THE LANGUAGE BARRIER: THE PROBLEM OF BILINGUALISM AND MUSLIM-CHRISTIAN INTERCHANGE IN THE MEDIEVAL KINGDOM OF VALENCIA

by ROBERT I. BURNS

THE thirteen-year Valencian crusade by King James of the confederated Arago-Catalan realms ended in 1245, doubling the coastline of Mediterranean Spain and heralding the close of the classical phase of Spain's Reconquest. A subtler and more intense confrontation then began between Muslim and Christian. James the Conqueror needed Christian settlers to defend his new seaboard; he needed as many Muslims as he could keep or attract, to wring profits from the land; and he needed a state of detente between the intermingled communities until he could stabilize Valencia as an independent and prosperous makeweight against his older provinces. This postcrusade story, with its assimilative-antagonistic tensions, its segregation and fraternization, and its bloody revolts and riots, supplies a chapter in the history of acculturative protocolonialism more fascinating and instructive than the crusade itself.[1]

I

Running just below the surface of that story is the mysterious problem of language. How did the dominant minority communicate with the sullen, dissident majority? Obviously numbers of Muslims spoke some Romance, while numbers of Christians had some Arabic. But did the generality of people communicate readily across the religio-cultural lines — in the cities, on the farms, or at the aristocrat-notable level? The question is of cardinal importance for all other aspects of interchange. If the two bodies uneasily co-inhabiting the kingdom stood isolated at the elementary level of language, conditions for forbearance or fusion were very different than if they shared a common tongue.

The meager and ambiguous evidence throughout Islamic Spain has produced two schools of interpretation, neither of which applies to thirteenth-century Valencia satisfactorily. One line of historians and linguistic specialists affirms that Spain's Muslim population was significantly bilingual, with Romance the more dominant or domestic tongue. Another holds that the Muslims generally spoke only Romance, with Arabic the preserve of a negligibly few erudites and officialdom. Some express this in terms of class division, separating the exclusively Romance-speaking masses from the Arabic-centered upper classes. Others phrase the opposition as Romance-speaking rural areas versus cities more hospitable to bilingualism. A number of authors see a chronological distinction: deepening Arabization from the late-eleventh century, under the brief Berber dynasties; they too are reluctant to surrender a considerable survival of bilingualism. Many representatives from the different schools cherish bilingualism as a characteristic peculiar to Spain within medieval Islam, a symbol and vehicle of deeper continuities.

Gew voices have challenged the consensus of the traditionalists. Two have recently spoken from a background of Valencian studies, one an essayist and the other a protagonist of 'ethnological' history. For the essayist the almost exclusively Arabist culture of sixteenth-century Morisco Valencia argues a fully Arabic pattern before the thirteenth-century crusade. For the ethnological historian the early victory of Arabic in Valencia flows logically from the dynamics of his structuralist model. In widening these tentative attacks upon the fundamental promise of the traditionalists, an historian ought to search now for data by regions and by time periods, sensibly allowing both for variety and evolution. The kingdom of Valencia during the crusade-era generation provides such a laboratory for closer investigation.

If the consensus for Romance dominance is impressive, the same cannot be said for the evidence invoked. There is little enough of it for a region like Valencia, so the linguist snatches at historical scraps, while the historian borrows conclusions from linguistic and literary analysis. Worse, the historical evidence lies scattered over a disconcerting sweep of centuries, so that it must be stretched forward to cover very different eras, while the literary conventions or toponymical-anthropomymical sources are by their nature inconclusively achronological. Anecdotal fragments play a major role. Ibn Hazm found it strange that some Muslims near modern Aguilar and Moron in eleventh-century Castile 'did not speak Romance but exclusively Arabic'. Ibn Sida of Denia at midcentury apologized for his inelegant Arabic, pleading the dominance of Romance speech in his environment. Some probative fragments can be fitted into contradictory interpretations, as when the Cid late in that same century had Mozarabs guard Valencia's walls because they knew the ways of Muslims 'and spoke as they did'. All three examples might also be made to reflect an eleventh-century transition into a more extensive Arabic, a stage in evolution away from bilingualism.

In assessing such evidence, not enough attention is paid to total ambience: the symbiosis between city and countryside in Islamic Spain, the sharp differences in regional background and development, the mobility so striking within the Mediterranean Islamic community and the drift of population, and the precise impact of the Berber dynasties. Perhaps the historian and linguistic scholar would be wise to search out comparative analogies from other areas of medieval Mediterranean Islam, as well, and especially to borrow concepts and findings from the behavioral sciences. The language problem involves so much hypothesis and conjecture that no source of light should be disdained.

For the non-Hispanic medievalist, coming to the problem from the outside, the very terms Romance and Arabic with their variants can be confusing. Classical Arabic in its medieval form was a universal or mandarin instrument serving the literati, bureaucrats, and religious figures (groups more interpenetrating than differentiated), with city children frequently learning its rudiments. Vulgar Arabic, at times so debased as to be useless for understanding the Koran, existed in various Spanish dialects; this is the Arabic in question here as a popular speech orientation. Imported Berber, which made some places briefly trilingual and which undoubtedly gained strength during the Almoravid and Almohad years prior to the Valencian crusade, did not take root in Spain; Guichard does argue for an early, intense Berberization of the Valencian region, but this need not have impeded eventual Arabization. Literary Arabic is the most accessible of the Islamic-Mudejar language of Valencia, in a legacy of carefully wrought literature; samples of less elevated work, though rare, are not lacking – for example, a contract of marriage. Some scholars see an echo of vulgar Valencian Arabic in the world-list attributed to the Dominican linguist Raymond Martí, presumably composed in thirteenth-century Valencia or at least in eastern Spain as a handbook for convert work among the conquered Muslims. In 1566 Martin de Ayala, the arch-bishop of Valencia, published an interlinear *Doctrina cristiana en lengua araviga y castellana* for newly converted Moriscos; clumsy and straitened in Latin characters, it offers clues to the pronunciation of Granadan vulgar Arabic. Valencian comprised a distinct dialect, despite the high degree of homogeneity of Spanish vulgar.[2]

What was Romance among Spanish Muslims? Though some describe its early form as a single language, resembling 'perhaps Galician and western Leonese more than any other',[3] it was a congeries which varied and evolved by regions. Aprioristically one might expect in thirteenth-century Valencia some form of Castilian, Aragonese, Catalan, or native Valencian. The Valencian crusaders called such tongues Latin, and a Romance-speaking Muslim a Latinate. Romance was also called *aljamìa*, from *al-'achamuja*. Only in the later Mudejar period did that word assume its modern meaning of any Romance language as written in Arabic or Hebrew characters; the phenomenon itself began earlier and has analogs in other Mediterranean countries. (The corresponding generic term for Arabic was *algaravìa*, from *al-garbi*).

