



## **European Master in Lexicography**

Universidade de Santiago de Compostela

### ***“Fuero Juzgo in the Diccionario de Autoridades: Traces of Visigoth Law in Spanish Academic Lexicography”***

Master’s Thesis

Student: Marija Žarković

Supervisor: Ernesto Xosé González Seoane

July 2019

Para Gloria Clavería Nadal,  
la investigadora que despertó en  
mí el deseo de investigar.

И за моје родитеље и брата.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The present study represents the product of the synthesis of my two great passions – lexicography and history. Therefore, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to those who have supported me and assisted me in the completion of this research. First of all, I am indebted to Dr. Gloria Clavería Nadal for her enormous support, guidance, and direction throughout the whole process. I came to the idea for this research while doing an internship in the research group guided by Prof. Clavería Nadal. She mentored and influenced me in the most masterful way, inspired me to deepen my knowledge further and dedicate myself to this field of study. I am not less grateful to Dr. Ernesto Xosé González Seoane, the supervisor of my thesis, for his valuable advice, for guiding and directing me and above all for the encouragement. Prof. González Seoane continuously helped me not to lose the track and assisted me with the language issues. He was an excellent supervisor, and I could not have conducted this research if it hadn't been for him. Moreover, I would love to acknowledge Dr. José Ignacio Pérez Pascual, whose door was always open for me, for his assistance in finding the right sources.

I express my appreciation to the coordinators of the program at the universities I attended, Dr. María José Dominguez Vasquez, Dr. Eva Buchi, and Dr. Idalete Silva Dias. I would especially like to mention Prof. Buchi's engagement in organizing the common semester in Nancy. Her effort was admiring and inspiring on both professional and personal level. I would also like to thank Dr. María Teresa Díaz for teaching me the bases of practical lexicography, teamwork, and compassion.

Special thanks go to the European Master in Lexicography selection committee and to each of the professors that I had the honor to learn from during the course of these two incredible years. Each one of them left a unique mark on my academic development.

Last but not least, to Nikola, for believing in me more than I did.

## Table of Content

<b>1 Introduction</b> .....	1
1.1 Objectives .....	2
1.2 Corpus .....	3
1.3 Methodology .....	3
<b>2 Historical Aspects</b> .....	5
2.1 A Panorama of Spanish Monolingual Lexicography .....	7
<b>3 <i>Diccionario de la lengua castellana</i> or <i>Diccionario de Autoridades</i></b> .....	9
3.1 General Characteristics of the <i>DA</i> .....	11
3.1.1 Outlines of the Macrostructure .....	12
3.1.2 Entry Structure .....	13
3.2 Employment of the <i>Autoridades</i> .....	13
3.2.1 Classification of the <i>Autoridades</i> .....	16
<b>4 Specialized Vocabulary in the <i>DA</i></b> .....	17
4.1 General and the Specialized Vocabulary .....	17
4.2 The <i>Diccionario de Autoridades</i> and the Specialized Vocabulary .....	18
4.3 Legal Vocabulary in the <i>DA</i> : Treatment and <i>Autoridades</i> .....	20
4.3.1 Conceptualization .....	20
4.3.2 Treatment of the Legal Vocabulary .....	21
4.3.3 Sources of the Legal Vocabulary .....	24
<b>5 <i>Fuero Juzgo</i></b> .....	27
5.1 How the Visigoths Tailored the Legal System .....	27
5.2 Language of the <i>Fuero Juzgo</i> .....	29

<b>6 The Role of the <i>Fuero Juzgo</i> in the DA</b> .....	30
6.1 <i>Las Antiguadas</i> : Towards a Depiction of Old Times .....	31
6.2 The (Un)specialized Lexicon .....	35
6.3 Legal Vocabulary and the <i>Fuero Juzgo</i> .....	36
6.4 The Evolution of the Legal Concepts .....	38
6.4.1 Case study .....	39
6.4.1.1 Preserved lexical units .....	39
6.4.1.2 Modified lexical units .....	46
6.4.2 Final observations .....	55
<b>7 Conclusion</b> .....	56
<b>8 Appendix</b> .....	60
<b>9 Bibliography</b> .....	65
<b>10 Declaration of originality</b> .....	72

## **Abstrakt**

Die Anwendung verschiedener Texte als Quellen für lexikografisches Material zum Zwecke der Veranschaulichung und Bestätigung der Verwendung der Lemmata ist eines der bekanntesten Merkmale des ersten von der Real Academia Española veröffentlichten Wörterbuchs. Diese Masterarbeit hat zwei Hauptziele. Erstens beabsichtigt man mit dem Text einen Beitrag zur allgemeinen Forschung des im ersten akademischen Wörterbuch lemmatisierten Fachlexikons zu leisten und sich dabei auf das juristische Vokabular zu konzentrieren. Zweitens werden die Quellen des lexikografischen Materials untersucht, wobei der Einsatz des mittelalterlichen Rechtskodex *Fuero Juzgo* als eine der Quellen im Mittelpunkt steht. Indem diese Arbeit sowohl die Implementierung dieses Kodex als Quelle als auch die Behandlung des darin veranschaulichten Rechtsvokabulars untersucht, gibt sie einen Einblick in den semantischen und formalen Werdegang der lexikalischen Einheiten durch die Zeit, die mit dem Rechtsbereich verbunden sind, aber auch stellt verschiedene Arten von Aspekten (historische, linguistische, lexikografische usw.) dar, die auf die eine oder andere Weise diesen Prozess beeinflusst haben.

**Schlüsselwörter:** Diccionario de Autoridades, Fuero Juzgo, juristischer Wortschatz, historische Lexikographie

## **Abstract**

The employment of diverse texts as sources of lexicographic material to exemplify and attest the use of the lemmata is one of the most recognizable traits of the first dictionary published by the Spanish Royal Academy. This Master's Thesis aims at two main objectives. Firstly, the text aspires to contribute to the general study on the specialized lexicon lemmatized in the first academic dictionary, thus concentrating on the legal vocabulary. Secondly, it examines the sources of the lexicographic material while focusing on the employment of the medieval legal code *Fuero Juzgo* as one of the sources. By examining both the implementation of this code as a source as well as the treatment of the legal vocabulary it exemplifies, this work provides an insight into both semantic and formal genesis of the lexical units tied to the domain of law through time but also depicts different types of aspects (historical, linguistic, lexicographical, etc.) which, in one way or another, have influenced this process.

**Key words:** *Diccionario de Autoridades*, *Fuero Juzgo*, legal vocabulary, historical lexicography

## 1 Introduction

In the last decades, the field of study of Spanish monolingual lexicography has been incorporating a wide variety of topics. The extraordinary interest in the research in this field helped its growth and advancement as well as the expansion to various interdisciplinary investigations. In the current study, we are motivated by the latest advances in the diachronic research of the dictionaries published by the Spanish Royal Academy. Specifically, this thesis aims attention on the particular traits of the first dictionary published by the academy, known as the *Diccionario de Autoridades* (1726 – 1739, henceforth, *DA*), that is considered to be the founder of a vast and prolific lexicographic flow embodied in the twenty-three published editions of the academic dictionary.

On the one side, we seek to contribute to the general study on the specialized lexicon implemented by the first academic dictionary, thus focusing on the legal vocabulary. On the other side, we intend to pay particular attention to the medieval law code *Fuero Juzgo* as one of the sources used for extracting usage examples for the compilation of dictionary and analyze the employment of this text as a source, as well as the vocabulary it was used to exemplify. The present study will, thus, serve to demonstrate some of the characteristic features of the treatment of the legal lexicon in the *DA*, but also of the methodology followed in the integration of one of its oldest sources of lexicographic material, i.e., the *Fuero Juzgo*.

This study is divided into seven chapters. The first is the present introduction which exposes the purpose, objectives, corpus, and methodology of investigation. The second chapter is composed of two parts, the first one of which represents a brief introduction to the historical period in question, while the second one consists of a panorama of the Spanish monolingual lexicography. In the third chapter, there is a presentation of the *DA* that includes the description of the general characteristics of the dictionary, and the explanation of the employment of the example sources for the purpose of dictionary compilation. The fourth chapter elaborates on limits between the general and the specialized vocabulary and reports on the inclusion of the specialized language in the *DA*, thus focusing on the legal vocabulary. The fifth chapter presents an introduction to the medieval law code *Fuero Juzgo* and contains a part dedicated to the vocabulary of this text. The sixth chapter represents the practical part of this study and is divided into four parts. The first two parts of the sixth chapter describe the role of *Fuero Juzgo* as one of the example sources in the *DA*, the vocabulary it helps exemplify and the way in which it was employed. The second part of the chapter number six consists of a multidisciplinary analysis that serves to illustrate the employment and the further evolution of

the chosen legal concepts in the academic dictionaries. Finally, there is a summary of the results of the work and the reflection on the importance of studying the legal lexicon in the historical context.

### 1.1 Objectives

This work focuses on the vocabulary, principally on the juridical lexicon, of the medieval law codex *Fuero Juzgo* and its presence and treatment in the first Spanish academic dictionary, i.e., the *DA*, as well as on the prevalence and evolution of this vocabulary in the Spanish academic lexicography until today. The research has the following objectives:

- 1) to describe the legal documents most commonly used as sources of the lexicographic material, but also the treatment of the legal lexicon in the first Spanish academic dictionary, while relying on the existing researches on these topics;
- 2) to investigate the manner in which the *Fuero Juzgo* was employed for the compilation of the *Diccionario de Autoridades*;
- 3) to show the treatment of the general and the legal vocabulary with the authority of *Fuero Juzgo* in the dictionary;
- 4) to investigate the treatment of the vocabulary of the legal domain in the *DA* exclusively based on those entries that state the *Fuero Juzgo* as one of the *autoridades*;
- 5) to conduct a diachronic and comparative analysis of certain lexical units that designate legal concepts exemplified in the *DA* using the *Fuero Juzgo* as one of the sources in order to describe the evolution of these legal concepts in Spanish academic lexicography from its very beginning (1726 – 1739) up till the last edition of the academic dictionary (2014). This analysis aims at the following objectives:
  - to analyze the change in the lexicographic treatment of legal concepts that have existed in the language since the middle ages in the first academic dictionary-based exclusively on the entries that have initially employed *Fuero Juzgo* as one of the *autoridades*;
  - to describe the changes that the lexical units designating legal concepts went through up until the 23<sup>rd</sup> edition of the academic dictionary and thus note the lemmas and senses that remained unchanged, the ones that have undergone noticeable changes, as well as the withdrawn ones;
  - to examine the changes in the lexicographic treatment of the cases and note the differences in inclusion criteria, in the sense listing as well as the new senses were being incorporated throughout time.

The results obtained in this work will contribute to the existing studies on the sources used for the compilation of the first academic dictionary (*las autoridades*), but also to the studies of Spanish historiography and historical lexicography.

## 1.2 Corpus

The corpus of this research is made up of a total of 246 lexical units lemmatized in the DA and exemplified by employing a quotation extracted from the *Fuero Juzgo*. After analyzing each of these units, we obtained 43 lexical units that designate legal concepts. A total of 246 entries and subentries served to find out the way in which *Fuero Juzgo* was included as one of the sources of lexicographic material during the compilation of the DA. Yet, the 43 entries and subentries that define legal concepts were meticulously studied for the purpose of describing their treatment and evolution. The Appendix contains a list of all the lemmas that were exemplified using the quotations extracted from the *Fuero Juzgo*, together with the information on the lemmas and the senses that were indicated as archaic, the ones that describe legal concepts and the ones that have managed to overcome the filtering and the selection of the subsequent publications have been included in the 23<sup>rd</sup> edition of the academic dictionary without any linguistic changes.

## 1.3 Methodology

The methodological procedure that is followed in this investigation is the following. First, a general study was carried out on the first academic dictionary, i.e., the DA, the methods in which academics employed a vast number of sources of lexicographic material, and the treatment of the specialized vocabulary (legal lexicon in particular) in the dictionary. After that, a research was conducted on the law code *Fuero Juzgo*, its main characteristics, the researches that studied it so far, the relevance it had for the Spanish legal system, and especially on its implementation by the academics for the purpose of compiling the first academic dictionary.

The practical part of this work consists of a diachronic and comparative analysis of the legal vocabulary that the first academics extracted from the *Fuero Juzgo* for the compilation of the DA. This analysis, that uses both the lexicological and the lexicographical approach, serves to show the evolution of particular legal concepts dating from the medieval times, as well as the developments in lexicographical methodology employed by the Spanish Royal Academy that were demonstrated in the treatment of these concepts in the first academic dictionary and in the successive editions up to the last, i.e. the 23<sup>rd</sup>, edition.



After we extracted the legal concepts that were lemmatized in the *DA* either as the main entry or as a subentry and illustrated using the quotations from *Fuero Juzgo*, we conducted a diachronic-comparative analysis and examined the evolution of each one of these concepts, from the first time a concept was lemmatized up to till the 23<sup>rd</sup> edition of the academic dictionary. Due to the extension of this work, it is not possible to describe the evolution path of each of these concepts. Therefore, the described ones are the concepts that best help to reach the aforementioned objectives: *atormentar*, *afrontar*, *juro*, *emienda*, *caldaria*, *calonia*, *esposayas*, and *pleitesia*.

The primary data source used for the compilation of the Thesis is the platform *Nuevo diccionario histórico del española* (henceforth *NDHE*) that contains a digitalized version of all six volumes of the *DA*<sup>1</sup> with the respective outer texts. This platform allowed us to search, use, and present here the entries that implemented *Fuero Juzgo* as one of the exemplifying sources. Moreover, it provided us with access to the essential metalexicographical texts, such as the foreword of the *DA* (henceforth *Prólogo*<sup>2</sup>).

The diachronic-comparative analysis was conducted using the platform *Nuevo Tesoro Lexicográfico de la Lengua Española* (henceforth *NTLLE*). The Spanish Royal Academy developed this electronic lexicographic resource in the form of a database that contains facsimiles of the majority of the monolingual Spanish dictionaries published in the period from sixteenth till the the twentieth century by different authors and institutions. Since this resource is freely available online, it provides the user with unlimited possibilities for linguistic research. Among other features, using this database, the user can track the changes in the meanings of particular lexical units that were occurring with the course of history. With the help of *NTLLE*, we were able to consult the 22 editions of the general language dictionaries published by the RAE, as well as both editions of the *DA*. The latest edition, i.e., the *Diccionario de la lengua española* (henceforth *DLE*), was consulted via a separate web site.

It should be emphasized that it is impossible to dispense the transdisciplinary character that investigations on specialized concepts tend to adopt. The analysis we conducted presupposes interrelationships between the legal and language sciences. Therefore, apart from the twenty-three editions of the general dictionary published by RAE, we also used the *Diccionario del español jurídico (DEJ)* as a reference point. In addition to the fact that this dictionary was

---

<sup>1</sup> Each of the samples of lexicographic material from the *DA* presented in this work was extracted from the digitalized version of this dictionary provided by the *NDHE*.

<sup>2</sup> This outer text is quoted rather frequently in this work and the reference *Prólogo* points to the foreword of the specified volume of the first edition of the *DA*, unless stated otherwise. This text can be consulted at the *NDHE* website.

compiled by the same institution, the *DEJ* undertakes, as Muñoz Machado (2016, p. XXIX) pointed out, the task of recovering a dictionary model that follows the methodological guidelines imposed by the *DA*. Namely, in this legal dictionary, each sense constitutes a new entry, thus following the model set by the *DA*. It formulates almost exclusively brief definitions and enriches them with indications of the use of each word or phrase, and with examples from *autoridades* or from documents extracted from the laws, different authors or jurisprudence (*ibid.*).

In order to facilitate a general view of the evolution of a definition, after the description of the evolution of each concept, we included a table that enables the comparison.

Due to the inconsistency in providing usage indications in the dictionary, it was necessary to set the three criteria of determining whether a lemma denotes a legal concept. First of all, a lexical form was considered to designate a juridical concept if it is included in the *DEJ* since this is considered to be a reliable lexicographic resource of legal vocabulary. Another relevant resource to be consulted was the *Diccionario de la Lengua Española (DLE)*, where the mark *Der.* is used to mark the juridical forms. Finally, in the cases when a lexical form does not appear either in the *DEJ* or in the *DLE* due to the language changes, the researcher analyzed the definition and the usage examples and decided whether a form was being used in a juridical environment based on the possible usage proofs.

Moreover, the digital database *Corpus diacrónico del español (CORDE)*, *Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual (CREA)* were consulted for the purposes of investigating the real usage of the lexical units in the language in different time periods. Finally, the *Diccionario crítico etimológico castellano e hispánico (DCECH)* by J. Corominas and J.A. Pascual was consulted for etymological information.

## 2 Historical Aspects

As stated by Bo Svensén, a “dictionary is a product of the culture in which it has come into being; it is less so to say that it plays an important role in the development of that culture” (Svensén, 2009, p. 1). The analysis of the *DA* requires situating the publication of this dictionary into a cultural and social context of the eighteenth century Spain, and the history of Spanish lexicography since the knowledge of the historical and sociocultural context can contribute significantly to the coherence of this study.

The eighteenth century was the time of recovery and reforms in many areas of life in Spain. The War of Succession (1701–1713) caused a considerable loss in power of the country

for the benefit of other European countries. The war left the nation devastated and with little cultural and social activity. Nevertheless, after the war was over, an attempt was being made to reduce the scientific and the technical “backwardness” that had been prominent in Spain since the end of the sixteenth century due to its intellectual isolation from Europe (Lapesa 1981, p. 418). In the words of Carriazo Ruiz (2015, p. 43), “this period can be characterized as a «Spanish Revolution» that would coincide in dates and in opposing parties other changes of paradigm such as those of the «English Revolution».” Since this work sets its focus on certain peculiarities of Spanish language and since the occurrences in the history of language do not follow the chronological periods of general history (Carriazo Ruiz 2015, p. 43), we shall disregard other areas of the life in eighteenth-century Spain and briefly comment the main phenomena in the language spheres during this period.

Rafael Lapesa (1981, p. 421) points out that two of the most relevant language issues came to be resolved in the eighteenth century and describes the methods in which these were handled. The first issue refers to the elimination of doubtful duplicates that emerged from the conjunction of certain Latin forms such as “*concepto/conceto, efecto/efeto, digno/dino*” (Lapesa 1981, p. 421). The second problem was that of orthography. As Lapesa (1981, p. 421) explains, the graphic system that had been used during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was mostly the same as the one used during the reign of the king Alfonso X (1252-1284) and therefore maintained graphic characteristics that were not corresponding to the language spoken in the eighteenth century.

All these aspects lead to one significant event when in the year 1713, on the initiative of Juan Manuel Fernández Pacheco y Zúñiga, the Royal Spanish Academy (*Real Academia Española*, henceforth, RAE) was founded. It was modeled after the *Accademia della Crusca* (1582), of Italy, and the *Académie Française* (1635), of France, and its primary purpose was “to fix the voices and vocabularies of the Castilian language with propriety, elegance, and purity” (Gómez Asencio 2008, p. 31). The first academics were convinced that it was necessary to purify and standardize the language in order to conserve it in its most magnificent splendor achieved in the literary texts of the previous century (Ruhstaller 2003, p. 240). Their convictions are symbolized by the emblem in the form of a fiery crucible, and the motto “Limpia, fija y da esplendor.”

Carriazo Ruiz (2015, p. 44) explains that the period of “the transition between Baroque’s classical Spanish to Enlightenment’s modern Spanish is marked by a purification of the literary models, corpus selection, the establishment of the normative authority of the *RAE*,

and the recognition of American varieties of Spanish” and further explains that in this moment of history a real change of the worldview occurred.

In its early days, the RAE performed very efficient work. After completing the *DA* (1726-39), the Academy published its very first edition of orthography, *Orthographía* (1741), and of grammar, *Gramática* (1771), and thus significantly enforced the language regulations but also notably encouraged the “correct” language usage. Moreover, it also published new editions of the *Quixote* (1780), and the *Fuero Juzgo* (1815) and empowered the sense of national identity and the Spanish cultural legacy.

All these occurrences cause the eighteenth century to be regarded nowadays, according to Cano Aguilar (1992, p. 254), as the period when all the essential historical processes which formed the Spanish language were finished. The author goes on to say that this century represents a changing point after which the “modern Spanish” finally achieved stability (1992, p. 257).

## **2.1 A Panorama of Spanish Monolingual Lexicography**

Spanish monolingual lexicography is a discipline with a remarkably long tradition. Its beginnings, according to Alvar Ezquerra (1995, p. 186), can be traced back to the beginning of the seventeenth century and are marked by the presence of reference works of technical and etymological character.

Francisco del Rosal, a doctor from Córdoba, was the author of the *Origen, y Etymologia, de todos los Vocablos Originales de la Lengua Castellana*, an etymological work recorded only in the form of manuscript (Nomdedeu Rull 2007, p. 452) that today has a strictly lexical function due to its medieval criteria, to the type of vocabulary it covers and to its geographical distribution (Alvar Ezquerra, 1995, p. 16).

Nevertheless, it is the publication of the *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española* (Madrid, Luis Sánchez) by Sebastián de Covarrubias in 1611 that is considered to be the starting point of the monolingual lexicography and the first general dictionary of Castilian language (cf. Freixas 2003, p. 22; Azorín 2000, p. 120). Covarrubias not only collected a vast linguistic and encyclopedic information but also added the etymological orientation to his work (Azorín 1989, p. 83). Manuel Seco summarized the importance of this work in the following way:

*"El Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española es, según universal consenso, una de las llaves imprescindibles para todo el que quiera acercarse al conocimiento de la lengua y la cultura españolas de las décadas en torno al año 1611, y un abigarrado mosaico de noticias que le*

sumergirán en los saberes, las creencias y el vivir españoles de aquellos comienzos de siglo" (Seco 1987-1988, p. 387).

What is more, the RAE recognizes the importance of the work of Covarrubias in the foreword of the *DA*<sup>3</sup> and uses it as one of the sources for the dictionary.

