

1. Introduction

In large measure, this introduction will be different from what we are familiar with in editions of Juan de Valdés's *Diálogo de la lengua* (henceforth, 'Valdés' and 'the *Diálogo*'). There are two main reasons for that: on the one hand, there would be little intellectual capital in replicating what has already been written and re-written on Valdés and his life; on the other hand, I intend to venture boldly into fresh terrains, so as to encourage debate on a subject that, perhaps unjustifiably, has broadly been regarded as done and dusted. Thus, the overarching rationale that has informed this edition is to take the discourse on the *Diálogo* to new heights, generate further interest and more serious debate than has been the case, and, in the process, expand the limits of current knowledge on the subject, by flagging and outlining problems, reporting fresh information, and putting forward educated hypotheses, as appropriate.

An integral part of the edition's objective is to make a case for a wider and more open recognition of Valdés as one of the Spanish Renaissance linguistic thinkers, and of his *Diálogo* as a serious (socio)linguistic work. It is believed that not only should such an approach produce a fitting introduction to an edition of this kind, but also that the edition would be deficient without it. Readers who are interested in such already widely available information as Valdés's family background, education, personal character and temperament, politico-ideological inclinations, controversies, idiosyncrasies, humanist credentials, diplomacy, religious thought, as well as in other works of his, are encouraged to consult the list of editions of the *Diálogo* and the select bibliography, both of which can be found at the end of this introduction.

1.1 The *Diálogo* as a Bone of Contention

‘The *Diálogo de la lengua* of Juan de Valdés is commonly misunderstood’ (Navarrete 2004: 3). This seemingly simple observation is, in fact, a Pandora’s Box, the dimensions of which will gradually emerge as this introduction develops. The rest of this section will be devoted to outlining, describing, calling into question, and arguing against, some of the major factors that I believe have been responsible for the said misunderstanding (and the subsequent misrepresentation) of the *Diálogo*.

Valdés’s work on Castilian has been traditionally perceived as anything other than a serious sociolinguistic commentary on the state of his language in the early 16th century. The main strands of that traditional perception can be summarized as follows:

- (a) The *Diálogo* is literature: ‘Hay obras literarias [como el *Diálogo*] a propósito de las cuales se puede hablar de la época a que pertenecen como de un factor cooperante a su creación’ (Montesinos 1928: LXXI).¹ In his ‘examination of literary prose’ in 16th-century Spain, the *Diálogo* was one of 40 works selected by Keniston (1937), specifically for its ‘literary form and content’ (p: xvi). And Barbolani (1982: 45) studied the *Diálogo* ‘desde un punto de vista más literario’, since there is ‘un Valdés de las historias literarias, conocido casi únicamente por esta obra [es decir, el *Diálogo*]’
- (b) The *Diálogo* is only a set of casual notes quickly dashed out by Valdés to his friends, ‘para que los italianos entendieran mejor lo que escribía’ (Lapesa 1940: 14); ‘[p]ropósito—más acorde con su actividad fundamental—en la redacción

¹ Montesinos was acknowledged as the best Spanish authority on Valdés: ‘el mayor de los valdesianos españoles’ (Asensio 1960: 101).

del *Diálogo*. Y es la preocupación que Valdés siempre sentía por hacer llegar a los discípulos sus ideas religiosas' (Lope Blanch 1984: 11)

- (c) The *Diálogo* is a trivial scribble by 'an amateur philologist' (Perry 1927: 1), who 'dealt in a somewhat cursory way with the subject of grammar, [...] only touching on one or two elementary rules' (ibid.: 47), to the extent that he could only be considered, at best, a marginal figure in Renaissance linguistic thought in Spain: 'Su nombre debería, en rigor, quedar al margen de la escuela lingüística española, que con tantos ilustres cultivadores contó durante todo el Renacimiento' (Lope Blanch 1984: 13)

Within this broad representational framework (and its ramifications), the *Diálogo* has been largely excluded from important linguistic works on Renaissance Castilian. We find various permutations of the above strands, across the literature, regarding what the *Diálogo* is perceived to be and not to be. There is a partial consolation, however. The work is a multi-faceted one and can serve as a starting point for different research foci: 'The dialogue is thus uniquely suited to deal with matters on which opinions may differ as opposed to those which may be known with certainty' (Hart 2001: 302). Notwithstanding this, the fact also remains that a single, short, piece of work like the *Diálogo*, cannot, realistically, be everything, at the same time; once purged of its literary attributions and fictional cloak, that multiplicity of foci on the work begins to dissipate.² In his study of Spanish Renaissance linguistic

² Consider, for instance, the contrast between these two statements: 'The *Diálogo de la lengua* is not the transcription of an actual conversation but a revision by Valdés of

thinkers, from Nebrija (1492) up to Correias (1627), Ramajo Caño (1987) does not include Valdés in his otherwise comprehensive inventory of grammarians.³ Some of the major factors that have cumulatively contributed to the emergence and spread of the misunderstanding of the *Diálogo* were discussed by Anipa (2007), a work that will be drawn on, over the next sections, in the explanation of the nature and effects of the main factors in question.

1.1.1 The Socratic Dialogue Form

The genre in which the *Diálogo* was written has contributed towards its misfortunes. A grammar text is not usually written in dialogue form; for pedagogical reasons, the conventional form of a grammar (from pre-modern times) is that of a reasonably well-structured piece, with a clear table of contents, clearly defined front matter, well-displayed verb paradigms, and a fair sample of other grammatical categories well covered, etc. The dialogue genre is not conducive to these structural features, a state of affairs that has worked against the perception, and eventual status, of the *Diálogo*, from the time of its first appearance in print, in the 18th century.

Another effect of the dialogue form is that studies of the work have generally taken the fictional characters around whom the dialogue was constructed to be real

notes that the scribe Aureliano had made at the request of other participants' and 'Like the *Diálogo de la lengua*, Castiglione's dialogue is wholly his own creation' (Hart 2001: 305).

³ 'The grammarians' is an umbrella term used for Western European linguistic thinkers of the Early Modern period who worked on non-classical languages.

people.⁴ For example, whilst Lapesa (1940: 14) observed that ‘el contenido del *Diálogo* excede de su motivación circunstancial’, he was convinced that ‘Valdés tiene que dar consejos respecto a usos lingüísticos y libros recomendables para aprender castellano, a la vez que justifica prácticas especiales que había ideado para que los italianos entendieran mejor lo que escribía’.

As is well known, part of the main principles of Renaissance humanism was the exaltation of natural phenomena and spontaneity, including language use. The Socratic dialogue was perceived to be typically close to real, face-to-face, interaction. Given the intellectual context in which Valdés lived and wrote—not to mention the fact that he wrote on other subjects in dialogue form as well—it is difficult to see why his choice of this classical-cum-humanistic genre for linguistic commentary to mirror a real-life conversation should pose any problem to his work. Moreover, other Spanish grammarians (such as Luna 1620, and Salazar 1622) also used the dialogue, but their works have been received differently. Scholars have gone to great lengths in attempting to find the real people in Valdés’s circle who could be identified with the characters in the *Diálogo* (see, for example, Lapesa 1940: 13, for an early summary of such efforts). We understand that documentary dialogues (in which interlocutors are real people) were the norm in 16th-century Italy, in contrast with dialogues composed elsewhere (see Cox 1992: 22), and it can be appreciated why, written in Italy, that of

⁴ Lope Blanch (1984: 12–13) seems to shy away from such a conviction and declares that ‘[n]o cabe pensar que el libro responda a una conversación mantenida realmente por los protagonistas que en él aparecen’, although he still believed that the work was based on real requests from Valdés’s friends (see also Hart 2001: 305).

Valdés could easily be misconstrued for one of those; but the reality is that Valdés was Spanish and a zealous one at that, and Naples was Spanish territory at the time, and he was working in the interest of the Spanish Empire, and had no interest whatsoever in just mimicking Italians. These are facts that can be gleaned from the *Diálogo* itself (see section 1.1.3 below).

In any case, anyone who has tried his hand at creative writing before would recognize that attempts to identify Valdés's interlocutors are a wild goose chase. This is because even interviewing a living author never guarantees that the information elicited is anything close to objective truth.⁵ Thus, the belief that three gentlemen, two of them Italian, decided to question Valdés about the Castilian language as used amongst courtiers, is something that should be safely discarded. That stance, in my view, should be a prerequisite for a better understanding of the *Diálogo*. Rather, the text should be approached with the clear conviction that all the pronouncements, questions, doubts, queries, answers, hesitations, factual errors, etc., in the work were from one and the same person, the author, who conceived and constructed it, possibly having planned it over a period of time, prior actually to committing his thoughts to paper. Once this conceptual barrier has been negotiated, the prospects of truly understanding the work take a different shape. The dialogue, in addition to serving as

⁵ Gustave Flaubert's oft-quoted 'Madame Bovary, c'est moi' should be a reminder for caution in such an endeavour, as, if that revelation was honest, then, we have a male author who wrote himself into a female character; in such a case, no search, however rigorous it might be, would ever have produced any objective identification of a real female person in the novelist's life or entourage to fit his protagonist.

the best possible means of replicating spontaneous human interaction, was also an effective tool for circumventing the constraints of conventional grammar texts.

In discussing the structure of Valdés's *Diálogo de Doctrina christiana* (1529), Barbolani (1982: 56) acknowledges that its formal aspect was an artificial device ('La estructura dialogada queda superpuesta artificiosamente a una doctrina orgánicamente tratada'). That being the case, it is difficult to understand why his other dialogue, the *Diálogo*, should not be viewed in the same light.

Valdesian scholars broadly agree that even in the *Diálogo*, Valdés does not always stick to his own norms. The question, then, is why his interlocutors hardly noticed and drew their master's attention to his inconsistencies. For example, after seven instances of *estilo* having been mentioned, including once by Torres, the term suddenly becomes completely new to Torres himself, who, at its eighth mention, has to request its definition from Valdés. Another instance is Torres's indication that he does not understand the term *article*, whilst he is perfectly well conversant with such other grammatical terms as *masculine*, *feminine*, *gender*, *number*, *cases*, *accent*, etc. More significant still is the instance where Valdés inadvertently refers to the *Diálogo* as a work, in reaction to a query from one of his fictional interlocutors (see section 1.1.5 below). This is evidence of oversight on the part of Valdés—the kind of carelessness about verisimilitude that he commented on in the fictional works of other Castilian writers. One can devote an entire project to accumulating evidence from the *Diálogo* itself to prove the fictional nature of the interaction that treated a non-fictional subject matter, but that is well outside the scope of this introduction. In effect, Barbolani's (1982: 60) view, representative of the traditional treatment of the dialogue in the *Diálogo*, that the content of the work 'nace al mismo tiempo que la obra,

reflejando conversaciones reales y la sensibilidad sobre el problema de la lengua adquirida en ambientes italianos', appears to be difficult to substantiate.

