

## CRITERIA FOR EDITION OF HISPANIC DOCUMENTS

(ORIGINS-19<sup>th</sup> century)

### INTERNATIONAL NETWORK CHARTA

#### PRESENTATION

It is clear that in recent years there has been a renewed interest in the texts as a primary source of historical and philological investigation. This revival of the text as a centre of research involves the development of new techniques and procedures for access to information with accessibility of the document in digital form, especially through the Internet. The setting-up of a corpus of texts has contributed to the renewal of the studies, while emerging digital libraries incorporate facsimiles. The development of electronic research tools gave new meanings to the editing of the text, since those editions had to win in systematicity and rigour in order to make them profitable. This has particularly benefited the archival documents. On the one hand, the archives themselves have promoted the spread of digital photographs of their funds, as the initiative known under the abbreviation AER (Archivos Españoles en Red) hosts a significant, though still scarce, documentary catalogue; on the other hand, publishers have tried to bring their documentary collections to the Web. Naturally, the paper edition still has its place, and it should be so, because the selective search does not replace but complements the linear and full reading of the text, even for the educational value of this one for the scholar.

It is equally undeniable that the study of documentary sources can be approached from various perspectives. Historians have always seen in them a unique resource for understanding the past. Areas regarded close to historical studies, once called "auxiliary sciences" and now "historiographic sciences and techniques", diplomatics and paleography, have always had its natural scope in the document. Despite having, within the Hispanic Philology, prominent figures that made one of their main tasks the study of documents, only in recent decades, and not without ups and downs, the necessity to go to the diplomas first-hand has been, among philologists, very evident in order to seek the necessary information to reconstruct past stages of the language.

The document brings together diverse interests, enclosing the general history, the history of mentalities and privacy, diplomatics, paleography, graphemics and the history of writing, historical phonetics and phonology, morphology, syntax and lexicology. All these fields of knowledge and others that could be added with little effort, are equally valuable, and have been applied to the study of the documents with different orientations and methods. But being all of them legitimate, only a complete vision of the document shall allow reaching the old idea of philology, understood as an integral knowledge of the text, which is to try to understand the text and help others to understand.

Traditionally, these disparate interests are reflected in very different ways of editing archival sources that vary according to the impression of the researcher on the text and in accordance with what readers expect. Thus, the historian, concerned more by the content than by the verbal expression, will follow an almost always palaeographic criterion, for the sake of the "respect" to the antiquity of the diploma, while certain

features which are significant from a linguistic point of view tend to be hidden (eg., *ss* in *passar*, *ñ* in ancient form *coñocer*, and so on.). The profit readers may obtain of the text is in part determined by how it will be presented to them, because the disparity of solutions forces them to walk in different directions with each edition.

The question we might ask is whether a way of editing texts is better than others, and that being equally valid for all orientations which converge in the document; or, on the contrary, each area and even each individual researcher should articulate his/her own editing system in accordance with his/her interests and the characteristics of the published texts. Of course, diversity does not affect just the interest of the edition, but also the manner in which it would be organised, which may take the form of a mere appendix to a documental study, publishing a single document, the collection of the funds of a archive, a corpus organized from multiple sources, or the most complex digital library which includes, as noted above, photographs of the pieces.

The answer to a question like this seems to depend on the usual individualism in the research on humanities, almost a trait in character, valuable undoubtedly, because it shows independence of mind and eagerness to get to the truth, but it also reveals inconvenients for the teamwork, in which several researchers, some of them in training, assume (as our case) an editing undertaking of considerable size. At the same time, the application of electronic resources requires common criteria that allow a lemmatization with optimal results (for example, the task of distinction between the adverbial *y* and the copulative conjunction *y* is facilitated through the use of ortographic accent). And far from the electronic edition, the desirability of rules that collect experiences was noticed in the past by Spanish philology. Over a half century ago the School of Medieval Studies published a wellknown standard (*Normas de transcripción de textos y documentos*, Madrid, CSIC, 1944).