Nonetheless, as Azorín (2000, pp. 159-160) states, the *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española* did not manage to become a model for the future dictionaries of the Spanish language. On the contrary, the author points out, after its publication in 1611, Spanish lexicography entered one of the poorest and the least productive periods of its history (ibid.). The situation improved when, more than a century after that, the new period in the history of monolingual lexicography commenced with the first dictionary created by the RAE which turned out to be the *DA*, and which was published between 1726 and 1739. After publishing the *DA*, the academics decided to establish a new, revised, and extended edition. Nonetheless, only the first volume of the new edition of the *DA* (1770) was eventually published because the reworking process of the *DA* resulted in the first edition of the *Dictionary of the Royal Spanish Academy* (henceforth, *DRAE*) in the year 1780. The first edition of the *DRAE* "had been initially conceived as the short version of *Autoridades* but ended up being used as the basis for several monolingual Spanish dictionaries." (Saurí 2006, p. 604) According to Álvarez de Miranda (2000, p. 52ff.), the main characteristic of the aforementioned reworking process of the *DA* was the reduction that was undertaken, mainly by suppressing the examples of "authorities" but also by moving the subentries of a given lemma into one general entry where the subentries would become different senses. The author explains further the genesis of such a trend where the examples or quotations were removed already in 1780 while the subentries subsided by the year 1791 when another edition of *DRAE* was published. The latter phenomenon reappeared, however, only twelve years later, in 1803.

Among the numerous dictionaries published in the nineteenth century and outside the lexicographic publications of the RAE, it is worth mentioning the *Nuevo diccionario de la lengua castellana* that was compiled in 1846 by Vicente Salvá, another monolingual dictionary of indisputable lexicographical value. This dictionary as well as the *Diccionario nacional o gran diccionario clásico de la lengua española*, published by Ramón Joaquín Domínguez in 1847, are considered "leading exponents of the best lexicography" developed during the nineteenth century (Saurí 2006, p. 604).

---

<sup>3</sup> See the *Prólogo* of the first volume of the *DA* (1726), p. I.

As opposed to the previous periods, the twentieth century witnessed an exceptional rise in the number of the dictionaries published, but also in the variety of dictionary types. However, since this work focuses primarily on the monolingual general-language dictionaries, we shall only mention the respected work of María Moliner, the *Diccionario de uso del español*, published in 1966, and the *Diccionario del español actual*, which was compiled by Manuel Seco and others, and published in 1999, as two of the essential non-academic Spanish lexicographic publications.

The dictionaries that have been compiled outside the RAE after the publication of the first academic dictionary, i.e. the *DA*, show a relatively high dependency on the academic publications, since the lexicographic material of the dictionaries published by the RAE has often been used for the compilation of the non-academic dictionaries<sup>4</sup> (Ruhstaller, 2003, p. 237).

Nevertheless, there are at least four dictionaries published outside the Academy that “may be considered true landmarks in the history of Spanish lexicography: R. J. Cuervo’s *DCR*, M. Moliner’s *DUE*, J. Corominas and J. A. Pascual’s *DCECH*, and M. Seco’s et al.’s *DEA*” (Bosque and Rodríguez 2018, pp. 638-639).

However, the impact the lexicographic publications of the RAE have had on Hispanic lexicographical tradition is immense, having been achieved throughout its 23 dictionary editions. The lexicographic works of the RAE have been dominating Spanish lexicography for almost three hundred years. These dictionaries identified Castilian Spanish as the language standard for Spanish until the 15th edition, that was published in 1925 (Saurí 2006, p. 605). After this, a change was required since, as explained by Bosque and Rodríguez, “the academic dictionary is now drawn up by RAE and ASALE (‘Association of Academies of the Spanish Language’)” and because of that “the old term *DRAE* (instead of *DLE*) is not recommended anymore” (Bosque and Rodríguez 2018, p. 3).

### ***3 Diccionario de la lengua castellana or Diccionario de Autoridades***

Between the year 1726 and the 1739, the RAE published its first dictionary - the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana, en que se explica el verdadero sentido de las voces, su naturaleza y calidad, con las frases o modos de hablar, los proverbios o refranes, y otras cosas convenientes al uso de la lengua [...]*, known as the *Diccionario de autoridades*<sup>5</sup>. Ever

---

<sup>4</sup> When writing her own work, María Moliner states that "absolutely all Spanish dictionaries" have taken their definitions from the *DRAE* (cf. M. Moliner, *DUE*, p. xlv).

<sup>5</sup> For a detailed study on the *DA*, cf., among many others, Lázaro Carreter 1972, Ruhstaller 2001, Freixas 2003 and 2010, and Álvarez de Miranda 2005.

since its first volume appeared, in the year 1726, this work has occupied the central position in Spanish lexicography and has shaped the lines of future lexicographic works in the Spanish language. The RAE was founded with the primary objective of compiling “un Diccionario copioso y exacto, en que se viesse la grandéza y poder de la Léngua, la hermosúra y fecundidad de sus voces, y que ninguna otra la excede en elegáncia, phrases, y pureza” (*Prólogo* 1726, p. I). This task proposed by the founders was to be compiled in the style of the great European models already published by that time but was also meant to continue the thread of a rich lexicographic tradition of their own nation, that was commenced by Nebrija and Covarrubias (Rodríguez Marín 2003, p. 193, cited in Nomdedeu Rull 2007, p. 452). The academic work would consist, as Carriazo Ruiz (2015, p. 75) explains, in the fixation of the language in its state of most magnificent splendor, that, in the opinion of the founders, corresponds to the second half of the sixteenth century and the first decades of the seventeenth century.

Two of the works that influenced and inspired the first Spanish academics and that helped determine the fundamental aspects of the first Spanish academic dictionary were the previously published dictionaries by the academies founded in the neighbor countries, *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca* and the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française*. In the foreword of the *DA*, it is stated:

Para la formación de este Diccionario se han tenido presentes los de las Lenguas extrangéras, y especialmente el Vocabulario de la Crusca de Florencia, cuya última edición, que fué la tercera, se hizo el año de 1591. (*Prólogo* 1726, p. II-III)

The influence the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie française* had on the *DA* can be noticed in some of the main aspects of the first Spanish academic dictionary, such as the features of the inclusion of phraseology and the proverbs, the exclusion of proper names and indecent lexicon, as well as the stylistic valuations (Ruhstaller 2003, p. 239).

Nevertheless, there are numerous differences between the *DA* and its French and Italian predecessors. As Freixas (2003, p. 110) explains, these differences consist mainly in the acceptance of provincial lexicon, of the archaisms and of the scientific and technical vocabulary that was rejected in the methodological principles set out in the foreword of the *Vocabolario* and of the *Dictionnaire*. Spanish academics also seem to depart from their models in the inclusion of vulgarisms accepted by *Crusca* and not even mentioned by *l'Académie*. Moreover, the *DA* overcame the *Vocabolario* and the *Dictionnaire*, and was opened to the inclusion of the etymological information.

The entire work, all six volumes of it, was printed in 1739, i.e., thirteen years after the first volume appeared and twenty-eight years after the work was initiated. This can be considered a reasonable amount of time, especially if compared to the working tempo of other European institutions from the same period (cf. Hernando Cuadrado 1997, p. 389).

The first Spanish academics did not intend to create a prescriptive lexicographic work, but instead to reestablish and describe the most appropriate linguistic forms and demonstrate the correct language usage<sup>6</sup> (Rivas Zancarrón 2017, p. 303). In order to achieve this goal, they compiled a dictionary of ‘authorities’ and justified the acceptance of a vast majority of lemmas and showed the proper implementation of lexical units by including the testimony of the use of a word by one or several respected writers or celebrated literary and non-literary texts. According to R. Saurí (2006, p. 603), a general perception among the Spanish intellectuals at the beginning of the eighteenth century that “Spanish was declining as a language of culture (the so-called Golden Century in Spanish literature had been two centuries earlier)” ultimately led to the creation of the RAE in 1714. By compiling the *DA*, the Academy fulfilled its main goal: it delivered outstanding lexicographic work, and by doing so, the RAE left its first and crucial mark into the history of not only Spanish but also European lexicography.

### 3.1 General characteristics of the *DA*

In order to obtain a full image of the main characteristics of both the microstructure and the macrostructure of the *DA*, it is necessary that we keep in mind the contents of the documents written by the authors of the dictionary that explain the methods of their lexicographic work.

The foreword of the *DA*, often referred to simply as *Prólogo*, constitutes a metalexicographical document of extreme importance for understanding the normative concepts established by the academics. Some of the essential most aspects discussed here are the senselessness of including detailed etymology in the dictionary due to the error possibilities (p. I), the very concept of the dictionary (p. II), its descriptive (and not the prescriptive) purpose (p. IV), etc.

Nevertheless, it is the documents best known as *Plantas* where the academics defined the criteria and the methodology that were to be followed in the compilation of the dictionary. What was established here are the structural characteristics of the dictionary entries, the distribution of work, but also stylistic, etymological, and orthographic rules to be followed by academics. The first *Planta* was elaborated after the board meeting held on the 13<sup>th</sup> of August

---

<sup>6</sup> The intentions of the academics were detailly described in the foreword of the first volume of the *DA* (1726).



1713, while the second one came after the meeting held on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of November 1713 as a result of the incompleteness of the first one (Freixas 2003, p. 159).

### 3.1.1 Outlines of the Macrostructure

The *DA* was published in six volumes. According to the lemma list of the *DA* that can be obtained in the corresponding area of the web page of the RAE, the work contains a total of 42 368 different lemmas in the sense these have today<sup>7</sup>. Nevertheless, Lázaro Carreter (1972, p. 75) calculated more than thirty-seven thousand entries and thousands of more senses, idiom, and sayings. The author also explains that this dictionary provides information for four times more words than the previously published monolingual dictionary of the Castilian language, the *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o Española* (ibid.).

In the *Prólogo*, the academics explain that every sense will be treated as a separate lemma and described in a separate entry<sup>8</sup>:

Despues de todas las acepciones que convienen à cada voz, y vãn en artículos aparte, se ponen todas las phrases que le corresponden, y luego los refrãnes, observando tambien en uno y otro el riguroso orden Alfabético (*Prólogo* 1726, p. VII).

When it comes to the selection of the lexicon that constitutes the macrostructure of the dictionary, it should be mentioned that in order to standardize the language, the academics considered it necessary to eliminate “[...] todos los errores que en sus vocablos, en sus modos de hablar, ò en su construcción ha introducido la ignorancia, la vana afectación, el descuido, y la demasiada libertad de innovar” (*Prólogo* 1726, p. XXIII). Nevertheless, they further described their normative intentions in the *Prólogo* and explained that, while it is their wish to eliminate the errors and the imperfections that are to be found in the language, they do not plan to correct the language but instead to describe its real usage. In this sense, Carreter (1972, p. 44) stresses that it would be unjust to qualify the attitude of the academics as ‘purist’ since the *DA* did include a significant number of dialectal variants, as well as the Gallicisms and Italianisms. Moreover, Ruhstaller (2003, pp. 239-243) describes not only the presence of the lexical elements that belong to specific dialects, but also the presence of the lexical units that are used in specific sociolinguistic restrictions, in particular, discourse styles, or in specialized domains.

---

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Rojo (2014, p. 146) for the number of different lemmas and senses in each of the six volumes.

<sup>8</sup> In her analysis, Freixas (2010, p. 407) affirms that the *DA* is the first monolingual dictionary “dedicado a definir o a describir el significado de las distintas acepciones de las palabras del español y calificar su uso en artículos que cuentan con una estructura predeterminada”.

### 3.1.2 The Entry Structure

When analyzing and discussing this lexicographic work, and especially its relation to a specific sphere of life (in our case the legal disciplines), it is important that we keep in mind its occasionally encyclopedic character and the inconsistency that is noticeable in various aspects of both microstructure and macrostructure. The inconsistency is particularly apparent when it comes to the structure of dictionary articles and to the lexicographical marking.

The structure of the articles varies according to whether we are dealing with an encyclopedic description or with an explanation of a sense of a lemma. In the majority of cases, an entry consists of the lemma, the grammatical information, the usage indication, the semantic information, the etymological information, the Latin equivalent and the citations from the texts, i.e., from the *autoridades*. Nonetheless, another inconsistency is regarded in the absence of systematically organized space inside an entry. Namely, the previously listed entry components very often do not follow the assigned order.

The very lemma sign may be represented by the primary sense, the secondary sense, or a complex form of a lexical unit. The definition of the complex forms would today correspond to the fixed combinations of a substantive element with other words that, with respect to the substantive element, play an adjective function (DRAE 2001; cited in Henríquez Salido 2004, p. 764). What Svensén (2009, p. 347) regards as semantic-pragmatic section, in the *DA*, consists of the definition and of the equivalence in Latin. However, the structure of the definition may vary from being expressed by a synonym to having encyclopedic characteristics. The contextual section (*ibid.*) mostly consists of the usage examples extracted from one or more *autoridades*, and it is placed at the end of the dictionary article. Nevertheless, there is also a number of articles that were not assigned any examples nor *autoridades*.

### 3.2 Employment of the *Autoridades*

In his study entitled *Análisis cuantitativo de las citas del diccionario de autoridades*, G. Rojo (2014, p. 9) demonstrated the multiplication of graphic variants different from those that appear in the list of abbreviations. Moreover, he proved that the texts contain quotations from works by authors not mentioned in the list of abbreviations. Thus, as the author exemplified, in the list of abbreviations are not the *Entremeses de Cervantes*, which appear four times under the CERV Entrem. Besides, as reported by Rojo (2014, p. 154) the most quoted author in work is Quevedo, the second one is Cervantes and the third, and considerably

less quoted than the first two, Lope de Vega. He goes on to say that these three make up 13,68% of all the quotations<sup>9</sup>.

The practice of incorporating and combining concise citations from diverse literary and non-literary texts as an evidence and demonstration that a word does in fact poses the meaning described in the definition, while stating the title and the name of the author of the citation inside most of the dictionary articles, is without any doubt one of the most prominent characteristics of the *Diccionario de Autoridades*. In her thesis, Freixas included an epigraph devoted to the verb *autorizar* which states that it also includes a meaning of “confirmar, apoyar, comprobar lo que se dice con autoridades, sentencias y textos de otros autores” (2003, p. 95). The author points out that with the term authority the academics referred both to an author that should be admired for his style, as to a specific work that was considered to illustrate some of the features of the language the academics wanted to demonstrate (ibid. p. 82). In the terminology used by Freixas, *autoridades* are those authors that are listed in the "LIST OF AUTHORS ELECTED BY THE REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA, for the use of voices and ways of speaking" (*Prólogo* 1726, p. LXXXV). Nevertheless, many other texts from which examples about the use of words are extracted are not included in this list<sup>10</sup>. The *autoridades* in the dictionary represent its corpus and are registered in the list of authors and works, that was published in the preface of the first volume, but also in the lists of abbreviations in each of the volumes. The primary purpose of implementing the *autoridades* was to fix the particular usage and to illustrate the lexical forms.

We can learn from the *Prólogo* (1726) that the cited documents date from the twelfth to the eighteenth century and were composed by the greatest masters of the Spanish language. Each of the authors quoted, as well as each of the works, has a unique abbreviation inserted right before the citation, ex. CERV. is an abbreviation for Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra and Quix. for *Don Quixote* (*Prólogo* 1726, p. LXXXII). The preliminary documents incorporate a text under the title *Lista de los autores elegidos por la Real Academia Española, para el uso de las voces y modos de hablar*, which is meant to declare each of the works and the authors quoted in the *Autoridades*. The authors and their works that were used as sources came to be known as *Las Autoridades* - the Authorities, and thus the dictionary itself became mostly known as the *Diccionario de Autoridades*.

---

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Rojo (2014, p. 150) for an overview of the percentage of entries that contain example quotations in the *DA*.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Rojo (2014, pp. 161-191).

Many investigations have been conducted so far about the sources and the *autoridades* implemented in the first academic dictionary (Lázaro Carreter 1972; Bravo Vega 1998; Desporte 1998-1999; Freixas 2003; Ruhstaller 2004). Freixas (2003, p. 412) estimated that there is a total of 460 writers<sup>11</sup> cited by RAE in the *DA*. Nevertheless, the works of the authors such as Francisco de Quevedo, Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, and fray Luis de Granada represent one-quarter of the total number of citations. According to Freixas, the taste for the literary works is due to the fact that the influence of anti-baroque ideology was yet to come, and the tastes renaissance were again dominant in the time when the dictionary was compiled. Moreover, the ruling opinion was that the eighteenth century was the point in time when the literature had reached its absolute splendor. However, the first academics did, as it will be discussed in this work, employ other types of texts such as scientific works, chronicles, legal documents, etc.

In the *Prólogo* (1726), there are numerous explanations of the motives and the causes for the inclusion of the sources. The quotations had the primary function of demonstrating that a word is “límpia, púra, castíza y Española” (*Prólogo* 1726, p. XVIII). The academics selected the works that were considered the most excellent examples of correct, appropriate, and tasteful language usage. This approach, however, presupposed employing the most respected authors and texts from the past and putting in practice the lexical and grammatical form these employed in order to show the light of day to a future fixated and pure language. Ruhstaller (2000, pp. 209 and 217) points out that an attitude as such lead to the inclusion of the words unfamiliar to the epoqe in which the dictionary was compiled, namely numerous archaisms and archaic dialecticisms.

As there may appear two or more usage citations per lemma, the creators of the dictionary decided to list the citations in alphabetical order and thus avoided any form of discrepancy among the authors. The academics aimed to avoid inconveniences and, guided by the experiences of other European academies, decided to restrict the number of authorities<sup>12</sup>.

---

<sup>11</sup> On the other hand, Ruhstaller (2003, p. 248) stated that, for the compilation of the *DA*, the academics used a total of 871 works written by 416 known and 86 unknown authors.

<sup>12</sup> “En el uso de las autoridades se resolvió no multiplicar muchas para una voz, porque advertidos de otros Dictionarios se solicitó evitar inconvenientes. En el de la Real Académia Francésa se califica la voz sin autorizarla: este es magistério de que huye la Académia Española, que dá la senténia; pero la funda, à fin de que quantos la lean conozcan la razon que la assiste: y no obstante, que el de la Crusca multiplica mucho las autoridades, pues hai voz que se califica con treinta, ò quarenta Autóres: se ordenó, para evitar esta prolixidad, que solo se autorizasse cada voz, ò phrase con dos, ò tres autoridades: pues si es castíza, y expressíva, dos, ò tres Autóres clásicos son testigos fidedignos para probar su nobleza, y sino es de tanto realce, dos, ò tres testigos conformes bastan para assegurar su naturaleza.” (*Prólogo* , 1726, p. XIX)

### 3.2.1 Classification of the *Autoridades*

When it comes to the classification of the documents used by the Academy as the quotation sources, we shall follow the gender categorization provided by Freixas in her remarkable study *Las Autoridades en el primer Diccionario de la Real Academia Española*:

- I. Works in Verse:
  1. Poetic-lyric;
  2. Epic narrative;
  3. Theatrical;
- II. Works in Prose:
  1. Epic narrative;
  2. Theatrical;
  3. Didactic essayistic;
  4. Juridical documents<sup>13</sup>. (2003, p. 250)

The author followed the gender classification proposed by Antonio García Berrio and Javier Huerta Calvo in their study *Los géneros literarios: sistema e historia* (Freixas 2003, p. 251). She added, however, a fourth section in the works in prose, i.e., the juridical documents, under which she categorized legal documents used as *authorities*: testaments, laws, jurisdictions, orders, etc.

Nevertheless, when it comes to the way of implementing the sources, the relevant studies<sup>14</sup> pointed out the criteria the academics followed when using a particular source to exemplify a lemma. The sources are categorized into two different groups. The first group primarily consists of the literary sources, i.e., the *autoridades* that were employed with the purpose of illustrating the properties and the proper use of a lexical form. The authorities that constitute the second group belong to the secondary sources, namely the lexicographic and specialized (scientific-technical) works that were not used to exemplify the correct use of a word, but rather as the sources of encyclopedic information. The justification of this approach is to be found in the foreword:

Las citas de los Autores para comprobación de las voces, en unas se ponen para autoridad, y en otras para exemplo, como las voces que no están en uso, y el olvido las ha desterrado de la Lengua, de calidad que se haría extraño y reparable el que hablase en voces Castellanas antiguas, que yá no se practican; pero aunque la Académia (como se ha dicho) ha elegido los Autores que la han parecido haver tratado la Lengua con mayor gallardía y elegancia, no por esta razón se dexan de citar otros, para comprobar la naturaleza de la voz, porque se halla en Autor nacional, sin que en estas voces sea su intento calificar la autoridad por precission del uso, sino por afianzar la voz [...] (*Prólogo 1726*, pp. v-vi).

---

<sup>13</sup> Translations are mine.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Ruhstaller 2000, Freixas 2010.

As explained, the first group represents the majority of the sources. This study, however, concentrates on the secondary sources and specifically on the legal texts used as sources.

## 4 The Specialized Vocabulary in the *DA*

### 4.1 The General and the Specialized Vocabulary

The difficulty of drawing a clear separation line between general and specialized language plays an important role in this study<sup>15</sup>. Therefore, the issue that should be clarified first refers to the perception of the concept of specialized language. We shall be guiding us by the conceptualization elaborated by Hoffmann (1998, cited in Ridao Rodrigo and Rodríguez Muñoz 2012, p. 3) that defines specialized languages as those that have to do with the linguistic aspects that are characteristic of a communicative domain determined by a common specialty, with the objective to facilitate communication between professionals in the same area.

Authors such as Vangehuchten (2005, in Santamaría Pérez 2006, p. 10) distinguish two groups of specialized lexicon, technical lexicon, and sub-technical lexicon. The sub-technical is considered to consist of the units of general vocabulary used in everyday speech, but only of those units that also are used in various professional domains, although with a more general and diffuse conceptual scope than that of the terms used exclusively in professional contexts (ibid.). It is precisely the sub-technical lexicon that is the most relevant for our study since the *DA* includes a significant number of articles that deal with the type of vocabulary that can be classified as sub-technical.