1.1.2 False Modesty

The belief that Valdés was not a grammarian or linguist has also had a detrimental effect on the status of the *Diálogo*. The main source of this belief is his own tactical claim that he did not have the necessary knowledge to be able to comment on Castilian. What is surprising, in this regard, is not Valdés's feigned claim, but our failure to see through those words. The *humilitas* device was usually employed in prologues or epilogues, with the objective of winning over potential readers, by means of the author's assumed humility. This approach dates back to classical times, when Socrates, for instance, in his ironic dialogues, would present himself as a simple man, readily confessing his ignorance about the issues under discussion, only to end up outwitting his challengers and demonstrating pervasive inconsistencies in their views, which he pointed out as evidence of lack of real wisdom. Calvo Pérez (1991: 185–86) rightly sees the same issue about Valdés's *Diálogo*; he mentions Marcel Bataillon as having failed to view the work that way, but does not indicate that the failure that he identifies in Bataillon is virtually the norm in the Valdesian literature.

Cox (1992: xii) reminds us of the 'conventions of self-abasement which played such a prominent role in Cinquecento writers' presentation of their works'. Self-deprecation was, therefore, a deliberate and calculated rhetorical device, and, in the case of Golden-Age Spain, we can readily recall such examples as Francisco Delicado's 'soy ñorante y no bachiller [...] siendo andaluz y no letrado' and Miguel de Cervantes's 'el estéril y mal cultivado ingenio mío'. It is a psychological fact that, in real life,

anyone who genuinely feels anyhow inadequate or insecure about his knowledge will not normally engage in self-deprecatory utterances; on the contrary, as Rutherford (2006: 768) has noted, ‘only a man who is very sure of himself can dare to do that!’ In the circumstances, the belief that Valdés’s case ‘no es declaración debida a personal modestia’ (Lope Blanch 1984: 13) may be contrived and unfair on the humanist’s image, because that was exactly what it was. In any case, Lope Blanch himself affirmed, in a previous paragraph, that Valdés ‘declaraba [su impreparación en cuestiones gramaticales] modestamente’. As mentioned in the previous section, for obvious generic structural reasons, Valdés did not have a well-defined prologue (or epilogue). That being the case, his most directly expressed false modesty occurs in the preliminary discussion in his book.

It is not helpful to ignore this well-known rhetorical device in the *Diálogo* and continue to use such self-effacing statements as ‘[p]or̄ no foy tan letrado, ni tan leido en cofas de ciencia quanto otros castellanos q̄ m̄uy largamente podrian hazer lo q̄ vos quereis’ (fol. 6^v) as evidence of Valdés’s true lack of intellectual acumen to comment on his language. If we do, we will be stuck before the following response of his, when a fictional interlocutor requests a discussion on the origins of the languages in use in Spain, particularly Castilian: ‘m̄uy larga mela leuantaís, q̄to q̄ eſto mas es querer ſaber hiftorias q̄ gramatica y pues voſotros holgais deſto, de m̄uy buena gana os dire todo lo q̄ açerca dello he cõſiderado, eſtad atentos por̄ ſobrello medigais vuſtros [sic] pareçeres’ (fol. 14^r). This response implies that Valdés had his focus on grammar—contemporary variable features and usage patterns of Castilian—and that the origins of the language should inevitably be part of that scheme (‘por̄ pues auemos de hablar della luſto es q̄ ſepamos ſu nacimiento’ (fol. 14^r). His thought process can be

reconstructed as follows: ‘although I have set out to comment on the use of linguistic features in Castilian, it is impossible to ignore the ubiquitous humanistic issue of the origins of the language’. It is useful to resort to analysis of this kind within the parameters of conversational implicature, in order to be able better to bring out the *Diálogo*’s essence.

1.1.3 The ‘Italian Yoke’

There is the general belief that Valdés wrote the *Diálogo* for Italians. The impression is even created that the quality of Valdés’s linguistic opinions and judgements could have been affected by the fact that he wrote from Italy. This appears to be highly unlikely. One can imagine, for instance, a present-day intellectual, say, from England, who goes off to live in France for a few years; the likelihood that he will not easily retain his native-speaker competence (formal and informal, spoken and written) and will no longer be able to comment, in an authoritative way, on the English language will be negligible, if not out of question altogether. That is how it is, in real life. The exchange below, which ensued when Valdés discussed his principles of ‘ingenio’ and ‘juicio’ is of some interest, in that respect:

Avn̄q̄ ſean quan altos y quan ricos quiſierē en mj opinion ſeran plebeyos, ſy no ſon altos de ingenio y ricos de luizio, M. Eſſa filofofia no la aprendiſtes vos en caſtilla. V. e’ngañado eſtais antes deſpues q̄ vine en Italia he olvidado mucha parte d’ella. M. ſera por culpa v̄rā. V. Sy ha ſido por culpa mja /o no, no digo nada, baſta q̄ es aſsy q̄ mucha parte de la q̄ vos llamais filofofia q̄ aprendi e’n Eſpaña he olvidado e’n Italia. M. e’ſſa es coſa nueua para mj. (fols 52^v–53^r)

This passage says a great deal; and its value can be best appreciated by actively bearing in mind that Valdés remains the sole generator of the whole exchange. With some imagination, we can easily infer his thought process as he wrote down the passage: ‘readers of this dialogue may be deceived that I have been largely influenced by the Italian intellectual culture (“engañado estais”)’. So keen was Valdés to stress his linguistic and intellectual independence that he appended to the assertion his signature and ‘Nota bie.’, in the margin against the passage. Needless to say, that is quintessentially emblematic of the widespread resentment amongst European scholars, at the time, as Italians attempted to lay claim to cultural supremacy as direct heirs to classical scholarly treasures of ancient Rome (see Terracini 1979, Mazzacco 1997, Hart 2001, and Crews 2008). Valdés exhibited that underlying tension throughout the *Diálogo* and, as said, had to flag it, not only with ‘Nota bien’ (which is fairly common in the margins of the manuscript), but with his signature as if to affirm: ‘I, Juan de Valdés, declare so’; he immediately proceeded to spell out that, as far as he was concerned, it was a long-standing fact that Spain (which, geopolitically, reigned supreme) was culturally superior to Italy, and that his *Diálogo* was a service—duty, maybe—to the Imperial Court and its courtiers, such as Garcilaso de la Vega, rather than to Italians (see section 1.1.5 below).

Following the publication of his work on Christian doctrine, the content of which did not entirely please the Inquisition, Valdés quickly left for Italy. A degree of uncertainty surrounds his movements within Italy, particularly between Rome and Naples; and the year of his departure from Spain is not even precisely known, but one of the dates commonly speculated is 1531. Given that the *Diálogo* is believed to have

been composed between 1534 and 1536, there were only a few years between his departure from home and the writing of the work. In the words of Calvo Pérez (1991: 111) ‘Valdés no llevaba tantos años fuera de España como para que creamos que había olvidado el castellano, sus problemas de estandarización, etc.’ This scholar hit the nail on the head, by indicating that the real issue at stake was the standardization of the Castilian language to go along with the Spanish Empire—a project begun in earnest by Nebrija in his thesis in the famous (and fascinatingly prophetic) prologue, encapsulated in the oft-quoted statement ‘siempre la lengua fue compañera del imperio’.

As is well known, the ramifications of language planning and language policy include, *inter alia*, ‘ironing out variability, usually by stigmatising as “non-standard” the forms found in regional or working-class varieties’ (Poplack 2002: 89); defining the language solely by the usage of ‘high-ranking persons, [as if] the language does not belong to all its speakers – only to a select few’ (Milroy 2002: 13); and the language planner setting himself up ‘as a lawgiver’, by pronouncing judgement, whereby ‘of two alternate forms of expression one must be wrong’ (Baugh and Cable 1994: 272). But, invariably, too, the lawgiver on language is prone to expounding the doctrine of usage with admirable clarity and, then, violating it (*ibid.*: 279)—most of the time without being consciously aware of it—as in the case of Valdés (see section 1.4 below). In other words, one must engage in proscribing and prescribing linguistic features, in order for the standard ideology to take hold eventually (some day).

We might pause and pose this question: who would argue that all of this was not precisely what Valdés did in his *Diálogo*?⁶ Anipa (2012b) has explained that, as a result of an unusual history of the Castilian language, of the four classic stages in the macro-sociolinguistic process of language standardization (see Haugen 1983), two of them (*selection* and *enforcement*) had already been largely accomplished in Spain prior to the time of the humanists, and that only aspects of *codification* and *elaboration/intellectualization* were left for them to work on. Valdés's own statement 'notando con atención los primores y delicadezas que guardauades y vsauades en v̄ro escreuir caſtellano' (fol. 3^r) points to his sustained native competence, whilst in Italy, and asserts the representativeness of his usage (if we do not lose sight of the fact that those words of praise to him were his own).

In Naples, Juan was in the service of the Spanish Crown; he worked in various positions, including being personal secretary to the Emperor (see Crews 2008). He was, therefore, in constant touch with Castilian-speaking courtiers and their entourage, whose language usage he set out to discuss and promote ('No os queremos meter enefe Laberinto ſolamēte cōmō a hombre criado enel Reyno de Toledo y enla Corte Deſpaña os preguntaremos de la lengua q̄ ſe [vsa] enla Corte' (fol. 26^v)). Also, the received knowledge that Valdés never saw Spain again is increasingly becoming questionable, as circumstantial evidence points to the contrary. For example, the

⁶ Perhaps this is the key to the paradoxical attraction of the *Diálogo*, because it is a well-known phenomenon that, subconsciously, modern professional linguists have the propensity to think of standard languages, before anything else, not without consequences (see Hudson 1996 [1980]: 34).

following statement in one of his letters suggests that he must have travelled to Spain freely and quite frequently: ‘A mj me es grandíss.^o daño el no tener mis dineros pa. poderme aprouechar dellos en esta uenida de S. m.^t, donde podré comprar alg.^a cosa a q̄. poderme arrimar en ytalia quando por guerras los caminos d’España estuuiesen cerrados’ (see Montesinos 1931: 17). In this statement, Valdés does not give the impression of someone who is permanently settled in Italy, but, rather, of one who, occasionally, gets stuck there and runs out of certain provisions, whenever hostilities blocked the way to Spain.

Recent archival information has revealed that Valdés’s infamous status as a high-level heretic that we are familiar with developed only after his death: ‘There is no evidence that either he or his writings were condemned as heretical during his lifetime’ (Crews 2008: 162). It becomes less startling to know that Valdés himself referred to heresy in a negative light, when he said that men of genius could get caught up in it, as a result of poor judgement:

~~si yo vuiese escoger~~ de escoger, mas querria con mediano ingenio buen Juizio, q̄ con razonable Juizjo buen Jngenio. T. porq̄? V. porq̄ hombres de grandes ingenios son los q̄ se pierden en heregias, y falsas opiniones, por falta de Juizio, no ay tal Joya nel hombre, como el buē Juizio. (fol. 88^v)

This also explains his sustained caution regarding religious issues, in the *Diálogo*. Therefore, the inquisitorial enquires that lead to his departure for Italy might just have been a mere glitch in his life, as it were. And so important were his services in Italy that it is unthinkable that a well-known and supposedly first-class heretic could have

enjoyed so much favour and trust from the Crown, engaged in high-level local and international diplomacy, and rubbed shoulders with high-ranking cardinals and even with the Pope. Crews (2008: 156) has pointed out that '[g]iven the secretive nature of Valdés's service, very few people in Spain would have known that he was Charles's personal secretary'.⁷

In a similar vein, attempts to adduce Valdés's use of occasional Italian words and phrases in the *Diálogo* as evidence for a significant Italian influence on him cannot be objective. The spread of Italian humanism could not have happened without some degree of general influence of the Italian language as well. For instance, in 16th-century France, the influence of Italian on the French of courtiers, in Paris, became so pronounced that it frequently attracted heavy criticism from contemporary intellectuals (see Anipa 2007: 27). Thus, any consideration that the *Diálogo* did not reflect the language of Castile, because it was written in Italy and because it contained Italianisms, does not take into account the broader Western-European cultural context of the day. The case of Valdés's use of Italianisms should, therefore, not be attributed to his departure from Spain. Interestingly, he himself appropriately called it linguistic accommodation (a term in current use in modern Sociolinguistics), which was a testimony to the geographical spread as well as the versatility of the Castilian language (see fol. 43^v)

1.1.4 A Dream 'Bequest' from Toledo

⁷ I have come across unpublished information, based on sources close to Valdés's circle, which says that he was even knighted by the Emperor.

