Perceval, José María. 1997. *Todos son uno: Arquetipos, xenofobia y racismo. La imagen del morisco en la Monarquía Española durante los siglos XVI y XVII*. Almería: Instituto de Estudios Almerienses.

Pérez Bayer, Francisco. 1901. El viaje de Pérez Bayer. *La Alhambra* IV:57–59, 84–85, 108–10, 152–54, 177–80.

Poole, Stafford. 1999. The Politics of L*impieza de Sangre*: Juan de Ovando and his Circle in the Reign of Philip II. *The Americas* 55:359–89.

Pozuelo Yvancos, José María. 1986. Norma, uso y autoridad en la teoría lingüística del siglo XVI. In *Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, Vol. 34: The History of Linguistics in Spain*, eds. Antonio Quilis and Hans-J. Niederehe, 77–94. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 77–94.

Quevedo y Villegas, Don Francisco de. 1968. *Obras Completas*. Edición y notas de Felicidad Buendía, Vol. I: *Obras en Prosa*. Madrid: Aguilar.

Read, Malcolm K. 1977. The Renaissance Concept of Linguistic Change. *Archivum Linguisticum* (n.s.) 8:60–69.

———. 1978. Cause and Process in Linguistic Change: The Diachronic Study of Language in the Spanish Renaissance. *Archivum Linguisticum* 9:15–23.

Reglà, Joan. 1974. *Estudios sobre los moriscos*. Barcelona: Editorial Ariel.

Révah, I.S. 1971. La controverse sur les statuts de pureté de sang. *Bulletin Hispanique* LXXIII:263–306.

Root, Deborah. 1988. Speaking Christian: Orthodoxy and Difference in Sixteenth-Century Spain. *Representations* 23:118–34.

Rothstein, Marian. 1990. Etymology, Genealogy, and the Immutability of Origins. *Renaissance Quarterly* 43:332–47.

Royo Campos, Zotico. 1960. *Reliquias martiriales y escudo del Sacro-Monte*. Granada: Abadía del Sacro-Monte.

Rubio Lapaz, Jesús. 1993. *Pablo de Céspedes y su círculo: Humanismo y Contrarreforma en la cultura andaluza del Renacimiento al Barroco*. Granada: Universidad de Granada.

Sahlins, Marshall. 1999. Two or Three Things that I Know about Culture. *JRAI* 5:399–421.

Schieffelin, B. B., K. A. Woolard and P. Kroskrity, eds. 1998. *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Shell, Marc. 1991. From Coexistence to Toleration; or, Marranos (Pigs). *Critical Inquiry* 17:306–35.
Sicroff, Albert A. 1979. *Los estatutos de limpieza de sangre; Controversias entre los siglos XV y XVII*. Madrid: Taurus.
Slaughter, M. M. 1982. *Universal Languages and Scientific Taxonomy in the Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sotomayor, Manuel. 1996. Introducción. In *Historia Eclesiástica de Granada*, J. Antolínez de Burgos. Granada: Universidad de Granada.
Surtz, Ronald E. 1999. Moriscas, Written Texts, and the Valencia Inquisition. Paper presented at meetings of the Society for Spanish and Portuguese Historical Studies, La Jolla, Calif.
Tate, Robert B. 1954. Mythology in Spanish Historiography of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. *Hispanic Review* XXII:1–18.
Thomas, Nicholas. 1994. *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel and Government*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
Todorov, Tzvetan. 1984. *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*. New York: Harper Colophon.
Tovar, Antonio. 1980. *Mitología e ideología sobre la lengua vasca: Historia de los estudios sobre ella.* Madrid: Alianza.
Valencia, Pedro de. 1997. *Tratado acerca de los moriscos de España. (Manuscrito del siglo XVII).* Estudio preliminar de Joaquín Gil Sanjuán. Malaga: Editorial Algazara.
Vilar, Jean. 1971. Formes et tendances de l'opposition sous Olivares: Lisón y Viedma, Defensor de la Patria. *Mélanges de la Casa de Velázquez* VII:263–94.
Viñaza, El Conde de la. 1978 [1893]. *Biblioteca histórica de la filología castellana*, Vol. 1. Madrid: Manuel Tello.
Vincent, Bernard. n.d. *La rivière morisque*. Unpublished ms.
Ward, Michael T. 1993. Bernardo Aldrete and Celso Cittadini: Shared Sophistication in Renaissance Linguistic Investigation. *Hispanic Review* 61, 1:65–85.
Weigand, Hermann. 1942. The Two and Seventy Languages of the World. *Germanic Review* 17:241–60.
Williams, R. 1977. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Woolard, Kathryn A. 1998. Introduction: Language Ideology as a Field of Inquiry. In *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*, ed. B. B Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard and P. Kroskrity. New York: Oxford University Press, 3–47.
Wunderli, Peter, and Petra Braselmann. 1980. Positions dialectiques chez Bernardo José de Aldrete. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 25:437–53.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417502000221 Published online by Cambridge University Press