Finally, in order to discuss the specialized vocabulary present in the *DA*, it is necessary to determine the basic types of units of expression that are to be used in the discussion. In her study, Santamaría Pérez (2006, p. 11) quotes the norm DIN 2342 (1986, p. 6) which states that “un término, como elemento de una terminología, es una unidad constituida por un concepto y su denominación”. The concept is defined, by the mentioned norm (op cit.: 2), as “una unidad del pensamiento que abarca las características comunes asignadas a los objetos”. Finally, the denomination is “la designación, formada por un mínimo de una palabra, de un concepto en el lenguaje especializado” (Santamaría Pérez 2006, p. 11).

---

<sup>15</sup> “Uno de los principales problemas que afectan al léxico de especialidad es su inclusión en los diccionarios generales de la lengua, puesto que no está claro que se pueda establecer una frontera entre el léxico general (compuesto por palabras) y el especializado (compuesto por términos); y ello sucede debido a la transformación continua de palabras en términos y de términos en palabras.” Pérez Pascual (2012, p. 207)

## 4.2 The *Diccionario de Autoridades* and the Specialized Vocabulary

It is generally known that the progressive incorporation of the specialized knowledge into the general knowledge influences the entry of the specialized vocabulary into the general lexicon. From the very beginning of Spanish academic lexicography, it was demanding to set the limits between the scientific and technical lexicon and the common lexicon due to the coexistence of both of these areas in the language. In fact, in the forward matter of the *DA* (1726, p. 2), it is explained that the Dictionary consists of “todas las voces de la Lengua, estén, ò no en uso, con algunas pertenecientes à las Artes y Ciéncias” without explicitly stating the words in question.

Freixas (2010, p. 47) pointed out that the tendencies Academy followed on the inclusion of the specialized languages are precisely one of the things that defers its work methods from the ones set by previously published eminent European dictionaries, i.e. the monolingual dictionary of Italian language published by the Accademia della Crusca as well as the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française*<sup>16</sup>. These differences consist, fundamentally, in the acceptance of provincial lexicon by the Spanish Academy, of the archaisms and of the scientific and technical vocabulary that was rejected in the methodological principles set forth in the Preliminaries of the *Vocabolario* and the *Dictionnaire* (ibid.).

Azorín (2000, p. 286) stated that the treatment of scientific and technical vocabulary represents one of the problematic chapters in the history of DRAE. The author indicates that the guidelines on including the words of technical origin used by speakers in non-specialized contexts (ibid.: 287), that the Academy has followed up to today, commenced with the *DA*. On the other side, Ahumada (2000, pp. 80-83) argues that the difference between these two types of lexicon corresponds to the distance that exists between two realities: the first one occurring

---

<sup>16</sup> The criteria followed by Academia della Crusca on the implementation of the specialized vocabulary can be found in the forward matter of the 3<sup>rd</sup> edition of the *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca*: “I nomi propri delle Provincie, Città, Fiumi, e fimili, come ancora de'loro derivati, si sono interamente tralasciati; ne pur i termini propi, e minuti di tutte l'Arti, e di tutte le Scienze: ne meno i nomi de'loro Strumenti, hanno avuto luogo nel presente Vocabolario; Come che non se ne trovino per la più parte gli esempli nelle buone Scritture, e come che essi formassero di per loro un'amplio Volume; ma non se ne è da noi trascurata la materia, anzi tra'nostri studi, ne abbiamo e notati, e dichiarati moltissimi, per farne un Nomenclatore a parte: non senza speranza, che anche questa nuova nostra applicazione, sia per incontrare il gusto de'Lettori, e per riportar gradimento dagli studiosi della nostra favella.” (Foreword 1691, p. 19, cited in Pascual Fernández 2009, p. 14). On the other side, the Académie Française also indicated the attitude towards the specialized vocabulary in the forward of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française*: “L'Académie en bannissant de son Dictionnaire les termes des Arts & des Sciences, n'a pas creu devoir estendre cette exclusion jusques sur ceux qui sont devenus fort communs, ou qui ayant passé dans le discours ordinaire, ont formé des façons de parler figurées; comme celles-cy, *Je luy ay porté une botte franche. Ce jeune homme a pris l'Essor*, qui sont façons de parler tirées, l'une de l'Art de l'Escrime, l'autre de la Fauconnerie. On en a usé de mesme à l'esgard des autres Arts & de quelques expressions tant du style Dogmatique, que de la Pratique du Palais ou des Finances, parce qu'elles entrent quelquefois dans la conversation.” (Foreword 1694, p. 32, cited in Pasqual Fernandez 2009, p. 15)

between the concepts of general and specific lexicon and the second one being reflected in the way in which both lexicons are being represented in dictionaries in practice.

The first manual created for the elaboration of the dictionary, the *Plantas* from the year 1713, contains only one observation regarding the specialized lexicon. It consists of an indication that the specific 'forensic', as well as poetical lexical forms, should be appropriately marked, in order to warn the reader of this particular usage. Nonetheless, this regulation proves that the Academy has recognized different degrees of lexical specialty ever since its very foundation, considering the fact that it introduces in the Dictionary both the lexical forms that have lost specialized traits and belong to the common language as well as those that are relevant to specific disciplines (Pascual Fernández 2009, p. 16). Furthermore, this attitude towards the specialized and non-specialized vocabulary is further described in the very foreword of the Dictionary:

En este diccionario se ponen generalmente todas las voces de la Léngua, estén, ò no en uso, con algunas pertenecientes à las Artes y Ciéncias, para que con su notícia se pueda saber su significado con la proporciónn correspondiente. (*Prólogo* 1726, p. II)

In the *Prólogo* (1726), there is a list of grammatical abbreviations (18 of these in total) under the title *EXPLICACION DE LAS CIFRAS GENERALES QUE SE PONEN en este Diccionario*. This list includes the abbreviation *Term.*, the short form of *término*, as a generic label to mark the specific vocabulary of science and technology. The application of this abbreviation is, as Pascual Fernández showed (2013, pp. 195-196), highly irregular. Nonetheless, despite the inconsistent application, the introduction of an abbreviation that marked the specific lexicon was a novelty introduced by the RAE, since earlier European models did not use to indicate specific usage of the words (*ibid.*). The abbreviation *Term.* represents the first step of the future creation of the system of abbreviations, further developed in the second edition of the dictionary (*ibid.*).

The investigations conducted in the recent years, such as Álvarez de Miranda (1992) and Azorín Fernández (2000), demonstrate the importance of the autoridades that do not belong to literary works in the strict sense. Moreover, Gutiérrez Rodilla (1993), for example, proved that the DA includes 3000 words that belong to the field of medicine. Ruhstaller (2003: 242) calls attention to a particularly admirable diversity of the fields of knowledge represented through the specialized vocabulary that was collected in the DA and lists a number of offices, e.g., gardeners, carpenters, plumbers, shepherds, etc.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Gutiérrez Rodilla (1993) and Gómez-Pablos (2002) for more information on the treatment of scientific-technical vocabulary.



When analyzing the importance of the texts used for the compilation of the first academic dictionary, Ruhstaller (2000, p. 203) emphasizes the significance of non-literary documents (jurisdictions, testaments, etc.) and states that these that serve to illustrate the vocabulary of specialized and technical areas. The author states that the decision to include the non-literary texts, and consequently the non-purist lexical forms, resulted from the previously expressed intention of the Academy to compile “un Diccionario de la lengua, el mas copioso que pudiere hacerse” (*Prólogo* 1726, p. XXIII). The inclusion of lexical forms that belong to different occupations and professional spheres allows the dictionary to express the richness of the language.

It may be concluded that the *DA* includes thousands of tecnicisms, despite what is said in its very prologue (Gutiérrez Rodilla 2003, p. 458). The Academy permitted the entrance of authors whose works were not considered to belong to the collection of linguistic excellence, the inclusion of the vocabulary that was exclusive to specific regions, of the lexical forms that had been used in earlier times or were clearly outdated at the time the dictionary was written (Rojo, 2016, p. 756) and of the ones that were specific for a particular vacation with the sole purpose of demonstrating the copiousness of the language.

### **4.3 Legal Vocabulary in the *DA*: Treatment and *Autoridades***

#### **4.3.1 Conceptualization**

Through history, members of civilized societies have often been exposed to situations in which they directly or indirectly have been coming across legal concepts. Depending on the historical period, these concepts relied on different ideologies, issues, and values. Therefore, it comes along naturally that some of the denominations of these concepts, i.e., certain legal terms, become a part of a general vocabulary used by the community.

Sandro Nielsen states that while “it may be argued that legal terminology does not belong in general language dictionaries”, this argument might be justified when it comes to “small” dictionaries but, he points out that “the idea of including legal terms in general dictionaries is not new” and explains that this practice counts on a long tradition. Nevertheless, it should be kept in mind that the Law of a given society is highly influenced by the ideology dominant in that very society (García de Enterría 1995; cited in Martí Sánchez 2004, p.182). Martí Sánchez (op. cit.) argues that valuable proof of ideological differences can be found when comparing administrative documents coming from different periods. Moreover, the author states that a legal domain is very often a matter of tradition and socially recognized habits and

explains that this evokes the invisible discourse of Law that consists of the conventions and the latent expectations that govern the way in which words should be used and interpreted.

Because legal language is a specialized language, it is characterized by a particular lexicon used by the professionals in the subject. Saussure (1945, p. 68) considers the specialized languages, and the juridical lexicon among them, to be fostered by an advanced degree of civilization. Nonetheless, it is necessary to point out the lack of the lexical forms used exclusively in the spheres of law and the fact that a high percentage of these forms are actually senses of general language lexemes semantically modified to serve the purpose of juridical issues (cf. Prieto de Pedro 1991, p. 169). As Hacken (2010, p. 408) argues, “legal language is, above all, a particular way of using the language”.

As we previously discussed, when describing the relation of this lexicographic work to the vocabulary of the field of law, it is crucial to keep in mind the factors such as the ruling social and political ideologies. Sevilla and Sevilla (2003, p. 20) state that specialized vocabulary consists of a set of morphological, lexical, syntactic and textual aspects that create a set of expressive and communicative resources the specialists in a subject need in order to function adequately in the practical context of a specialty. Thus, it can be concluded that the specialized vocabulary is determined by the way in which the community of specialists uses this vocabulary when exercising their profession (ibid.). What is more, the legal language, in particular, is distinguished by the presence of ideologically marked evaluative terms, and, therefore, with a high dose of subjectivity (Martí Sánchez 2004, p. 182).

#### **4.3.2 Treatment of the Legal Vocabulary in the DA**

The work principles exposed in the second *Planta* show that, besides the information on whether a lemma is currently in use or not, and whether it is used as “baxa, ò rústica; Cortesana, Curiál, ò Provinciál: equívoca, proverbiál, metaphórica, ò bárbara” (*Prólogo*, 1726, p. XVI), there should be a warning in case a lemma is used exclusively in “estilo forense”:

Si alguna Voz se halláre ser própria solo de la Poesía, anotarlo tambien: como Tonante, Altitonante, Averno, &c.

Lo mismo se advertirá en las Voces, cuyo uso es solamente admitido en el estilo forense: como Cassar en el sentido de Annular, ò Cancelar. (*Prólogo* 1726, p. XVII)

This paragraph demonstrates that the RAE paid particular attention to the lemmas (or the senses) derived from the professional activity of lawyers and the practice of the courts of

justice. The adjective *forense* forms part of most of the legal usage indications and is used by the editors as a hypernym for a subset of the vocabulary of the legal sciences.

Based on the examined lemmas, we can confirm that the creators of the *Diccionario de Autoridades* did not follow consistently almost any systematically arranged rules or principles when describing and explaining the vocabulary of the legal domain, and it is therefore not easy to establish clear limits between the articles of our corpus. It should be noted that the indications that inform about peculiarities or restrictions of the usage of a lexical unit are to be found in the dictionary rather frequently. Nevertheless, there is a lack of coherence in indicating belonging to a specific field of expertise. Lexicographic marks, the precise information on the peculiarities that limit or impose usage conditions of the lexical units (Fajardo 1996-1997, p. 32), show no systematization and are implemented in the form of diverse unabbreviated indications and comments<sup>18</sup>. According to Gómez-Pablos (2002, p. 113), the general system of abbreviations was employed systematically started from the first edition of the *DRAE* (1870). The list of abbreviations in the *Prólogo* (1726, p. LXXXX) contains only the indications of the texts and authors employed as sources. The lack of consistency can be observed in the examples that follow.

ALERA. s. f. Lo mismo que Era. Es voz formada de este nombre, y del artículo Al, y **usada en el estilo forense** de Aragón.

ABROGACION (Abrogación.) s. f. Lo mismo que derogacion y revocación. **Es término forense**, y tomado del Latino Abrogatio.

CARGOS. Assimismo **en lo judicial** se llaman los capítulos, o crímenes que impútan, y ponen a alguno, delatándole y acusándole.

CUERPO DE DELITO. **En la Jurisprudencia criminal** es la señal, o vestigio que queda de haverse cometido el delito, que sirve de principio y fundamento para su averiguación y castigo: con tal precisión, que sin su prueba, ni puede haver causa, ni delinquente, siendo cuerpo de delito, probado en el cadáver de la persona que mataron violentamente, las heridas, contusiones, o otras señales que se le hallaren, reconocidas y declaradas con la solemnidad y individualidad prevenidas por derecho, por Médicos y Cirujano. [...]

MATRIMONIO ESPIRITUAL. Se llama **en el derecho Canónico** principalmente el vínculo que contrahe el Obispo con su Iglesia, que iniciado por la elección, ratificado por la confirmación, y consumado por la consagración, no puede disolverse, sino es por autoridad del Sumo Pontífice: lo que en su proporción puede semejantemente decirse de aquellos Prelados inferiores, que gozan jurisdicción quasi Episcopal.

---

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Fajardo (1996-1997) for an illustration of the problems in lexicographic marking in Spanish monolingual lexicography in general.

ENUNCIATIVO, VA. adj. Declarativo, expresivo, manifestativo de lo que se ocultaba o no se sabía. Es término Filosófico, **usado en lo legal**, y tomado del Latino Enuntiativus.

We have listed a total of 477 entries containing the adjective *forense* inside the indication of usage of a lexical unit in the spheres of legal disciplines and thus referring to a subset of the vocabulary of the legal sciences. Henríquez Salido (2010) conducted a thorough analysis of the articles in the *DA* that treat lexical units from the spheres of law and implement a usage indication “información forense”. The author explains that various models were used, rather inconsistently, to warn about the usage of a lexical unit. Furthermore, she states that the method of inserting the indication “En lo forense” separated by a point, following the subentry and at the very beginning of a definition, is the most frequently used method for stating explicitly that the lexical unit in question is used in the spheres of legal sciences. Henríquez Salido (2010) registered approximately 160 example entries that contain that exact form, while we have registered a total of 276 entries that implement the sole comment “En lo forense” as the usage indication.

In the *DA*, the word *forense* was used by the academics to denominate the concepts they considered to be “lo perteneciente al foro”, i.e., connected to law, to a private statute of a kingdom or a province, or to a jurisdiction<sup>19</sup>. Further indication models informing about the use of a lexical unit and containing the adjective *forense*, that were registered by Henríquez Salido (2004) as highly frequent, are: “Término forense”, “Term. forense”, “Es voz forense”, “Phrase forense” among others. The author (op. cit. p. 764) confirms that the relations between these indications and other entry components are not systematic, and that an indication as such may correspond to the meaning of the lemma, to the meaning of one or more subentries or to the meaning of a multiword lexical units that cannot be decomposed semantically. Furthermore, while the adjective *forense* may be the most commonly used as a component of the indication or comment in order to mark a subset of the vocabulary of the legal sciences, a number of other indications were also used for this very purpose. As the previous examples show, some of these indications are “en lo judicial”, “En la Jurisprudencia criminal”, “usado en lo legal” etc.

Another difficulty that can be found when identifying the juridical lexicon and that has shown to be particularly relevant for our work is the common absence of any marks that would provide information on the usage domain. Namely, one can rather commonly come across an entry or a sense that deals with a concept that belongs to a particular specialized domain but

---

<sup>19</sup> This interpretation is based on the definition of the lexical unit *foro* in the *DA*.

that does not, however, include any form of lexicographic marking that would inform the users about its peculiar use. The absence of usage indications is mostly due to the fact that these concepts are either frequently or occasionally used in the general language. The usage of these lexical units within the spheres of legal professions can, however, be deduced based on other entry components, such as the definition or the usage examples.

It is particularly challenging to determine the “exact” number of lemmas that describe juridical concepts. This is partly due to the inconsistency in lexicographic marking, but the frequent absence of any usage marks proved to be a far more difficult issue. Namely, since in the *DA* there is a vast number of articles and senses that treat concepts that are used frequently or occasionally in general language as much as those used in the spheres of legal sciences and are therefore not marked as strictly juridical terms, it would only be possible to count the lemmas by analyzing each of the dictionary articles and senses in the search for juridical concepts<sup>20</sup>. For the purpose of this work, we have analyzed in a detailed manner only those articles and senses that implement the *Fuero Juzgo* as one of the sources and listed among these the ones that describe the juridical concepts.

#### 4.3.3 Sources of the Legal Vocabulary

Many studies have confirmed so far that the authors and texts most frequently quoted for the purposes of the compilation of the *DA* belong to the Spanish Golden Age, a period of flourishing in arts and literature in Spain. After these literary works, the most frequently cited are the documents of scientific, juridical, and historiographic character from all time periods (Freixas 2006b, p. 61). Rojo (2016, p. 756) points out the fact that correct use of a lexical unit in the *Autoridades* was justified by sole employment of that lexical unit by the author that was previously selected based on his language domain.

In order to illustrate primarily the lexicon from juridical domain, but often also general vocabulary, the academics implemented a total of forty-eight legal texts (Freixas 2006b, p. 62) of diverse traits and dating from different, often very distant, time periods. The most frequently cited legal documents are compilations of national domain, such as *La nueva recopilación de las leyes del reino* (from 1567), the works of Alfonso X (the *Fuero Real* and *Las partidas*) and the *Cedula real en la que su majestad manda se observe y guarde la moderación de alquileres de casas y precios de todos los géneros comerciables* (ibid.).

---

<sup>20</sup> Henríquez Salido (2004, p. 764) listed a total of 447 lexical units that contain indications stating the exclusive ‘forensic’ use.

In her Ph.D. thesis (2003), Freixas conducted a comprehensive analysis of the documents used as sources for the compilation of the *DA*. The author studied a number of works belonging to each of the previously listed genders in order to find out which type of text predominates in the first lexicographic corpus created by the Academy for the purpose of compiling the dictionary. The following table contains the data extracted from the mentioned study and informs on the number of juridical documents that appear in the lists of *autoridades*, in the abbreviation lists, and in each of the volumes.

Type of juridical document	Number of sources in the list of autoridades	Number of sources in the lists of abbreviations of each of the volumes						Total number of sources
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	
<i>Fueros y repertorios legales</i> ('Jurisdictions and legal repertories' <sup>21</sup> )	9	16	15	16	12	16	19	31
<i>Estatutos de Corporaciones</i> ('Corporate bylaws')	1	2	4	3	2	3	3	7
<i>Pragmáticas, leyes y tasas</i> ('Proclamations, duties and taxes')	1	2	3	3	3	2	2	9
<i>Testamentos</i> ('Testaments')					1			1
<b>Total number of juridical documents</b>	11	20	22	22	18	21	24	48

Table 1. Types of legal texts and their representation in the *DA* (in Freixas 2003, p. 262)

It is evident that there are significant differences in the number of juridical documents of each type presented in the list of *autoridades* and the ones presented in the lists of abbreviations. Namely, Freixas points out the fact that the juridical documents constitute 5% of the sources listed in the abbreviation lists in all six volumes of the dictionary while in the lists of *autoridades* these constitute only 2%. In continuation, we shall provide a description of four of the documents that were marked by Freixas (2006b) as the most frequently quoted legal texts. Moreover, we shall also rely on the list provided by Freixas (2003, pp. 354-356) as well as on the type division and chronological classification of the legal texts this author presented in her thesis. After that, we shall commence the analysis of the legal text that stands in focus of this work – *Fuero Juzgo*.

### 1) *La nueva recopilación de los leyes del reino*

<sup>21</sup> Legal terms were translated from Spanish to English using the IATE (Interactive Terminology for Europe), the EU's terminology database.

The legal text titled *La nueva recopilación de las leyes del reino* was enacted on March 14, 1567, and contained the legislation coming from very diverse sources of laws, jurisdictions and court orders in an attempt to gather all the applicable legislation (Cabello Martín 2010). It was composed of nine books, divided into 'titles' and 'laws' (ibid.).

In the *DA*, the academics referred to this work using the abbreviation “RECOP.” and we registered a total of 1524 entries and subentries that are exemplified using this work as one of the *autoridades*. Some of the lexical units denominating legal concepts that were exemplified using a quotation extracted from this work are *comissario*, *consejo*, *criminal*, *defender*, *defensor*, *examinar*, *execución*, etc.

## 2) The Legal Legacy of Alfonso X the Wise

Two of the documents originating from the period of Alfonso X of Castille (1252 – 1284), known as the Wise for developing a cosmopolitan court and encouraging culture and education, were used as sources in the *DA* and these are the *Fuero Real* and the *Siete Partidas*.

*El Fuero Real* was a legal code issued by the king Alfonso X by the end of 1254 for the purposes of the implementation of the royal law in those territories that still did not have it (Pérez Martín 2015, p. XVIII). The studies have shown that it was primarily based on three existing legal texts: the *Fuero Juzgo*, the *Fuero de Soria* and the *Derecho Común*. The *Fuero Real* appears in the list of abbreviations in the *Prólogo* (1726, p. LXXXXIII) under the abbreviation *Fuer. R.* It was implemented as a source for a total of 110 lemmas and senses. Although only one of the lemmas (*afruentar*) exemplified by *Fuero Real* is marked as a legal term, it can be deduced from the definitions and the usage examples that this code is used for exemplifying other legal terms. Examples of such are the following entries:

MERINO. s. m. Juez puesto por el Rey en algún territorio, en donde tiene jurisdicción amplia: y este se llama Merino mayor, a distinción del puesto por el Adelantado o Merino mayor, el qual tiene jurisdicción para aquello solo que se le delega. [...] FUER. R. lib. 3. tit. 20. l. 4. Merino o sayón que huviere de entregar a alguno de déudo que otro le deba, o de otra cosa que tenga de lo suyo, no tome más para sí de la valía del diezmo.