Local chauvinism adds a complicating factor in the case of Valencia. Was Valencian Romance merely a dialect or subform of imported Catalan as it declined into variant shape among the multilingual postcrusade settlers? Or is it a more ancient and honorable form, reflecting immemorial precrusade Romance of the Valencian region, a linguistic bridge proudly uniting over the centuries a common Valencian people who were separated at another level by the accident of Islamic and Christian religions? This latter vision reflects, in local and linguistic form, the wider battle of interpretations about the nature and evolution of Spanish culture: did European Spain absorb and transmogrify its few Muslim conquerors, so that 'the Arabs did not invade Spain', or did a radical discontinuity intervene, profoundly orientalizing the Spaniards?[4]

II

Representative opinions on bilingualism, first for Spain as a whole and then for Valencia, can illustrate and elaborate the several schools. The great Evariste Levi-Provençal concluded that Romance dialects deriving from Latin persisted alongside Arabic in Islamic Spain from the ninth to the fifteenth century; 'a kind of Romance-Hispanic *koine* prevailed in almost all regions', though more in country than city, over Arabic or Berber. Henri Terrasse sees Islamic Spain as becoming 'Arabized only little by little and remaining bilingual', with Romance serving as 'the language of women, the language of the home, often enough that of inmost thoughts'. Emilio Garcia Gomez has showed that Romance Lyric poetry continued, enjoyed presumably by Mozarabs and at least a stratum of bilingual Muslims. Following Julian Ribera Tarrago, he puts Romance as the familiar language of all classes from emir to rustic.

An older historian so widely read as Andrés Giménez Soler taught flatly that the Spanish Muslims 'had not adopted the language of the Arabs' and consequently that Mudejars 'never spoke Arabic'; one or other erudite mastered it, of course, but the common language remained native Romance. Later historians such as F. Arranz Velarde contrast the exceptional literary Arabic with the widespread Romance. Among current authors the Arabist Inwar Chejne has 'widespread bilingualism' yield only to the armies of the Reconquest and thus 'become less prevalent' from the late eleventh century; because of this 'linguistic conquest the Mudejars forgot their Arabic, and 'the language of the Moriscos was Romance'. Titus Burckhardt more cautiously states that 'a large number of the townspeople (we do not know how great a proportion) spoke Romance at home and in the streets'; though literary Arabic was 'thoroughly alive', some Muslims had no Arabic beyond their prayers. Reyna Pastor de Togneri, analyzing the shift from Islamic to Christian Spain, finds 'a certain Romance-Arabic bilingualism which was distributed equally' among Muslims and Mozarabs; unaware of the frequent phenomenon of bilinguality in the Islamic world, she sees this as unique to Spain.[5]

The authority of Ramon Menéndez Pidal, so potent in problems of Spanish history, adds weight to the bilingual case. In his magisterial study on the origins of Castilian, he divided bilingualism into three stages. During Spain's first two centuries of Islamic rule, Romance 'predominated', except for 'extreme cases', educated Muslims and Mozarabs were bilingual, while 'Romance doubtless dominated' the masses. During the tenth and eleventh centuries, despite the flowering of Arabic culture and concomitant languishing of the native spirit, he sees the balance of evidence as favoring the thesis that the previous linguistic situation persisted. From 1099, with Berber influence increasing and Mozarabs leaving en masse, Romance still retained 'considerable social and even literary value', and bilingualism 'continue very strong in all Islamic Spain'. Fragmentary for each stage, his evidence grows progressively weaker until the third stage rests on episodes such as Pope Celestine seeking on missionary knowledgeable in Latin and Arabic to visit the Mozarabs, Jacques de Vitry reporting that

Mozarabs used Latin as a learned language, and the dubious biography of the Valencian Mozarab St. Peter Pascual. Persistence of Romance nomenclature in botany, and the odd phrase or final verse of Romance mixed into a poetical form add little reassurance.[6]

The reader begins to suspect that the Berber dynasties found a real but fading bilingualism, perhaps already minimal or spotty, and further discouraged it – partly by hostility, partly by diminishing and isolating the Mozarabic enclaves, partly by presiding over a far larger influx of Arabic speakers than has been admitted, and mostly by paralleling a continued linguistic acculturation whose origins and momentum anteceded them. Romance ahd endured long enough to influence a mixed Arabic for Spain's masses, the kind of garble which evoked contempt from the otherwise Hispanophile Ibn Khaldun: due to contamination from Romance languages 'the entire urban population' of fourteenth-century Granada 'had come to speak another language, one peculiar to them', an Arabic which seemed 'no longer Arabic'.[7]

The narrower battlefield of Valencian linguistics has its special alarums and excursions. Francisco Carreres y Candi, in his monograph on Valencian a half-century ago englobed within a multivolume standard reference work, summed the older positions and bibliography from the chronicler Beuter up to Simonet, concluding that 'the Arabic tongue was little known by our Muslims, even among the highest social classes'. He conceded a negligibly few bilingual Muslims plus a general familiarity with the Arabic language, and insisted despite 'ancient prejudices' that 'the Iberian Romance language' held the field alone in the Valencian region up to its conquest by King James. Nicolau Primitiu applied this position to the postcrusade Mudejars so exuberantly as to misread an important document and make a convert *faqih* abandon his Arabic to learn Valencian so as to preach to the Muslim masses. The current champion of the traditionalist view, Antonio Ubieto Arteta, insists that Islamization of eastern Spain was merely 'a religious conversion but not a change of culture [*raza*] or of language'; Valencia's Muslims spoke Romance as their basic tongue, the educated adding Arabic. Consequently 'the Valencian region suffered no change in its human structures', either from the eighth-century Arabic conquest or the thirteenth-century Christian reconquest.[8] Current events have politicized this desire to legitimize Valencian as an ancient and perduring language which dominated Islamic Valencia. Fortifying a growing mood of regional autonomy, V.L. Simo Santonja has just published a large volume of eloquent argumentation on the antiquity, superiority, and perennial dominance of Valencian; its impact locally has been strengthened by a reissue of Ubieto's 1975 book with added chapters of linguistic arguments. An academic curiosity has transmogrified into a political polemic.