It is now advisable to propose new rules? The recognition of the maturity, training and independence of all our colleagues should invite one to leave a so risky endeavour. As researchers, we all have knowledge over our scope of study, but it is also true that we make incursions in others fields; at the same time as there will always be, or so we hope, newcomers to prepare their thesis or those initiated in this vast area. But what is presented here it is not a standard. This would require an authority we absolutely lack. In any case we can speak of criteria, with which to measure our own solutions rather than functioning as a reference model. Editors can easily expose their own solutions taking them as a reference. The only advantage of these criteria over the private solutions is that they have been considered and tested during a long time. The criteria presented here are worth, in the meantime, to be followed as a starting point. Another interesting feature is the attempt to fit the whole of the Hispanic domain, viewing the extensive documentary series likely to be unraveling in the archives of the various Spanish-speaking countries. The universal nature of these criteria relates to the care of archival funds from Spain, Latin America and even the Philippines.

These criteria are articulated in the statement that the Network CHARTA (*Corpus Hispánico y Americano en la Red: Textos Antiguos*) applies to its editions. It was established in 2005 and is composed of researchers from the universities of Alcala, Deusto, Murcia, Valladolid, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria and the Spanish National Research Council (Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas). The Universities of Los Andes (Venezuela), Gothenburg (Sweden), Jaén (Spain), Munich (Germany),

Neuchâtel (Switzerland), Padua (Italy) and Salamanca (Spain) joined these founding groups in 2007. One of the main objectives of CHARTA is precisely to establish a standard for editing documentary sources, which has a ruling character for the research groups network, and to develop a large corpus of documents from Spain and America from the origins to the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

The founding groups of CHARTA have met in Bilbao (October 2005), Alcalá de Henares (May 2006), Madrid (December 2006), Valladolid (May 2007 and 2008). At these meetings we managed to articulate a comprehensive proposal for the editing of documentary sources. Among the bibliographic precedents, P. Sánchez-Prieto Borja's book *Cómo editar los textos medievales. Criterios para su presentación gráfica* (Madrid, Arco / Libros, 1998) is included. However, that proposal was meant for literary texts from the Middle Ages, whereas here the time scope extends to the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In addition, documentary sources pose their own problems as opposed to literary works. We must recognize small differences between the two areas. The documentary sources seem doomed not to leave the closed area of research, while the editor of literary texts aims to reach a wide audience, taken for granted with the contemporary texts, and still would like to achieve some degree of diffusion for classical works, and even in the school for medieval texts. This approach requires, however, some precision. From various fields of knowledge with different interests, sometimes unexpected, such as interest on local history or details of the life of another age, the curious reader may be felt attracted by the message that we present in the document. How to reconcile the reasonable objective of paving the way for readers with the palaeographic rigour that is required by the researcher of the history of writing or phonetics, for example? As it will be seen, the answer lies in what might be called "multiple editions".

Moreover, together with these criteria, soon it will be published in Cilengua, Fundaciónn San Millán de La Cogolla, *La edición de textos españoles medievales y clásicos. Criterios de presentación gráfica (The Spanish edition of medieval and classical texts. Criteria for graphic presentation)*. These criteria, which CHARTA has promoted along with Cilengua and the Spanish Royal Academy (RAE), geared to the literature of the Middle Ages and of the Golden Age. In this case, the proposal was created with the fundamental support of the RAE, as an initiative of José Antonio Pascual, and will be used in the Corpus of the *New Historical Dictionary of Spanish*.

There are some differences in the approaches between the criteria applied to literary texts and documentary sources. The latter is generally more conservative of the solutions of the testimony, no matter how disparate or wrong it may seem, for the estimation of the error is different, as much as the reality of its manuscript transmission. The literary text is born usually to be spread and, at least in the Middle Ages, the most usual is that we only have copies, not the originals. The document, however, certifies and takes legal effect in its genuine form, so it is important to credit it viewing the original. Copies will not be only such, but authorized copies, confirmations, transfers, envelopes (i.e., "sobrecartas"), and so on. The literalness of the document is important, and even the amendments, erasures, corrections and handwritings must be indicated and authenticated. Hence the familiar formula ("such word is between lines. *Vala*"). In these circumstances, the *hapax* and error become increasingly established, even as a demonstration of the readiness of the notary, or rather, who writes in his own hand, which is not always the same. No matter how funny or nonsense it may seem, the

mistake "it is in three lines" of a 1562 document (Archivo Municipal de Guadalajara) must be corrected in the edition. Certain graphic aspects, which may not reflect the pronunciation (*mill*, *numqua* in 13th-14th centuries, *-ss-* in the 17th century, and so on), are kept in the critical text even for assessing the timing, extent, and strengthening innovation in the conventional field of professional writing.