EMPECIMIENTO. s. m. Daño, perjuicio y ofensa. Es voz antigua, y sin uso. [...] FUER. R. lib. 4. tit. 22. l. 7. E si manda quisiere facer, fagala sin empecimiento de aquel fijo que assí recibió.

*Las Siete Partidas* represent a Castilian legal code that is often considered to be the most important work of Alfonso X and one of the most essential documents in Spanish history. Compiled around 1265, the *Siete Partidas* established the renewal of the legal system based on

of the canon law and the Roman law. This work legalizes all the aspects of both church and civil life, and due to its diverse vocabulary, it was rather extensively used for the compilation of the lexicographic content of the *DA*. Namely, as explained by Freixas, the academics occasionally used the same passage from this work to exemplify the usage of two different words, described in two separated entries, e.g., *escuelas / maestraescuela* and *cosecha / marzagda* (2006b, p. 63). In his study *Análisis cuantitativo de las citas del Diccionario de Autoridades*, Rojo registers a total of 788 quotations extracted from the *Siete Partidas* and three different abbreviations used to refer to this work: *PART.*, *PARTID.*, and *PARTIDAS*. According to Rojo (2014: 196), the number of the examples extracted from the *Siete Partidas* corresponds to 1,1 % of a total number of the usage examples in the *DA*.

3) *Cedula real en la que su majestad manada se observe y guarde la moderación de aquileres de casas y precios de todos los géneros comerciabiles*

In the metatexts of the *DA*, academics refer to this work under the title *La Pragmática de tassas del año de 1680* (Freixas 2006b, p. 63) and in the dictionary entries they refer to it using the abbreviation *PRAGM. DE TASS.* This document represents a royal order from the year 1680, the main purpose of which was to mend the inflation that resulted from the fake currency issued by the Fábrica de Molino (ibid.). We registered a total of 799 lemmas that employ this work as one of the example sources.

## 5 *Fuero Juzgo*

### 5.1 How the Visigoths Tailored the Legal System

*Fuero Juzgo* or *Libro de los Jueces* is the Castilian-Romance translation of the Visigoth law code *Liber Iudiciorum*, written originally in Latin, and documented by the unknown author in the first half of the thirteenth century. This medieval text represents the symbol of the continuity of the old Spanish-Gothic legislation since it formed the basis of medieval Spanish law. From a pragmatic point of view, one needs to be familiarized with the issuer of the codex in question, but also with its focus group, the actions or the conducts that were regulated by it and the context in which it was valid in order to understand the historical significance this codex has had, and to apprehend the role it had as one of the *autoridades* in the *DA*.

The *Liber Iudiciorum* was promulgated by Recesvinto in 654 and approved by the VII Council of Toledo. It is a compilation of laws dictated by a number of rulers, yet it is also believed to be transcribed from certain Latin sources. The very content of the *Liber Iudiciorum*



is the result of the combination of the Germanic juridical elements with the Roman ones, and it can thus be qualified as Roman vulgar law (Castillo Lluch 2012, p. 2). It consists of twelve books of laws that served for the resolution of various conflicts that a community might come across. The successive modifications of this codex that were made before the reign of Egica (687 – 702), who elaborated the second recompilation of the laws, resulted in dissimilarity in various versions of the manuscript preserved in churches and monasteries. Therefore, during the reign of Fernando III (1527 – 1598) the unification was initiated.

On the 4<sup>th</sup> of April in the year 1241, Fernando III conceded it as the official law codex to the municipality of Cordoba (*Fuero de Cordoba*) and ordered that it be translated from Latin to the vulgar Romance language (Lardizábal 1815, p. XXXVII). Although the process of execution of this order is not known in detail, the Liber was translated and titled *Fuero Juzgo* since it was aimed to be used at the tribunals of justice and was the basic instrument for the unification of law that was meant to be carried out through the extension of the validity of the *Liber* and by adaptation of the juridical orders of the heterogenic population of the city of Toledo (Henríquez Salido 2010, p. 101). *Fuero Juzgo* was used as a book of laws by Fernando III and his son Alfonso X the Wise for the unification of Castilian legislative policy in the mid-thirteenth century.

The influence the *Liber Iudiciorum*, and later the *Fuero Juzgo*, had on the moral values, on the legal system, but also on the identity of the nation is indisputable. First and foremost, it is the legal body that enjoyed validity the longest on the Iberian Peninsula up until the approbation of the Civil Code by the end of the XIX century (Castillo Lluch 2012, p. 2). Moreover, it is known today that the original Latin text is the most well-preserved work of the Visigothic legislative production (Ortiz Caballero 1988, p. 124).

After the disappearance of the Visigoth monarchy and with the Muslim invasion in the year 711, the *Liber* maintained validity at certain territories. Furthermore, the decision of Fernando III to formally restore the Visigoth codex and to do so by translating it to Vulgar Romance language, and not to Latin as the custom required, officially established the use of vulgar language in the administrative affairs of Castilian chancellery. Henríquez Salido (2010) emphasized the importance of this codex and states that in the primitive medieval kingdoms of the Iberian Peninsula of the thirteenth century we can find two legal texts, in which there is quite detailed information about the art of making the law and the personal and intellectual traits the legislator must have. The first text is the *Fuero Juzgo* and the second one is the *Siete Partidas*. These were the first doctrinal bodies in the history of Spanish law that established the requisites required of people who establish laws, and stated the rules the citizens must

understand, since otherwise the principle of legal safety would have been seriously harmed (Henríquez Salido 2010, p. 100).

In the foreword of the edition published in 1815 by the Spanish Royal Academy it is stated that codex is one of the most excellent monuments of Spanish language, of unique antiquity and importance and that by issuing this edition of the *Fuero Juzgo* in Castilian, the Academy gave new light to the study of language, but it also did a remarkable service to the Nation, offering it one of the most serious and influential documents in the history of jurisprudence.

## 5.2 The Language of the *Fuero Juzgo*

In the absence of uniformity of linguistic criteria, spontaneous tendencies that accompany oral communication often result in overlaps and vacillations when it comes to the usage of different phonetic, morphological, and syntactic forms. Therefore, the Spanish language of the twelfth and the thirteenth century lacked the stability that comes from extended usage of a standardized written form of a language (Lapesa 1981, p. 207). The Vulgar Castilian version of *Fuero Juzgo* documented in 1241 was one of the pioneering documents written in vulgar language, in an era when the Romance languages were still covered in Latinism and mixed with sequences completely in Latin (Cano Aguilar, 1992, p. 67). The first prominent aspect of the language of *Fuero Juzgo* is a lack of consistent rules in almost every linguistic aspect. Numerous irregularities of pronunciation and spelling as well as the vacillations regarding the lexical forms, the use of the articles, etc. are thus eminently evident when revising this codex. The general nature of the vocabulary of *Fuero Juzgo* is relevant for this work since it exceptionally influenced the approach the academics had to this text and thus determined its role as one of the *autoridades*.

According to Cano Aguilar (1992, p. 194), during the thirteenth century, Castilian became the only language used by the Royal Chancellery, and consequently the language of all legal and normative texts. Therefore, it is not surprising that the vocabulary implemented in *Fuero Juzgo* consists mostly of simple words, easily understandable even today and sufficiently common to remain in use throughout the centuries. However, there is a number of terms and expressions to be found that are no longer in use or that show noticeable semantic changes. In her work *Historia del léxico jurídico*, Henríquez Salido conducted a detailed analysis of the language of this codex.

The *Liber Iudiciorum* introduces the readers to various concepts that belong to various spheres of life. Henríquez Salido groups the sets of concept denominations in specific semantic

fields according to their lexical value. Three fields that specifically stand out are the semantic field related to family descendants (succession issues), the field related to the persons that have the right to inherit the belongings of the deceased and the one related to the issues relevant to the legal affairs (Henríquez Salido 2010, p. 111).

It is of importance to keep in mind that different versions of the codex that have survived until today do not reflect the same tendencies. Both Latin and Castilian codices show not only dissimilarities in particular words but also in whole text paragraphs. Entire laws were often omitted, added, or modified (Ortiz Caballero 1988, p. 127). The very edition the academics consulted for the purposes of the compilation of the *DA* was the one published by the jurist Villadiego Vascañana y Montoya in Madrid, the year 1600 (Freixas 2003, p. 82). Nevertheless, researches like Freixas (2003) and Zancarrón (2017) present strong reasons to doubt the authenticity of the examples extracted from this work. Namely, two critical issues are to be kept in mind when it comes to the accuracy of Villadiego's transcript of *Fuero Juzgo*. The first one is the fact that this version, in words of Rivas Zancarrón (2017, p. 307), “[...] contenía una transcripción paleográfica con fallos – según el contraste que hemos hecho con tres manuscritos, propiedad de la Real Academia: mss. 50, 51 y 53.6”. Secondly, due to changes that were made in later manuscripts, these did not always reflect the actual aspect of the original one. Additionally, the implementation of certain alphabet characters causes confusion, especially of those that represent imposed graphical variations that did not illustrate the real state of the written language of the XIII century. Freixas pointed out that it should be kept in mind that the academics themselves reedited the texts used as sources in accordance with the orthographical norms they implemented in the *DA* (Freixas 2003, p. 432).

## **6 The Role of the *Fuero Juzgo* in the *DA***

The first Spanish academic dictionary employs the medieval law codex *Fuero Juzgo* as one of its most archaic sources of lexicographic material. In the foreword of the first volume, it is registered as the only cited prose text that originally dates before the year 1200. Given that the text was ancient, the quotations from this work were employed more as exemplary when explaining archaic or disused words, than as prescriptive (Zancarrón 2017, p. 305). The sole fact that this text originates from such an early period causes difficulty in its lexicographical treatment. Namely, as Rojo (2016, p. 757) observed, the first academics did not possess particularly profound philological knowledge. Thus, they had to engage in solving the problems that they were coming across while analyzing texts as old as this one is.

The decision on the inclusion of *Fuero Juzgo* was made in *Actas* dating from the 3<sup>rd</sup> of August 1713, and it is a result of a resolution of the academics to introduce certain types of specialized vocabulary in the dictionary (Zancarrón 2017, p. 305). Freixas (2003) classifies this document under the genre of *Documentos Juridicos*<sup>22</sup> and the subgenre *Fueros y Repertorios Legales*<sup>23</sup>.

We listed a total of 246 articles that implement *Fuero Juzgo* as one of the *autoridades*. In the list of abbreviations that is to be found in the *Prólogo*, the official abbreviation used by academics to designate the citations extracted from this work was stated to be *Fuer. Juzg.* Nevertheless, this abbreviation was used in 239 cases, while the *Fuer. Juz.* stands next to five quotations (lemmas *acreer*, *adevino*, *adexar*, *apocar* and *catar*); the *Fuer. J.* is used in the entry explaining the lemma *caldaria*; and the *Fuer. Juzgo* in the entry describing the lemma *sueldo*. According to Rojo (2014, p. 58), the quotations extracted from the *Fuero Juzgo* represents approximately 0,33 % of total quotations in the six volumes of the dictionary and this text is mainly quoted in the first volume.<sup>24</sup>

### 6.1 *Las Antiquadas*: Towards a Depiction of Old Times

Various studies have shown so far that a significant number of lemmas that form part of the *DA* represent only lexical variants of more commonly used units (Ruhstaller (2002), Freixas (2003), Zancarrón (2017), etc.). The dictionary is not compiled exclusively from the lexical forms that were in use in the time it was created, i.e., in the eighteenth century, but also from the separately lemmatized diverse archaic variants of these forms.

Persistent in their intention to support the lexicographic data using the literary models, i.e., the *autoridades*, dating from all periods of time, the academics implemented a significant number of lexical forms that had been either modified or substituted by other forms and were consequently either never or rarely used. Considering the fact that the documents vary from those that originate in Medieval times to the works compiled as late as in the eighteenth century, it is not surprising to find out that the *DA* contains a vast quantity of lexicon that was no longer in use in the time the dictionary was compiled. The explanation of the intention of the academics to include the words that are no longer in use is to be found in the second *Planta*:

---

<sup>22</sup> Juridical Documents

<sup>23</sup> Jurisdictions and Legal Repertories

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Rojo (2016).

Hízose un plan para el Diccionario y sus esenciales puntos fueron, que esta obra había de comprehender todas las voces de nuestra lengua, así del actual uso, como del antiguo, colocadas por riguroso orden alfabético [...] <sup>25</sup> (*Prólogo* 1726, p. XXVII).

It is also stated in the *Prólogo* (1726, p. V) that some of the example quotes are implemented as authoritarian and serve to demonstrate the way lexical forms should be used, but that there are also other quotes that serve merely as the examples of the lexical forms that are no longer in everyday use, and that would seem inappropriate. Furthermore, in a different part of the *Prólogo* (1726, p. XXI) it is elucidated that, due to the mutations and variations of the language, certain lexical forms that can be found in the works such as the *Fuero Juzgo*, the *História general de España*, and the *Siete Partidas del Rey Don Alphonso* are no longer in use and are very often confronted to the versions of the same forms that were being used by the contemporary authors.

The entries describing the archaic variants are most often simple to identify since these are followed by the comments and the instructions of proper usage. According to Jiménez Ríos (2001, p. 118), the variety of the diachronic marks employed in the *DA* can be grouped in three sections: (1) *voces antiguas*, (2) *anticuadas* and (3) *voces de poco uso, sin uso and raras*.

The majority of lemmas that were assigned *Fuero Juzgo* as one of the authorities, we listed 164 of these, represent lexical forms that were either no longer in use or that were infrequently used when the dictionary was compiled, i.e., in the eighteenth century, and are thus marked as archaic forms. Due to the fact that archaisms represent more than half of the lemmas that implement *Fuero Juzgo* as one of the *autoridades*, we shall examine these forms as a separate group.

Based on the purpose of their implementation in the dictionary and the diachronic modifications these aim to illustrate, we can distinguish two groups of archaisms that originate from the *Fuero Juzgo*: (1) the archaic lexical forms, and (2) the concept denominations that were no longer in use at the time the *DA* was compiled and published (1726 – 1739).

In the first place, archaic lexical forms were included to demonstrate the changes that occurred in the formal representation of a lexical unit and to provide information on the correct lexical form. These archaisms represent the majority of the lexical units exemplified by a citation extracted from the *Fuero Juzgo*. We have registered a total of 133 archaic lexical forms

---

<sup>25</sup> Transl.: A plan for the Dictionary was made and its essential points were that this work had to comprehend all the voices of our language, the ones of current use, as well as the the old ones, placed in rigorous alphabetical order [...]

that were implemented in the dictionary with the mere purpose of explaining the meaning by providing a modern-day, i.e., the mid-eighteenth century, form. Namely, this is due to the fact that *Fuero Juzgo* is a medieval code, and thus its language corresponds to the linguistic system of the medieval times. It is not a concept a variant as such is meant to clarify, but instead a written form of a lexical unit (Zancarrón 2017, p. 309). The formal variants serve to inform the users either about an orthographic-phonetical change (such as in cases of *anno*, *aducho*, *afogar*, *avolo*, *la*), or about a morphological change (*amonestamiento*, *ayuntanza*, *quebrantanza*, *despreciamiento*). The definitions inside these articles appear most often in the pattern of: [Lemma] *Lo mismo que* [...]. Following entries serve as examples of the aim of academics to clarify graphical changes of the vocabulary:

AJUNTANZA. s. f. Lo mismo que Ayuntamiento. Vease. Es voz antiquada. Lat. Cópula. FUER. JUZG. lib. 3. tit. 2. ley 2. E quantos quier que sean nacídos de aquella ajuntanza sean siervos.  
 QUEBRANTANZA. s. f. Lo mismo que Quebranto. Es voz antiquada. FUER. JUZG. Prolog. l. 4. Onde acoitar se deben de sacar los coitados de las quebrantanzas.

There is a total of 133 lemmas exemplified by *Fuero Juzgo* that serve to present the archaic lexical variants that illustrate certain change in the form of a word. These are:

*abeya; abeyera; abundar; acoitarse; acoita; accontentarse; ad; adelante; adevino; adexar; aducho; afalecer; afogar; agedado; agruador; aidoro; ajuntanza; amecer; amonestamiento; angelo; anno; anteviso; antiguamente; aparciar; aponer; apostia; aprimas; apostolo; apresentar; aprestamo; aquele, la, lo; asconder; asperancia; aspiramento; aspirar; ata; atal; ate; atanes atemer; atemprado; atemprar; avolo, la; axamar; axanar; axar; axengar; ayodoro; ayudorio; ayuntanza; ayegar; ayeno; bon, na; bona; boy; bous, ó beuyes; caballero; caballo; cabeza<sup>5</sup> (podrido de la cabeza); colonia; cambia; cabo; carnalmentre; castiello; certamentre; christus; cibdad, cibdade, cibdat; cabdient; cobdicia; cobdicioso; cobdiza; coidar; coido; coitado; compana; compano; comprimimiento; comprir; conceyo; decaemento; decaimento; defalecer; defamar; defeso, sa; degredo; depos; deraigar; derechora; descomongar; desfolar; desperar; desperecer; despreciamiento; destajar; duc; duos; entregamientre; erranza; esposayas; establecimiento, estanco, estonce, y estonces, fio, forcia, forciar, forza; home; hoste; partir; participio; pasco, penedencia, penedencial, pleiteamiento, porco; porta; porto; pro; ren; testimonia; quadrinieto; quebrantanza, querellador, tormentar; valladar; veyece; xaga; xamar; xano, na; xeno, na.*

Secondly, a number of archaic lexical forms is included with the purpose of illustrating a former denomination of a still existing concept. Namely, the *Autoridades* include not only

the forms that are marked as *antiguadas* because of a formal modification these went through, but it also implements the concept denominations that used to be actively used and that thus depict the realities of the past times. The incorporation of these lexical forms clearly demonstrates the willingness of the academics to create a reference work that will contribute not only to understanding of the texts from all time periods, but also to comprehending the historical circumstances of the past that might be unknown to a reader in the eighteenth century (Freixas 2006b, p. 65).

There are 30 archaisms with the authority of *Fuero Juzgo* that treat instead of providing lexical variants of concept denominations, serve to present a concept denomination that no longer was in use at the moment the dictionary was compiled. Contrary to the entries from the first group, the definitions implemented in these entries do not consist of providing a correct form or a synonym but present a description of a concept. The following lemmas designate ancient denominations of particular concepts:

*acreer; afalagamento; afollar; afrontar; alugar; andido, da; ascuso; assañarse; axenge; carta; coito; decebimiento; delibrar\*; deslaidar; doncas; encerrador; enrizar\*; entenciar; entenzon; escrito; estorbo; extremar; fazfirido, da\*; guisa; parcir\*; perquirir; previco; provinco; rafez o rahez.*

Articles that follow serve to demonstrate the treatment of ancient concept denominations:

ACREER. v. n. Vale lo mismo que dár prestádo sobre prendas, ù dár à empréstito en el modo regular y comun. Es voz antiquáda. [...] FUER. JUZ. lib. 5. tit. 6. ley 3. E el que lo acreyó, debe guardar los penos.

DESLAIDAR. v. a. Afear, y desfigurar el rostro con herídas, dexándole señalado. Es voz antiquada [...] FUER. JUZG. lib. 6. tit. 4. l. 3. Si el home libre desláida servo ayeno, ol ficier deslaidar, si el servo era de vil guisa, peche diez soldos al Señor del servo.

PERQUIRIR. v. a. Buscar alguna cosa con cuidado y diligencia. Es voz antiquada. [...] FUER. JUZG. lib. 1. tit. 1. l. 1. Non debe home perquirir otra razón.

Finally, it is to be noted that certain lexical units that were marked as *antiguadas*, as a matter of the fact were still in active use during the compilation time but were noted as archaic because of the ancient nature of the particular sense these are describing. It is the sense that is no longer in use, not the lexical unit. Such cases are: *aspirar, carta, destajar, enrizar, extremar, participio and partir*.

## 6.2 The (Un)specialized Lexicon

The medieval texts implemented as the sources did not only have the function of providing information on the use of archaisms, but these documents also serve to prove the origin of the words, i.e., the existence of these as a part of the Spanish lexicon ever since the old times (Freixas 2010, p. 273). Besides being employed as an essential authority of archaic lexical forms, the *Fuero Juzgo* had an important role as one of the sources of both general and specialized lexicon in the compilation of the *DA*. As Freixas (2003, p. 394) noted, some of the lexical forms extracted from the *Fuero Juzgo* would be difficult to find in any other text and pointed out that since these forms originate from such a respected law codex, academics were interested in implementing them. This chapter focuses on different types of vocabulary that were illustrated in the *DA* with the help of quotations extracted from the *Fuero Juzgo*.

In accordance to its essential characteristics, the text *Fuero Juzgo* was often implemented as a source when exemplifying technical vocabulary used by the people engaged in different types of legal professions, i.e. the occupations of the people engaged in the law tribunals and in solving legal issues (e.g. *afrentar*, *demandar*, *prueba*), as well as in the civil administration (*ayuntamiento*, *conceyo*, *establecimiento*). Nevertheless, the quotations extracted from this text also served to exemplify the vocabulary used in farming and agriculture (*porco*, *silo*, *cabeza*, *cabalo*, *bues*, *ò bueys*), in religious issues (*angelo*, *apostolo*, *celestial*, *Christus*) etc.

Moreover, the eighteenth century is known to be an era when the Galician language had a particularly strong impact on Spanish (Cano Aguilar 1992, p. 263). Therefore, it is worth mentioning that in the *DA*, there are eight lexical forms exemplified by the *Fuero Juzgo* the usage of which is related to a particular geographic region, and that seven of these correspond to Galicia<sup>26</sup>: *alugar* (Asturias and Galicia), *boy*, *moyo*, *porco*, *porto*, *valladar*, and *xano*, *na*<sup>27</sup>.