This legitimation of modern Valencian as a direct descendant of a Visigothic and Mozarabic language shared by Muslims and Christians is firmly dismissed by the eminent Manuel Sanchis Guarner, whose work in historical linguistics of the Valencian kingdom is now the standard. While the Arabic invasion did freeze the several Visigothic dialects we lump together as Mozarabic, Valencia's dialect was 'very different from the present Valencian language', which is 'nothing else than the Catalan imported by the Reconquest' and modified by regional morphological-phonetic elements and some Arabic and Mozarabic vocabulary. Sanchis Guarner does leave the impression of a residually bilingual Islamic and Mozarabic upper class, rather like Menéndez Pidal's position on Valencia. But the influence of Fuster, the feebleness of Mozarabic as a literate language (so that educated Mozarabs 'preferred Arabic', while the masses could hardly resist the steady pressure of Arabic as a superior vehicle), and the significance he attaches to the bilingual Mozarabs as intermediaries between Islamic and Christian regions up to the very invasion by James I – all lead to assume but not express some degree of general triumph by Arabic.[9]

The Valencian historian Roque Chabas, observing that Romance documents prepared by the crusaders for Muslims were regularly in Castilian, suggested that the generality of Valencian Moors had for long been out of contact with their Catalan-speaking neighbors but in touch with Castile. The Arabist Ribera Tarrago arrived at the same conclusion concerning Valencian Muslims, from his examination of surviving words. José Lacarra, speaking for the Ebro Valley residents he has researched so thoroughly, who constituted the immediate prefrontier of Muslim Valencia, believes they spoke 'a Romance idiom'. The archivist Enrique Bayerri, in his monumental volumes on the same region, argues that 'the normal thing was to ignore the Arabic language of the rulers', except for a handful of useful phrases, even the local intellectuals falling back on Romance in their private lives.[10]

Against the range of Romance-dominant schools, Joan Fuster proposes that Valencian Muslims were Arabic speaking at the time of the crusade, and bilingual only by exception. Where the scholars of Romance persuasion argue forward from a much earlier linguistic state, Fuster is driven to his contrary conviction by the obviously unlingual Arabic speech of the Moriscos and assumes that this must represent a precrusade cultural condition rather than a brilliant creation by subjugated Mudejars. Pierre Guichard, in his recent application of anthropological structuralism to the society of Islamic Spain and especially to Valencia, touches lightly on language as a basic structural factor. Of Valencia's Mudejars he concludes: 'contrary to what is sometimes thought, they spoke [only] a vulgar Arabic dialect', so that individual contacts with Christians 'appear to have been relatively limited'. Each position, Guichard's aprioristic and Fuster's aposterioristic, achieves only plausibility unless solid contemporary evidence can be unearthed.[11]

III

Some evidence from the crusade generation is ambiguous; in arranging surrender formalities in Arabic, for example, the conqueror just might have intended a courteous regard for the official language. Taken as a whole, however, the evidence indicates that the two peoples could not normally understand each other, and that the barrier was Arabic. In arranging surrender, King James refers to interpreters. Negotiations with Murcia involved his sending first a ransom-official knowledgeable in the enemy's language (the Christian *exea*) together with a Mudejar. This encounter led to a second, conducted for the king by Dominic Lopez, a settler of Murviedro who 'knew Arabic' and Astruc Bonsenyor 'a Jew who was my secretary of Arabic'; the word each time is *algaravia*. At his subsequent secret meeting with the Murcian envoys, James kept at his side only Astruc 'who was a *trujaman* – that is, crown dragoman or interpreter. Such dragomans formed part of the king's entourage. Ibn Farah (Abenferri), the envoy from Jativa, had to conduct his business 'before my [the king's] dragoman'. At Minorca James sent three agents 'and one Jew whom I had given them for a dragoman'. He had his message to Elche carried 'by one of my dragomans, with the *exea*'. James's agent negotiating with the ruler of Majorca spoke through an accompanying dragoman. Even so unceremonial an occasion as settling a quarrel over irrigation rights between the Christians of Bairén and Benietos in 1244, involving testimony from a local Muslim, required the use of 'a dragoman'.[12]

All the Valencian surrender treaties still extant originated as Arabic or Arabic-cum-Latin documents. Sometimes the authorities prepared matching copies in each language (as they did also with Majorca's whole book of postcrusade land division); at other times they preferred an interlinear system. King James's son Peter has left a description of the charter given by James in 1242 to the Muslims of Eslida and its neighboring towns, the whole being preserved in a copy of 1342. 'The document was written in Latin words, interlineated with Arabic or Saracen letters'. Only the Latin, the copyist noted, was being transcribed for preservation, a circumstance explaining why copied charters usually survive in Latin. The same result came from dividing a bilingual chirograph or double document torn across a line. Thus the crown copy of Uxo's 1250 pact was understandably in Catalan, as was King Peter's 1283 military directive (in Arabic) to his Valencian Mudejars. The restoration of treaty privileges to Alfandech, after a revolt, survives in Latin; but a notation by James II in 1298 attests that he had seen the original Arabic letters, complete with Peter's seal, and had caused this faithful Latin translation to be drawn from that Arabic. An agreement of vassalage between the Muslim lord of Alcala in Valencia and Prince Alfonso in 1244 bears the notation that the originals were in Latin and Arabic. A 1232 surrender of revenue rights by the ex-*wali* of Valencia, Abu Zayd, comes down to us in Latin but still has the Muslim's approval appended in Arabic along with his titles and the date by the Islamic era. The transfer of fealty by the sultan of Murcia from King James to Castile, five months after James's conquest, is annotated: 'written in Latin and Arabic [*en arabigo*]'.[13]

James had the charter for Chivert drawn in both languages; our transcript of 1235 witnesses that the original filled 'thirty-seven lines of Saracen letters, of which I the undersigned notary wrote none in the present copy'. The 37 lines of Arabic at Chivert disconcert at first; the Latin requires over 170 lines of print in a modern book just for the body of text. The Latin of the original however, as the notary betrays in discussing damage to its last lines, ran to no more than 40 lines at most; if the Arabic was more compact than the Latin, the correspondence of 40 lines to 37 indicates an interlineated original. The disparity between 40 Latin lines and 170 probably derives partly from the wholesale abbreviations then prevalent and partly from the oblong shape of the parchment which easily reduced the total of original lines. Any number of humbler, private documents may have had an Arabic counterpart or original now lsot. Mudejars sometimes transferred land titles to Christians by means of an Arabic deed, as at Alcira in 1245. King James referred to such a 'Saracenic instrument' in 1261 when confirming the conveyance of a Carbonera property by the Jativa *qa'id* to the settler Dominic Marqués. So rarely does an early Valencian document actually survive in its original Arabic, however, that the brief agreement of 1277 with the rebel *qa'id* of Finestrat now appears extraordinary.[14]