It should be noted that, as opposed to the single edition of literary texts, which coincides with what we call "critical presentation", a triple presentation of archival documents is proposed: a) the facsimile, b) the palaeographic transcription and c) the critical presentation. This multiple edition is justified by the inability to gather all the information that the researcher demands on a single "edition". Triple accesses allow to carry out studies of the most varied nature, they are complementary, and we put up on the ideal of questioning the document in its entirety. The facsimile makes it possible, apart from checking the readings, addressing diplomatic and palaeographic studies. The combination of this with the palaeographic transcription will highlight the graphic system and raise the evaluation of the phonetic spellings. The critical presentation which facilitates reading is the appropriate "issue" for the study of morphology, syntax and vocabulary, while improving the historical studies. This triple access has particular application in digital publishing, but also has been tested in the conventional form of the book (see *Textos para la historia del español...*).

Of course, neither this proposal nor any other will be entirely satisfactory, and it is impossible to predict the thousand and one questions we leave to move to daily editorial practice. And those issues cannot be resolved on just the field of scientific solutions, for any "spelling system", and the proposal we submitted itself is so partially, shares, due to the nature of spelling, a certain conventional nature which starts from the recognition of the actual spelling, the one in Spanish nowadays after many hesitations and no few hard tracks. At the end, the proposal is made for modern readers. And, of course, it will be supplemented in the future.

## 1. Introduction

It is advisable that each collection or documentary edition, as it is the case, may be preceded by an introduction. This will be the place to mention issues such as the previous editions of some documents and the differences in reading compared to them.

## 2. Header

### 2.1. Group identification, corpus and document in the corpus

- It includes the acronym of the research group, of the corpus, of the file, number of the document.

### 2.2. Identification of the document

- It identifies the name of the file, ID number of file.
- In the bundles of documents. It consists of several documents without an ID number itself, each one should be identified with a serial number in parentheses,

indicating sheets or pages of the document. If the document has different foliation or page numbers, the one that makes its location easier will be followed.

- In the case of a partial transcription of the document, the transcribed part will be shown:

ff 1r-5v

### 2.3. *Date and location*

- It is expressed in the order: year, month, day:

1320 julio 5

- When the date is incomplete or does not appear, it should be proceeded as follows: the lack of date is encoded with the abbreviations: s.f. ('sin fecha' without date), s.a. ('sin año' without year), s.m. ('sin mes' without month) y s.d. ('sin día' without day).

- When the year can be reconstructed with certainty it will be expressed between square brackets []; if the reconstruction is estimated *ca.* should be used before the year:

s.f. [ca.1350]

s.a. [1320] julio 5

s.a. [ca.1320] julio s.d.

- If the document covers several years it should be mentioned the year of the beginig of the range and the fianl one separated by hyphens:

1320 junio 5-1322 febrero 7

- The ages, calendae, idus, and so on are tranformed to the system of dating today.

- The location is placed below the date in brackets.

- Attention is drawn to the town in the province today, the country today:

(Alcalá de Henares, Madrid, España)

- If the document is given in a convent, monastery or other institution, it should be indicated the name, type of institution, location if different from the name of the province today, the country today:

(San Andrés, iglesia de. Calahorra, La Rioja, España)

- When the place is not listed, use the abbreviation *s.l.* ('sin lugar' without location). If it can be recosntructed, the name of the location is given in brackets:

(s.l. [Toledo])

- Place names are standardized in their graphic form.

### 2.4. *Regesta*

- It contains the type of document, sender, recipient and a brief summary of the content.

- The names are spelled as they appear in the critical presentation (according to the first appearance in romance). Appointing people with intitulation, is preferred to using the names such as *Fernando II de Aragón* (and not *Fernando el Católico*).

### 2.5. *Scribe*

- It includes the name of the scribe, using the same spelling that appears in the critical presentation, followed by the literal phrase that expresses the type of intervention, in brackets and in italics:  
Pero Gil (*la fiz escrever*)

### 2.6. *Support*

- It may include the expression of the type of support (parchment or paper).

### 2.7. *Measurements*

- This may include information on the measurement of the piece. It is expressed in millimeters (height x width).

### 2.8. *Preservation status*

- This may include information on the preservation status of the piece.