An intriguing piece of information came to light, early last century, in the last will and testament of a 16th-century humanist, from Toledo, Alvar Gómez de Castro. The information in question is most relevant to the subject under discussion. Gómez de Castro said that the main possessions that he would leave behind were books, amongst them a manuscript of Valdés's *Diálogo*, which he had personally copied.⁸ The earliest of the three extant manuscripts was firmly identified to have passed through this humanist (see San Román 1928: 553–54). However, San Román's absolute conviction that MS 8629 was the copy that Gómez de Castro recorded in his will was incorrect (see Anipa 2010); recognizing Gómez de Castro's hand in the manuscript's margins—marginal annotation being a common practice amongst the learned at the time (see Bouza Alvarez 2004: 42)—is one thing, but identifying the copy of the *Diálogo* that he mentioned in his will is another thing altogether. The humanist expressed his desire for preserving the *Diálogo* in Toledo. Even more interesting is the information that he wished to have the *Diálogo* bound together with Antonio de Nebrija's grammar:

Ansi mesmo la *Gramatica de Romançe de Antonio de Nebrija* quiero que se enquaderne con el *diálogo de valdes de la lengua española*, q̄ tengo escrito de mano, y que se ponga en la libreria de la dicha s^{ta} yglesia, lo qual ella mandara enquadernar en tablas, pues es libro raro para guardarse allí, y si en esto oviere olvido, mando q̄ a mi costa se enquaderne y se ponga en dicho lugar (San Román 1928: 553).

⁸ This small, but important, detail came to light, for the first time, only in a recent publication (Anipa 2010).

This attestation is immensely important. It is, however, surprising that it failed to make any significant impression beyond the mundane, i.e., serving to establish definitively the *Diálogo*'s authorship.

It is clear why Gómez de Castro was determined to have the two works bound together in a single volume, as San Román (1928: 554–55) rightly noted: 'Se revela el buen sentido de Alvar Gómez al ordenar que se encuadernasen juntos el *Diálogo* y la *Gramática de Nebrija*, como obras relacionadas, y en su tiempo las más importantes para estudiar los preceptos de nuestra lengua'. It is also significant that the Toledo humanist should characterize the *Diálogo* as 'raro', meaning, in that context, 'insigne, sobresaliente o excelente en su linea' (RAE 1963 [1726–37]: s.v. *Raro*). That status makes it inseparable from Nebrija's grammar and, therefore, a far cry from its being literature, or a casual instruction manual concocted for Italian friends. More significant still is the fact that he made the provision to have the specified binding ('encuadernamiento en tablas') of his desired, combined volume paid for from his own funds, should there be an oversight of his request on the part of the Santa Catalina Church.

Firmly rooted in the traditional arena, Barbolani provided a fairly jejune interpretation to this specific information, remarking that the *Diálogo* was destined to be known as different from Nebrija's grammar, and that Valdés himself would have preferred it so, anyway: 'Valdés sin duda hubiera preferido las cosas como fueron' (1982: 98). Of course, what she meant by that interpretation is quite clear: on the one hand, it is the question of literature versus grammar, and, on the other hand, a haughty Castilian versus a pretentious Andalusian (the latter openly despised by Castilian intellectuals, including Cristóbal de Villalón and Valdés). But these are not

what Gómez de Castro (who was not oblivious to the social realities of his day) had in mind. And not all Valdesian scholars would entirely agree with that interpretation of the issue at stake,⁹ for, as Calvo Pérez, for instance, has observed, the complementarity of Nebrija and Valdés lie in the fact that they were ‘el primer gramático y el primer lingüista, respectivamente’ (1991: 84), grammar being, still in our day and age, an integral part of the broad discipline of Linguistics. In any case, Barbolani’s conviction about Valdés’s possible views on Gómez de Castro’s combined binding is inconsequential, as it would not have any bearing on the objective status of the *Diálogo*.

One of the best descriptive comments that I have come across on the subject is this one by Calvo Pérez (1991: 103–04):

Por lo demás, en el momento presente, se podría disponer toda una especialidad de Lingüística acudiendo solamente a los ‘tópicos’ a los que se refiere J. de Valdés: El *D. de la L.* es como un ambicioso programa de investigación que precisaría del concurso de múltiples especialistas para ser llevado eficazmente a cabo tanto en relación con el castellano del siglo XVI, como con el de hoy mismo, o con no importa qué otra lengua en cualquier momento histórico. Es por esto por lo que si J. de Valdés aparece como un deficiente tratadista en cuanto a la sistematización, en cambio aporta multiplicidad de

⁹ Contrast with Montesinos’s ‘[e]s lástima que Valdés no viera hasta qué punto las tentativas de Nebrija podían ser fecundas; que él y el aborrecido andaluz coincidían al forjar para el imperio español la nueva arma del idioma’ (p. lxvii).

datos para conocer un determinado estado de lengua. Tendrían que pasar siglos para que algún otro lingüista alcanzara un grado de diversificación semejante al de Valdés.¹⁰

This passage explains so well what Valdés did, to the extent that the long-standing belief that he wrote literature becomes increasingly questionable.¹¹ Like many others, Terracini (1979, cited by Barbolani 1982: 92) took the line of literary focus in the *Diálogo*, observing that ‘Italia, con el planteamiento de sus *questione della lingua*, ha provocado en España el surgir de una especie de *questione della letteratura*’. The reality is that Valdés, who knew what literature meant, could possibly not have given the title *Diálogo de la lengua* to his book, just for the sake of it. Since, in his dialogue on Christian doctrine, he appropriately gave it the title *Diálogo de Doctrina christinana*, he could easily have used something like ‘*Diálogo de literatura*’ or ‘*Diálogo de crítica literaria*’, if he had deemed it appropriate for his work on language.

¹⁰ It is gratifying to me only to have come across Calvo Pérez’s book several years after the publication of *The Grammatical Thought and Linguistic Behaviour of Juan de Valdés* (2007). The reason is that we have, as a result, two independently conceived works that coincide in the objective to unveil the extensive linguistic content of the *Diálogo*, both authors independently sharing the same conviction that the job in hand requires a radical approach: ‘será preciso que recurramos a una metodología diferente de la que otros autores han empleado y a la ponderación que la estructura dialógica de la obra nos exige’ (Calvo Pérez 1991: 115).

¹¹ It is well known that any work—even a typical sociolinguistic text—can be read and discussed as literature. That said, there must be some objective limits to infinite textual malleability.

The information contained in Gómez de Castro's will equally make a considerable dent in the belief that the *Diálogo* was a collection of extemporized comments issued to Neapolitan friends, as in Montesinos's (1928: XLIV)

[n]o se vale del latín ni del italiano, que dominaba lo suficiente; se expresa siempre en español. Claro está que siendo el fin de Valdés puramente práctico, no pudo cumplir su labor sin concesiones y compromisos, y en el *Diálogo de la lengua* da razón de cómo se entendía con los italianos [...] Pero, además, estas páginas improvisadas, en las que lo importante era hacer saber algo concreto, se echa de ver demasiado la improvisación y el deseo de llegar pronto al ánimo del lector.

Gómez de Castro was Valdés's contemporary. He was born in 1516, in the province of Toledo, just as Valdés (at the time), and died in 1580. The *Diálogo* as an improvised pamphlet ('páginas improvisadas') for Italians would hardly have been of any use to a contemporary Castilian humanist.

The question as to who might have taken the manuscript to Spain, from Naples, cannot be ignored. Some scholars suspect that Valdés must have taken the manuscript home himself. But, whether or not he did, it is known to have changed hands, for some time, before reaching Gómez de Castro. San Román (1928) tried to trace its possible earlier owners, and suggested Juan de Vergara as the one who passed it on to Gómez de Castro.¹² Once again, one would wonder how Castilian intellectuals in

¹² It has been revealed that, rather than having inherited the manuscript mentioned in his will, as San Román thought ('éste [MS 8629] era, precisamente, el de Alvar Gómez' (1928: 553)), Gómez de Castro actually copied it (see Anipa 2010).

Toledo could have had the same linguistic needs as Italian L2 learners of Castilian in Naples to have accorded so much importance to the *Diálogo*.

1.1.5 *Este trabajo*: A Planned Project It Was

There is ample evidence, deliberately provided by Valdés in the *Diálogo* itself, which refutes the traditional perception of the work. Despite its fictional shroud, Valdés referred to the *Diálogo* as a ‘trabajo’—a piece or work: ‘el que no quisiere tomar este trabajo, dexé lo estar q̄ no por esso se yra al infierno’ (fol. 40^r). This is a world away from how the work is generally perceived and represented.

Another issue that negates conventional belief and perception is that Valdés revealed in the *Diálogo* that the work was composed for the consumption of gentlemen in the Spanish Court: ‘mas quisiere satisfazer a Garcilasso dela Vega conotros dos caualle:^{ros} de la Corte’ del Emp:^{dor} que yo conozco’ (fol. 53^r)¹³. Operating along the lines of Navarrete’s convictions that Valdés effectively set out to create a poetic theory for imperial purposes, Crews (2008: 100) makes the point that socio-geopolitical realities of Valdés’s day suggest that the *Diálogo* must even have been the fruit of official policy:

None of Valdés’s writings bear the mark of official sponsorship more than his *Dialogue on Language*, and no other work so consciously reflects a typical humanist sodality [...]

¹³ We know that when Valdés wrote his *Diálogo*, Garcilaso de la Vega, mentioned in this statement, was living in Naples (having been allowed to leave an island in the Danube, where he had been exiled by Charles V, in order to serve the rest of his term in Naples).

Charles elevated the language in his famous three-hour speech in Spanish before the papal court on 17 April 1536, claiming, 'My Spanish language is so noble it deserves to be known and understood by all Christian people'. Charles's speech and Cobos's practical need for correspondence in Spanish suggest that Juan's dialogue was officially commissioned.