The intermediary role of bilingual Jawa in Valencia, like that of Sanchis Guarner's Mozarabs, assumes the existence of a language barrier. The 'secretariate of Arabic' was an institution long established in the realms of Aragon, used mostly for foreign contacts but also where necessary for domestic needs. Its incumbents were Jews, valued for their language skills. In 1220 Pope Honorius III had rebuked King James for 'rarely or never' sending diplomats to the caliph at Marrakesh except Jews, who might betray Christendom's plans and secrets. Prince Alfonso had his own Arabic 'office', to which in 1284 he appointed the Jew Bondavid Bonsenyor with instructions 'to cause documents to be drawn or read in Arabic'. Men like Samuel the *alfaquim* drew local instruments in Arabic for Valencia, in their capacity as 'writers of Arabic' for the crown – a safeguard for the Muslims of Carbonera, for example, or 'a certain Saracen parchment of Guadalest'. The Christians' use of Jews as the ordinary intermediaries with Islam oddly enough found no echo among the enemy; Valencian Muslims of the crusade era did not employ Jews as interpreters in surrender negotiations, either because the inimical Berber domination had discredited their use, or because they found it more acceptable to communicate in Arabic while relying on the known institution of royal dragomans. The single use of a Jew occurred at the surrender of Petrercastle – and he had immigrated there only recently when Castilian tributory overlordship had been accepted; James expressed surprise that 'the Saracens had done him no harm'.[15]

Several times in his memoirs King James directly names the the language of the Valencian Islamic kingdom and of the offshore island principates. He has the Murcian ruler of Majorca address the aljama 'in his Arabic'. When Peñíscola unexpectedly sent its offer of surrender in writing, James had to find a Muslim at Teruel 'who knew how to read Arabic' in order to decipher it; the Romance or Latin of this bilingual go-between was Aragonese. The first surrender feelers from Almazora came through Michael Pérez, an esquire of Peter Cornel, who used to bargain for the release of prisoners there because 'he knew Arabic'. A message from the *qa'id* of Bairén, conversely, came by a 'Saracen who knew our Latin [Romance]'; and at Villena the king treated with 'two Saracens, one of whom knew Latin'. Long after the crusade, in 1282, a bill of sale for a Valencian slave thought it worth identifying her specifically as 'a White, Latin-speaking Moor, by name Fatima'.[16]

The word commonly used in King James's memoirs to indicate the speech of the enemy was *algaravia*. To the king this was a synonym for Arabic and for 'the Saracens' language'. He also used *arabich*, as when he sent broadcast to the aljamas of his Valencian kingdom 'letters and messages in Arabic'. His son Peter similarly issued tax instructions 'written in Arabic [*in arabico*] to all the Saracens of the lord king in the realm of Valencia'. These words signified the natural speech, and to all appearances the only speech, of his Muslim subjects. In the surrender documents, a species of permanent constitution for rural as well as urban areas, this *arabich* was demonstrably Arabic. The more ambiguous term 'Saracenesque' (*sarrahinesch*), counterpart to 'Christianesque' (*cristianesch*), could mean Arabic. When King Peter during a North African adventure sent ashore a Christian sailor 'who knew Saracen very well', the precise language is not specified; the Muslims reciprocated by finding 'a Moor who knew how to talk Romance [pla]'. A clearer context was the reception of Mudejar tax accounts at Orihuela in 1317 in *murisch* and their translation into *christianesch*.[17]

On the spontaneous and popular level there is also evidence that the Muslims of eastern Spain spoke Arabic. The ruler of Islamic Majorca heartened the defenders in the hurlyburly of a Christian assault by shouting encouragement in Arabic; King James, catching the hortatory imperative, exhibited his knowledge of Arabic fragments by recording how the Muslim 'cried to his men "roddo!", that is to say "stand".' On another occasion a surrender rather than be killed, proudly chose death with the cry 'Le mulex'; King James interpreted the phrase: 'which is to say, "No, lord".' A less pertinent but nonetheless useful episode comes from Valencia's Granadan periphery after the turn of the century. When the Arago-Catalan forces attacked Almeria in 1310, Prince Ferdinand of Majorca was attacked by the son of the ruler of Guadix, who kept shouting to him: 'Ani be ha soltan!' (probably the colloquial *ani ben as-sultan*, for *ana bnu 's-sultani*). Ferdinand had to learn from the interpreters (*los torsimanys*), with him on the battlefield, that this meant he was a king's son. Such incidents, involving spontaneous speech, suggest that one should apply literally the observation in the *Cronica latina*, written probably by the crusading primate of Toledo, Roderick Jiménez de Rada (d. 1247), that Spanish Muslims were 'a people of a different religion and language'.[18]

The attitude of missionaries in this region may convey something about the language. Raymond Lull deserves a passing nod: though his immediate milieu was the analogous Majorca kingdom, his wider horizons embraced nearby Valencia. He learned 'lo lenguatge arabic', in which he wrote some of his books, from a bilingual slave purchased on Majorca; rather defensively he explains to God in one passage that praising Him in Arabic is a good thing, and that he fears no man for doing so. More to the present point were the famous Arabic language schools set up at both Valencia city and Jativa. The Dominicans concentrated precious manpower there after the crusade, confident of an eventual harvest of Muslims. Though the language schools envisaged an apostolate among the intellectuals or influential figures, and served an area broader than this conquered kingdom, their very location at so early a date, the successes they reported, and the institutionalizing of the missionary efforts as schools of Arabic, point at least to a numerous Mudejar group who handled Arabic familiarly, and implies that Arabic was the only tongue by which they were accessible.[19]