### 2.9. *Transcribers*

- The names of the researchers responsible for the edition are aligned to the right side of the document. The names of the reviewers, if any, are placed after the name of the transcriber:

Transcriptor del documento

1er. revisor

2º revisor

## 3. CODICOLOGICAL ITEMS

### 3.1. *Information on the numbers of sheet/folio, column and line*

- The number of sheet/folio, line and letter of column is entered in braces and in the place to be appropriate, even in the middle of word.

hoja número 3: {h 3}

folio número 8: {f 8}

línea 7: {7}

columna primera: {a}

- The indication of face (“r”) and back (“v”) is written immediately after the number of sheet or folio, with no space.

hoja número 3, recto: {h 3r}

folio número 8, vuelto: {f 8v}

- Columns are indicated by letters: “a”, “b”, “c”... after the number of sheet or folio, with no space. If the document contains a single sheet, just the letter should be written.

hoja número 3, columna segunda: {h 2b}

folio número 2, recto, columna primera: {f 2ra}

- Line numbers and column letters are not preceded by abbreviation:

{1}, {2}, {a}, {b}

- All the lines in the manuscript are numbered in the paleographic transcription as well as in the critical presentation.
- Paragraphs are not numbered.
- To indicate the change of line in the margin annotations use the vertical line (|).

### 3.2. *Deterioration of the original*

- When it is certain that there are characters in an area damaged by breakage, bending or spot, asterisks (\*) will be used in the paleographic transcription: if one knows the exact number of letters that are unreadable, an asterisk will be used for each letter; if, on the contrary, the exact number of letters is uncertain three asterisks will be used separated by a space and between brackets.

d\*\* vez\*nos

dos v[\*\*\*]

- When it is not known whether there is or not text, the cause of the deterioration will be expressed in italics and square brackets in its place:

[*roto*]

[*doblez*]

[*mancha*]

- Fragments reconstructed by the editor are written between angle brackets in the critical presentation:

d<os> vez<i>nos

- The fragments of text that cannot be reconstructed in the critical presentation are replaced by suspension points between angle brackets:

dos <...> de la villa

### 3.3. *Signs or special items*

- Use square brackets and italics to indicate the presence of signs or special items:

[*crismón*]

[*cruz*]

[*signo*]

[*rúbrica*], [*firma*], [*firma en árabe*], [*firma en hebreo*], and so on.

- The indication is done in its place, even in the middle of a word:

...fiz aqui mio sig[*signo*]no...

### 3.4. *Information on interventions in the text*

- Only those integrated into the text are to be considered.
- These are indicated in square brackets and italics, and the word preceding the concerned text (in brackets):

...amas las partidas & falle [*interlineado* por pesquisa] derecha... (indicate that “por pesquisa” is interlined text).

- The possible indications are the following:

[*tachado*]

[*raspado*]

[*sobre raspado*]

[*interlineado*], [*interlineado otra mano*]

[*margen*], [*margen otra mano*]

[*mano 2*], [*mano 3*], [*mano 1*]

[*margen*] refers to the original text that, by omission or correction, the copyist is forced to write in the margin and not interlined. It is inserted into the text in the appropriate place and the lines are separated by vertical bars (|).

[*margen otra mano*] is used for marginal notes or annotations to the text whose importance warrants transcription. They are inserted in the most convenient place.

The change of hands in the text is expressed by the indication of [*mano 2*], [*mano 3*]... placed in the beginning of the change. The [*mano 1*] is only marked to indicate a return to the initial hand.

## 4. PALEOGRAPHIC TRANSCRIPTION

Its principle is fidelity to the spelling used (no paleographic) of the manuscript, so it will not reproduce the different forms of the same letter. *V* and *j* are an exception in the the end of the 12th century and the first half of 13th century manuscripts, although at that time those are not signs but allographs of *u* e *i*, respectively.

### 4.1. *Development of abbreviations*

- The restored letters are marked with italics:

*Omne*

- The upper letters are considered to be abbreviated whenever they really abbreviate, and are marked with italics:

q<sup>i</sup>en → *quien*

- The digests and syllabic abbreviations whose morphology is identical to Latin and Romance is resolved according to Latin or Romance:

gra → *gratia* – *gracia*

tra → *terra* – *tierra*

nro → *nostro* – *nuestro*

- The digests of Latin morphology are resolved in its Latin form, out of respect to the form:  
sco → *sancto* (v.i. § 5.1.)
- In digests of Greek letters, as *ih̄s xps*, *ihu xp̄u*, *jhu x<sup>o</sup>...*, the letters forming it are to be kept.  
ih̄su xp̄isto

In this case, the Latin equivalent is based on morphological proximity of the letters not on the alphabetical correspondence (ih = ιη, xp = χρ); The correspondence no longer recognized in the Middle Ages, such as *ih̄esu(s)* o *iherusalem*, often in the full form, demonstrates so. The lesser inconsistency seems to be developing *ih̄su xp̄isto* (see also § 5.1.).

