



# The textual transmission of the Mozarabic Chronicle of 754

CARMEN CARDELLE DE HARTMANN

*The so-called Mozarabic Chronicle of 754 is a work of extraordinary value for the history of the Arab conquest of Spain since it is an eyewitness account of the events. Because of the difficulty it presents, the text was largely neglected by historians, until two recent editions, translations into Spanish and English and several studies have returned it to the central place it deserves as a source for the eighth century.<sup>1</sup> In this article I want to look at some aspects of its textual history which have not previously been studied in sufficient depth, for the light they shed both on the circulation of historical works in medieval Spain and on the history of two mysterious codices, a Mozarabic manuscript of which only six folios remain, and the lost Alcobaciensis manuscript.*

## Spanish historiography and the Mozarabic Chronicle of 754

Spanish historiography begins with a work rooted in the Roman Empire: the Chronicle of Hydatius (bishop of Chaves 427–c. 468).<sup>2</sup> Hydatius considered himself a Roman, and placed his hope in the

<sup>1</sup> The most useful of the older editions is certainly that of Mommsen, *Continuatio Hispana*, M[onumenta] G[ermaniae] H[istorica], A[uctores] A[ntiquissimi] 11, *Chronica Minora* 2, pp. 323–69 (henceforward cited as CM2). Modern editions by J. Gil, *Corpus Scriptorum Muzarabicorum*, I [CSM] (Madrid, 1973), pp. 15–54 and J.E. López Pereira, *La Crónica [Mozárabe de 754: edición crítica y traducción]* (Zaragoza, 1980), with a Spanish translation. This author also wrote a useful study: J.E. López Pereira, *Estudio crítico [sobre la Crónica Mozárabe de 754]* (Zaragoza, 1980). Trans. K.B. Wolf, *Conquerors and Chroniclers of Early Medieval Spain* (Liverpool, 1990), pp. 111–158, commentary pp. 28–45. A historical study of the period which uses the Mozarabic Chronicle extensively is R. Collins, [*The Arab Conquest of Spain, 710–747*] (Oxford, 1989, cited in the 1st edn.; a rev. ed. appeared in 1994), who also, at pp. 52–80, has an interesting discussion of the problems posed by the *Continuatio Byzantina Arabica*, the Chronicle of 741.

<sup>2</sup> Edited by Mommsen CM 2, pp. 3–36, A. Tranoy, *Hydace, Chronique, Tome I: Introduction, texte critique, traduction. Tome II. Commentaire et Index* (Paris, 1974) and R.W. Burgess, *The Chronicle of Hydatius and the Consularia Constantinopolitana* (Oxford, 1993).

continuance of the empire. The historiographic genre he cultivated, the chronicle, aspired to universality. Eusebius of Caesarea, whose chronicle exercised so much influence over later Christian historiography, planned his work as a comparative chronology of different empires. Universality, in time (starting with Abraham) as well as in space, is the fundamental characteristic of his chronicle. His work was translated into Latin by Jerome, who continued it up to his own times. With this translation, Jerome not only put Eusebius' work at the disposal of the West, but he also made an innovation in the genre; planning one's own work as the continuation of a previous chronicle made possible the writing of contemporary history in chronicle form. In Hydatius' continuation of Jerome, the genre experienced a new reduction of its universality; although Hydatius endeavoured to chronicle the Roman Empire, the turbulence of the fifth century prevented him from receiving the necessary information, and it was equally impossible to know about the whole of Hispania. The more the work advanced, the more its perspective diminished, until in the last section it concentrates almost exclusively on Hydatius' own province, Gallaecia.<sup>3</sup>

It is impossible to know whether the next Spanish chronicler, John of Biclar, was familiar with the work of Hydatius.<sup>4</sup> John, a Visigoth and a Catholic, studied in Byzantium as a young man, where he probably knew the work of Victor of Tunnuna, an epitome of the chronicles of Eusebius–Jerome and Prosper, continued to his own time in a chronicle focusing on the Byzantine Empire and the theological disputes of the sixth century.<sup>5</sup> John probably brought a copy of Victor to Spain, adding to it a chronicle which culminated in the description of the conversion of the Visigoths to Catholicism under Recared. His two main foci of interest are Byzantium and Visigoth Spain, supplemented by a few references to Italy and North Africa.