A particularly valuable witness, this time to the Arabic unilingualism of the common man, comes from the last decade of the thirteenth century or the first decade of the fourteenth. By that time the Muslim educated and notable classes had suffered depletion both by loss of real power and by emigration, while adaptation to the conquerors' patterns would have been most intense and as yet unrestricted by legislation or other pressure. Yet the Dominican bishop of Valencia, a saintly scholar-statesman distinguished for his peacemaking services on the larger Mediterranean scene, found the weight of Arabic in Valencia a discouraging incubus. Speaking of the heartland of the new kingdom, where Christian settlers clustered in greatest intensity, he complained in a sermon delivered before his metropolitan that half or even half of his diocese spoke only Arabic. The bishop may have exaggerated for effect, and his proportions leave room for the increase of bilingual Moors expected by that period; but he makes clear that even then the majority of the Mudejar community were unilingual and confined to Arabic.[20]

Without this accumulating evidence, the later Morisco unilingual Arabism would come as a shock, a language revolution unnoticed and unrecorded until long triumphant. By calling the evidence lying neglected in Boronat's old collection of documents, Fusta has called attention to this phenomenon of triumphant Arabic in the sixteenth century. He realizes how improbable it is that the late

Mudejars or early Moriscos forged a universal and exclusive language for their community in the intervening two centuries, with acculturative pressures steadily increasing and the rural classes early coming to predominate. Fuster shows not only that the Moriscos here spoke Arabic exclusively, allowing for a stratum of exceptions, but that both their own leaders and the Christians saw this as a defence for their communal identity and for their religious preferences. Transforming the forced, pseudo-conversion of the Moriscos into genuine conversion would have required learning their language, as zealous ecclesiastic urged; but this, the civil authorities countered, would only consolidate the foe. Destruction of the language itself, as the inner fortress of the Morisco 'nation' had higher priority than conversion. Pretending to use conversion as a means to assimilation, but more shrewdly aiming at acculturation, the crown launched what Fuster describes as 'a war' and 'a systematic offensive' to extirpate Arabic. One effect of this linguaphobia was the incidental documentation about the tenacious strength of Arabic in Valencia.

At a post-rebellion treaty in 1528 the Valencian Moriscos reminded Charles V that 'in the said kingdom the greater part of the Moorish men and almost all the women' were ignorant of Romance (*aljamia*) and that to learn it would require 'a very long span of time', at least forty years. The emperor fatuously gave them ten years to learn Castilian or Valencian. The parish rectors in 1550 found communication impossible because Valencian Moors 'do not know' Romance; some thought their isolation from Christian contact to blame, but Morisco attitudes indicate that the isolation was sought to protect the language and way of life. The bishop of Orihuela found Moorish women especially 'stubborn and resistant to our language'; he considered 'their language an impediment to their conversion', a device of the aljama *alfaquis* who thereby sustained the whole fabric of Moorishness. Moriscos in Aragon proper, who had lost their grasp of literary Arabic, sent their children to Valencian parts to study it. A Morisco commoner, on the other hand, though he could 'read and write [vulgar] Arabic,' confessed that he understood 'little or nothing of the book of the Koran'. A Moor of Chiva, who 'had never spoken or written except in Arabic', seem to represent the norm, with bilingual Moors the exception.

At that time the Valencian aljamas still kept their intra-aljama records of contracts, marriages, sales, and the like in Arabic, a number of Valencian Christians fell into the Arabic speech of their neighbors, so that later the government was able to use them as spies. Converts wrote religious books in Arabic for their reluctant fellow Moors; Muslim pedagogues countered with classes in Arabic. Fuster points to 'a veritable public documentation [in Arabic] which guided the daily life of the aljamas'. He describes 'the fight against Arabic' waged grimly by sixteenth-century Christians, and sees all this as a key to understanding the Morisco problem and the tension between the two peoples.[21]

The accumulating evidence impresses. If it does not lead inexorably to an exclusively Arabic-speaking populace, it does demand readjustment of currently held theories, a revision which nunaces also the traditional understanding of Spanish Muslim society. The Arabic-speaking stratum in Valencia was, at the least, far more numerous than previous commentators allowed for; it must have included not only the professional and administrative classes, and the average horseman in battle, but the generality of people who were not at the lowest level of proletariat and rustic. The tradesman, the elders of a smaller town, the multitudinous owners of better farms, the prosperous share-farmers (*exarici*) – all those most visible as the people of a place, all those not faceless, in short the generality of folk with even moderate influence – were Arabic speaking.

This just may leave room for the theory that the masses still clung to a garbled Romance – the despised 'rustic' in hamlet and countryside, the poorer classes of *exarici*, the lowliest laborers or workers in the city, perhaps the sheepmen, minstrels, fishermen, and muleteers. Numerically formidable, their language would have survived in life's backwaters. Sealed away in their lowly anonymity, incapable of real communication in Arabic beyond the necessities of the market-place, they would have been useless as translators and unacceptable to both sides in responsible public actions. If the speakers of Arabic had some grasp of Romance, to cope with such classes, it must have been as rudimentary and ineffective as the Romance-speakers' Arabic, at the level of the tourist or resident colonial. More probably these rural masses had already lost their Romance too and spoke Arabic.

In a cosmopolitan region like the eastern coast, special 'Latiniate' or bilingual Moors surely were at least as common as Arabic-speaking Christians. From their ranks came the interpreters, the friars' language instructors, and the Moorish members of a Christian lord's household; but as individuals they shed no light on the language of the populace at large. The full picture of thirteenth-century Valencian society therefore, as conjecturally reconstructed in the light of fresh evidence, suggests either a largely Arabic-speaking rather than bilingual population or less probably a people divided by language. If divided, the Arabic speakers covered a wide range including illiterates, with the Romance speakers generally illiterate and anonymous. (Such a divided Muslim community would have had little occasion for extensive intracommunication, bridging the gap by garbled phrases of vulgar Arabic.) In short, Arabic was the common coin of the Valencian world encountered by most crusaders, merchants, administrators and settlers.

IV

The full revision of the accepted traditionalist position can be presented in several conclusions. (1) The Arabic-speaking classes comprised a very broad sector of the population, and not a small elite, at the very least, in precrusade Valencia. (2) The Romance-speaking masses, if any, were nearly invisible in public affairs; they must have had at least a bilingual grasp of vulgar Arabic. But the evidence indicates that the masses were already confined to Arabic; just like the generality of the upper and middle classes. (3) After the crusade, when the literate and administrative classes emigrated in disproportionate humbers, while the farmers stayed as prized resources for the Christian landlords, it was precisely the masses who clung to Arabic, with an intransigence obviously owing less to their increasing isolation than to a proud, deliberate sense of cultural identity.