- The abbreviated forms of treatment are developed in the paleographic transcription according to their form and taking into account their different solutions (see also § 5.1.)  
vm → *vuestra merced*
- It must be born in mind in each document when the linet really shows abbreviation and when it is an expletive use, such as:  
*No / non, ni / nin*  
*Maçana / mañana, conoçer / çoñoçer...* (distinguished from the loop of the ç)  
*Mucho / muncho* (distinguished from the digraph *ch* with linet)  
*Reys / reyes, bueys / bueyes* (distinguished point on *y*, become linet)
- No account is taken on the linet on *como*.
- As for the palatal nasal phoneme, it should be transcribed "nn" (also "nn" in the earlier documentation), and ñ from the 16<sup>th</sup> century.
- *N* or *m* is resolved before *p*, *b* according to the general use of the manuscript; if the sequence containing the nasal explicitly never appears, *n* or *m* should be used depending on the manuscript's tradition.
- If there is no abbreviation linet or mark, the missing letters are not rewritten.
- The Tironian sign is expressed with the symbol &.

#### 4.2. Spellings

- The spellings are reproduced but not the different forms that each letter can represent, as follows:
  - straight and uncial *d* → *d*.
  - capital, uncial, with fallen *r* → *r*.
  - round, high, low, sigma, upper *s* → *s*.
  - straight top line, sigma, with tuft *z* → *z*.
  - low and high *v* → *v*.
  - *u* / *v* → remain.
  - *i* / *j* / high *i* → keep *i* / *j*, with which both *j* and high *I* are represented.
  - *z* with tuft / ç → transcribe *z* and *c*, respectively.
  - ç / *c* → are maintained, even when *c* is the spelling of a sibilant consonant (*cabeca*).
- Sigma → transcribed *s* / *z* according to their supposed value.

- Geminated consonants are kept (*sabbado*, *abbat*), as well as the simple used instead of the double and the double for simple spelling (*carera* 'race', *onrra* 'honour').
- Special attention is to be given to the distinction between doubled letters and letters of double stroke (*f* and high *s*). Uses in the manuscript will be observed.

#### 4.3. Numbers

- The Roman numerals keep the characters of the text:  
lxvj
- The sign *U* is maintained to represent *mil*.
- The points delimiting the numerals are maintained.  
.xiiij.
- Arabic numerals in figures are kept.

#### 4.4. Uppercase and lowercase letters

- Capital, uppercase and lowercase letters, that imply capital letter, are transcribed uppercase.
- The high letters are transcribed with uppercase or lowercase depending on the practices and intention of the copist.

#### 4.5. Accentuation

- The diacritic signs, as dot on the letter *y* or two dots or dashes upon the two letters (*íí*, *éé*, *řř*) are eliminated.
- The accent mark is reflected if it implies accentuation (e.g., those used in some documents when transcribing foreign names).

#### 4.6. Union and separation of words and word break at the end of line.

- We must distinguish between joined words and words linked together through cursive stroke; only the first ones are transcribed as a single word.
- The rupture of a syllable at the end of line is marked in the manuscript where appropriate.

#### 4.7. Punctuation

- The basic signs are to be respected: (.), (,), (:), (; instead of point and inverted coma) (/), (-), (¶).
- The high or medium dot is transcribed low.
- Punctuation marks are written adjacent to the previous word, without space, except the (.) enclosing or flanking abbreviations and Roman numerals.
- Eliminate the dots, dashes, etc... that are used to complete the line.

#### 4.8. Change in language

- The change of language is indicated by the corresponding abbreviation in square brackets and italics:

[*lat. Ferrandus dei gratia Rex Castelle*]

- In the case of Latin, this will be stated only in those documents in which the distinction between Latin and the romance is clear.
- Onomastics must be excluded; so names and place names are not considered as another language.