In the shadow of these predecessors, whom he utilized as sources,

<sup>3</sup> On the problem of the universality of Hydatius' chronicle and the narrowing of its perspective, see C. Cardelle de Hartmann, *Philologische Studien zur Chronik des Hydatius von Chaves* (Stuttgart, 1994), pp. 65–9 and S. Muhlberger, *The Fifth-century Chroniclers: Prosper, Hydatius and the Gallic Chronicler of 452* (Leeds, 1990), pp. 264–7.

<sup>4</sup> Edited by Mommsen, CM 2, pp. 207–20 and J. Campos, *Juan de Biclaro, obispo de Gerona. Su vida y su obra* (Madrid, 1960), with historical commentary. My new critical edition of this chronicle and that of Victor will appear shortly in *Corpus Christianorum*.

<sup>5</sup> The surviving version of the chronicle of Victor begins in the year 444 and lacks the initial epitome which I deduce it once possessed. It is not appropriate to discuss in detail here my reasons for postulating this initial epitome. For a detailed discussion, see my introduction in the *Corpus Christianorum*. Victor has been edited by Mommsen, CM 2, pp. 1789[sic]–206 and by A. Placanica, *Vittore da Tunnuna. Chronica. Chiesa e Impero nell'eta di Giustiniano* (Florence, 1997), with commentary.

Isidore of Seville wrote his historical works: a universal chronicle<sup>6</sup> and Histories of the Goths, Vandals and Sueves.<sup>7</sup> It was the *Historiae* which was to exercise most influence on later Spanish historiography. The work sets out the history of these three peoples. The influence of the chronicle genre is undisputed, as much its brevity as its arrangement by chronological units, not years in this case, but reigns. It is not clear whether Isidore had a model for this work. Recently it has been suggested that he could have been inspired by the lost history of Maximus of Zaragoza.<sup>8</sup> Both of Isidore's works survive in both long and short versions, but whereas the difference between the two versions of the chronicle lies solely in their length, the two versions of the Histories differ also in content, phraseology and even point of view.<sup>9</sup>

The one attempt at a historical monograph in the Visigothic period is the *Historia Wambae regis seu rebellionis Pauli adversus Wambam* of Julian of Toledo. As this work had no influence on eighth-century historiography, I will not consider it further. After 625/6, the year in which the long versions of both Isidore's Chronicle and his Histories end, no historiographical works from Spain survive, with the exception of the works of Julian of Toledo and a number of *laterculi*. At the beginning of the eighth century, the Arab invasion put an end to the Visigothic kingdom, but not to its cultural tradition, as we shall see.

Two works with several common features survive from the eighth century; they have a chronicle structure, several common sources, are included in codices with similar contents, and their authors are unknown.

The earlier is the one which Mommsen designated the *Continuatio Byzantina Arabicaada. DCCXLI*,<sup>10</sup> commonly known as the Chronicle of 741. It is a brief work which begins with the death of Recared and confines itself to notices about the Byzantine empire and the Arab expansion. This led T. Nöldeke<sup>11</sup> to conclude that the chronicle was written in Syria. Its use of the Spanish Era, however, and the inclusion

<sup>6</sup> Edited by Mommsen, CM 2, pp. 391–490.

<sup>7</sup> Edited by Mommsen, CM 2, pp. 241–303 and C. Rodríguez Alonso, *Las historias de los godos, vándalos y suevos de Isidoro de Sevilla. Estudio, edición crítica y traducción*, (León, 1975).