(4) After the crusade the incidence of Romance may have risen sharply; occasions for its use multiplied as Christian settlers moved in. By the late 1250's a full generation of Mudejars had grown up under Christian rule, many of them doubtless absorbing the conquerors' language. As Ibn Khaldun saw clearly, the conquered tend to imitate their conquerors.[22] The young, the facile, the adaptable, the opportunist, and to some extent all those thrown into closer contact with Christian neighbors, who comprised the new establishment, would either acquire or sharpen Romance. This in turn set the stage for that mingling and transdescending of religio-cultural differences which triggered restrictive legislation and polemic. It could also have amplified the residual 'Mozarabic' element, the old Valencian some scholars see as legitimation and bridge for a modern Valencian independent and non-provincial.

(5) After the postcrusade revolts, the picture changed. The destruction of political hopes by the conquest of Montesa, the increasing absorption of Valencia into a European mood as immigration and Catalan institutions worked their influence, the increas-

ing loss of leader classes by emigration, the growing isolation and eventually the active search for cultural islands by the more zealous Mudejars now in retreat from the pressure of Christian presence – all combined to discourage neo-Romance except among that minority who kept a foot in both worlds or who drifted into the European orbit for opportunist reasons.

When the Arabist orientation began to predominate in precrusade Valencia is difficult to say. The region had long been a unique corner of Spanish Islam, something of a frontier far from the feeble heart of Cordova caliphate. It assumed its cultural and linguistic forms by slow evolution, with a turning point probably under 'Abd ar-Rahman III in the tenth century. A seaboard community, linked horizontally with the Near East and vertically with North Africa, its non-peasant elements lay unusually open to external Islamic influences and population drift. The early dominance of Romance, wearing ever thinner, must have been badly eroded by the opening of the twelfth century, with the mass emigration of Mozarabs only contributing to a deeper charge long at work in the cultural patterns and now presided over by the Berber dynasties.

The language revolution began long before the Berber dynasties arrived, accelerated during the twelfth century, and triumphed at least by the Almohad era. All the Valencian crusade or postcrusade evidence encourages this conclusion. Rejecting it merely postpones and intensifies a revolution by which the Mudejars would then have had to destroy conclusively their immemorial Valencian Romance, their intimate tongue of home and daily living – a phenomenon improbable and unrecorded by contemporaries. The precrusade evolution or spread of Arabic probably was weakened by the coming of the Christian conquerors, until in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries new factors reversed the trend: increasing isolation in the countryside, increasingly restrictive legislation, and reflexive zeal by the *'ulama* or community leaders. The protective ramparts of Arabic, a barrier to ready communications with the Christian settlers from the fall of Valencia city on, eventually became the Morisco barricades.

Even if one were to concede the traditionalists' near-universal Romance dominance, or a maximum bilinguality, their understanding of the life-situation would still be wrong. A special form of language barrier would still have stood between Muslim and Christian; the thin stratum of classical Arabic speakers among the upper class would still have posed a disproportionate obstacle. In anthropological terms, the Arabic of the dynamic establishment figures, both in city and countryside, comprised a main boundary –

maintaining mechanism for Valencia's Islamic culture. This was more true for Arabic in Islam than for the role of Latin in Europe, because of the interpenetrating nature of the Islamic establishment. It was more true also because Arabic was a language essentially sacred in a sense that Hebrew, Latin, or Greek were not. In such a situation of Arabic-Romance bilingualism basic communication between Valencian Muslims and Christians might indeed have been easy; but the linguistic-cultural frame would have emphasized the separateness of each world, so that the very communication paradoxically would only have intensified the sense of alienation.

By any interpretation, language was a problem in postcrusade Valencia, and entered the texture of the conquered kingdom's larger social problems. When all the evidence is brought to bear it seems reasonable to conclude that the role of Arabic here went far beyond the framing function of a formal or mandarin tongue, profound as the implications of such a bilingual situation would have been. It was a problem in the very mechanics of daily living. Each people spoke a different language in Valencia, without a significantly diffused bilinguality. Language had to have been the primary perceived difference and alienating factor between Muslim and Christian here.

NOTES:

[1]On the crusade and postcrusade developments see my *The Crusader Kingdom of Valencia: Reconstruction on a Thirteenth-Century Frontier*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), *Islam under the Crusaders: Colonial Survival in the Thirteenth-Century Kingdom of Valencia* (Princeton, 1973), *Medieval Colonialism: Postcrusade Exploitation of Islamic Valencia* (Princeton, 1976), and my forthcoming *The Crusader-Muslim Predicament: Colonial Confrontation in the Conquered Kingdom of Valencia* (Princeton), with their bibliographies and introductions.

[2]*Vocabulista in arabico*, ed. Celestino Schiaparelli (Florence, 1871), moot attribution to Martì (1230-1286)) from Simonet to Coromines, authors have variously sited its composition, with opinion currently favoring D.A. Griffin's argument that it is a copy done in the Catalan regions, perhaps on Mallorca, but reflecting thirteenth-century Valencian speech. Julian Ribera Arrago, 'La doctrina cristiana en lengua arabiga, de Martin de Ayala', *Disertaciones y opusculos*, 2 vols. (Madrid, 1928), II, 330-335.

Pierre Guichard, 'Le peuplement de la région de Valence aux deux premiers siècles de la domination musulmane', *Mélanges de la casa de Velazquez*, V (1969), 103-158. On Valencian Arabic see also G.S. Colin, 'Al-Andalusia *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2d edn., 4 vols. to date (Leiden, 1960ff.), I, 501-503; he allows for possible differentiations on a large scale among the rural Moors of Valencia, but they may just as well have shared the town vernacular except where Romance held the field. Ramon Menéndez Pidal in his study 'Sobre Aluacaxì y la elegia arabe de Valencia' cautions that Valencian vulgar Arabic was not involved, the elegy being an ignorant reconstruction of an Arabic text from a Castilian translation by a Christian or Jew at the end of the thirteenth century (*Homenaje a D. Francisco Codera en su jubilacion del profesorado: Estudios de erudicion oriental*, ed. Eduardo Saavedra *et alii* [Zaragoza, 1904], pp. 393-409). See Ribera's 'La elegìa de Valencia y su autor', *ibid., pp*. 275-291.

[3]Pedro Aguado Bley, summing the opinion of Codera and others, in his still popular and recently reprinted *Manual de historia de España*, 3 vols. (Madrid, 1947), I, 456.

[4]Ignace Clogue's 1969 French volume with that title is now gaining wider readership as *La revolucion islamica en occidente* (Guadarrama, 1974).