One is tempted to recall and reflect on the following telling parenthesis of the *Diálogo*—one of the most cited pieces of the work, largely not for the right reason, unfortunately: '(porque como veis ya en ytalia ajsy entre Damas como entre Caualleros je tiene por gentileza y galania saber hablar Castellano)'. It has now been revealed that a fully-fledged table of contents was pre-planned by Valdés and embedded in the 'front matter' of his work. That can be reconstructed from the manuscript, where one finds the marginal annotations 'Diuiſion' (fol. 12^r) (i.e., 'Division' [of the work]), followed by 'Nota. toti⁹ operis Descriptionē' (fol. 13^r) (i.e., 'Note: summary of the whole work'—literally, 'description of the whole work'), against a summarized presentation of all the topics to be covered in the treatise, preceded by the full description of them.¹⁴

It has already been noted that one of the factors that have not favoured the *Diálogo*'s status is the absence of a table of contents. Successive editors of the work have, on occasion, attempted to indicate, in one way or another, the various parts of the text, presumably as a quick guide to readers, but such efforts have been half-

¹⁴ The corresponding marginal annotation in K.III.8 reads 'orden de pregūtas' (fol. 11^r), whilst *Add.* 9939 just used numerals within the body of the manuscript (fol. 44^v), with no comment in the margins.

hearted and never aimed at reconstructing the work's table of contents conceived by Valdés. The real thing (stifled by the constraints of the dialogue genre) is much more elaborate than even the appreciable effort of Calvo Pérez (1991: 102). The following is the relevant passage from MS 8629 to be used in the reconstruction:

M. Sy os quereis gouernar por mi haremos deſta manera. En la prime.^{ra} parte le preguntaremos lo q̄ ſabe del origen /o principio q̄ an tenido aſsy la lengua Castellana como las otras lenguas q̄ oy ſe hablan e'n Eſpaña En la ſegunda loq̄ perteneçe ala Gramatica e'n la Terçera lo q̄ le auemos notado enel eſcreuir vnas letras mas q̄ otras, e'n la quarta lacauſa q̄ lo mueue a poner /o quitar en alg.^{os} vocablos vna ſylaba.e'n la quinta le pediremos nos diga por q̄ no vſa de muchos vocablos q̄ vſan otros, enla ſeſta le rogaremos nos auſe delos primores q̄ guarda quāto al ſtilo, enla ſeptima le demādaremos ſu parecer açerca de los libros q̄ eſtan eſcritos en Castellano. Al vltimo haremos q̄ nos diga ſu opinion, sobre qual lengua tiene' por mas conforme ala latina la Caſtellana o la Toſcana. Demanera quelo primero ſera del origen dela lengua, lo ſegūdo dela Gramatica, lo Terçero delas letras à donde entra la ortografia, lo quarto delas ſylabas, lo quinto delos vocablos, lo ſeſto del eſtilo, lo ſeptimo de los libros, lo Vltimo dela conformidad delas lenguas. (fols 12^r-13^r)

The final sentence of this passage is a summary of the description that precedes it. The significance of the passage is that it confirms that, contrary to traditional perception, the contents of the work had been carefully thought out by Valdés, for nowhere else in the *Diálogo* does this kind of comprehensive recapitulation occur. Below is the reconstructed table of contents, a modified version of one in Anipa (2007: 55):

DIUIJION. TOTI⁹ OPERIS DESCRIPTIONĒ

(División y Sumario de toda la obra)

- Prólogo:* *De la autoridad lingüística*
- PRIMERA PARTE: **Del origen de la lengua**—('le preguntaremos lo q̄ sabe del origen o principio q̄ an tenido assy la lengua castellana como las otras lenguas q̄ oy se hablan en España').
- SEGUNDA [PARTE]: **Dela Gramática**—('lo q̄ pertenece a la gramática').
- TERÇERA [PARTE]: **Delas letras à donde entra la ortografía**—('lo q̄ le auemos notado en el escreuir vnas letras mas q̄ otras').
- QUARTA [PARTE]: **Delas fylabas**—('la causa q̄ lo mueue a poner o quitar en algos vocablos vna sylaba').
- QUINTA [PARTE]: **Delos vocablos**—('le pediremos nos diga porq̄ no vsa de muchos vocablos q̄ vsan otros').
- SESTA [PARTE]: **Del estilo**—('le rogaremos nos auise de los primores q̄ guarda quanto al estilo').
- SEPTIMA [PARTE]: **De los libros**—('le demandaremos su parecer açerca de los libros q̄ estan escritos en castellano').
- VLTIMO: **Dela conformidad delas lenguas**—('haremos q̄ nos diga su opinion, sobre qual lengua tiene por mas conforme a la latina la castellana o la Toscana').

This table of contents has been formatted in such a way that the sections not in boldface are from the longer description of the topics, whilst those in boldface are from the synopsis that follows it. And, with the exception of the items in italics, everything else is taken from the *Diálogo*. The word ‘part’ that is used for the first chapter is left understood in the next six. Thus, the layout in this reconstruction looks normal and real, and, had it had the chance to be displayed visually, it would have made a significant difference to the perception, reception and status of the work.

Up until the stage where Valdés was made, in the fictional dialogue, to commit himself to responding to all the questions that he would be asked, the subject for discussion was not fully known to the reader. The material in that section and the manner in which it was treated can conveniently be reworked into a fairly decent prologue to the *Diálogo*:

(a) The subject matter is the usage picture of the Castilian language, with special attention to its written form (‘y notando con atencion los primores y delicadezas que guardauades y vsauades en $\overline{v}r\overline{o}$ escriuir castellano teniamos \int obre \bar{q} hablar y contender porquel s.^{or} ~~Pa.~~ [Torres] como hombre naçido y criado en españa presumiendo saber la lengua tambien como otro, y yo como curioso della de \int seando saberla a \int sy bien escriuir como la se hablar’ (fol. 3^r))

(b) The variety of Castilian on which the commentary will be focused is the language of the privileged class and, as Valdés is close to the Court, his usage and preferences will be representative. Thus, besides the much cited words ‘ $\overline{c}om\overline{o}$ a hombre criado en el Reyno de Toledo y en la Corte Despaña os preguntaremos de la lengua \bar{q} \int e [vsa] en la

Corte y jñ alguna vez tocaremos algo de fōtras prouinçias recibireis[lo] en paçiençia' (fols 26^v-27^r), the passage below directly refers to the perceived representativeness of Valdés's own written language:

siempre' hallauamos algo q̄ notar en v̄ras cartas ajsy en lo que perteneçia ala ortografia como a los vocablos, como al estilo.y aconteçia que como ~~llegauamos a topar~~ topauamos algunas cosas q̄ no auíamos visto vsar a otros á los quales teníamos por tan bien hablados y bien entendidos en la lengua castellana quãto avos muchas vezes veníamos a contender reziamente quando sobre unas cosas y quando sobre otras por q̄ cada vno de nosotros o queria fer maestro /o/ no q̄ria ser dicipulo. Agora q̄ os tenemos aqui adonde nos podeis dar razō delo q̄ ajsy auemos notado en v̄ra manera descriujr os pedimos por md, nos satiſfagais buenam^{te} a lo q̄ os demandaremos. (fols 3^r-3^v)

(c) The task is not easy, since, unlike Latin, which enjoys a range of authoritative works written in it, his project is on a non-classical language. It is a sociolinguistic commentary, and not a traditional grammar book ('Me' parece coſa fuera de propoſito que querais voſotros agora que perdamos nueſtro tiempo hablando en vna coſa tan baxa y plebeya' (fol. 5^r))

(d) Whilst work on sociolinguistic usage is, to him, such a fascinating subject, it will, in his view, be unfamiliar, and not particularly interesting, to readers who are not linguistically inclined or informed: 'Punticos y primorçicos de lengua vulgar coſa a mi ver tan agena de v̄ros ingenios y luizios q̄ por v̄ra hōrra no querria hablar en ella quando bien a mj me fuesse' muy fabroſa y apazible' (fols 5^r-5^v)

(e) The fact that Pietro Bembo's treatise on Tuscan apparently failed in its objectives makes the task trickier, with no guarantee that one on Castilian will fare any better ('à muchos he oido dezir q̄ fue coſa inutil aq̄l ſu trabajo' (fol. 5^v))

After considering carefully, and eventually discarding, possible authoritative sources of reference, with which to illustrate Castilian usage (e.g., Nebrija's works and the language of *Amadís de Gaula*), Valdés finally decides to do so with traditional Castilian sayings as well as with usage in his own writing/letters ('Muy bien aveis dicho porque' en aq̄llos refranes ſe vee' mucho bien la puridad dela lengua Castellana' (fol. 9^v); 'ſy os contentan las coſas q̄ en mis cartas aveis notado, las tomeis, y las vendais por v̄ras q̄ para ello yo os doy liçençia' (fol. 11^r)). Sociolinguistic variability, including variation in his own usage and preferences, is at the heart of Valdés's thinking process:

lo q̄ en v̄ras cartas avemos notado, es de calidad q̄ ni lo podemos tomar por bueno, porque no todos lo aprouamos del todo, ni lo podemos defechar por malo, por q̄ ay coſas q̄ nos ſatiffazen y ay otras q̄ no entendemos, es meneſter q̄ en todo caſo nos deis Cuenta, no ſolamente delo q̄ aveis eſcrito, pero avn delo q̄ dello depende /o puede depender. (fol. 11^r)

Given the fact that the dialogue in its entirety is his creation and that this quotation forms part of his thought process, it can be inferred that he is musing on the inevitable problem of trying to encase language in a straitjacket as one takes on the

phenomenon of variability, always dominated by the formidable force of continuity.¹⁵ In other words, we are witnessing the manifestation of Valdés's internal linguistic conflict, a well-known phenomenon in Linguistics: 'each individual is a battle-field for conflicting linguistic types and habits' (Martinet, in Weinreich 1953: vii). Not surprisingly, therefore, Valdés throws in the towel, later in the *Diálogo*, when he tellingly declares: 'Pero en esto podeis confiderar la riqueza. de la lengua Castellana, q̄ tenemos en ella vocablos en q̄ escoler. comō. entre peras' (fol. 73^v).

Cox (1992: 6) rightly points out that '[a] dialogue on the same subject, on the other hand—however minimalist its *mise-en-scène*—is constrained to reflect on the way in which it is going about its explanatory task'. In effect, it is the importance of what kind of thought 'thinks itself as a dialogue' (Jordan 1981: 205) that can inform our analysis of the preliminary section of the *Diálogo*.

Part of Valdés's discussion that involved literary texts (some 14% of the *Diálogo*) was mainly about stylistics—an integral part of Linguistics. It is common knowledge that literature is a legitimate source of data for the investigation of linguistic features, because, whilst the ideas in a literary piece may be fiction, the language per se in which the fiction is written is real and belongs to a real author. As Romaine (1982: 21) crisply puts it, 'The linguist will be interested in the language as language in the first instance, while the literary critic is interested in the language as

¹⁵ In the words of Saussure (1972 [1915]: 109), '[c]e qui domine dans toute altération, c'est la persistance de la matière ancienne; l'infidélité au passé n'est que relative. Voilà pourquoi le principe d'altération se fonde sur le principe de continuité' (see also Anipa 2001: 23–34).

literature' (see also Anipa 2012a: 179–80). That being the case, it would be rather unfair on Valdés for us to be arguing that his devoting a fraction of the *Diálogo* to the discussion of the writing styles of prominent literary figures should turn his work into literature, and that 'Valdés was strictly a literary man' (Mazzocco 1997: 275).