<sup>8</sup> This is the argument put forward by Collins, 'Isidore, Maximus and the [Historia Gothorum]' in A. Scharer and G. Scheibelreiter (eds.), *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter* (Munich, 1994), pp. 345–58.

<sup>9</sup> See Collins, 'Isidore, Maximus', pp. 348–53. Collins supposes that the short version could in fact be the lost work of Maximus of Zaragoza, a hypothesis as attractive as it is impossible to verify.

<sup>10</sup> Edited by Mommsen, CM 2, pp. 323–69, in parallel with the Mozarabic Chronicle and by J. Gil, *CSM*, pp. 7–14.

<sup>11</sup> In his 'Epimetrum' to Mommsen's edition, *MGH, AA XI*, pp. 368–9.

of brief notices about the Visigothic kings (from the death of Recared to the accession of Suintila) indicate Spain as its place of composition. The eulogistic tone which the author adopted toward Muhammad led C. Dubler<sup>12</sup> to consider him a Spanish convert to Islam. This opinion has been questioned only recently by R. Collins,<sup>13</sup> who pointed out that insulting the Prophet was a capital offence, so that discretion and a purely secular treatment of his life were advisable. The author of this chronicle did exactly this, praising him as a *princeps sarracenorum*.<sup>14</sup> The distant tone in which he noted that his people *considered* him a prophet does not suggest that he shared this opinion and is not the enthusiasm of a convert.<sup>15</sup> The most substantial part of this chronicle concerns the Arab governors, about whom he gives detailed information. Dubler postulated a Syrian chronicle to have been among his sources, as it must have been among the sources of the Mozarabic Chronicle.<sup>16</sup> Given that its structure according to reigns is so similar to that of the Histories of Isidore, Collins hypothesized an intermediate source, a *Historia Arabum*, written in Spain or in North Africa by an author who took the Histories of Isidore as his model, and who demonstrates pro-Syrian sympathies.<sup>17</sup> One must also bear in mind oral transmission. As for other sources, it is possible only to point to a Byzantine chronicle and the Histories of Isidore. John of Biclar does not appear to have been directly, but only indirectly, influential: in the structure of the work, with its distribution of notices according to different geographical areas, in its chronology based on Byzantine imperial regnal years, even in beginning with the death of Recared, whose reign makes up the final part of the Chronicle of Biclar. This use of sources points to a compilation of historical writings which must have circulated in Spain in the eighth century, to which this chronicle and the Mozarabic Chronicle were added. This collection of texts would have comprised an extensive epitome of the Chronicle of Eusebius and Jerome, the continuation of Prosper, the chronicles of Victor of Tunnuna, John of Biclar and Isidore, together with the latter's Histories compiled from the long and short versions.<sup>18</sup> The author of

<sup>12</sup> 'Sobre la Crónica [arábigo-bizantina de 741 y la influencia bizantina en la Península Ibérica]', *Al-Andalus* 11 (1946), pp. 282–439, at pp. 330–1.

<sup>13</sup> Collins, *Arab Conquest*, pp. 62–3.

<sup>14</sup> '... supra ipsos principatum tenentia Mahmet nomine, de tribu illius gentis nobilissimus natus, prudens admodum uir et aliquantum futurorum prouisor gestorum' (CSM, ed. Gill, p. 9, §13).

<sup>15</sup> 'Praedictus princeps Sarracenorum Mahmet regni annis X uitae finem accepit. Quem hactenus tanto honore et reverentia colunt, ut Dei apostolum et prophetam eum im omnibus sacramentis suis esse scriptisque adfirmat...' (CSM, ed. Gil, p. 9, §13).

<sup>16</sup> Dubler, 'Sobre la Crónica', p. 328, and J. López Pereira, *Estudio crítico*, pp. 106–111.

<sup>17</sup> Collins, *Arab Conquest*, p. 56.