[5]Lévi-Provençal, *Histoire de l'Espagne musulmane*, 3 vols. (Paris, [1950-1953] 1967); revised in translation by Emilio Garcìa Gomez, *España musulmana hasta la caìda del califato de Cordoba(711-1031 de J.C.)*, 2 vols., in Ramon Menéndez Pidal *et alii*, *Historia de España*, 12 vols. to date (Madrid, 1957 ff.), IV, xix, 47-48, and V, 96, 103-104, with opinions of Terrasse, Ribera, and the editor Garcìa Gomez. Gimìnez Soler, *La edad media en la corona de Aragon* (Barcelona, 1944), pp. 293-294. Arranz Velarde, *La España musulmana (la historia y la tradicion* (Madrid, 1941), p.71. See also S.M. Imamuddin, *Some Aspects of the Socio-Economic and Cultural History of Muslim Spain, 711-1492 A.D.* (Leiden, 1965), pp. 134-135, 187-188; and on the earlier period but by implication applicable to the later, M.W. Watt and Pierre Cachia, *History of Islamic Spain* (New York, 1967), p. 56. Chejne, *Muslim Spain: Its History and Culture* (Minneapolis, 1974), pp. 184-185, 375-377. Burckhardt, *Moorish Culture in Spain* (London, 1972), p.81. Pastor de Togneri, *Del Islam al Cristianismo: En las fronteras de dos formaciones economico-sociales, siglos XI-XIII* (Barcelona, 1975), p. 38.

[6]Menéndez Pidal, *Orìgenes del español, estado linguìstico de la peninsula ibérica hasta el siglo xi* (3rd edn. revised, [Madrid, 1950]), pp. 418-432, with the crusade and precrusade period on pp. 425 ff.

[7]Ibn Khaldun, *The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History*, transl. Franz Rosenthal, 3 vols. (Princeton, '967), III, 352. On p. 367 he contrasts the Berbers, who have a mere gloss of Arabic speakers over a Berber-speaking population, with Spain where Arabic plays a greater role and non-Arabic speakers were more recent immigrants; in such comments on contemporary, as against historical Spain, Granada is meant. Spaniards also

displayed interior differences of dialect (pp. 351-353). On the linguistic borderline between the Tortosa and Valencia diocese, which falls deeply within the Valencian kingdom, coincides with the older frontier between Islamic Tortosa and Valencia, and probably reveals pre-Arabic dialect divergences, see the discovrey of Ramon Menéndez Pidal, 'Sobre los limites del valenciano', *Primer congrès interbacional de la llengua catalana* (Barcelona, 1908), p. 342, with its application in my *Crusader, Kingdom Valencia*, I, 43 and II, 391.

[8] Carreras y Candi, 'El lenguaje valenciano', book-length study within *Geografia general del reino de Valencia*, 5 vols. (Barcelona, 1920-1927), vol. *Reino de Valencia*, pp. 570-585, esp. p. 583. For Primitiu in his *Recordances de Sant Vicent Ferrer* (Valencia, 1950) see the refutation by Manuel Sanchis Guarner, *La llengua dels valencians* (Valencia, 1972), pp. 134-135. Ubieto, *Origenes del reino de Valencia: Cuestiones cronologicas sobre su reconquista* (Valencia, 1975), pp. 90, 190-191.

[9] Sanchis Guamer, *Introduccion a la historia linguistica de Valencia* (Valencia, 1950), pp. 135-136, 144, 147. See also his *Els parlars romanics de València i Mallorca anteriors a la reconquista* (Valencia, 1961), pp. 53, 59-61, 99; *Els valencians i la llengua autoctona durant els segles XVI, XVII, i XVIII* (Valencia, 1963), pp. 58-62, and on the vulgar Arabic pp. 95-96; and his more recent *Llengua dels valencians*, pp. 118-119, 134. Sanchis Guamer is persuaded by the exiguous evidence, as I am not, that a sufficient community of Mozarabs remained in Valencia to serve as intermediaries for the crusaders and to influence the alteration of their Catalan into Valencian. Among the valuable fragments extent for reconstructing Valencian Mozarabic speech, the personal and place names of King James's *repartimiento* for land distribution are particularly important.

[10] Chabas, 'Viaje literario al archivo general de la corona de Aragon', *El archivo*, I (1886), 190. Ribera, *Disertaciones*, II, 352-357, esp. p. 355. Lacarra, 'La reconquista y repoblacion del valle del Ebro', in K.M. Font y Rius *et alii*, *La reconquista española y la repoblacion del pais* (Zaragoza, 1951), p. 69. Bayerri, *Historia de Tortosa y su comarca*, 8 vols. to date (Tortosa, 1933 ff.), VI, 423-427, citing Ribera, Sanchez-Albomoz and others.

[11] Joan [Juan] Fuster, *Poetes, moriscos, i capellans* (Valencia, 1962), sections on 'La llengua dels moriscos' and 'La lluita contra l'algaravia', pp. 95-113; also in his *Obres completes*, 4 vols. (Barcelona, 1968-1975), I, 408-416, 426-430. Pierre Guichard, *Al-Andalus, Estructura antropologica de una sociedad musulmana en occidente* (Barcelona, 1976), pp. 23-29 on the historiography of hispanicity versus discontinuity, p. 33 (quotation), pp. 271-272, 393-402 on non-linguistic evolution of Valencia.

[11] King James I, *Llibre dels feyts*, facsimile edn. (Barcelona, 1962); also in *Les quatre grans croniques*, ed. Ferran Soldevila (Barcelona, 1971); also as *Crònica*, ed. J.M. de Casacuberta, 9 vols. in 2 (Barcelona, 1926-1962): chaps. 78, 436, 437, 439 on Murcia; 119 (Minorca), 321, 416. The irrigation document is in Roque Chabas, *Distribucion de las aguas en 1244 y donaciones del termino de Gandia por D. Jaime I* (Valencia, 1898): 'trugaman'.