## 6.3 Legal Vocabulary and the *Fuero Juzgo*

In our materials that resulted from the analysis of the digital version of the *DA*, there are 43 legal concepts (including entries and subentries) exemplified using the *Fuero Juzgo* as one of the sources. Many of these lexical units, as indicated before, appear without indication of the usage in legal domains. The main criteria used for deciding whether an unmarked lexical

---

<sup>26</sup> This is especially interesting if we remember that the *Fuero Juzgo* is known for a high percentage of the lexical forms from Leon, cf. Orazi (1997).

<sup>27</sup> Due to the inconstancy in diatopic marking, it is highly probable that there are more words in our corpus that were used mainly in Galicia. The listed words are the ones that are marked as such by the academics.



unit can be considered a legal concept relies on the presence of the unit in question in the *DEJ*, the Spanish juridical dictionary published by the *RAE*. Nevertheless, there are two important issues that must be taken into consideration. Firstly, the first academic dictionary includes numerous lexical variants, most of which are no longer in use today and are thus not included neither in the *DEJ* nor in the *DLE*. Secondly, since the *DA* was published almost three centuries ago, and since the legal language is often considerably affected by the society and the ruling ideology, it must be assumed that what was considered to be a legal concept in the eighteenth century is not necessarily regarded as such in the present day and *vice versa*. Consequently, for the concepts that are neither marked as juridical nor included in the *DEJ*, it was necessary to examine first the definition, and after that the usage examples provided by the *DA* and analyze the usage context in order to decide whether a lexical unit in question may be considered a designation of a legal concept or not.

Regarding the degree of the specialty of the legal lexicon lemmatized in the *DA* and exemplified using quotations from *Fuero Juzgo*, we can distinguish two groups<sup>28</sup>:

- 1) Technical lexicon, i.e., the entries and subentries describing the lemmas that are specific for the legal domains. These are *atormentar, afrontar, caldaria, colonia, castigamento o castigamiento, degredo, demandar, derechora, emienda, juro, parte, prueba, testimonia, tormentar*.
- 2) Sub-technical lexicon, i.e., the entries and subentries describing the lemmas that possess a more general and diffuse conceptual scope. Such are: *acoita, agruador, aparciado, da, aparciar, aponer, apostia, aprestamo, atemprar, boda, bona, cabeza 2, cabeza 7, cabildo, carga, carta, conceyo, decebimiento, delibrar, enculpar, esposayas patrimonio, penedencia, penedencial, pleiteamiento, pleitesia, pro, querellador, señal*.

Based on the grammatic characteristics of the legal concepts exemplified by the *Fuero Juzgo*, these can be classified into three groups.

- 1) Verbs that denotate either the actions performed by those who exercise the legal professions, or the deeds regulated by law, e.g. *afrontar, alugar, aparciar, aponer, atemprar, atormentar, delibrar, demander, descomongar\*, enculpar, tormentar*;
- 2) nouns that designate issues related to the causes, procedures and charges that are practiced : *acoita, agruador, amonestamiento, apostia, aprestamo* etc.;

---

<sup>28</sup> This classification was made according to the criteria presented by Vangehuchten (2005, cited in in Santamaría Pérez 2006, p. 10).

- 3) derived adjectives: *apardiado, da*.

On the other hand, one of the most important issues that should be discussed when conducting a research on the treatment of a particular vocabulary in a dictionary is certainly the lemmatization of the lexical units. The *DA*, as we mentioned, lemmatized every sense of a word as a separate lemma and described it in a separate entry, the first one being considered the main entry while the rest are regarded as subentries. When it comes to the entries examined for the purpose of this work, we can distinguish various aspects in the process of lemmatization and lexicographic marking.

The legal concepts exemplified by the *Fuero Juzgo* that were lemmatized as main entries belong to four types:

- 1) Archaic lexical variants of legal concepts that merely indicate the correct lexical form (*querellador, esposayas, pleiteamiento, testimonia* etc.);
- 2) The concepts so often used in the general language that the entries do not include any indication of particular use, (such are *afrontar, acoita, aparciado, da, apostia, aprestamo, patrimonio, pleitesia*, among others);
- 3) The concepts described without usage indications, but in such a way that the usage domain can be deducted based on the definition or the examples (*atormentar, caldaria, juro, parte*, etc.);
- 4) The concepts marked as legal terms (only *duplo*).

A number of concepts are included as subentries of other general language entries and can be placed in three groups:

- 1) Legal concepts indicated as such (*demandar* and *prueba*);
- 2) The concepts described without usage indications, but in such a way that the usage domain can be deducted based on the definition or the examples (*emienda* and *carta*);
- 3) Concepts that belong to the legal domain as well as to some other specialized domain, such as *cabildo* (religion as well as canonic law).

#### **6.4 The Evolution of the Legal Concepts**

Despite being an essential document in many aspects of Spanish history, there are many unresolved matters and uncertainties concerning the *Fuero Juzgo*. The original language of the code, the lack of coherence between the preserved manuscripts, the ambiguous information

regarding the dates when the text was composed and the translations, and unreliability of the complete editions of this text are only some of the difficulties one comes across when working with it<sup>29</sup>. Due to these issues, it can be rather demanding to discuss with certainty most of the linguistic aspects of this law code. Two additional points at issue, that are particularly relevant for our study, are the previously mentioned inexactness of the edition used as the *autoridad* in the *DA* and the fact that the creators of the dictionaries tended to modify the lexicographic material in accordance with the rules and the principles they established for the compilation of the dictionary. In such a situation, we should consult the writings of Saussure (1959, p. 67) whose linguistic theory emphasizes the existence of two parts of the linguistic sign – the sound sequence (signifier), which in our analysis might cause numerous troubles having in mind that it is mainly connected to the formal representation, and the concept (signified). Consequently, the later level of the linguistic sign will be the basis for our further study on the lexical items in question.

“A lexical item,” Langacker (2000, p. 4) argues, “is not thought of as incorporating a fixed, limited, and uniquely linguistic semantic representation, but rather as providing access to indefinitely many conceptions and conceptual systems, which it evokes in a flexible, open-ended, context-dependent manner.” Semantic change of a lexical item is one of the most recognizable linguistic changes. It represents a product of the evolution of the usage of a particular lexical unit. A variety of senses and connotations possessed by every lexical item can be added, removed, or altered over time.

This part of the study concentrates on the concepts (signified) that belong to the domain of legal sciences and the professional activities such as the jurisprudence, the law, and the courts, and that were exemplified in the *DA* using quotations extracted from the *Fuero Juzgo*. Namely, Sager (1998, p. 261), one of the most renowned terminologists, defines terms as depositories of knowledge and states that terms “refer to discrete conceptual entities, properties, activities or relations which constitute the knowledge space of a particular subject field.” Our objective on this occasion is to analyze and evaluate the treatment given to the described legal conceptual entities based on several cases, describing their treatment in this first academic dictionary, and their trajectory in the different editions of the academic dictionary. The analysis is conducted from both the diachronic and the comparative approach, and it focuses on the semantic change the chosen concepts underwent through time.

---

<sup>29</sup> Cf. for example Castillo Lluch (2016) and García Martín (2016).

### 6.4.1 Case analysis

The analysis we conducted demonstrates that each of the legal concepts that were illustrated in the *DA* by employing quotations from *Fuero Juzgo* form part of the 23<sup>rd</sup> edition of the dictionary published by the RAE. Nevertheless, many of these concepts are represented today by a lexical form different than the one that was lemmatized in the *DA* while some show semantical changes. Therefore, we shall demonstrate the evolution of the legal concepts by classifying these in two groups based on the changes these show in comparison to modern-day concepts.

#### 6.4.1.1 Preserved lexical units

The first group consists of the entries that describe the lemmas that denominate legal concepts assimilated by the first academic dictionary, i.e., the *DA*, carrying forward traces of Visigoth customs first codified in *Fuero Juzgo*, that have managed to overcome the filtering and the selection of the subsequent publications have arrived in the twenty-first century. These are: *acoita*, *afrontar*, *atormentar*, *aponer*, *boda*, *cabeza* (2), *cabeza* (7), *cabildo*, *caldaria*, *carta*, *carga*, *conceyo*, *coito*, *decebimiento*, *delibrar*, *demandar*, *duplo*, *enculpar*, *juro*, *parte*, *patrimonio*, *pleitesía*, *pro*, *prueba*, *querellador*, *señal*, *tormentar*. Following examples serve to illustrate the evolution in the lexicographic treatment of some of the lexical units preserved up to the 23<sup>rd</sup> edition of the academic dictionary with no radical linguistic changes.

##### 1) *Afrontar*

There are two entries attributed to the lemma *afrontar* in the *DA* (1726), both of which point out to the usage of this term in legal procedures. The first entry is illustrated using a quotation from *Fuero Juzgo*, it contains the usage indication “del estilo forense” and defines *afrontar* as the act of legally demanding, admonishing and preventing somebody from doing something. The second entry also denotes a legal concept, even though it is not marked as such, and defines *afrontar* as the action of summoning a person in order for them to explain their behavior.

The second edition of the *DA* (1770), however, includes as many as six articles that deal with the verb in question. The main entry addresses a meaning of the verb *afrontar* as a general concept and defines it as the action of either placing two objects against one another or confronting two persons. The usage example of this lemma is illustrated using a citation from the *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española* compiled by Covarrubias, a work published for

the first time in 1611 and often used as a source during the compilation of the first edition of the *DA* (1726 - 1739). The fact that this work is used to exemplify this particular sense in the second edition in the *DA* (1770) points out two important issues. Firstly, it proves that the verb *afrontar* was used in the sense of placing two objects against one another before and during the period when the first edition of the *DA* was compiled. Secondly, its actuality was evident in one of the *autoridades* frequently consulted for purposes of the compilation of the first dictionary, i.e., in the *Tesoro* by Covarrubias, but was still disregarded by the first academics. In the second edition of the *DA*, the sense illustrated using a citation from the *Fuero Juzgo* was placed as the second sense, marked as an archaic concept and defined as “Requerir, citar.”. Nevertheless, the indication of juridical usage was removed from the definition, proving that this sense was already acquired in the frequent or occasional use in the common language.

Besides that, the interrelation of the senses is palpable, and the most prominent one was placed as the main sense. The third entry of the lemma *afrontar* in the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition of the *DA* defines the verb *afrontar* as “Dar en cara con algun delito ó defecto”, the fourth one as “Lo mismo que afrentar”<sup>30</sup>, the fifth one as “Hacer frente, ponerse cara á cara”, while the sixth subentry defines this verb as “Alindar, confiar”. Each of the subarticles includes the mark “antiq.” denoting the archaic traits, and each of these is exemplified using the citations from the texts that already existed when the first edition of the *DA* was being compiled, even though it includes only two.

From the fourth edition of the *DRAE* (1803), the third and the fifth subentry are left out, only for the third subentry to be reincluded in the sixth edition (1822). In the 11<sup>th</sup> edition (1869), another subsense was added, referring to the battlefield military confrontation.

In the 12<sup>th</sup> edition (1884), the second sense, “Requerir, citar”, was replaced by “Acarear, 1a acep.”. Nevertheless, this change lasted only until 1914, when in the 14<sup>th</sup> edition all the six senses appear again. Finally, in the 16<sup>th</sup> edition (1936) the entry under the lemma *afrontar* contains 7 different senses, including each of the senses the RAE was adding and removing from this entry during the last two centuries. These are the same senses that are included in the present version of the *DLE* (2014), only in an inverted order:

**afrontar**

Del lat. \*affrontāre, der. de frons, frontis 'frente'.

1. tr. Poner cara a cara.
2. tr. Hacer frente al enemigo.

---

<sup>30</sup> Based on the citations that exemplify *afrontar* in this edition of the *DRAE* (e.g. “[...]Si alguna vez se denunciare el pecado del proximo.. por malicia para coni fundirle, y afrontar , peca mortalmente.” (*DA*, 1770)), one can understand that the academics were referring to the entry that describes the word *afrontar* as “Causar afrenta” (*DA*, 1770).

3. tr. Hacer cara a un peligro, problema o situación comprometida.
4. tr. desus. Poner una cosa enfrente de otra. Era u. t. c. intr.
5. tr. desus. afrentar.
6. tr. desus. Requerir, amonestar.
7. tr. desus. echar a la cara.

In the *Prólogo* (XVIII) the academics named two main criteria for determining the ‘correct’ form of a word, the first one being the proof of usage given by the *autoridades* and the second one etymology. Nevertheless, besides recognizing the previous two, S. Ruhstaller (2002, p. 2322) pointed out the third criterion applied by the academics: the real usage of a word by the language speakers in the time of complying the dictionary. This last criterion is noticeable when analyzing the change in the order of the senses of the lemma *afrontar*. The sense originally exemplified using a citation from the *Fuero Juzgo* is today included as the sixth one and marked as a disused. The gradual development of the entry describing the word *afrontar* can serve as a demonstration of the evolution process of this word.

Definition of <i>afrontar</i>	
DA (1726)	— (1 <sup>st</sup> sense) Requerir, amonestar, ò prevenir jurídicamente à uno, protestando lo que conviene, para que no le pare perjuicio. Es voz antigua del estílo forense, y yá sin uso. FUER. JUZG. lib. 8. tit. 5. ley 1. E afronte la tercera vez al señor de los porcos.
DA (1770);	— (2 <sup>nd</sup> sense) antiq. Requerir, citar. FUER. JUZG. lib. 8. tit. 5. ley 1. E afronte la tercera vez al señor de los porcos.
1780; 1783; 1791;	— (2 <sup>nd</sup> sense) ant. Reparar, citar.
1803; 1817; 1822; 1832; 1837; 1843; 1852; 1869;	— (2 <sup>nd</sup> sense) ant. Requerir, citar.
1884; 1899; 1914; 1925;	(The sense was withdrawn.)
1936/1939; 1947; 1956;	— (6 <sup>th</sup> sense) ant. Requerir, amonestar.
1970; 1984; 1992;	— (2 <sup>nd</sup> sense) Poner cara a cara. — (6 <sup>th</sup> sense) ant. Requerir, amonestar. — (7 <sup>th</sup> sense) ant. Echar en cara algún delito ó defecto.
2014;	— (1 <sup>st</sup> sense) Poner cara a cara. — (6 <sup>th</sup> sense) desus. Requerir, amonestar. — (7 <sup>th</sup> sense) desus. Echar a la cara.
DEJ (2016)	/

## 2) *Atormentar*

In the DA (1726), the *Fuero Juzgo* is implemented to illustrate the first sense of the lemma *atormentar* that defines this verb as juridical testing that consists in making the accused suffer severe physical or mental pain, with the purpose of forcing him or her admit the crime

or give away the accomplices. Although the database CORDE provides usage examples dating before the year 1726<sup>31</sup> that prove the usage of the word *atormentar* in the sense of molesting a person physically outside any legal context, the creators of the first academic dictionary chose to focus on the usage interpretation proved by the *Fuero Juzgo*.

Nonetheless, in the second edition of the *DA*, published forty-four years after the first volume of the first edition, we encounter lexicographic configurations. Namely, while in the *DA* (1726) it is the sense that is linked to the legal domain that is considered the to be the principal meaning of the words *atormentar*, in the *DA* (1770) this sense is relocated to the third position. Moreover, in the second edition, this sense is marked using the abbreviation *For.* (of the adjective *forense*) designating the usage of this sense inside the legal domain<sup>32</sup>, as well as the abbreviation *antiq.* (of the adjective *antiquada*) denoting that the sense in question fell into disuse. The primary sense of the same lemma in the *DA* (1770) covers a more general context and defines *atormentar* as the act of upsetting and molesting someone physically. The second sense remains the same in both editions of the dictionary, and it refers to the metaphorical meaning of the verb *atormentar*.

The sense initially illustrated by the *Fuero Juzgo* does not have the lexicographic mark *antiq.* since the 9<sup>th</sup> edition (1843), and it lost the mark *for.* in the 13<sup>th</sup> edition of the *DRAE* (1899). In the 12<sup>th</sup> edition (1884)<sup>33</sup>, this sense was listed as the second and remained in the second place until the 23<sup>rd</sup> edition (2014) when it was moved to the third. Apart from some minor changes, the articles under the lemma *atormentar* were maintained in the same form until the sixteenth edition of the *DRAE* (1936) when additional sense was included. The structure of the entry remained the same henceforth up to the *DLE* (2014). The *DEJ* includes the lemma *atormentar* and attributes it the same meaning the *DA* did by relying on the *Fuero Juzgo*, while the *DLE* treat it as the second sense of the lemma *atormentar*.

The treatment of the lemma *atormentar* in the dictionaries published by the RAE leads us to the following conclusions:

---

<sup>31</sup> We searched for the examples of usage of the lemma *atormentar* in the context described in *DA* (1770) from the period between 1600 and 1726 and registered more than ten cases.

<sup>32</sup> In fact, according to Henríquez Salido (2010), the editions of the Dictionary since 1780 increased the number of words of legal domain.

<sup>33</sup> It should be kept in mind that the 12<sup>th</sup> edition (1884) was the first one to include in the foreword a paragraph in which it explains the method of listing the senses: “En cada artículo van colocadas por este orden las diversas acepciones de los vocablos: primero, las de uso vulgar y corriente, después las anticuadas, las familiares, las figuradas, las provinciales & hispanoamericanas, las de Germanía y, por último, las técnicas.” (*DRAE* 1884, p. XIX).

- The lexical unit *atormentar* in the sense of manner of obtaining a forced confession for the legal purposes was still dominant when the first edition of the *DA* was published;
- The academics treated this sense of *Atormentar* as a legal term from the year 1770 until 1899;
- This sense is marked as archaic ever since the second publication of the *DA* (1770).

Definition of <i>atormentar</i>	
Autoridades (1 <sup>st</sup> edition)	— (1 <sup>st</sup> sense) Poner à otro à questão de tormento, que es una prueba judicial con que se aflige al réo, contra el qual hai indícios bastantes, ò semiplena probanza, à fin de que con el dolor confiesse si cometió el delito, y descubra los cómplices. En lo antiguo se solía decir tambien Tormentar. Es voz compuesta de la partícula A, y del nombre Tormento.
Autoridades (2 <sup>nd</sup> edition); 1780; 1783; 1791; 1803; 1817; 1822; 1832; 1837; 1843; 1852; 1869;	— (3 <sup>rd</sup> sense) (For. antiq.) Dar tormento al reo para que confiese la verdad.
1884; 1899; 1914; 1925; 1936/1939; 1947; 1956; 1970; 1984; 1992;	— (2 <sup>nd</sup> sense) Dar tormento al reo para que confiese la verdad.
2014;	(3 <sup>rd</sup> sense) Dar tormento al reo o a un testigo para obtener una confesión.
DEJ (2016)	Hist. Dar tormento a un reo o a un testigo para obtener una confesión.

### 3) *Juro*

The word *juro* appears lemmatized for the first time in the volume of the *DA* that was published in the year 1734. Specifically, the noun is defined in two different entries, the first of which refers to the perpetual property right, while the second one refers to a kind of annual pension that the King grants to his vassals<sup>34</sup>. The second entry includes a multiword expression *Por juro de heredad* that is defined as: “Modo adverbial, que en el sentido recto vale por modo de renta perpetua hereditaria. Y se extiende a qualquier otra cosa que se pretende, como por modo de derecho sucessivo, que se debe conceder siempre.”.

<sup>34</sup> Starting from the 6th edition (1822) on, the King is no longer mentioned: “Especie de pensión perpetua que se concedía sobre las rentas públicas, ya por merced graciosa, ya por recompensa de servicios, ó bien por vía de réditos del capital que ha recibido.”.



A quotation from the *Fuero Juzgo* is used to exemplify the first entry. Nevertheless, the RAE did not lemmatize the lexical variant that was represented by the *Fuero Juzgo*. Namely, after the definition, there is a comment informing that the lexical variant *júrio* was the one that was being used in the past. The same lexical variant appears in the example sentence, but the lemmatized variant is *juro*, exemplified by a source other than the *Fuero Juzgo*.

In the first edition of the DRAE (1780), the second entry and the multiword expression become subsenses of the lemma *juro*, while the first entry converts to the main sense. In the following editions of the academic dictionary, more multiword expressions were added:

- *de juro* (4<sup>th</sup> edition, 1803): “Ciertamente, por fuerza, sin remedio”;
- *Caber el juro ó libranza* (5<sup>th</sup> edition, 1817): “Lo mismo que tener cabimiento en la relacion por antelacion.”;
- *juro moroso* (5<sup>th</sup> edition, 1817): “Aquel que ya sea por no estar justificado, ó por ausencia del dueño ó por otro impedimento, se ha dejado cierto número de años sin acudir a su cobranza, y porque el dinero no esté ocioso se vale el rey de el con la calidad de satisfacerle á la parte siempre que acredite su pertenencia. Censurados ob moram retentus. and *cabere juro ó libranza*.”;
- *a juro* (20<sup>th</sup> edition, 1984): “de juro, a la fuerza.”.

Apart from the inclusions of the expressions, the two senses that we can trace back to the DA have kept their essence unchanged and the definitions slightly moderated until today. In the DLE (2014), the first sense is the same as the one exemplified by the *Fuero Juzgo* in the DA, thus proving the endurance of this concept from the middle ages till today in the same meaning, although not in the identical lexical form.

On the other side, in the DEJ (2016) the definition of the lemma *juro* corresponds to the concept described in the second sense of the lemma *juro* in the DA (“Derecho que ostenta una persona (individual o colectiva) a percibir periódicamente de la Hacienda real una pensión situada en una renta real.”), thus regarding the concept *juro* as a pension assigned by a king to a particular person for a specific reason.

Nevertheless, the sublemma *juro de heredad* in the DEJ describes the concept of a perpetual property right, initially exemplified by the *Fuero Juzgo*. It is stated that this concept is characteristic for the period of the validity of common law, i.e., *ius commune*, that lasted from approximately 1100 until 1400 (Cairns and Du Plessis 2010: 1).