## 5. CRITICAL PRESENTATION

### 5.1. *Development of Abbreviations*

- Abbreviations are developed without record.
- For the development, the graphic criteria of the critical presentation are taken into account:

sco → santo (no “sancto”)

ihs xps, ihu xpu, jhu x<sup>o</sup> → Jesucristo

- The abbreviated forms of treatment are developed according to the editor.

vm → vuestra merced / vuessa merced / usted

- The Tironian sing will be developed as *e* or *y* according to the editor.

### 5.2. *Spellings*

#### 5.2.1. Vowel spellings

- Alternation between diphthongs and no diphthongs for a single word is kept:

rogo – ruego

- The missing vowel in diphthongs represented by the most closed element is not replaced:

cilo → cilo

auulo → avulo

- The apocope requires no special mark (*delant*, no *delant'*).
- In vowel contacts between words, the loss of a vowel is marked with ('):

sobrellos → sobr'ellos

contral → contra'l

- The enclisis apocope with the pronoun is marked with (·):

quel → que·l 'que le' (different from quel → qu'el and quel → qu'él).

#### 5.2.2. *Archaic spellings for palatal sounds*

- In certain cases such as *i*, *gi*, *gg*, *ig*, *ch*, and so on, in order to represent the palatal consonant sounds, we must take part when it is considered to be necessary for the correct phonetic interpretation of the text:

conecho → conejo

eiar → echar  
Sanggez → Sánchez

### 5.2.3. *u, v, b*

- *U* and *v* are distributed according to their vocalic or consonantal value:

uva, vua, uua, vva → uva

- *B* and *v* are reflected as shown in the document:

estava → estava  
estaba → estaba

- *B* is conserved in both *cibdad*, *cabdal* ... and in *cabsa*, *Abstria*.

### 5.2.4. *i, j, y*

- *I, j, y* are distributed according to their vocalic or consonantal value:

djxo → dixo  
iusto → justo

- The variation *i-y* with possible phonetic value is reflected, depending on the date and the value that we believe they have (in the 13<sup>th</sup> century *i* can represent both the mediopalatal and the prepalatal):

yudgar → yudgar  
iudgar → judgar, yudgar

- The sequence of vowel + final *i* is transcribed according to current spelling usages:

soy, Roy, muy, fui

- Diacritical tilde is used to differentiate between the *y* adverb and the *y* copulative conjunction.

### 5.2.5. *f-, ff-, -ff-, h-, -h-, ø*

- *Ff*, both initial and internal are transcribed as *f*.
- *H* is deleted, in words where it has not been consolidated:

hedat → edat

- *H* is not replaced when the document does not present it:

heredat → heredat  
eredat → eredat

- Interior *h* is not reflected:

veher → veer

- The verb *haber* is a special case. There are two possibilities: 1) it will be written with *h-* or not according to the tradition to which the manuscript belongs, taking the approach that involves less intervention by the editor, 2) in medieval texts, it will be written without *h-* and *-v-*, and subsequently for the fifteenth century texts, with *h-* and *-b-*, regardless of the uses in the manuscript. In any case, the 1st and 3rd pers. sing. will be written *he*, *ha* or *é*, *á*.

### 5.2.6. *k, c, qu, ch; g, gu*

- *K* is replaced by *c* or *qu*:
  - akel → aquel
  - kalendas → calendas
- *Ch* is replaced by *c* or *qu*:
  - charta → carta
  - achel → aquel
- *Qu* is replaced by *c* for the value [kw]:
  - qual → cual
  - quando → cuando
- *C* is reflected as *qu* on *arquo, riquas*, and so on.
- Some cases deserve special attention as *gualardón-galardón, guarir-garir*.

### 5.2.7. *l, ll*

- *Ll* will be restored in cases like *lamar* ‘llamar’.
- Processes of palatalization and depalatalization affecting different Hispanic varieties must take into account (*privilegio, lleña, pilloto*).
- *-Ll* will be reflected in final position (*ell, aquell*). In the case of *mill*, it is advisable that this spelling is respected throughout the Middle Ages and simplified to *mil* from the 16<sup>th</sup> century on.

### 5.2.8. *m, n, nn, ñ (gn, ng, ign, ni, and so on.)*

- *m* is maintained in syllabic final position before *b* and *p*:
  - embiar
  - empecer
- *m* before any consonant different from *b* and *p* must be respected when its use is etymological (*comde* → *comde*), but is standardized when it is not due to etymological reasons (*imcorporar* → *incorporar*).
- *n* is written before *v* (*enviar*).
- *ñ* appears as the palatal nasal (*anno* → *año*).
- Changes as *conocer-coñocer, linaje-liñaje*, and so on, deserve special attention.