[13] Bibl. Univ. Valencia, cod. 145, Bulas, reales ordenes y concordias sobre diezmos, doc. 21 (May 29, 1242): 'Carta scripta erat latinis diccionibus, interliniata literis arabicis vel sarracenicis, idem quod ipse dicciones latine significantibus in effectu; series vero dicti privilegii quantum ad dicciones latinas sequitur sub hac forma'. The Eslida and Uxo charters are conveniently in the documentary appendix of Francisco Fernandez y Gonzalez, *Estado social y politico de los mudejares de Castilla, considerados en si mismos y respecto de la civilizacion española* (Madrid 1866), docs. 15 and 23; Peter's 1283 order is doc. 53, the Murcia treaty doc. 47. The Alfandech charter is in the Arch. Crown (Archivo de la Corona de Aragon) at Barcelona: James II, Reg. Canc. 196, fol. 164: 'de arabico in latinum ad mandatum nostrum'. The Abu Zayd concessions in in *El archivo*, IV (1890), no. 16; that of al-Azraq the lord of Alacla is *ibid.*, I (1886), pp. 204-205. The *repartimiento* dividing Majorca exists in both Latin and Arabic versions; the Arabic may be the lost original of 1232 or a contemporary copy, the Latin and Catalan versions, of 1267, reflecting either a translation or a Latin original. The Arabic was published by Jaime Busquets Mulet, 'El codice latinoarabigo del repartimiento de Mallorca', *Homenaje a Millas-Vallicrosa*, 2 vols. (Barcelona, 1954-1956), I, 243-300.

[14] Arch. Crown, James I, Reg. Canc. II, fol. 199 (April 9 1261): 'vobis Domenico March [esii] ... prout in instrumento sarracenico'. For the Finestrat document and episode see my *Islam under the Crusaders*, p. 333. The Chivert charter is in *Homenaje a Codera*, pp. 28-33. The land sales at Alcira, 'a sarracenis ... cum cartis sarracen[is]is', entered a legal dispute in 1245 (see my *Islam under the Crusaders*, p. 267 and n.).

[15] Arch. Crown, Peter III, Reg. Canc. 41, fol. 97 (March 27, 1279): 'tradidimus Samueli alfaquimo quandam literam assecuramenti Sarracenorum de Carbonera que erat sarracenica'. Reg. Canc. 44, fol. 142v (June 22, 1279): 'tradidimus Samueli alfaquimo quandam cartam perhamini sarracenicam ... de Godalest [Guadalest]'. Reg. Canc. 48, fol. 6v (April 29, 1280): 'quandam literam sarracenicam que ut Samuel alfaquimus dixit ...' *Libre dels feyts*, ch. 414: two envoys 'e i Juheu que.y estava en temps d.En Joffre e.ls Sarrains no. l havien negun mal feyt'. On use by Jews of the crown see my *Islam under the Crusaders*, pp. 253-254 and *passim*, and my *Medieval Colonialism*, ch. VIII, part 5. The pope's letter is in Solomon Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century: A Study of their Relations During the Years 1198-1254, Based on the Papal Letters and the Conciliar Decrees of the Period*, 2d edn. rev. (New York, 1966), doc. 45 (Nov. 4, 1220). Bonsenyor is in David Romano, 'Los hermanos Abenmenassé al servicio de Pedro el Grande de Aragon', *Homenaje a Millas-Vallicrosa*, II, 255 (Feb. 13, 1284).

[16] *Llibre dels feyts*, ch. 79: 'en sa algaravia'; ch. 182: 'faem la ligir a i Sarahi que havia en Terol, qui sabia ligir d.algaravia'; ch. 189: 'sabia algaravia'; ch. 411: 'ii Sarayns ... i d-aquels era latinat'. Francisco Roca Traver, 'Un siglo de vida mudejar en la Valencia medieval (1238-1338)', *Estudios de edad media de la corona de Aragon*, V (1952), 177n.: 'una

mora blanca latinada per nom Fatom'. Sanchis Guarner refutes the suggestion that the Peñiscola Muslims were speaking either Valencian or Aragonese in that episode, and argues that the Teruel Moor's Romance was Aragonese (*Historia linguistica de Valencia*, pp. 142-143).

[17] *Llibre dels feyts*, ch. 367: 'cartes e missatges en arabich'. Arch. Crown, Peter III, Reg. Canc. 46, fol. 221v (July 9, 1284): 'fuit scriptum in arabico universis Sarracenis domini regis regni Valencie'. Muntaner, Cronica, ch. 85: 'sabia molt be sarrahinesch'; the Muslims 'hagren un moro qui sabia parlar pla' — a medieval idiom for Romance, as when documents were 'en lati o en pla'. The Orihuela accounts are in *Rentas de la antigua corona de Aragon*, ed. Manuel de Bofarull y de Sartorio, in the *Coleccion de documentos inéditos del archivo general de la corona de Aragon*, ed. Prospero de Bofarull y Mascaro *et alii*, 41 vols. (Barcelona, 1847-1910), XXXIX, 109ff.: 'reebre los comptes murischs et trasladar aquells en cristianesch'. For a 'litera sarracenica' of 1280 by Jativa Muslims paying taxes, see my *Medieval Colonialism*, p. 223n.

[18] *Llibre dels feyts*, chaps. 60, 85, 247. *Cronica latina de los reyes de Castilla, edicion critica* (ed. M.D. Cabanes Pecourt [Valencia: 1964]), p. 114: 'populum alterius religionis et lingue'.

[19] An account of the schools and their bibliography is in my 'Christian-Islamic Confrontation in the West: The Thirteenth-Century Dream of Conversion', *American Historical Review*, LXXXVI (1971), 1386-1434.

[20] *Collectio maxima conciliorum Hispaniae et novi orbis*, ed. José Saenz de Aguirre, 6 vols. (Rome, 1753-1755), V, 286: 'Audivi namque e bonae memoriae episcopo valentino hoc publice praedicante: quod tot vel plures sunt in sua diocesi mezquitae Sarracenorum quot ecclesiae Christianorum, et tot vel plures ... scientes loqui algaraviam seu sarracenice quot e contra'. Reported to Benedict XII by the metropolitan Arnold as an eyewitness. Though dated 1337, the report quotes 'the late' bishop of Valencia; this cannot be the reigning Raymond of Gaston (1312-1348) but only Raymond Deçpont (1289-1312), former governor of the Ancona march at Rome, chancellor and intimate of the kings of Aragon, protector of the poor, who brought the twenty-year war of the Sicilian Vespers against France to a close and helped resolve a number of lesser difficulties (see my *Crusader Kingdom of Valencia*, I, 27; E. Olmos y Canalda, *Los prelados valentinos* [Valencia, 1949], pp. 77-82).

[21] Quotations from Fuster (see above, note 11). See also Sanchis Guarner, *Els valencians i la llengua autoctona*, pp. 60-62.

[22] *Muqaddimah*, I, esp. ch. 2, sections 22-23, and ch. 3, section 5.