Definition of <i>juro</i>	
Autoridades (1 <sup>st</sup> edition)	— (1 <sup>st</sup> sense) En su riguroso sentido vale derecho perpétuo de propiedad. En lo antiguo se solía decir Júrio. Viene del Latino Ius. FUER. JUZG. lib. 4. tit. 4. l. 6. Si algún home forzar a la Eglesia alguna cosa de lo que ye dieron los fideles de Dios, si lo tovieron so júrio, o lo dier a otre, non le vala en ningun tiempo.
Autoridades (2 <sup>nd</sup> edition); 1780; 1783; 1791;	— (1 <sup>st</sup> sense) En su riguroso sentido vale derecho perpétuo de propiedad. En lo antiguo se solia decir jurio.
1803; 1817; 1822; 1832; 1837; 1843; 1852; 1869; 1884; 1899; 1914; 1925; 1936/1939; 1947; 1956; 1970; 1984; 1992; 2014;	— (1 <sup>st</sup> sense) Derecho perpétuo de propiedad.
DEJ (2016)	— (2 <sup>nd</sup> sense) Hist. Durante el derecho común, derecho de propiedad, que implica la plena capacidad del propietario para actuar libremente sobre sus pertenencias o bienes. También se denomina jure hereditario.

#### 4) *Caldaria*

One of the lexical units lemmatized in the *DA* that could hardly be exemplified by or extracted from any source other than the legal texts as archaic as *Fuero Juzgo* is the noun *caldária*. This word stands for a Visigoth law that allowed or ordered a person accused of a serious crime to prove his or her innocence by placing and keeping a bare hand in boiling water. Scalding was considered evidence of the guilt of the accused, while the lack of scalding would prove that a person was innocent. The etymological information provided in the entry explains that the law was denominated after the Latin equivalent of the word cauldron.

While the second *DRAE* edition (1791) lemmatized the adjective *caldaria*, the first, the second and the fourth edition (years 1780, 1783 and 1803 respectively) defined this concept under the lemma *ley caldaria*. In this case, the academics did not comply with the strict alphabetical order, and the entry for *ley caldaria* is placed between the entry *calda* and the entry *caldayco, ca*. However, in the consecutive editions published in 1817, 1822, 1832, 1837, 1843, 1852, 1869 the concept is described as a subsense of the lemma *ley*. From the 12<sup>th</sup> edition of the *DRAE* until the *DLE* (2014), the semantic-pragmatic section of the entry dedicated to the word *caldaria* consisted only of a cross-reference referring the user to the subsense *ley caldaria* under the lemma *ley*. Although this is a concept related to a distant past and the era of Visigoths, and although the latest evidence of the use of this lexical unit recorded by database CORDE dates from the year 1855 – 1875, neither did the *DA* nor did any of the following editions of the academic dictionary mark it as an antique or a disused word.

The treatment of the lemma *caldaria* evidently proves the willingness of the academics to preserve the archaic vocabulary in the dictionaries. Nevertheless, it provides us with an insight into the Visigoth punishment system and the way its influence is still to be found in the modern-day lexicography.

Definition of <i>caldaria</i>	
Autoridades (1 <sup>st</sup> edition)	— (1 <sup>st</sup> sense) usado en terminación femenina. Ley, que permitía o mandaba al indiciado de crimen grave, probar su inocencia metiendo la mano o el brazo en agua hirviendo, y si se quemaba quedaba probado el delíto; y si no, purgaba los indícios y quedaba libre. Villadiego en los Comentarios de la referida ley dice tomó el nombre del Latino Caldarium, que significa el caldero, porque con él se sacaba el agua hirviendo. [...] FUER. J. lib. 6. tit. 1. l. 3. Sea constreñido como manda la ley caldária.
1780; 1783; 1803;	— <b>ley caldaria</b> . La que ordenaba antigua mente en España la prueba del agua caliente que se hacia metiendo la mano y brazo desnudo en una caldera de agua hirviendo para comprobar su inocencia el que la sacaba ilesa.
1791; 1817; 1822; 1832; 1837; 1843; 1852; 1869;	— <b>ley</b> ⇒ <b>caldaria</b> . La que ordenaba antigua mente en España la prueba del agua caliente que se hacia metiendo la mano y brazo desnudo en una caldera de agua hirviendo para comprobar su inocencia el que la sacaba ilesa.
1884; 1899; 1914; 1925; 1936/1939; 1947; 1956; 1970; 1984; 1992; 2014;	— (1 <sup>st</sup> sense) Ley caldaria.
DEJ (2016)	— (The lemma not included.)

#### 6.4.1.2 Modified Lexical Units

As we have previously demonstrated, many lexical units lemmatized by the *DA* were no longer in active use in the period the dictionary was compiled, but only serve to illustrate the archaic lexical forms. Moreover, numerous lexical units that were actively used in the eighteenth century underwent different linguistic changes up until the present day. This section focuses on the legal concepts exemplified in the *DA* using *Fuero Juzgo* that are still included in the 23<sup>rd</sup> edition of the academic dictionary, although under linguistically changed denominations. These are *agruador*, *aparcado*, *da*, *aparciar*, *apostia*, *aprestamo*, *atemprar*, *bona*, *calonia*, *castigamento*, *degredo*, *derechora*, *emienda*, *esposayas*, *penedencia*, *penedencial*, *pleiteamiento* and *testimonia*. Examples that follow serve to illustrate the evolution in the lexicographic description of some of these lexical units.

##### 1) *Calonia*

The lexical unit *calonia* was lemmatized in 1739 as an archaic variant of the unit *calúmnia*. The definition of this lemma consists only of a cross-reference and is exemplified

by a sentence extracted from *Fuero Juzgo*. However, the lemma *calúmnia* is defined as a false and malicious accusation carried out to hurt, defame, or discredit another person. Moreover, the lemma is assigned two multiword expressions, both of which designate legal concepts. The first one is *Afianzar de calúmnia*, and it is defined as “Phrase forense. Obligarse el acusador a probar lo que deduce contra el acusado, sujetándose a las penas establecidas en las leyes, si no lo hiciere”. The following expression is *Juramento de calúmnia*, defined as: “Se llama en lo forense el que hace el actor para justificar su buena intención en poner o seguir el juicio, y que no es malicioso: y se hace para evitar la calúmnia.” Nevertheless, in the consecutive dictionary editions, the multiword expression *Juramento de calúmnia* was withdrawn only to be lemmatized as a separate sense in the 16<sup>th</sup> edition.

The lemma *calonia* was being included in the consecutive editions of the academic dictionary until the 6<sup>th</sup> edition (1822), each time defined as “Lo mismo que Calúmnia.” From the 7<sup>th</sup> edition on, only the lexical unit *calúmnia* was lemmatized.

In the 12<sup>th</sup> (1884) edition of the *DRAE*, the second sense was assigned to the lemma *calúmnia*, it was marked as a legal concept and defined as: “For. Imputación falsa de un delito de los que dan lugar á procedimiento de oficio.”

In the 16<sup>th</sup> edition (1936), the third sense was included and marked as a legal concept. This sense was, interestingly enough, the *Juramento de calúmnia*, i.e., the multiword expression that was last seen in the *DA*. This expression remained present in the academic dictionary until the 22<sup>nd</sup> version (1992), while the 23<sup>rd</sup> version (2014) includes only the first two senses.

The phrase *Afianzar de calúmnia*, that stands for the obligation of the accuser to prove the accusations and suffer the punishment in case he or she fails to do so, and that was lemmatized for the first time in the *DA*, remained in the *DRAE* until the 22<sup>nd</sup> edition (1992) even though it was marked as an archaic phrase ever since the edition of 1925.

The *DEJ* (2016) lemmatizes two legal concepts denominated by *calúmnia*. The sense of accusation of a crime made with knowledge of its falsehood or reckless disregard for the truth is today a criminal law concept. On the other side, in the canon law, *calúmnia* stands for a canonical crime committed by the person who falsely denounces a confessor for the crime of requesting a penitent a sin against the sixth commandment of the Decalogue.

Based on the treatment of the lexical unit *calonia* in the academic dictionaries, we can conclude the following:

- the concept of a false and malicious accusation carried out to hurt another person existed in the Visigoth law and was denominated *calonia*;
- The lexical unit *calonia* was replaced by *calúmnia* even before the *DA* was published and it was used in the legal domains;
- The concepts denominated under multiword expression *Afianzar de calúmnia* was considered a legal concept until before the year 1925;
- The concept of *Juramento de calúmnia* was considered relevant when compiling the *DA*. However, after that it was present in the academic dictionaries only from 1936 until 1992;
- Starting from the year 1884, academics mark a sense of *calúmnia* as a legal term<sup>35</sup>.
- The legal system of the twenty-first century treats *calúmnia* both as a criminal law concept as well as the canon law concept.

Definitions of <i>calonia</i> and <i>calúmnia</i>	
Autoridades (1 <sup>st</sup> edition)	<p>⇒ <i>Calonia</i> (1<sup>st</sup> sense) Lo mismo que Calúmnia. Es voz antiquada. FUER. JUZG. lib. 3. tit. 4. l. 5. No haya ninguna pena, ni ninguna calónia.</p> <p>⇒ <i>Calúmnia</i> s. f. La acusación falsa y maliciosa que se hace de alguno, por enojo o venganza, para causarle daño, infamarle o desacreditarle. Antiguamente se escribía sin la m; pero ya no se practica.</p>
1780; 1783; 1791; 1803; 1817; 1822;	<p>⇒ <i>Calonia</i> (1<sup>st</sup> sense) Lo mismo que Calúmnia.</p> <p>⇒ <i>Calúmnia</i> La acusación falsa hecha malisiosamente para causar daño.</p>
1832; 1837; 1843; 1852; 1869;	<p>⇒ <i>Calonia</i> [Permanently withdrawn from the dictionary.]</p> <p>⇒ <i>Calúmnia</i> (1<sup>st</sup> sense) La acusación falsa hecha malisiosamente para causar daño.</p>
1884; 1899; 1914; 1925;	<p>⇒ <i>Calúmnia</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— (1<sup>st</sup> sense) La acusación falsa hecha malisiosamente para causar daño.</li> <li>— (2<sup>nd</sup> sense) For. Imputación falsa de un delito de los que dan lugar á procedimiento de oficio</li> </ul>
1936/1939; 1947; 1956; 1970; 1984; 1992;	<p>⇒ <i>Calúmnia</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— (1<sup>st</sup> sense) La acusación falsa hecha malisiosamente para causar daño.</li> <li>— (2<sup>nd</sup> sense) For. Imputación falsa de un delito de los que dan lugar á procedimiento de oficio.</li> <li>— (3<sup>rd</sup> sense) For. V. Juramento de calúmnia</li> </ul>
2014;	<p>⇒ <i>Calúmnia</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— (1<sup>st</sup> sense) Acusación falsa, hecha maliciosamente para causar daño.</li> <li>— (2<sup>nd</sup> sense) Imputación de un delito hecha a sabiendas de su falsedad.</li> </ul>
DEJ (2016)	⇒ <i>Calúmnia</i>

<sup>35</sup> It was, namely, stated in the 12<sup>th</sup> edition of the DRAE that this edition includes a higher number of technicalisms.

	<p>(1<sup>st</sup> sense) Pen. Imputación de un delito hecha con conocimiento de su falsedad o temerario desprecio de la verdad.</p> <p>(2<sup>nd</sup> sense) Can. Delito canónico cometido por quien denuncia falsamente a un confesor por el delito de solicitar a un penitente a un pecado contra el sexto mandamiento del decálogo.</p>
--	--

## 2) *Emienda*

The lemma *emienda* was described in six different entries in the *DA*. The third entry defines this word as penal punishment and exemplifies it using a quotation extracted from *Fuero Juzgo*. The definitions of the remaining entries are respectively: (1) “Corrección de algún error”, (2) “Se llama tambien la nota y advertencia que se hace quando las palabras están erradas, o mal escritas y colocadas, de calidad que varían el sentido y significado”, (4) “Significa tambien remuneración, premio, satisfacción y recompensa”, (5) “En el orden Militar de Caballería de Santiago se llama assí el Caballero que substituye y tiene las veces del Caballero llamado Trece, en su auséncia, en los Capítulos y demás actos y funciones públicas y solemnes”, while the sixth entry represents a multiword expression *emienda de la vida* and is defined as follows: “Es la mudanza de mala en buena, mejorando de costumbres”. The structure of the entry remained the same up to the second edition of the DRAE (1783).

In the third *DRAE* edition (1791), there are only two senses of the lemma *emienda*, the first one consisting only of a cross-reference to the lemma *enmienda* while the second one describes the concept previously described in the entry number five in the *DA*. The structure of the entry for *emienda*, apart from the sense order and irrelevant changes inside the definitions, remained the same until the present day.

The lemma *enmienda* was not included in the dictionary before the third *DRAE* edition (1791). What was registered in this edition is an orthographic-phonetical change of the lexical unit. The new lemma *enmienda* has three senses, namely the first, the third, and the fourth sense that were attributed the lemma *emienda* in the *DA*. Consequently, the concept of penal punishment was now defined under the 3<sup>rd</sup> sense of the lemma *enmienda*. The sense is assigned a lexicographic mark “for.” (forense) indicating that it is a legal concept. Moreover, it is important to mention that this sense was also assigned two multiword expressions. The first one represents a proverb *Quien yerra y se enmienda á Dios se encomenda*, while the second multiword expression is a phrase *Tomar enmienda* and is defined as the action of punishing. Both of these multiword expressions were withdrawn in the next edition (1803). The usage

mark indicating the legal domain was also removed in 1803 and was never included again for this particular sense.

In the 15<sup>th</sup> edition (1925), the phrase *Tomar enmienda* was again included but this time as a separate phrase along with a new expression *Poner enmienda*, outside of any of the senses. Moreover, this edition adds the fourth sense to the lemma *enmienda* and defines it as: “Propuesta de variante, adición o reemplazo de un proyecto, dictamen, informe o documento análogo”, and the fifth one: “Sustancias que se mezclan con las tierras para modificar favorablemente sus propiedades y hacerlas más productivas”.

The 16<sup>th</sup> edition (1936) implements a juridical sense of the lemma *enmienda*: “En los escritos, rectificación perceptible de errores materiales, la cual debe salvarse al final” as well as the multiword expression *Va sin enmienda*.

The sense of *enmienda* referring to the concept of penal punishment remained a part of the entry until the present day while continually changing the position inside the entry. In the DLE this concept occupies the 6<sup>th</sup> position in the entry and is marked as disused.

On the other side, the *DEJ* includes the lemma *enmienda* in the following sense:

“Propuesta de modificación de un texto sometido a debate y aprobación parlamentarios presentada por un diputado o grupo parlamentario. Puede tener por objeto un texto legislativo (enmienda a un proyecto o proposición de ley) o un texto no legislativo (por ejemplo, a una proposición no de ley).”

The diachronic approach in the analysis of this word allowed us to investigate the steps taken before it assumed a specialized meaning. To summarize:

- The lexical unit *emienda* designated the concept of penal punishment in the medieval legal system described in the *Fuero Juzgo*;
- From the edition 1803 until the edition 1884, the sense of *enmienda* as the penal punishment was treated as a legal concept;
- The lexical form *emienda* is lemmatized in the DLE (2014) as a disused form of *enmienda*, even though it was marked as archaic ever since 1791;
- In the present day, the concept of *enmienda* as a penal punishment is disused and it not considered to be a legal concept;
- The legal term *enmienda* today exists only as the concept of proposed modification of a text submitted to parliamentary debate and approval presented by a deputy or a parliamentary group.

Definitions of <i>emienda</i> and <i>enmienda</i>	
Autoridades (1 <sup>st</sup> edition)	⇒ <i>emienda</i> (3 <sup>rd</sup> entry) Vale tambien satisfacci3n y castigo penal, por alg3n dao comedido. Lat3n. Satisfactio. FUER. JUZG. lib. 2. tit. 1. l. 30. Faga emienda por el dao, y por el tuerto que fizo. QUEV. M. B. No fue temeridad, sino conocimiento de que al delinqueute no le defiende la guarda, sino la emienda. ⇒ <i>enmienda</i> [Not included]
1780; 1783;	⇒ <i>emienda</i> (3 <sup>rd</sup> sense) Satisfacci3n y castigo penal, por alg3n dao comedido. ⇒ <i>enmienda</i> [Not included]
1791; 1803; 1817; 1822; 1832; 1837; 1843; 1852; 1869;	⇒ <i>emienda</i> (1 <sup>st</sup> sense) ant. Lo mismo que enmienda. ⇒ <i>enmienda</i> (3 <sup>rd</sup> sense) for. Satisfaccion y paga en pena del dao hecho.
1884; 1899; 1914; 1925; 1936/1939; 1947;	⇒ <i>emienda</i> (1 <sup>st</sup> sense) ant. Enmienda. ⇒ <i>enmienda</i> — (3 <sup>rd</sup> sense) Satisfaccion y paga en pena del dao hecho.
1956; 1970;	⇒ <i>emienda</i> (1 <sup>st</sup> sense) ant. Enmienda. ⇒ <i>enmienda</i> (4 <sup>th</sup> sense) Satisfaccion y paga en pena del dao hecho.
1984;	⇒ <i>emienda</i> (1 <sup>st</sup> sense) ant. Enmienda. ⇒ <i>enmienda</i> (3 <sup>rd</sup> sense) desus. Satisfaccion y paga en pena del dao hecho.
1992;	⇒ <i>emienda</i> (1 <sup>st</sup> sense) ant. Enmienda. ⇒ <i>enmienda</i> (4 <sup>th</sup> sense) desus. Satisfaccion y paga en pena del dao hecho.
2014;	⇒ <i>emienda</i> (2 <sup>nd</sup> sense) ant. Enmienda. ⇒ <i>enmienda</i> (6 <sup>th</sup> sense) desus. Satisfaccion y paga en pena del dao hecho.
DEJ (2016)	(The sense is not included.)

### 3) *Esposayas*

The concept of betrothal was a widespread institution in the past. It was adopted by the Romans, then by the Visigoths, and inherited by the Spanish as a ceremony prior to marriage (Jimenez and Castro de Achával, 2008, p. 75). In the *DA*, the lemma *esposayas* is an archaic variant defined as “Lo mismo que Esponsales” and exemplified by a sentence extracted from the *Fuero Juzgo*. This definition stayed the same until the edition 1914 when it was changed to “Lo mismo que esponsalias.” The lexical variant *esponsalias* was lemmatized in the academic



dictionaries from the 3<sup>rd</sup> *DRAE* edition (1791) up until the 22<sup>nd</sup> (1992), and in each of the editions its definition consisted only of a reference to the lemma *esponsales*.

On the other hand, the lemma *esponsales* is defined in the *DA* as “La mútua promessa de los que han de contraher Matrimonio.” This entry remains unchanged until the edition 1869 when a new sense was added and defined as the same promise when it is covered with the solemnities that the law requires for its validity. Moreover, it contains a lexicographic mark “*Jurisp.*,” which indicated that it belongs to the juridical domain. This juridical aspect was described in more details in the twentieth century. Namely, starting from the edition from 1936, the second sense is defined as a promise of marriage made in any of the forms that the law requires to have a civil effect of small compensation in exceptional cases of non-motivated breach. Both senses remained unchanged up till the 23<sup>rd</sup> edition of the academic dictionary.

The *DEJ* considers the *esponsales* as a concept from the canonic law and defines this lemma as a “mutual promise to marry each other that men and women are accepted and make, that in canon law, since the enactment of the *Codex Iuris Canonici* of 1983, refers to the regulation established by the particular law of episcopal conferences”.

Based on the treatment of the lexical unit *esposayas* in the academic dictionaries, we can deduce the following:

- the modern-day concept of *esponsales* existed as a legal concept in the time the *Fuero Juzgo* was compiled and var denominated by the word *esposayas*;
- the academic dictionaries treat the lexical unit *esponsales* as a legal concept since the 11<sup>th</sup> edition of the *DRAE* (1869);
- the academic dictionaries used to lemmatize three different archaic lexical variants of this very concept (*esposayas*, *esponsales*, and *esponsalias*). As Ruhstaller (2002, p. 2322) stated, the criteria applied when including different variants of words additionally proves the lack of coherence and the orientation of the academics towards the real usage of the language.

Definitions of <i>esposayas</i> and <i>esponsales</i>	
Autoridades (1 <sup>st</sup> edition)	<p>⇒ <i>esposayas</i> (1<sup>st</sup> sense) Lo mismo que Esponsales. Es voz antiquada. FUER. JUZG. lib. 3. tit. 1. l. 5. E desde el día de las esposayas a tal día de las bodas, non debe esperar el uno al otro más de dos años.</p> <p>⇒ <i>esponsales</i> La mútua promessa de los que han de contraher Matrimonio</p>
1780; 1791; 1817; 1832; 1843;	1783; 1803; 1822; 1837; 1852;
	<p>⇒ <i>esposayas</i> (1<sup>st</sup> sense) Lo mismo que Esponsales.</p> <p>⇒ <i>esponsales</i> La mútua promessa de los que han de contraher Matrimonio.</p>

1869; 1884; 1899;	
1914; 1925;	⇒ <i>esposayas</i> (1 <sup>st</sup> sense) Lo mismo que esponsalias. ⇒ <i>esponsales</i> (1 <sup>st</sup> sense) La mútua promessa de los que han de contraher Matrimonio.
1936/1939; 1947; 1956; 1970; 1984; 1992;	⇒ <i>esposayas</i> (1 <sup>st</sup> sense) Lo mismo que esponsalias. ⇒ <i>esponsales</i> (2 <sup>nd</sup> sense) For. Esta misma parte de la promesa cuando está hecha en alguna de las formas que la ley requiere para que surta algún efecto civil de mera indemnización en casos excepcionales incumplimiento no motivado.
2014;	⇒ <i>esposayas</i> (The lemma is not included.) ⇒ <i>esponsales</i> (1 <sup>st</sup> sense) Mutua promesa de casarse que se hacen y aceptan los miembros de una pareja. (2 <sup>nd</sup> sense) Der. Promesa de matrimonio hecha en alguna de las formas que la ley requiere para que surta algún efecto civil de mera indemnización en casos excepcionales de incumplimiento no motivado.
DEJ (2016)	⇒ <i>esponsales</i> (1 <sup>st</sup> sense) Can. Mutua promesa de casarse que se hacen y aceptan el varón y la mujer, que en el derecho canónico, desde la promulgación del Codex Iuris Canonici de 1983, se remite a la regulación que establezca el derecho particular de las conferencias episcopales.