Intriguingly, Valdés himself was well aware of the literature–Linguistics relationship and proactively drew his readers' attention (in a manner similar to the first part of Romaine's statement, just quoted), in the *Diálogo*, to the fact that he was specifically interested in the language of literature as language: 'aquí no hablamos jino de loq̄ perteneçe a la lengua' (fol. 86^v), he crisply stated. In any case, the interconnection of knowledge domains was the norm in pre–modern times, when a single academic or intellectual would be a specialist in several domains and across the arts and sciences, etc., as Calonge (2005: 63) has put it:

Todas las ciencias particulares permanecían unidas a la filosofía; la separación posterior [al siglo XIII] de estas ciencias—que no tuvo otro valor que el de la división del trabajo—estaba muy lejos de producirse. [...] Para el hombre de este siglo, no existen las acotaciones o parcelas en las que se mueve el especialista moderno y en las que algunos olvidan que el universo es algo más que el pequeño campo de su actividad.

1.1.6 His Genius Is the Culprit

The composition of the *Diálogo* was carried out via an excellent fictional cloak; and it is no exaggeration to say that part of the misconstruction of the work is due to how well the fictional shroud on a non–fictional subject was executed. Very keen on verisimilitude in fiction writing (as we see in his review of literary texts), Valdés

planned the preliminary section of his dialogue to flow so naturally and realistically that, nearly five centuries on, he still hypnotizes his readers into believing that a dialogue did truly take place between him and his friends, near Naples.¹⁶ That keenness on verisimilitude is concisely expressed in the statement ‘los q̄ escriuen mentiras las deuen escreuir de fuerte, q̄ se alleguen quanto fuere poſſible ala verdad, de tal manera q̄ puedan v̄dē fus mentiras por verdades’ (fol. 90^v),¹⁷ a declaration that perfectly applies to the fictional dialogue in the *Diálogo* itself. In other words, notwithstanding the many oversights (upon scrutiny, as pointed out above), Valdés managed to craft the overall fiction of his dialogue so well that he has continued to sell successfully to most of his readers his ‘mentiras’ for ‘verdades’. His own genius, therefore, has played a large part in working against his *Diálogo*.

1.1.7 A Disturbing but Little-Known Paradox

In addition to the misperception and misunderstanding issues presented above, we have a much more serious set of problems about the *Diálogo*: (a) there is a disconcerting paradox surrounding it, and (b) there is a complete lack of awareness of the paradox in question. On the one hand, in spite of its unfortunate circumstances, scholars working on early modern Castilian have had a predilection for the *Diálogo* as the authoritative source of linguistic reference. It is referenced multiple times more than Nebrija’s grammar; even Keniston (1937), who specifically set out to use the

¹⁶ Usoz went to the extent of suggesting (in a pseudo-subtitle to his edition) the year in which the dialogue was actually held.

¹⁷ ‘Mentira’ was a common pre-modern Castilian term for fiction.

Diálogo as a literary text, inadvertently accorded it a unique place as a linguistic authority.¹⁸ One is left wondering how a work that is not worthy of consideration as a serious sociolinguistic work, and whose author deserves only a peripheral mention (when it comes to Renaissance linguistic thought in Spain) could possibly be a favourite reference work on (socio)linguistic matters. This is a disturbing paradox. On the other hand (and perhaps worse than the paradox itself), there appears to be a complete lack of awareness of the situation. This is partly the reason for my qualification of Navarrete's statement about misunderstanding of the *Diálogo*, cited earlier, as a Pandora's Box. Although he has his focus elsewhere (poetic theory aimed at cultural unification under Charles V's empire), and not on Linguistics, Navarrete proceeds to state another, linguistically relevant, problem about the work:

A second misconception about the *Diálogo* is that it is somehow a spontaneous exercise lacking in artistry, disorganized and superficial in its presentation of linguistic theory. In fact, there is a sequential exposition of topics in linguistics, from a theory of the origin of Castilian, through grammar, phonology, lexicography, etc. (2004: 5)

And he rightly acknowledges, in contrast to the prevailing view, that '[t]he *Diálogo de la lengua* is an artfully structured exposition of Spanish linguistics and related topics' (p. 10) and that 'the primary focus of the *Diálogo* is sociolinguistic' (p. 11; see also Hamilton 1953: 133). It may not be an over-exaggeration to state that observations of this kind, however ad hoc they are, must be a step in the right direction, in terms of a

¹⁸ See Anipa (2007) for rather surprising statistics on the frequency with which the *Diálogo* is routinely used, in comparison with Nebrija's grammar.

new dawn in the conceptualization of the least investigated aspect of Valdés's complex *Diálogo*.

1.2 The Extant Manuscripts

There are three known 16th-century manuscripts of the *Diálogo*: MS 8629, the earliest, held in the Biblioteca Nacional de España (henceforth, 'the BN'); KIII.8 (in El Escorial); and *Add.9939* (in the British Library). To these can be added a mid-19th-century manuscript—a copy made by Usoz y Río—donated to the BN, in 1873. The present edition is based on the earliest of the three 16th-century manuscripts. Apart from the fact that scholars unanimously agree that it is the most reliable of the three (although this is yet to be tested and confirmed objectively—see section 1.2.2 below), the main reason for the choice of MS 8629 for this edition is that, when it comes to Valdés's linguistic usage, it is the closest. This is a copy on which his grapho-phonological, morpho-phonological and morphological rules and preferences, as well as his sociolinguistic behaviour can potentially be best tested (see section 1.2.1 below).

1.2.1 Some Fresh Reports

The importance of MS 8629 for testing Valdés's sociolinguistic behaviour has been significantly enhanced, following a close study, which has revealed that, contrary to received knowledge, according to which this manuscript was copied in the second half of the 16th century, it existed before the year 1540 (see Anipa 2011). This is an interesting development, from a linguistic viewpoint, because the fact that it was copied in Valdés's lifetime opens up the possibility of Valdés's direct influence, potentially including his own hand, in the manuscript. This possibility was

automatically ruled out, over a century ago (and logically so), at the time when two crucial pieces of information had not yet come to light: (a) an autograph of Valdés to work with, which came to light with the discovery of his letters (see, for example, Montesinos 1931), and (b) evidence, just unearthed, that MS 8629 was, indeed, copied during his lifetime.

There is yet another fresh discovery about this manuscript that needs reporting here, for the first time. The *Diálogo* manuscript of the BN that was published by Mayans (in 1737) and, later (in 1860), by Usoz y Río, was not the MS 8629 that we know today. This is a solid conclusion, based on a close scrutiny of Usoz's annotated manuscript (MS 7265), which he eventually published. A discovery like this one doubly confirms that there were, indeed, two *Diálogo* manuscripts in the BN until past the mid-19th century, when one of them—the one used by the two early editors—became untraceable. The evidence shows that they were almost identical and that both passed through the same hands and/or were subjected to virtually the same corrections and annotations.

The trajectory of MS 8629, from Extremadura to the BN, has been studied by researchers, since the 19th century (see Graux 1880, and Fernández Pomar 1965). Drawing on those studies, Anipa (2011) has shed more light on the subject, the gist of which is deemed relevant here. Once arrived in Spain, the manuscript circulated amongst members of the Toledo Circle (close friends of Valdés, associated mainly with the University of Alcalá de Henares and Toledo Cathedral). At one point, it was in the possession of García Girón de Loaisa y Carvajal, who bequeathed it to his nephew, Pedro de Carvajal. Pedro also bequeathed it to his nephew, Diego Esteban de Carvajal y Nieto, who, later, passed it on to his son, Rodrigo Ignacio de Carvajal. Rodrigo,

eventually, donated the family library to the Dominican convent of San Vicente Ferrer, in Plasencia.¹⁹ That transaction, which was concluded in 1650, had, amongst other things, a provision that the Carvajal family should keep one of the keys to the convent library, in order to be able to use it whenever they wished (see Andrés 1974).

A brief genealogy of the Carvajals of Plasencia, held by the Real Academia de la Historia, reveals that Rodrigo (the Carvajal who offered the family library to the Dominicans) had two brothers and a sister: Pedro de Carvajal, Fernando de Carvajal, and María de Carvajal. Evidence that the Carvajals continued to read the *Diálogo* is provided by the fact that, in the 17th century, Pedro de Carvajal, brother of Rodrigo Ignacio de Carvajal, left a signed annotation on the preliminary folio of MS 8629, included in this edition.

As already indicated, how the manuscript moved from Naples to Toledo is another chapter in the *Diálogo* saga. I put forward a set of hypotheses, in that respect, based on the following likely channels: (a) Valdés himself bringing the manuscript to Toledo;²⁰ or (b) through Garcilaso de la Vega;²¹ or (c) via the Cardinal of Burgos,

¹⁹ The convent of San Vicente Ferrer, at the time, had a near-university status and was one of the most important centres of learning in Spain, with two chairs of Theology and one of the Arts (see Graux 1880).

²⁰ This hypothesis is an enhanced version of San Román's (1928) suspicion that Valdés might have brought the manuscript to Juan de Vergara, his close friend. The added likelihood is based on the new indication, reported above, that Valdés must have freely visited Spain, during his self-exile in Italy.

Francisco de Mendoza y Bobadilla;²² or (d) through Diego Hurtado de Mendoza;²³ or (e) via Pedro de Carvajal, Bishop of Coria.²⁴

²¹ In addition to Garcilaso's name being specifically mentioned by Valdés as one of the consumers of the work, the celebrated courtier was residing in Naples during the 1530s, when the *Diálogo* was composed.

²² He was very close to the Court, was a great bibliophile (almost obsessed with books), acquired a significant amount of manuscripts in Italy, and was a compatriot of Valdés—also born in Cuenca. Moreover, part of his massive library was bought by García Girón de Loaisa y Carvajal, whose library held MS 8629, without doubt.

²³ A cousin to Pedro de Carvajal, Bishop of Coria (who once possessed the manuscript), there is every reason to believe that he could have acquired the manuscript in Italy: 'Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, while serving in Italy as Charles V's ambassador to Venice, the papacy, and the Council of Trent, also acquired the reputation as a poet, erudite, and collector of manuscripts and antiques' (Nader 2004: 8); and see Navarrete's (2004) discussion of the *Diálogo*'s heavy influence on the style of Diego Hurtado de Mendoza's poetry).

²⁴ He was another well-known bibliophile. Having, undoubtedly, possessed MS 8629 (when he was Dean of Toledo Cathedral), he was one of the Toledo Circle that was very close to the Court; it was King Philip II himself who put his name forward for appointment as Bishop of Coria. In fact, 'le consultaba el Rey Filipe [sic] Segundo en muchas ocasiones [...]. Por su exemplo, muchas letras, y notable urbanidad, y apazibilidad, que en todos los negocios que han tenido, le consultaban' (Fernández 1627: 324–25). The catalogue record on him, in the Biblioteca de Extremadura, reads:

As a recapitulation, other recent discoveries about the *Diálogo* include the following: it has been ascertained that Fray Pedro de Carvajal, the annotator of the preliminary folio of MS 8629, was not some Inquisitor or Inquisitor General, as has always been reported; the annotator Pedro de Carvajal was not the once Dean of the Toledo Cathedral (and, later, Bishop of Coria), as has always been reported, but, rather, a great nephew of that Pedro; crucially, MS 8629 was produced in Valdés's lifetime, prior to 1540; and Gómez de Castro made his own copy of the manuscript he had, almost certainly from MS 8629.