### 5.2.9. *r, rr*

- *r* is represented in the initial position and as a postconsonantal vibrant
  - rrey → rey
  - onrra → onra
- According to geographic areas final *-rr* and postconsonantal groups (for example, in the Basque Country and Navarre) will be maintained.

- *rr* is restored in forms such as *corer* 'run', but not when it seems that the multiple (trill) and simple vibrant alternate:

parroquia → parroquia  
 paroquia → paroquia

#### 5.2.10. Spelling of sibilants

##### 5.2.10.1. *c, ç, sc, sç, z*

- *C* and *ç* will be regularized: *c* before *e, i*, and *ç* before *a, o, u*:

çien → cien  
 cabeça → cabeça

- *Sc* and *sç* are transcribed as *c* before *e, i* when their phonetic value, at the time of the document, would be equal to *c*:

paresce → parece

- The distribution of *c* and *z* is respected:

facer → facer  
 fazer → fazer

##### 5.2.10.2. *s-ss*

- The initial and postconsonantal *ss* is transcribed as *s*:

ssaber → saber  
 consabido → consabido

- In the inner position the distribution of *-s-/-ss-* in the manuscript is maintained.

##### 5.2.10.3. *i, j, g, x*

- The distribution of *j* and *g* before *e, i* in the manuscript is respected:

ajeno → ajeno  
 ageno → ageno

- The use of *g* before *a, o, u* with the value /ž/ or /x/ (Juango → Juanjo) is corrected, except when it is suspected that it is a sign of aspiration (as *aparego* in American documents).

- The distribution of the use of *x / j, g* in the manuscript must be reflected:

dixo → dixo  
 dijo → dijo  
 xeneral → xeneral

##### 5.2.10.4. Sibilants barterers or swaps

- The swaps of sibilants are reflected (*digen* 'they say' → *digen*), just as the variation of *s-x* (*examen-esamen*).

### 5.2.11. -t, -d, -z

- Uses of the document must be reflected:

pared, paret, parez

- In the case of final *-nt* and *-nd* the use of the manuscript is respected when the dental is etymological (*grand - grant, segund - segunt - según*), but is eliminated if it is not:

algund, algunt → algún

### 5.2.12. Consonant groups (“Learned” spellings)

- They are regularized if they have no particular phonetic value (except in the Latin contexts):

Phelipe → Felipe

charta → carta

- They are kept when they may involve a phonetic difference:

dino → dino

digno → digno

chancellor → chancellor

cancellor → canceller

escripto → escripto

escrito → escrito

- The non-etymological groups such as *colu(m)pna* (a possible dissimilation to prevent the assimilation or palatalization of the nasal consonants) could be also respected, but could not in *duepno* → *dueño*.

## 5.3. Numerals

- Roman numerals will appear in uppercase and without dots (*.lxvj.* → *LXVI*).
- The sign U is resolved as *mill* or *mil*.
- Arabic numerals shall be maintained in figures.

## 5.4. Uppercase and lowercase

- (M) and (m) are used to mark the difference between common and proper names. The names of authorities and institutions (king, council) deserve special attention.

## 5.5. Accentuation

- Accentuation is introduced to reflect the ancient prosody, and so we follow the current spelling of the Spanish Academy.
- The accentuation has diacritic value in pairs such as *nós / nos, ó / o, ál / al, ý / y*.

- Hiatuses and diphthongs present particular problems (*tenié* o *tenía*, *reina* o *reína*, *vío* o *vio*).

#### 5.6. *Union and separation of words and word break at the end of line*

- Words are to be joined or separated in order to show the grammatical and lexical units of the language at the age of the manuscript. We will have to decide, then, whether elements that integrated cases such as today's *buenamente*, *susodicho*, *aunque*, *todavía*, and so on, must be written together or separately.

#### 5.7. *Punctuation*

- The current system of punctuation must reflect the syntax of the document, not the modern syntax.
- Attention must be paid to the formulaic structures of documents in order to offer a coherent and systematic punctuation.

#### 5.8. *Change of language*

- The word or fragment written in another language is marked in italics without brackets and without any indication of the concerned language.
- Onomastics is not considered to be "another language".