#### 4) **Pleitesia**

In the *DEJ* (2016), the word *pleitesía* is included as a general law concept and defined as the act of reverent compliance or submission to someone. The only sense of lemma *pleitesia*<sup>36</sup> in the first academic dictionary (1737) was, however, defined as a pact, agreement, or promise to do or fulfill something.

After it was defined in the first edition of the *DA* (1737), this lemma was withdrawn from the dictionaries published by the RAE, and it was not included again until the publication of the 5<sup>th</sup> edition of the *DRAE*, in 1817. The treatment of these lexical units in the academic dictionaries in this period matches the results on the usage frequency we obtained using the CORDE. Namely, this corpus contains nine usage registrations of the word *pleitesía* in nine documents dating from the year 1600 until the year 1737, the last example dating from 1706. However, it registers only one case of this word from the year 1737 until the year 1817, when the word was lemmatized again. Finally, there are eight cases registered from the year 1817 till the year 1900.

<sup>36</sup> Even though the lemma itself does not carry a graphical accent on the last syllable, the accent is included on the representations in the examples thus proving that it is the same lexical unit as the one defined in the *DEJ* (2016).

In the 5<sup>th</sup> edition of the academic dictionary (1817), the lemma *pleitesia* was assigned a definition similar to the one in the *DA*: “Pacto, convenio, concierto o avenencia”, and the multiword expression: “Cometer pleitesia o pleito”, that was defined as “Hacer algun pacto o concierto con ciertas seguridades de cumplir lo prometido”: Both the sense and the expression are marked as disused.

The definitions remain unchanged until the 19<sup>th</sup> (1970) edition of the *DRAE* when the order of senses in the entry was changed, and the lemma was assigned two new senses:

**pleitesía.** (De pleilds.) f. Rendimiento, muestra reverente de cortesía. || 2. ant. Pleito, contienda. | 3. ant. Pacto, convenio, concierto, avenencia. || 4. ant. Capitulación, rendición, sometimiento.

The definitions assigned to the lemma *pleitesía* in the 19<sup>th</sup> edition of the *DRAE* (1970) were included unchanged in the *DLE* (2014). Interestingly, the database CORDE contains evidence of the usage of the word *pleitesía* in the sense of “Rendimiento, muestra reverente de cortesía” as early as in the year 1891 – 1894. Nevertheless, the dictionaries compiled by the RAE did not include this sense before the edition from the year 1970.

The sense that was exemplified using the *Fuero Juzgo* in the *DA* occupies the third position in the entry of the lemma *pleitesía* in the *DLE* (2014). This method of listing the senses of an entry corresponds to what J. Casares described as an empirical method<sup>37</sup> since it gives preference to the most frequently used senses over the ones that correspond to archaic semantic values. Moreover, the definition assigned to this lemma in the *DEJ* (2016) refers to the act of showing respect to somebody. The case of the word *pleitesia* serves to demonstrate the semantical change this lexical unit underwent, and it leads us to the following conclusions:

- In the time period the *Fuero Juzgo* was compiled, the lexical unit *pleitesia* was used as the denomination of the concept of the pact, agreement or promise to do or accomplish something;
- This lexical unit was exceptionally rarely used during the eighteenth century, and it was consequently withdrawn from the academic dictionaries;
- Even though, according to the CORDE, this lexical unit showed the polysemic traits as early as by the end of the nineteenth century, its multiple senses were not registered by the RAE before the year 1970;

---

<sup>37</sup> As opposed to the historical method, cf. Casares (1950, pp. 58 – 63).

— According to the *DEJ* (2016), the concept of *pleitesía* as a demonstration of respect is today considered a general law concept.

Definition of <i>pleitesía</i>	
Autoridades (1 <sup>st</sup> edition)	— (1 <sup>st</sup> sense) El pacto, convenio o promessa de hacer o cumplir alguna cosa. Latín. Fidei promissio. FUER. JUZG. lib. 2. tit. 3. l. 3. E si aquel personero se dexare vencer por pleitesía o por engaño, quanto perdió por el señor del pleito, todo gelo debe entregar el personero de lo suyo.
1780; 1783; 1791; 1803;	— (The lemma was withdrewed.)
1817; 1822; 1832; 1837; 1843; 1852; 1869; 1884; 1899; 1914; 1925; 1936/1939; 1947; 1956;	— (1 <sup>st</sup> sense) Pacto, convinio, concierto, avenencia.
1970; 1984; 1992; 2014;	— (3 <sup>rd</sup> sense) ant. Pacto, convenio, concierto, avenencia.
DEJ (2016)	— Gral. Muestra reverente de acatamiento de algo o sumisión a alguien.

#### 6.4.2 Final observations

The case analysis examined the lexicographic treatment of certain legal concepts that were exemplified by *Fuero Juzgo* in the *DA* and made it possible to comprehend the evolution of both these concepts and their denomination up until the 23<sup>rd</sup> edition of the academic dictionary. This investigation had a diachronic-comparative approach, and it led us to the following conclusions:

- 1) the majority of the legal concepts exemplified by *Fuero Juzgo* are still present in the contemporary language, some of which with and some without linguistic changes;
- 2) we have not registered any significant semantical changes of the senses<sup>38</sup> depicting legal concepts initially exemplified with the help of *Fuero Juzgo* up till the 23<sup>rd</sup> edition of the academic dictionary;
- 3) semantical changes of the lemmatized lexical units are regarded in polysemy. Lexical units that used to have a single meaning in the *DA* very often end up having multiple meanings in last editions of the academic dictionary;
- 4) linguistical changes that occurred in the denominations of the legal concepts until the present day are either of orthographic-phonetical or morphological character;
- 5) whether or not a lexical unit shall be treated as a legal concept depends on the social and cultural circumstances;

<sup>38</sup> We are referring here to the entries or the subentries (senses in today's meaning) in the *DA* that include *Fuero Juzgo* as one of the sources. In other words, we are not talking about other senses of a lemma.

- 6) some of the lexical units that denominate legal concepts initially exemplified using *Fuero Juzgo* today denominate different legal concepts;
- 7) registration and the lexicographical treatment of the legal concepts do not happen randomly, nor do these occur with fixed criteria, but depending on the time period in which the dictionary is compiled. The differences in the treatment of the lexicon depend on the lexicographical methods followed by the Academy in the given period of time;
- 8) starting from the 12<sup>th</sup> edition of the *DRAE* (1884) the changes in the usage frequency of a particular lexical unit can be traced based on the changes of position it occupies inside the entry in academic dictionaries;
- 9) based on the lexicographic marks employed (or omitted) by the RAE we can get to know in which period a word obtained or lost a specific, often specialized, connotation;
- 10) the well-known fondness of the RAE for preserving the lexicon of past eras manifests itself when analyzing the vocabulary exemplified by the ancient texts. Many of the archaic lexical variants of legal concepts remained in the dictionary even though a modern-day variant was also lemmatized. It is particularly interesting that some of the lemmas that were marked as archaic already in the *DA* still form part of the 22<sup>nd</sup> and even the 23<sup>rd</sup> edition of the academic dictionary;
- 11) the academic dictionaries used to lemmatize multiple variants of the archaic lexical units describing the same concepts;
- 12) according to the data retrieved from the CORDE, we can see that there were cases when it took several decades for the Academy to include a new sense of a word after it appears in the language.

## 7 Conclusion

The research carried out in the previous chapters describes the mark the medieval law code *Fuero Juzgo* left not only in the first academic dictionary, i.e., the *DA*, but also in the subsequent editions. Throughout the study, we sought to disclose the possibility of analyzing the employment of *Fuero Juzgo* as one of the sources of lexicographic material in the *DA*, but also its importance for the Spanish monolingual lexicography by describing the presence and the evolution of the legal lexicon initially exemplified by this law code in the subsequent editions of the academic dictionary.

In the theoretical chapters, we briefly illustrated the historical background and explained the aspects that led to the need for the compilation of the first Spanish academic dictionary. We situated the *DA* into the history of Spanish monolingual lexicography and

described its importance for the further development of this discipline, but also the main features of this dictionary, including the motives and the methods of implementing diverse texts as the sources of lexicographic material. Following that, we provided an illustration of the legal documents most commonly used as sources of the lexicographic material, but also of the treatment of the legal lexicon in the *DA*. This was followed by the presentation of the main characteristics of the medieval law code *Fuero Juzgo*, the document that stands in focus of this study, and its linguistic characteristics. The information previously presented helped us describe the role *Fuero Juzgo* had in the *DA*, and ultimately led us to the results that follow.

Firstly, this work contributed to previously conducted studies<sup>39</sup> that showed how the intention of the academics to compile a dictionary of the Castilian language that would be as copious as it could be made led to the inclusion of numerous medieval documents as the sources, and consequently, to the lemmatization of diverse archaic lexical forms. There are 163 lemmas in the *DA* that are exemplified by *Fuero Juzgo* and marked as archaic. Since 246 lemmas in total include *Fuero Juzgo* as one of the sources, we can state that 66% of the lemmas exemplified by this document represent archaic lexical variants. Based on the purpose of their implementation in the dictionary and the diachronic modifications these aim to illustrate, we distinguished two groups of archaisms that originate from the *Fuero Juzgo* (the archaic lexical forms, and the concept denominations that were no longer in use by the mid-eighteenth century). Consequently, the inclusion of numerous archaisms led to the continuous reappearance of a significant number of archaic lexical or semantical variants in the subsequent editions. Finally, the result is visible in the 23<sup>rd</sup> edition (2014) of the academic dictionary, which includes 59 archaic words that are marked as disused but that were initially exemplified in the dictionary using the quotations from *Fuero Juzgo*. The 59 archaisms still present in *DLE* constitute 36% of the total number of archaisms in the *DA* that were exemplified by this legal code. The diachronic-comparative analysis also showed that some of the lemmas that were marked as archaic already in the *DA* still form part of the 22<sup>nd</sup> and even the 23<sup>rd</sup> edition of the academic dictionary.

However, we should not disregard the fact that only one version of the text of *Fuero Juzgo* was used for the purposes of compiling the *DA*<sup>40</sup>, and that different versions of the codex that have survived until today do not reflect the same tendencies<sup>41</sup>. Besides, the argument that the academics used to modify the lexical units and adjust these to the orthographic regulations of

---

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Ruhstaller (2002), Freixas (2003), Zancarrón (2017), etc.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Zancarrón (2017).

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Ortiz Caballero (1988).

the *DA*<sup>42</sup>, that has already been developed by researchers<sup>43</sup>, represents a significant obstacle in analyzing the orthographic-phonetical variants. As a consequence, it is not possible to fully rely on the *DA* when it comes to the analysis of the orthographic-phonetical variants of the vocabulary of *Fuero Juzgo*.

Secondly, when it comes to the semantical values of the lexical units exemplified using the quotations from *Fuero Juzgo*, this study described the treatment of the general and the legal vocabulary with the authority of *Fuero Juzgo* in the dictionary. The diachronic and the semantic perspective of the vocabulary we analyzed needed to be brought together in order to demonstrate that this document was not used only for the purpose of presenting the formal variants of the words, but that it also served to illustrate different concept denominations that were still active in language as well as those that were considered disused. As a result, the quotes from *Fuero Juzgo* were used to exemplify a broad specter of occupations. Nonetheless, due to its legal nature, this document mainly served as an *autoridad* for the lemmas and senses dealing with legal concepts. This allowed us to study the process of implementation of *Fuero Juzgo* as one of the *autoridades*, to analyze the practical employment of this text in the *DA*, and finally, to evaluate the further treatment of the legal lexicon initially exemplified by this law code in the subsequent editions of the academic dictionary.

We listed a total of 43 legal concepts (including entries and subentries) exemplified using the *Fuero Juzgo* as one of the sources. On the basis of the analysis conducted, we can confirm that a significant part of the legal lexicon, i.e., a total of 30 lexical units, corresponds to what Vangehuchten (2005, in Santamaría Pérez 2006, p. 10) described as a sub-technical lexicon. Most of these are lexical units regularly used in the general language and thus appear without indication of the usage in legal domains. However, the legal nature of these units can most often be deducted based on the definitions or the examples.

Thirdly, the study of a specific group of lexical units from the perspective of historical lexicography and from the academic lexicographic data, such as the one carried out in this research, provided, on the one hand, the information on how the vocabulary developed throughout time and, on the other, contributed to tracing the history of its lexicographical treatment. Due to the fact that practical lexicography very often captures semantical changes in a language, the diachronic-comparative analysis of individual lexical units that designate legal concepts exemplified in the *DA* using the *Fuero Juzgo* as one of the sources allowed us

---

<sup>42</sup> See the analysis of the treatment of the lemma *juro*.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Freixas (2003).

to see the periods when the new senses of words appeared and how the ones that once had been actively used, vanished with time or were replaced by another ‘signifier’.

From the lexicographical point of view, this type of analysis allows us to capture different moments in the history of lexicography<sup>44</sup>. Furthermore, since our study examined the series of dictionaries published by one single institution, i.e., the RAE, it demonstrated the diverse lexicographical methods and ideologies followed by the lexicographers in charge of the compilation of the academic dictionary in different periods. Consequently, besides being able to learn that a total of 27 lemmas that denominate legal concepts included by the first academic dictionary and exemplified by *Fuero Juzgo* managed to overcome the filtering and the selection of the subsequent publications, and have arrived in the twenty-first century, we also provided an insight into the properties of lexicographic treatment applied by every single version of the dictionary in each of the periods of the history of lexicography that it has witnessed. In the end, we were able to describe the evolution of certain legal concepts in Spanish academic lexicography from its very beginning (1726-1739) up till the last edition of the academic dictionary (2014).

The space limitations did not allow us to describe the evolution of each of the legal concepts from our corpus. Moreover, as we demonstrated, *Fuero Juzgo* was not the only medieval legal code used as a source in the process of compilation of the *DA*. Therefore, in a future investigation it would be interesting to use the methods elaborated in this work in order to analyze the presence of the vocabulary of the rest of the medieval legal documents in the academic lexicography, to compare the results obtained and be able to study the presence, the evolution and the treatment of a higher number of medieval legal concepts in Spanish monolingual lexicography.

To conclude, although it has been known for as long as the lexicographic practice exists that dictionaries mirror the time period during which they were compiled<sup>45</sup>, this study, among numerous others, represents a testimony to the fact that, in some cases, words may have a much longer trajectory, surpass the realities they describe and serve as the windows to the past.

---

<sup>44</sup> Numerous researchers (Gutiérrez Rodilla 1993, 2003; Garriga 1996-1997; Bajo 2001; Clavería 2001 among others) used the study and the comparison of the lexicographic material in the editions of the academic dictionary for the historical investigation of various types of specialized vocabulary and have proved that this research method provides valuable linguistic and lexicographical information.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Marias (1965, p. 44).



## 8. Appendix

<i>Diccionario de Autoridades</i>	Legal Concept	<i>Antiguadas</i>	DLE (2014)
ABEYA		ANT.	
ABEYERA		ANT.	
ABONDAR		ANT.	DLE
ACATAR			DLE
ACOITARSE		ANT.	DLE
ACOITA	LC	ANT.	
ACONTENTARSE		ANT.	
ACORDAR 3			DLE
ACORDAR 4			DLE
ACREER		ANT.	DLE
AD		ANT.	DLE
ADELANTRE		ANT.	
ADEVINO		ANT.	
ADEXAR		ANT.	
ADUCHO		ANT.	
ADULTERADOR		ANT.	DLE
AFALAGAMENTO		ANT.	
AFALECER		ANT.	
AFOGAR		ANT.	DLE
AFOLLAR		ANT.	DLE
AFRONTAR	LC	ANT.	DLE
AGEDADO		ANT.	
AGRUADOR	LC	ANT.	
AIDORO		ANT.	
AJUNTANZA		ANT.	
ALUGAR		ANT.	DLE
AMARGOSO, SA			DLE
AMECER		ANT.	
AMONESTAMIENTO		ANT.	DLE
ANDIDO		ANT.	
ANGELO		ANT.	
ANNO		ANT.	
ANTEVISO		ANT.	
ANTIGUAMENTE		ANT.	
APARCIADO, DA	LC		
APARCIAR	LC	ANT.	
APOCAR		ANT.	DLE
APONER	LC	ANT.	DLE
APOSTIA	LC	ANT.	
APOSTOLO		ANT.	DLE
APRESENTAR		ANT.	
APRESTAMO	LC	ANT.	
APRIMAS		ANT.	
AQUELE, LA, LO		ANT.	DLE
ASCONDER		ANT.	DLE
ASCUSO		ANT.	
ASMAR			DLE
ASPERANCIA		ANT.	
ASPIRAMENTO		ANT.	
ASPIRAR		ANT.	DLE
ASSAÑARSE		ANT.	
ATA		ANT.	

ATAL		ANT.	DLE
ATANES		ANT.	
ATE		ANT.	
ATEMER		ANT.	
ATEMPRADO, DA		ANT.	
ATEMPRAR	LC	ANT.	
ATORMENTAR	LC		DLE
AVOLO, LA		ANT.	
AXAMAR		ANT.	
AXANAR		ANT.	
AXAR		ANT.	
AXEGAR		ANT.	
AXENGE		ANT.	
AYEGAR		ANT.	
AYENO		ANT.	
AYODORO		ANT.	
AYUDADOR, RA			DLE
AYUDORIO		ANT.	
AYUNTADO			
AYUNTAMIENTO			DLE
AYUNTANZA		ANT.	
BODA	LC		DLE
BON		ANT.	DLE
BONA	LC	ANT.	
BOSCAR		ANT.	
BOY		ANT.	
BUES, Ò BUEYS		ANT.	DLE
CABALERO		ANT.	DLE
CABALGADURA			DLE
CABALLERIA (CELESTIAL)			
CABALO		ANT.	
CABER (NO CABER EL CORAZÓN en sí o en el pecho)			
CABEZA 2			DLE
CABEZA 7	LC		DLE
CABEZA 8	LC		DLE
CABEZA 9		ANT.	DLE
CABEZA 35 (PODRIDO DE LA CABEZA)		ANT.	DLE
CABILDO	LC		DLE
CABO		ANT.	
CALDARIA	LC		DLE
CALONIA	LC	ANT.	
CAMBIA		ANT.	
CARGA	LC		DLE
CARNALMENTRE		ANT.	
CARRO			DLE
CARTA	LC	ANT.	DLE
CASTIELLO		ANT.	
CASTIGAMENTO O CASTIGAMIENTO	LC		
CATAR			DLE
CATORCE			DLE
CEGAR			DLE
CELESTIAL			DLE
CENCERRA			DLE
CERCA			DLE

<i>CERTAMENTRE</i>		ANT.	
<i>CHRISTUS</i>		ANT.	
<i>CIBDAD, CIBDADE, CIBDAT</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>CLARAMIENT</i>		ANT.	
<i>COBDICIA</i>		ANT.	
<i>COBDICIOSO</i>		ANT.	
<i>COBDIZA</i>		ANT.	
<i>COIDAR</i>		ANT.	
<i>COIDO</i>		ANT.	
<i>COITA</i>		ANT.	
<i>COITADO, DA</i>		ANT.	
<i>COMPANA</i>		ANT.	
<i>COMPANO</i>		ANT.	
<i>COMPRIMIENTO</i>		ANT.	
<i>COMPRIR</i>		ANT.	
<i>CONCEYO</i>	LC	ANT.	DLE
<i>DECAEMENTO</i>		ANT.	
<i>DECAIMENTO</i>		ANT.	
<i>DECEBIMIENTO</i>	LC	ANT.	DLE
<i>DEFALECER</i>		ANT.	
<i>DEFAMAR</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>DEFESO, SA</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>DEGREDO</i>	LC	ANT.	DLE
<i>DELIBRAR</i>	LC	ANT.	DLE
<i>DEMANDAR</i>	LC		DLE
<i>DEPOS</i>		ANT.	
<i>DERAIGAR</i>		ANT.	
<i>DERECHORA</i>	LC	ANT.	
<i>DESCOMONGAR</i>		ANT.	
<i>DESCONVENIBLE</i>			DLE
<i>DEFOLAR</i>		ANT.	
<i>DESLAIDADO, DA</i>			
<i>DESLAIDAR</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>DESPERAR</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>DESPERECER</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>DESPRECIAMIENTO</i>		ANT.	
<i>DESTAJAR</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>DONCAS</i>		ANT.	
<i>DUC</i>		ANT.	
<i>DUOS</i>		ANT.	
<i>DUPLO</i>	LC		DLE
<i>EMENDAR</i>			DLE
<i>EMIENDA</i>	LC		DLE
<i>EMPUJAMIENTO</i>			
<i>ENCENDER</i>			DLE
<i>ENCERRADOR</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>ENCULPAR</i>	LC		DLE
<i>ENRIZAR</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>ENSUCIAR</i>			DLE
<i>ENTENCIAR</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>ENTENZON</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>ENTREGAMIENTRE</i>		ANT.	
<i>ERRANZA</i>		ANT.	
<i>ESCRITO</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>ESPOSAYAS</i>	LC	ANT.	
<i>ESQUIVAR</i>			DLE
<i>ESTABELECIMIENTO</i>		ANT.	