Usoz (1860: vi) reports that, having read in a newly published book, some years after he had seen and copied the *Diálogo* manuscript, that there had been two copies in the BN, he wrote to the library to enquire. The reply that he received—that there was only one copy in their index of manuscripts—convinced him that no other copy was there. This is interesting information, in more than one respect. Whilst researching towards this edition, I discovered that the manuscript copied and used by Usoz, from the BN, was not MS 8629. Additionally, a scrutiny of Usoz's close focus on details of the changes that Mayans had made, in his edition, to the content of the manuscript, confirms that the two editors used one and the same copy of the *Diálogo*. Consequently, the manuscript currently in the BN was not the one used by Mayans either. This goes to confirm the mention of two copies of the *Diálogo* in the BN, information that has remained doubtful, over the past one and a half centuries.

'PEDRO DE CARVAJAL. Este bibliófilo, que fue Obispo de Coria y primo de Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, sustituye a éste como embajador en el Concilio de Trento. Su estancia en Italia le permitió adquirir gran cantidad de manuscritos y encargar la copia de otros'.

Usoz also mentioned Mayans's report of how the manuscript came to his possession: it came from Valencia to the custody of Blás Antonio Nasarre (probably in Saragossa), in whose home he came across it, by chance; and, after browsing it, Nasarre kindly agreed to lend it to him: 'Luego le dije, lo bien que me parecía; y que era digno de la pública luz. Oyólo con gusto, i se lo restituí impreso, añadiendo ocho Tratadillos más' (cited by Usoz 1860: iii; see also Graux 1880). This generates another hypothesis, regarding the mystery of two manuscripts in the BN, because Mayans's 'i se lo restituí impreso' seems to imply that he returned the *Diálogo* to Nasarre in printed form. By inference, therefore, Mayans kept the actual manuscript (for some time, at least); and we can quite confidently suggest that that copy was passed on to the BN, possibly, still via Nasarre, Chief Librarian of the Real Biblioteca, at El Escorial.

It is hardly surprising, then, that Mayans should have copied, or had a copy made of, the manuscript; that would tie in well with the fact that *Add. 9939* was known to have been amongst Mayans's manuscripts that were bought by the British Library (< British Museum). It has to be noted that this information does not detract from the fact that the original from which the British Library one was copied ended up in the BN, prior to Usoz's time.

Still more exciting is the fact that we know that MS 8629 had a trajectory to the BN separate from that of the manuscript used by Mayans and Usoz: whilst the latter went via Valencia (and Nasarre and Mayans), the former was acquired direct from Plasencia to El Escorial. The chronology of the trajectories of the two manuscripts confirms it all: the Valencian one was known in Aragon/El Escorial, before 1737 (the date of publication of Mayans's edition), MS 8629 only left Extremadura for El Escorial, in 1753, some sixteen years later.

There is yet another relevant point to be made on this issue: we are aware that the Dominican convent of San Vicente Ferrer had its roots in Valencia, the saint being from there. In that context, it is not very surprising that a *Diálogo* manuscript copy, virtually identical to the one from the Plasencia convent, found its way to Valencia. Another piece of the *Diálogo* jigsaw puzzle falls into place. The new set of information raise the following prospects: (1) since the copy made by Gómez de Castro, in the 16th century, has not been discovered as yet, the possibility of its discovery (perhaps in Toledo) cannot be ruled out; (2) with knowledge that the BN held two manuscript copies, until about the early 19th century, there is the possibility that the one used by Mayans and Usoz can be found, some day; and (3) any future researcher who wishes to trace when both copies were held by the BN, and to track down the possible factors that must have led to one of them becoming untraceable, has, henceforth, a well-defined time frame to work with, i.e., between 1753 (when MS 8629 reached El Escorial) and 1824 (when the first BN index of manuscripts was compiled and featured only one copy). These two dates define the period that roughly corresponds to the manuscripts' last days in El Escorial and early days in the BN.

That we still have a long way to go in investigating the history of the *Diálogo* manuscripts is borne out by a statement by Alcalá Galve (2006: xlii), in his edition of the complete works of Valdés, in which he characterizes our knowledge of the early history of the *Diálogo* as 'ignorancia total'.²⁵

²⁵ My personal reaction to that declaration was that it should be interpreted as a strong exhortation to scholars to reopen the long-shelved case files, as it were, on a

1.2.2 A Brief Word on Which One is What

Based on the fact that MS 8629 is unanimously accepted as the earliest of the three manuscripts, and that virtually all modern editions have been based on it, there has been very little controversy or doubt about the other two manuscripts: they were copied from MS 8629 (and/or its near-identical twin that has gone missing). But there have been some fairly unsubstantiated views in the literature, which are worth pointing out. One of those (unanimous) views is that MS 8629 is the best, most reliable and most important of the three. The issue I have had with such a view is that it was originated and has been replicated, without a sufficiently solid evidential basis. What if that claim were refutable? Without delving into details here (due to constraints on space), it is worth noting that there is no reason why a proposition to the contrary cannot be made: i.e., that MS 8629 is the ‘worst’ and least reliable of the three extant *Diálogo* manuscripts.

Another view (on the other side of the coin, as it were) is that K.III.8 and *Add.* 9939 are full of errors. Again, no comparative evidence has been systematically provided to that effect.²⁶ Digging up such evidence and constructing a full

subject that had been largely abandoned from the early 20th century, as if the last bit of scholarly energy had been expended on the *Diálogo*’s acrimonious authorship debate.

²⁶ In a similar vein, a remark about the only *Diálogo* edition that was based on *Add.* 9939 leaves one baffled and wondering whether subtle nationalistic tendencies might not have been at work, as there appears to be no rational basis for it. This is the remark: ‘A la bibliografía debe añadirse ahora una nueva edición de nuestro *Diálogo*:

argumentation for the contrary proposition is outside the scope of this introduction.²⁷

However, a careful study of the manuscripts can help one posit a hypothesis that MS 8629 (together with the missing one, once held by the BN) might well have been two drafts, which were, later, rendered into a fair copy K.III.8. This would be in line with Bouza Alvarez's (2004: 43) note that

[i]f one is to believe Manuel de Faria e Sousa in his *El gran justicia de Aragón* (1650), authors usually composed two drafts, although he himself laments that 'I was never so fortunate that I could avoid at least three drafts, and in some cases four, five or even more'. From these drafts would emerge the final version (our 'original'), which the Portuguese chronicler calls *en limpio* (the fair copy) to be read in public, copied in manuscripts, or taken to a printing shop for publication.

A careful examination of the three manuscripts gives the impression that K.III.8, in particular, was a fair copy, and that *Add.* 9939 was something close to that. It is, therefore, curious that it is the opposite view that obtains about the relative status of the three manuscripts. My ultimate view is that this is an issue that might well occupy Valdesian scholars for some time to come, because we have a clearly identifiable problem for which no solution has yet been considered. In the meantime,

Diálogo de las lenguas, edited with introduction and appendices by J. H. Perry (London, University of London Press, 1927). No he podido examinarla. Lo disparatado del título lo hace sospechosa' (Montesinos 1928: LXXVIII). One cannot fathom out what really could be 'disparatado' about the title of Perry's edition.

²⁷ See Anipa (in preparation).

we can focus a little further on MS 8629, the chosen manuscript for the present edition.

There are three different hands in the main body of MS 8629, which, for convenience, I will label A, B and C.²⁸ Hand A covers folios 1^r–38^v (plus line 1 of fol. 39^r), 47^r–73^r, and 97^r–98^r; hand B occupies folios 39^r (from line 2) to 45^v; and hand C corresponds to folios 74^r–96^v. Signatures/initials have just been found in hands A and C (Anipa, in preparation), paving the way for the possible identification, some day, of the copyists of those two parts (which, together, comprise 90.4% of the entire manuscript). The manuscript(s) was/were incorrectly foliated and have had to be rectified: folio number 53 was repeated; folio number 71 appeared as 81; and folio number 80 was made 79. All folio numbers in this edition will refer to the rectified foliation.

It has been known, all along, that MS 8629 has two missing folios. One of them is folio 80 (corrected number), the content of which had been known (probably from a loose draft), by the time that Mayans had a copy, and was duly inserted in the manuscript, in a later hand. Usoz thought the insertion was done by Mayans, but, now

²⁸ There is the possibility that Boehmer's identification of up to six hands in the manuscript was the result of what Montesinos (1928: LXXV) described as 'su valdesianismo exagerado'. However, now that it has come to light that MS 8629 was not the copy used by Mayans and Usoz, we can no longer be certain about the copy that Boehmer used, only a few decades from the latter editor. That uncertainty renders conjectural any dismissal of his finding of six hands; there might (have) be(en) six different hands in the missing manuscript, after all.

that we know for certain that there were two near-identical manuscripts in the BN, and that both of them feature the content of the same missing folio, as a later insertion, we can be quite sure that Usoz's speculation was not correct. The other missing folio should have been located between the end of what should be folio 84 and the start of 85, where the unfinished story of the Count of Ureña should be; in this case, no content was inserted there. The missing folio was duly signalled in an annotation beneath folio 84 as 'aquí falta hoja'; again, this annotation must have been written before the time of Mayans, particularly as the wording of it in his edition is slightly different from what actually features on both manuscripts, as reported and commented on by Usoz, on the one hand, and ascertainable from MS 8629, on the other. Moreover, an underrun of the portion copied by hand B left a blank folio 46 both in MS 8629 and the one used by Mayans and Usoz; the blank folio is presented as such, in the present edition.

1.3 Existing Editions

In the prologue to his edition of the *Diálogo*, Usoz (1860: IX) makes an observation about a practice that is pertinent to existing *Diálogo* editions:

Al publicar el S. M. [es decir, el señor Mayans] el Manuscrito, de una manera tan lizenziosa, probó lo que sienta [sic] Valdés, de que *mudar costumbres, es á par de muerte*, pues, por costumbre inmemorial, entre nosotros: pues no se tiene fidelidad, al imprimir los Escritos de aquellos á quienes ya no podemos consultar. Hoi mismo, se están imprimiendo en España obras de antepasados Autores Españoles, sin atender á sus mejores Orígenes, i sin reproducir sus ediciones jenuinas, i alterándolas, ó

desalmándolas con la mayor frialdad. Lo cual se nota, en fé de sentida afición, á lo que de bueno i útil contienen los Escritos, i Obras zitadas.²⁹

This is a ubiquitous and timeless practice in academic culture, in general, and not peculiar to Spain (as Usoz seems to imply). It is outside the scope of this introduction to expound on the competing schools of thought on the issue. Suffice it to note that, in the case of the *Diálogo* (and works of a similar nature), anything less than a faithful transcription of the manuscript creates a rather serious problem, as will be illustrated in the rest of this section.

There can be no doubt that the existing editions of the *Diálogo* do constitute the bedrock of research into the work and that they will always have their place in Valdesian and Renaissance scholarship. However, their texts have always been presented with a range of ‘corrections’ as well as various degrees of spelling modernization, which render them not sufficiently representative of the original. The heart of the matter is that grapho–phonology (the linguistic level worst affected by such practices) was immensely important in humanistic linguistic thought and debate

²⁹ Although rather obscure today, anyone who is well familiar with Usoz’s edition of the *Diálogo* will agree that it should still occupy a special place in current Valdesian scholarship, the reason being that the editor, despite not having set out to produce a diplomatic edition, displayed a keen interest in respecting the manuscript as closely as possible (‘Ahora reimpresso conforme al manuscrito’—on his title page), and in pointing out graphological and morphological alterations that Mayans had made to the original text, in his edition.