<i>ESTANCO</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>ESTONCE, Y ESTONCES</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>ESTORBO</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>EXPENDER</i>			DLE
<i>EXTREMAR</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>FALSO, SA</i>			DLE
<i>FAZFIRIDO, DA</i>		ANT.	
<i>FIO</i>		ANT.	
<i>FORCIA</i>		ANT.	
<i>FORCIAR</i>		ANT.	
<i>FORZA</i>		ANT.	
<i>GALARDONAR</i>			DLE
<i>GUISA</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>HOME</i>		ANT.	
<i>HOSTE</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>JURO</i>	LC		DLE
<i>LAZO</i>			DLE
<i>MIENTES</i>			DLE
<i>MOYO</i>			DLE
<i>PALADINAMENTE</i>			DLE
<i>PALMADA</i>			DLE
<i>PARAR MAL</i>			DLE
<i>PARCIAL</i>			DLE
<i>PARCIR</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>PARTE</i>	LC		DLE
<i>PARTICIPIO</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>PARTIR</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>PASCO</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>PATRIMONIO</i>	LC		DLE
<i>PECUNIA</i>			DLE
<i>PENEDENCIA</i>	LC	ANT.	
<i>PENEDENCIAL</i>	LC	ANT.	
<i>PERJURAR</i>			DLE
<i>PERQUIRIR</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>PLATA</i>			DLE
<i>PLEITEAMIENTO</i>	LC	ANT.	
<i>PLEITESIA</i>	LC		DLE
<i>PORCO</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>PORTA</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>PORTO</i>		ANT.	
<i>POSPONER</i>			DLE
<i>POSTRIMERAMENTE</i>			DLE
<i>PREVICO</i>		ANT.	
<i>PRO</i>	LC	ANT.	DLE
<i>PROLONGAR</i>			DLE
<i>PROVINCO</i>		ANT.	
<i>PRUEBA</i>	LC		DLE
<i>QUADRINIETO</i>		ANT.	
<i>QUEBRANTANZA</i>		ANT.	
<i>QUEMADOR</i>			DLE
<i>QUERELLADOR</i>	LC	ANT.	DLE
<i>RAER</i>			DLE
<i>RAFEZ, O RAHEZ</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>REINO</i>			DLE
<i>REN</i>		ANT.	
<i>HACER SABER</i>			
<i>SEMEJAR</i>			DLE
<i>SENDOS, DAS</i>			DLE

<i>SENTIR</i>			DLE
<i>SEÑAL</i>	LC		DLE
<i>SIEMPRE JAMAS</i>			DLE
<i>SIERVO, VA</i>			DLE
<i>SILO</i>			DLE
<i>SOBRE</i>			DLE
<i>SOLDADA</i>			DLE
<i>SUFRIR 1</i>			DLE
<i>SUFRIR 4</i>			DLE
<i>SUSO</i>			DLE
<i>TESTIMONIA</i>	LC	ANT.	
<i>TORMENTAR</i>	LC	ANT.	DLE
<i>TRECESIMO, MA</i>			DLE
<i>VALLADAR</i>		ANT.	DLE
<i>EN VANO</i>			DLE
<i>VENDICION</i>			DLE
<i>VEYECE</i>		ANT.	
<i>VISITAR</i>			DLE
<i>XAGA</i>		ANT.	
<i>XAMAR</i>		ANT.	
<i>XANO</i>		ANT.	
<i>XENO</i>		ANT.	

## 9 Bibliography

1. Ahumada, I. 2000, 'Diccionarios de especialidad en los siglos XVIII, XIX y XX', *Cinco siglos de lexicografía del español*, Universidad de Jaén, Jaén, pp. 79-102.
2. Alvar Ezquerro, M. 2001, 'Los primeros siglos de nuestra lexicografía', in A.M. Medina Guerra (ed.), *Estudios de lexicografía diacrónica del español: (V Centenario del Vocabularium Ecclesiasticum de Rodrigo Fernandez de Santaella)*, Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Málaga, Málaga, pp. 135-181.
3. Alvar Ezquerro, M. 1995, 'Los diccionarios del español en su historia<sup>1</sup>', in *International Journal of Lexicography*, vol. 8, Issue 3, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 173-201.
4. Álvarez de Miranda, P. 1992, 'En torno al *Diccionario* de Terreros', *Bulletin Hispanique*, vol. 94, no. 2, pp. 559-572.
5. Álvarez de Miranda, P. 2000, 'La lexicografía académica de los siglos XVIII y XIX', in I. Ahumada (ed.), *Cinco siglos de lexicografía del español*, Publicaciones de la Universidad Jaén, Jaén, pp. 35-61.
6. Álvarez De Miranda, P. 2005, 'La proeza de un diccionario con textos: algo más sobre el *Diccionario* de autoridades', in T. Martínez Romero (ed.), *Les lletres hispàniques als segles XVI, XVII i XVIII*, Universitat Juame I, Castelló de la Plana, pp. 73-92.
7. Azorín Fernández, D. 1989, 'La labor lexicográfica de Sebastián de Covarrubias', *Boletín de la Asociación Europea de Profesores de Español*, vol. 36/37, pp. 81-90.
8. Azorín Fernández, D. 2000, 'La lexicografía académica en el siglo XVIII', in D. Azorín Fernández (ed.), *Los diccionarios del español en su perspectiva histórica*, Publicaciones de la Universidad de Alicante, Alicante, p. 159-175.
9. Bajo Santiago, F. 2001, 'El léxico científico-técnico del vino en el DRAE', in M. Bargalló, E. Forgas, C. Garriga, A. Rubio & J. Schnitzer (eds.), *Las lenguas de especialidad y su didáctica*, Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Tarragona, pp. 69-79.
10. Blecua, J. A. 2006, *Principios del Diccionario de Autoridades*, Real Academia Española, Madrid.
11. Bosque, I. & Rodríguez, M.A.B. 2018, 'Spanish lexicography in the Internet era', in P. A. Fuertes-Olivera (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Lexicography*, Routledge, London, pp. 636-660.

12. Bravo Vega, J. 1998, 'Esteban Manuel de Villegas, autoridad léxica', C.G. Turza, F.G. Bachiller & J.J. Mangado Martínez (eds.), *Actas del IV Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española: La Rioja, 1-5 de abril de 1997*, vol. 2, Arco Libros, Madrid, pp. 43-52.
13. Cabello Martín, M. 2010, 'La Nueva Recopilación de leyes de 1567', *Folio Complutense Noticias de la Biblioteca Histórica de la UCM*, weblog, UCM, Madrid, viewed 22 July 2019, <<https://webs.ucm.es/BUCM/blogs//Foliocomplutense/2147.php>>.
14. Cairns, J. W. and Du Plessis, P. J. 2010, 'Introduction', in Cairns, J. W. and Du Plessis, P. J. (ed.) *The Creation of the Ius Commune From Casus to Regula*, Edinburgh University Press Ltd, Edinburgh, pp. 1-7.
15. Cano Aguilar, R. 1992, *El español a través de los tiempos*, Arco/Libros, Madrid.
16. Carrazo Ruiz, J.R. & Mancho Duque, M.J. 2003, 'Los comienzos de la Lexicografía monolingüe', in A.M. Medina Guerra (ed.), *Lexicografía Española*, Ariel, Madrid, pp. 205-234.
17. Carriazo Ruiz, J. 2015, 'La crisis/revolución de 1700 en la historia de la lengua española: el cambio de paradigma en las Weltansichten y lo viejo y lo nuevo en el Diccionario de Autoridades', *Arte Nuevo. Revista de estudios áureos*, vol. 3, pp. 43-108.
18. Casares, J. 1950, *Introducción a la lexicografía moderna*, CSIC, Madrid.
19. Castillo Lluch, M. 2012, 'Las lenguas del Fuero juzgo: avatares históricos e historiográficos de las versiones romances de la Ley visigótica', *e-Spania*, viewed 16 July 2019, < <http://journals.openedition.org/e-spania/20994> >.
20. Clavería Nadal, G. 2001, 'El léxico especializado en la lexicografía de finales del siglo XIX: la decimotercera edición (1899) del Diccionario de la Lengua Castellana de la Academia', in J. Brumme (ed.), *La historia de los lenguajes iberorrománicos de especialidad: la divulgación de la ciencia*, UPF/Vervuert/Iberoamericana, Barcelona/Frankfurt/Madrid, pp. 207-222.
21. Clavería Nadal, G. 2012, 'Nuevas perspectivas en el estudio de la evolución del léxico', in G. Clavería Nadal et al. (eds.), *Historia del léxico: perspectivas de investigación*, Iberoamericana, Madrid, pp. 13-90.
22. Corominas Vigneaux, J. & Pascual Rodríguez, J.A. 1980-1991, *Diccionario crítico etimológico castellano e hispánico*, Gredos, Madrid.

23. Cotarelo y Mori, E. 1914, 'La fundación de la Academia Española y su primer director don Juan Manuel F. Pacheco, marqués de Villena', *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, vol. I, pp. 4-38.
24. Desporte, A. 1998-1999, 'Les entrées non autorisées dans le *Diccionario de Autoridades*', *Cahiers d'études hispaniques médiévales*, vol. 22, 1998-1999, pp. 325-346.
25. Diccionario de la lengua española 2014, Real Academia Española, viewed January-July 2019, <<https://dle.rae.es/>>.
26. Diccionario del español jurídico 2016, Real Academia Española, viewed January-July 2019, <<https://dej.rae.es/>>.
27. Ezquerro, M.A. 1995, 'Los diccionarios del español en su historia', *International Journal of Lexicography*, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 173 – 201.
28. Fernández Llera, V. 1929, *Gramática y vocabulario del Fuero Juzgo*, Imprenta Clásica Española, Madrid.
29. Freixas Alás, M. 2003, 'Las autoridades en el primer Diccionario de la Real Academia Española', PhD thesis, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona.
30. Freixas Alás, M. 2006a, 'La técnica lexicográfica en el *Diccionario de Autoridades*: la contribución del académico Juan Ferreras', in J.I. Pérez Pascual & M. Campos Souto (eds.), *El Diccionario de la Real Academia Española: ayer y hoy*, Anexos de la Revista de Lexicografía, no.26, Universidade da Coruña, A Coruña, pp. 83-97.
31. Freixas Alás, M. 2006b, 'Los textos legales en el Diccionario de Autoridades', in G. Clavería Nadal & M.J. Mancho (eds.), *Estudios de léxico y bases de datos*, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, pp. 49-76.
32. Freixas Alás, M. 2006c, 'Las fuentes lexicográficas en el Diccionario de Autoridades', in *Caminos actuales de la historiografía lingüística: actas del V Congreso Internacional de la Sociedad Española de Historiografía lingüística*, vol. 1, pp. 577-594.
33. Freixas Alás, M. 2010, 'Planta y método del Diccionario de Autoridades. Orígenes de la técnica lexicográfica de la Real Academia Española (1713–1739)', *Anexos de Revista de Lexicografía*, vol. 14, Servizo de Publicacións da Universidade da Coruña, A Coruña.
34. Real Academia Española 1815, *Fuero Juzgo «en latín y castellano, cotejado con los más antiguos y preciosos códices por la Real Academia Española»*, Ibarra, Madrid.



35. Galindo y de Vera, L. 1863, *Progreso y vicisitudes del idioma castellano en nuestros cuerpos legales desde que se romanceó el Fuero Juzgo... Memoria escrita por..., premiada por la Real Academia Española... en 1863*, Imprenta Nacional, Madrid.
36. García Martín, J.M. 2016, *El Fuero Juzgo: historia y lengua*, Iberoamericana, Madrid.
37. García Martín, J.M. 2018, *Ideología del Liber Iudicum transmitida a la España del XVIII mediante el Fuero Juzgo*, Classiques Garnier, Paris.
38. Garriga Escribano, C. 1996-1997, 'Penetración del léxico químico en el DRAE: la edición de 1817', *Revista de Lexicografía*, vol. III, pp. 59-80.
39. Gutiérrez Rodilla, B.M. 1993, 'Los términos relacionados con la medicina en el *Diccionario de autoridades*', *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, vol. 73, pp. 463-512.
40. Gutiérrez Rodilla, B.M. 1994-1995, 'Construcción y fuentes utilizadas para los términos médicos en el *Diccionario de Autoridades*', *Revista de lexicografía*, vol. 1, pp. 149-162.
41. Gutiérrez Rodilla, B.M. 2003, 'Los diccionarios, instrumentos importantes en la reconstrucción del lenguaje científico', in B. M. Gutiérrez Rodilla (ed.), *Aproximaciones al lenguaje de la ciencia*, Instituto de la Lengua Castellano-Leonés, Madrid, pp. 453-463.
42. Fajardo, A. 1996-1997, 'Las marcas lexicográficas: concepto y aplicación práctica en la lexicografía española', *Revista de Lexicografía*, vol. III, pp. 31-57.
43. Gómez Asencio, J. J. 2008, 'El trabajo de la Real Academia Española en el siglo XVIII (y después)', *Península. Revista de Estudios Ibéricos*, vol. 5, pp. 31-53.
44. Gómez-Pablos, B. 2002, 'El léxico especializado en el *Diccionario de Autoridades*', in M. Campos Souto & J.I. Pérez Pascual (eds.), *De historia de la lexicografía*, Toxosoutos, A Coruña, pp. 107-118.
45. ten Hacken, P. 2010, 'Creating legal terms: A linguistic perspective', *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*, vol. 23, pp. 407-425.
46. Henríquez Salido, M.d.C. 2004, 'La marca "forense" en el *Diccionario de Autoridades*', in C. Corrales Zumbado et al. (eds.), *Estudios de historiografía lingüística. Actas del IV congreso Internacional de la SEHL*, vol. I, Arco/Libros, Madrid, pp. 763-773.
47. Henríquez Salido, M.d.C. 2008, 'El dominio forense en el Primer diccionario general etimológico de la lengua española de Roque Barcia', in *Actas del II Congreso Internacional de Lexicografía Hispánica*, Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes, Alicante.

48. Henríquez Salido, M.d.C. 2010, *Historia del léxico jurídico*, Civitas, Madrid.
49. Hernando Cuadrado, L.A. 1997, 'El Diccionario de Autoridades y su evolución (1726-1739)', *Verba: Anuario Galego de Filoloxía*, vol. 24, pp. 387-401.
50. Jiménez, L. & Castro de Achával, M. 2008, *Historia del derecho*, Universidad Empresarial Siglo 21, Córdoba.
51. Jiménez Ríos, E. 2001, *Variación léxica y diccionario: los arcaísmos en el diccionario de la Academia*, Iberoamericana/Vervuert, Madrid/Frankfurt am Main.
52. Lardizábal y Uribe, M. de 1815, 'Discurso sobre la legislación de los visigodos y formación del Libro ó Fuero de los jueces, y su version castellana' in *Fuero Juzgo por la Real Academia Española*, Ibarra, Madrid.
53. Langacker, R.W. 2000, *Grammar and Conceptualisation*, Mouton De Gruyter, Berlin.
54. Lapesa, R. 1981, *Historia de la lengua española*, Gredos, Madrid.
55. Lázaro Carreter, F. 1972, *Cronica del Diccionario de autoridades (1713-1740)*, Real Academia Española, Madrid.
56. Marias, J. 1965, *Realidad historica y social del uso lingüístico*, Real Academia Española, Madrid.
57. Martí Sánchez, M. 2004, 'La compleja identidad del léxico jurídico', *ELUA. Estudios de Lingüística*, vol. 18, pp. 169-189.
58. Moliner, M. 1998, *Diccionario de uso del español*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Gredos, Madrid.
59. Muñoz Machado, S. 2016, *Diccionario del español jurídico*, Espasa, Barcelona, pp. XIII-XXXIII.
60. Nomdedeu Rull, A. 2007, 'Por qué la Real Academia Española es modelo de norma lingüística', in L. Blini, M. V. Calvi & A. Cancellier, *Atti del XXIII Congresso dell' AISPI (Palermo, del 6 al 8 de octubre de 2005)*, AISPI & Instituto Cervantes, Madrid, pp. 446-460.
61. Orazi, V. 1997, *El dialecto leonés antiguo*, Universidad Europea-CEES Ediciones, Madrid.
62. Ortiz Caballero, R. 1988, 'Estudio sobre la ley: del fuero juzgo a la novísima recopilación', *Derecho PUCP: Revista de la Facultad de Derecho*, pp. 123 – 144.
63. Pascual Fernández, L. 2009, 'El sistema de abreviaturas en el Diccionario académico: Introducción (1726), institucionalización (1770) y consolidación (1780). La marcación del léxico específico', Research work, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona.
64. Pascual Fernández, L. 2013, 'Diccionario de autoridades (2<sup>a</sup> ed.) técnica lexicográfica y lengua de la ciencia', PhD thesis, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona.

65. Pérez Martín, A. 2015, 'El Fuero Real: Estudio preliminar', in A. Pérez Martín (ed.), *Fuero Real de Alfonso X El Sabio*, Foreword, Agencia estatal Boletín oficial del estado, Madrid, pp. X-XXXIV.
66. Pérez Pascual, J.I. 2012, 'El léxico de especialidad', in L. Luque Toro, J.F. Medina Montero & R. Luque (eds.), *Léxico español actual III*, Università Ca'Foscari, Venice, pp. 189-219.
67. Prieto de Pedro, J. 1991, *Lenguas, lenguaje y derecho*, Cívitas, Madrid.
68. Real Academia Española n.d., *CORDE*, RAE, Madrid, viewed January-July 2019, <<http://corpus.rae.es/cordenet.html>>.
69. Real Academia Española n.d., *CREA*, RAE, Madrid, viewed January-July 2019, <<http://corpus.rae.es/creanet.html>>.
70. Real Academia Española n.d., *NDHE*, RAE, Madrid, viewed January-July 2019, <<http://web.frl.es/DA.html>>.
71. Real Academia Española n.d., *NTLLE*, RAE, Madrid, viewed January-July 2019, <<http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUILoginNtll>>.
72. Real Academia Española n.d., *NTLLE*, RAE, Madrid, viewed January-July 2019, <<http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUILoginNtll>>.
73. Rivas Zancarrón, M. 2017, 'La autoridad del Fuero Juzgo en el Diccionario de Autoridades' in F. del Barrio de la Rosa (ed.), *Palabras Vocabulario Léxico: La lexicología aplicada a la didáctica y a la diacronía*, Edizioni Ca' Foscari, Venice, pp. 299-322.
74. Ridao Rodrigo, S. & Rodríguez Muñoz, F.J. 2012, 'La terminología forense en diacronía. Los campos léxico-semánticos de conflicto y juicio', *Revista de Llengua i Dret*, vol. 58, pp. 01-14.
75. Rodríguez Barcia, S. 2008, *La realidad relativa. Evolución ideológica en el trabajo lexicográfico de la Real Academia Española (1726 - 2006)*, Servicio de publicación da Universidade de Vigo, Vigo.
76. Rojo, G. 2014, Análisis cuantitativo de las citas del diccionario de autoridades. *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, vol. XCIV, booklet CCCIX.
77. Rojo, G. 2016, 'Sobre el uso de textos medievales en el Diccionario de Autoridades', in E. Corral Díaz, Esther, E.F. Francisco & P.L. Gradín (eds.), *Cantares de amigos. Estudos en homenaxe a Mercedes Brea*, Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Santiago de Compostela, pp. 755-767.

78. Ruhstaller Kuhne, S. 2000, 'Las autoridades del Diccionario de Autoridades', in S. Ruhstaller Kuhne & J. Prado Aragonés (eds.), *Tendencias en la investigación lexicográfica del español. El diccionario como objeto de estudio lingüístico y didáctico (Actas del congreso celebrado en la Universidad de Huelva del 25 al 27 de noviembre de 1998)*, no. 33, Servicio de publicaciones de la Universidad de Huelva, Huelva, pp. 193-224.
79. Ruhstaller Kuhne, S. 2002, 'Variantes léxicas en el Diccionario de Autoridades. Descripción lingüística y juicios normativos', in M.T. Echenique Elizondo & J. Sanchez Mendez (eds.), *Actas del V Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española*, vol. II, Gredos, Madrid, pp. 2321-2330.
80. Ruhstaller Kuhne, S. 2003, 'Las obras lexicográficas de la Academia', in A.M. Medina Guerra (ed.), *Lexicografía española*, Ariel, Madrid, pp. 235-261.
81. Ruhstaller Kuhne, S. 2004, 'Sobre la génesis del diccionario académico. Las Ordenanzas de Sevilla como fuente de material léxico en el Diccionario de Autoridades', *Zeitschrift fur romanische philologie*, vol. 120, pp. 106-127.
82. Sager, J. 1998, 'Terminology: Theory', in M. Baker (ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Routledge, London/New York, pp. 258-262.
83. Santamaria Pérez, I.S. 2006, *El Léxico de la Ciencia y de la Técnica*, Liceus, Madrid.
84. Saurí Colomer, R. 2006, 'Spain: Lexicography in Iberian Languages', in K. Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Elsevier, New York, pp. 603-607
85. Saussure, F. de 1945, *Curso de lingüística general*, Losada, Buenos Aires.
86. Saussure, F. de 1959, *Course in General Linguistics*, Philosophical Library, New York.
87. Seco, M. 1987-1988, 'Covarrubias en la Academia', *Anales cervantinos*, Vols. XXV-XXVI, pp. 387-398.
88. Sevilla Muñoz, M. & Sevilla Muñoz, J. 2003, 'Una clasificación del texto científico-técnico desde un enfoque multidireccional', *Language Design: Journal of Theoretical and Experimental Linguistics*, no. 5, pp. 19-38.
89. Svensén, B. 2009, *A handbook of lexicography: The theory and practice of dictionary-making*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
90. Villar Díaz, M.B. 2018, 'Las relaciones léxico-semánticas paradigmáticas y sintagmáticas en el repertorio lexicográfico diacrónico: avances y retos', in M.P. Garcés Gómez (ed.), *Perspectivas teóricas y metodológicas en la elaboración de un diccionario histórico*. Iberoamericana, Madrid, pp. 249-273.

## Declaration of Originality

Student Name: Marija Žarković
Date of Birth: 09.09.1994
Subject of Study: Lexicography Programme Title: EMLex
Topic of Work: <i>Fuero Juzgo</i> in the <i>Diccionario de Autoridades</i> : Traces of Visigoth Law in Spanish Academic Lexicography

I declare herewith, that this above-mentioned master's thesis is my own original work.

Furthermore, I confirm that:

- this work has been composed by me without assistance;
- I have clearly referenced, in both the text and the bibliography or references, all sources (either from a printed source, internet or any other source) used in the work;
- all data and findings in the work have not been falsified or embellished;
- this work has not been previously, or concurrently, used either for other courses or within other exam processes as an exam work;
- this work has not been published.

I appreciate that any false claim in respect of this work will result in disciplinary action in accordance with university or departmental regulations.

I authorize access to the electronic full text of my work.

Signature .....

*Marija Žarković*

Date .....

*22.07.2019.*