(see Pozuelo Yvancos 1984); unsurprisingly, therefore, Valdés devoted his longest chapter in the *Diálogo* to this linguistic level: ‘Delas letras à donde entra la ortografía’.

The linguistic damage done to the text through modernizing and ‘correcting’ is considerable. The damage is even greater, when the text is only half-modernized, rather than fully so, because, in the latter case, a linguist who wished to rely on an existing edition would be fully aware that a given edition is not a legitimate representation of 16th-century Castilian. Unfortunately, however, it is the former—the pick and choose practice of partial modernizing—that obtains in the vast majority of editions. It might not be contentious to draw an analogy with sleek and pretty end results of the texts produced by the practice, more often than not, at the discretion of editors. The situation effectively compares with that of photoshopped pictures of celebrities, which can look fascinating in fashion magazines, but far removed from how the same celebrities look in real life. In other words, an existing gap in the field has been that the available editions of the *Diálogo* cannot be appropriate for scientific study; and, since this text is essentially (socio)linguistic, it is logical to argue that the existing editions actually constitute a handicap, as they harbour considerable danger, in terms of misleading researchers and skewing their linguistic judgements and conclusions based on them.

At this juncture, a brief illustration of such damage may be appropriate as evidence, in order not to leave this pertinent claim unsubstantiated. Based on the textual simulacrum of an existing edition, there is the belief, in traditional scholarly circles, that ‘Valdés’s own spelling system is rigorously worked out’, that he ‘consistently represents the initial /h/ < Lat. /f/ by *h*’, to the extent that any exception must ‘suggest that amendments were probably made to Valdés’s original version by

the printer', and that 'a device used by Valdés to represent *sinalefa* is the circumflex accent (e.g. **pudiendôs** [...], modern *pudiéndoos*') (see Pountain 2002: 131–32; all formatting original). Nevertheless, none of the above—based on Lope Blanch's edition (which, itself, was prepared by collating those of Barbolani, Montesinos and Lapesa—see Lope Blanch 1984: 35)—can be ascertained in the manuscript. The fact is that there is nothing rigorous whatsoever about Valdés's spelling system in the *Diálogo*, nor is there any consistency about his use of initial /h/ for words of Latin origin. And, crucially, from a sociolinguistic standpoint, there is nothing scandalous or extraordinary about the implied lack of consistency in the *Diálogo*, for 'the important fact, which is fundamental to all linguistic study' is 'that great variations [...] exist and are to be expected' and that 'in linguistic matters consistency (so-called) means inaccuracy' (Jones 1917: x). This is what truly defines the fundamental approach that professional linguists should adopt to the study of the *Diálogo*; and this is the fundamental issue that necessitates a diplomatic edition. Moreover, perceived deviations, e.g., in *hombre*, have nothing to do with any printer's decision, because, in the manuscript, the deviations are pervasive but not consistent. And there is not even a single instance of the use of the circumflex accent in the entire manuscript.

The unfortunate state of affairs just exemplified is normally caused by a combination of factors: (a) trusting a questionable source of data (a non-diplomatic edition of the *Diálogo*); (b) trusting Valdés too readily about his self-report on his usage and preferences;³⁰ and (c) blaming printers, copyists, etc., too readily, without

³⁰ It has been demonstrated (Anipa 2007: 196) that, like any other linguistic proscriptivist and/or prescriptivist (past or present), Valdés was a victim of the

first seeking evidence (a common practice; see how Valdés himself stated it (fol. 88^r)), as if that were a panacea for dealing with linguistic inconsistencies encountered in texts—inconsistencies which, scientifically speaking, do not constitute a problem, in the first place.

1.4 This Edition

In the light of the issues raised in the previous section, and of the discussion, reports and arguments in this introduction, it transpires that not only does a diplomatic edition of the *Diálogo* have a place in Valdesian scholarship, but it is extremely important, if not imperative. In addition to the work lending itself to myriads of intellectual perspectives (the dialogue genre, the fictional dialogue itself, Italian Renaissance and its influence, a few hints here and there about religious issues of the day, comparative humanistic discourse, etc.), it is primarily concerned with language: variation, codification, elaboration of functions, sociolinguistic behaviour, and the ideology of language standard and its conflicting pressures on society and the geopolitics in Early Modern Spain. These core topics fall under both Macro- and

common and sociolinguistically interesting attitudinal phenomenon that Labov (1966: 471) characterized as ‘other perception and self-deception’, i.e., the acute awareness of other people’s linguistic behaviour, in terms of (normally, non-standard) linguistic features that they use, whilst remaining oblivious of one’s own usage of the same features, a state of affairs that only comes to light when self-reports on language usage are compared with documented records of speakers’ actual usage (see, in particular, Anipa 2007: chapter 7).

Micro–Sociolinguistics; and it is self–evident that no effective investigation into most of them can be achieved, in the absence of a faithfully transcribed text. Overall, in his own metalanguage, Valdés made use, in the *Diálogo*, of the grapho–phonological, morpho–phonological, morphological, and syntactic features that he proscribed in the very *Diálogo*, significantly more than of those that he ascribed to himself and proscribed (see Hamilton 1953: 126).³¹ Crucially, the startling statistics revealed about Valdés’s linguistic usage in the *Diálogo* are firmly corroborated by usage in his letters (see Montesinos 1931: 96, and Anipa 2007: 137–54)—ironically, the very letters on which the *Diálogo* discussion was supposedly based, according to the fictional presentation.

The present edition is intended to make the exact content of the manuscript available, in print, to the Valdesian scholarly community and to posterity. Barring

³¹ It must be acknowledged that the attribution of content of the *Diálogo* to Valdés (as has always been done by Valdesian scholars over the centuries), when the copyists of the manuscripts are still not known has its risks; but the identification of the copyists of MS 8629 should still be regarded as an unfinished business. Until that has been accomplished, users of the *Dálogo*, professionals and non–professionals alike, will continue to make do with taking the language in the text as Valdés’s. A relevant argument by Anipa (2012a: 187) regarding the language in Shakespeare’s works makes the point that, from a sociolinguistic viewpoint, ‘if we assume that Shakespeare’s plays are a collective testimony to late 16th– and early 17th–century English (because they equally reflect the language of a few others who might have tampered with his manuscripts), that is not too bad a testimony to go by’.

potential human error and any computer trickery that might have remained undetected in the process, the transcription is made as rigorous as possible. This includes original punctuation, capitalization, use of accents, word division, abbreviations, cancellations, underlining, overlining, errors, use of ‘j’, hesitation, change of mind, corrections, marginal annotations, etc. It is fairly likely that, in literature, most of these detailed features can be comfortably jettisoned, with no repercussions; it is different in the field of Linguistics, where they are precious raw material, in diverse ways. Amongst other things, linguists do carry out research into slips of the pen (i.e., errors in writing), not only at word level, but also at whole-letter and even letter-part levels, in order to find out what they can tell us about language production (see, for example, Hotopf 1983, and Garman 1990).

In cases of overlining (also used in most abbreviations in the manuscript), a plethora of marks indicating the same thing are transcribed as a uniform, horizontal line. The forward slash is used for various slash-like adornment marks, used most commonly in front of initial ‘o’. Similarly, an apostrophe-like adornment mark used after the letter ‘e’ is retained, using the conventional apostrophe; this appears to be obtrusive, but only slightly so, and, after careful consideration, it is deemed better to show this fairly distinctive (albeit inconsistent) written mark than to ignore it.

A couple of features proved particularly difficult, since they presented insurmountable problems. One of them was how to distinguish between the graphs in the trio ‘i’, ‘j’ and ‘y’; this was a thorny topic of discussion in the *Diálogo*, characterized by Valdés himself as ‘un laberinto’ (fol. 43^r). The difficulty is about how they appear in the manuscript, especially in differentiating upper and lower case uses. The other difficult problem concerned word boundaries, where, in numerous cases, it was

virtually impossible to determine whether two words were written together or separately. Even though the editor decided to err on the side of caution (i.e., not to join any two or more words, in such indeterminate instances, unless it was obvious), it would be tantamount to dishonesty, if not outright foolishness, not to admit to a degree of arbitrariness in the rendering of this intractable problem.

The contents of square brackets that do not bear footnotes are additions by the editor, the vast majority of which concern words whose parts are obscured in the manuscript, but which can be retrieved with certainty. The inevitably large numbers of repeated footnotes are purely descriptive in nature (partly due to constraints on space). The notes are made as brief and succinct as practicable; and the nature of the orthography and punctuation in the manuscript prevents a uniform placement of footnote reference numbers. Cancellations, which appear in the manuscript as single strikethrough (mainly horizontal, but also oblique and undulating) are uniformly transcribed with double strikethrough, rather than single, because the latter has proved not to be conspicuous enough, particularly for very short words and single letters.

Finally, the items of Valdés's embedded table of contents in the *Diálogo* are implemented in this edition: chapters of the text, each beginning on a fresh page, are clearly labelled with the relevant titles drawn from the table of contents presented in section 1.1.5 above. This has been done in the absolute conviction that it cannot possibly render the text unreadable to anyone whatsoever. The name of the fictional interlocutor commonly written 'Marcio' is spelt 'Martio', in line with how it appears at the top of the first folio of MS 8629; (in fact, 'Martio' is the short form for 'Martiano', which also features once in the manuscript). 'Torres' (and its subsequent initial) is

used, in place of the more popular ‘Pacheco’; moreover, the name ‘Valdés’ is used, instead of ‘Valdesius’ or ‘Valdesso’—one of which was originally written at the top of the first folio, prior to the scoring out of the last few letters. Although possibly not common knowledge, the name of the *Diálogo*’s author was also often rendered, particularly in Italy, as ‘Giovani Valdesso’, ‘Juan de Valdesso’, and ‘Johannes Valdesius’. Regarding the ‘Pacheco’/‘Torres’ name change, Barbolani (1982) suspects that it might well have been the wish of Valdés himself. I concur with that. Usoz, for his part, despite using the spelling ‘Marzio’ in his introduction and notes, did well by retaining the manuscript’s ‘Martio’ throughout the body of the text itself; but, taking the fictional dialogue for real, he, curiously, retained both ‘Torres’ and ‘Pacheco’ as two separate interlocutors.³²

All in all, this is, in essence, a linguistics-orientated edition of ‘the best-known Valdesian work’ (Crews 2008: 102). That the *Diálogo* is a 16th-century text with a difference is no exaggeration. In spite of its modest size, the *Diálogo* deals with a remarkable stock of metalanguage–cum–object language, Renaissance linguistic debate (including thoughts on the origins, diachrony, and status of Castilian), language codification and intellectualization, variation, continuity, change, the social significance of linguistic variants in usage, consideration of differences between spoken and written media, stylistics, cross-linguistic assessments, sociolinguistic behaviour (description of features; ubiquitous value judgements), and the ideology of

³² There is significantly more to this issue of name change in MS 8629 than is immediately apparent, but its discussion falls outside the scope of this introduction (see Anipa, in preparation).

language standard (epitomized by pervasive prescriptivism and proscriptivism) and its conflicting pressures on a profoundly stratified society and on the geopolitics of the day. All that must be treasure trove for anyone interested in the state of early modern Castilian, amongst other things. Consequently, it is appropriate that the *Diálogo* should be approached and treated differently from any other Renaissance Spanish text; and the present edition has sought to do just that: present a reliable and risk-free text that a wide range of professional linguists can use with full confidence. In the light of Alcalá Galve's 'exhortation' to the Valdesian scholarly community, and of the fact that, hitherto, Valdés's linguistic work has attracted less than 10% of all writings on him (Calvo Pérez 1991: 54), the importance of an edition of this kind cannot be over-emphasized. Ultimately, it is my hope that the variegated issues raised in this introduction are provocative enough to spur on more than a few, trigger a more sophisticated debate, and reignite impetus in further research into the *Diálogo*.

2. Editions of the *Diálogo*

Ardanaz, José (ed.). 1994. *Diálogo de la lengua* (Barcelona: Orbis)

Barbolani, Cristina (ed.). 1967. *Diálogo de la lengua* (Mesina–Firenze: Università degli Studi di Firenze)

Boehmer, Edward (ed.). 1895. *Diálogo de la lengua*, in *Romanische Studien*, VI, Heft XXII: 339–420

Chabrolle–Cerretini (ed.). 2008. *Dialogue de la langue = Diálogo de la lengua, versión bilingüe, presentation et notes* (Paris: Champion)

Comas, Antonio (ed.). 1972. *Diálogo de la lengua* (Barcelona: Bruguera)

Cuesta Torre, M^a Luzdivina (ed.). 2002. *Diálogo de la lengua* (Barcelona: Océano)

Lapesa, Rafael (ed.). 1940. *Diálogo de la lengua* (Zaragoza: Ebro)

Laplana Gil, José Enrique (ed.). 2010. *Diálogo de la lengua* (Barcelona: Crítica)

Lope Blanch, Juan Manuel (ed.). 1984. *Diálogo de la lengua* (Madrid: Clásicos Castalia)

Marsá, Francisco (ed.). 1986. *Diálogo de la lengua* (Barcelona: Planeta)

Mayans y Siscar, Gregorio (ed.). 1737. *Diálogo de las lenguas*, in *Orígenes de la lengua española*, tome II (Madrid: Juan de Zúñiga)

Montesinos, José (ed.). 1928. *Diálogo de la lengua* (Madrid: La Lectura)

Moreno Villa, José (ed.). 1919. *Diálogo de la lengua* (Madrid: Saturnino Calleja)

Perry, Janet (ed.). 1927. *Diálogo de las lenguas by Juan de Valdés* (London: University of London Press)

Quilis, Antorio (ed.). 1999. *Diálogo de la lengua* (Madrid: Libertarias/Prodhufi)

Terracini, Lore (ed.). 1957. *Diálogo de la lengua* (Modena: Instituto di Filologia Romanza dell'Università di Roma)

Usoz y Río, Luis (ed.). 1860. *Diálogo de la lengua (tenido azia el A. 1533)* (Madrid:
Martín Alegría)

3. Select Bibliography

- Alcalá Galve, Ángel (ed.). 2006. *Obras completas de Juan de Valdés. Volumen 1*
(Alicante: Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes)
- Andrés, Gregorio de. 1974. 'Historia de un fondo griego de la Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid. Colecciones: Cardenal Mendoza y García de Loaisa, *Revista de Archivos Bibliotecas y Museos*, 77: 5-65
- Anipa, K. 2001. *A Critical Examination of Linguistic Variation in Golden-Age Spanish*
(New York: Peter Lang)
- 2006. 'A Revised Approach to the Study of Variation in Renaissance Castilian',
Bulletin of Spanish Studies, LXXXIII, 4: 481-503
- 2007. *The Grammatical Thought and Linguistic Behaviour of Juan de Valdés*
(Muenchen: LINCOM GmbH)
- 2010. 'Lost in Grammar: 'Explicating a Crucial Clause in Gómez de Castro's Last Will', *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique*, LV, (1): 3-18
- 2011. '“¿Porque este libro es más antiguo?": The Early History of the *Diálogo de la lengua* Revisited', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, CXII, 2: 131-45
- 2012a. 'The Use of Literary Sources in Historical Sociolinguistic Research', *The Handbook for Historical Sociolinguistics*, ed. by Fernández-Campoy, J. M., and J. C. Conde-Silvestre (Malden, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 175-95)
- 2012b. 'Centrifugal and Centripetal Forces in the Sociolinguistic Configuration of the Iberian Peninsula', *Standard Languages and Multilingualism in European History*, ed. by Hüning, M., and U. Vogl (Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 232-59)
- In preparation. 'New Discoveries about the *Diálogo de la lengua*: Did Juan de Valdés Copy Part of MS 8629?'

- Asensio, Eugerio. 1960a. 'Juan de Valdés contra Delicado. Fondo de una polémica',
Studia Philologica. Homenaje a Dámaso Alonso (Madrid: Gredos, pp. 101–13)
- 1960b. 'La lengua compañera del imperio (a): historia de una idea de Nebrija en
España y Portugal', *Revista de Filología Española*, XLII: 399–413
- Bataillon, Marcel. 1950. *Erasmus y España. Estudios sobre la historia espiritual del siglo
xvi* (Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica)
- Baugh, Albert and Cable, Thomas. 1994 [1951]. *A History of the English Language*
(London: Routledge)
- Bouza Alvarez, Fernando. 2004. *Communication, Knowledge, and Memory in Early
Modern Spain* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press)
- Calonge, Julio. 2005. *Estudios de lingüística, filología e historia* (Madrid: Gredos)
- Calvo Pérez, Julio. 1991. *Tres biografías lingüísticas entorno a Cuenca: I. Juan de Valdés
y la fuerza de la contradicción* (Cuenca: Diputación Provincial de Cuenca)
- Cox, Virginia. 1992. *The Renaissance Dialogue: Literary Dialogue in Its Social and
Political Contexts, Castiglione to Galileo* (Cambridge: Cambridge University
Press)
- Crews, Daniel. 2008. *Twilight of the Renaissance: The Life of Juan de Valdés* (Toronto:
University of Toronto Press)
- Fernández, Alonso Fray. 1627. *Historia y Anales de la Ciudad y Obispado de Plasencia*
(Madrid: Iuan Gonçalez)
- Fernández Pomar, José M. 1965. 'Libros y manuscritos procedentes de Plasencia.
Historia de una colección', *Hispania Sacra*, 18: 33–102
- Fitzpatrick, Juan, J. 1958. 'El Diálogo de la lengua. Observaciones sobre el lenguaje y la
sociedad', *Cuadernos Americanos*, XVII, 6: 173–81.

- Garman, M. 1090. *Psycholinguistics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- González Ollé, Fernando. 1985. 'Nuevos datos sobre la primacía toledana', *Revista de Filología Española*, 67: 123–26
- Graux, Charles. 1880. *Essai sur les origines des fonds grecs de l'Escorial* (Paris: F. Vieweg)
- Hamilton, Rita. 1953. 'Juan de Valdés and some Renaissance Theories of Language', *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, XXX, 119: 125–33
- Hart, Thomas R. 2001. 'Diálogo más que tratado': The Art of Juan de Valdés', *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, LXXVIII: 301–10
- Haugen, Einar. 1983. 'The Implementation of Corpus Planning: Theory and Practice', *Progress in Language Planning*, ed. by Cobarrubias, J., and J. Fishman (Berlin: Mouton, pp. 269–89)
- Hotopf, W. N. 1983. 'Lexical Slips of the Pen and Tongue: What They Tell Us about Language Production', *Language Production*, Vol. 2: *Development, Writing and Other Language Processes*, ed. By Butterworth, B. (London: Academic Press, pp. 147–99)
- Hudson, Richard A. 1996 [1980]. *Sociolinguistics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Jones, Daniel. 1917. *An English Pronouncing Dictionary* (London: Dent)
- Jordan, Mark. 1981. 'A Preface to the Study of Philosophical Genres', *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 14, 4: 199–211
- Keniston, Howard. 1937. *The Syntax of Castilian Prose* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)

- Labov, William. 1966. *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*
(Washington DC: Centre of Applied Linguistics)
- Lloyd, Paul M. 1992. 'On Conducting Sociolinguistic Research in the Middle Ages',
Hispanic Medieval Studies in Honour of Samuel G. Armistead, ed. by Gerti, E. M.,
and H. L. Sharrer (Madison: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, pp. 201–10)
- Luna, Juan de. 1620. *Diálogos familiares muy vtiles para los que quieren aprender la
lengua Castellana* (London: Jones)
- Martinet, André. 1953. Preface, *Languages in Contact*, U. Weinreich (New York:
Linguistic Circle of New York)
- Mazzocco, Angelo. 1997. 'The Italian Connection in Juan de Valdés's *Diálogo de la
lengua*', *Historiographia Linguistica*, XXIV, 3: 267–83
- Milroy, James. 2002. 'The legitimate language: giving a history to English', *Alternative
histories of English*, ed. by R. Watts, and P. Trudgill (London: Routledge, pp.7–
25)
- Montesinos, José (ed.). 1931. *Cartas inéditas de Juan de Valdés al Cardenal Gonzaga*,
Revista de Filología Española, Anejo XIV (Madrid: S. Aguirre)
- Nader, Helen (ed.). 2004. *Power and Gender in Renaissance Spain. Eight Women of the
Mendoza Family, 1450–1650*(Illinois: University of Illinois Press)
- Navarrete, Ignacio. 2004. 'Juan de Valdés, Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, and the
Imperial Style in Spanish Poetry', *Renaissance and Reformation*, XXVIII, 3: 3–25
- Poplack, Shana, et al. 2002. 'Deformed in the Dialects: An Alternative History of non-
Standard English', *Alternative histories of English*, ed. by R. Watts, and P.
Trudgill (London: Routledge, pp.87–110)

- Pountain, Christopher. 2002. *A History of the Spanish Language through Texts*
(London: Routledge)
- Pozuelo Yvancos, José María. 1984. 'Norma, uso y autoridad en la teoría lingüística del siglo XVI', *Historiographia Linguistica*, 11: 77-94
- Ramajo Caño, Antonio. 1987. *Las gramáticas de la lengua castellana desde Nebrija a Correas* (Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca)
- Rutherford, John. 2006. 'The Comical and the Humorous in the *Poema de Mio Cid*', *Bulletin of Spanish Studies*, LXXXIII, 6: 739-69
- Real Academia Española. 1963 [1726-37]. *Diccionario de Autoridades* (Madrid: Gredos)
- Salazar, Ambrosio de. 1622. *Espexo general de la gramática en diálogos, para saber la natural y perfecta pronunciacion de la lengua castellana* (Rouen. Adrien Morront)
- San Román, Francisco de B. 1928. 'El testamento de Álvaro Gómez de Castro', *Buletín de la Real Academia Española*, XV: 543-66
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1972 [1915]. *Cours de linguistique générale* (Paris: Payot)
- Terracini, Lore. 1979. 'La sostanza del *Diálogo de la lengua*', *Lingua come problema nella letteratura spagnola del Cinquecento* (Turin: Stampatori)