<sup>18</sup> For more detail see below, pp. 3–6.

the Chronicle of 741 seems to have made use of these sources alone for the Visigothic period, since the last Visigothic king mentioned is Suinthila, the last to appear in Isidore's Histories. It seems, then, that he did not live in one of the cultural centres of the period where it would have been easy to fill in the gaps in his material, but somewhere in the south or east of the Peninsula, where a Byzantine chronicle was available, and where he could have obtained oral reports about the Arab conquest. Since our author has been deprived of his convert status, and faced with the difficulty of conjecturing where he wrote, it must be acknowledged that we know precisely nothing about him.

I come now to the chronicle whose transmission is the subject of this article, the Mozarabic Chronicle of 754. This chronicle is longer and more complex than the Chronicle of 741. It follows the framework of John of Biclar, although to the two axes about which the latter chronicle turns, Byzantium and Visigothic Spain, a third, the expanding Arab Empire, is added. From the accession of Heraclius in 611, with which the work begins, to the Arab invasion of Spain, the entries are distributed among these three centres. Although the entries resemble those of John of Biclar (rulers, rebellions, wars, the church, plagues), they are developed much more fully than in the model. In contrast with the concise, clear and elegant Latin of John of Biclar, the characteristics of the author of the Mozarabic Chronicle are a convoluted style and a delight in unusual expression which make the work very difficult to understand. After the section dedicated to the Arab conquest of Spain the structure of the work changes; Byzantium is used merely as a chronological outline, the events in the Arab east are of interest only as they impact on Spain and the notices referring to Arab Spain take on a length and detail more appropriate to a monograph than to a chronicle.<sup>19</sup> The author, whose name is unknown, is evidently a cleric, who was not writing his first work of history. Indeed, the chronicle twice refers to an *epitome temporale*, an historical work recounting the struggles between the different Arab factions in Spain between 742 and 746.<sup>20</sup> There is as yet no consensus about where he worked. Scholars since Mommsen have considered Toledo to be the most likely place, rejecting for lack of evidence previous hypotheses

<sup>19</sup> On the themes and structure of the Mozarabic Chronicle, López Pereira, *Estudio crítico*, pp. 19–74, for John of Biclar, cf. P. J. Galán Sánchez, *El género historiográfico de la crónica. Las crónicas hispanas de época visigoda*, (Cáceres, 1994), pp. 121–34.

<sup>20</sup> *La Crónica*, ed. López Pereira, §§86 and 88, pp. 112 and 118. A third allusion, §94, p. 18, in which he refers to his work as *liber verborum dierum saeculi* has sometimes been interpreted as a reference to another work, until A. Moure Casas, 'En torno a las fuentes de la Crónica Mozarabe', *Humanitas in honorem A. Fontán*, (Madrid 1992), pp. 351–363 demonstrated that it was used repeatedly in the Book of Kings (*ibid.*, p. 354).

which proposed Beja, Cordoba or even Zaragoza.<sup>21</sup> López Pereira has made a new suggestion, based on internal evidence. An excursus narrates an episode taking place in the region of Murcia, in the south-east of the Peninsula, involving two minor rulers, Theodomir and Athanagild. This excursus is noteworthy both on account of its length and because it refers to an outlying region.<sup>22</sup> Recently Collins<sup>23</sup> has returned to the defence of Toledo, not only because of the knowledge the author displays of an inscription on the city walls, but above all because of the impressive array of sources he manages, which point to a cultural centre of the status of the Visigothic capital: the compilation of historical writings mentioned above (of which he uses as his sources the chronicles of John of Biclar and Isidore) the latter's *Etymologies*, the *Historia ecclesiastica* of Eusebius of Caesarea, a collection of the Acts of the Hispanic Councils, Braulio of Zaragoza, the *De virginitate beatae Mariae* of Ildefonsus of Toledo, Taio of Zaragoza and also a Byzantine chronicle, an Arab source and another of Syrian origin (or the intermediate *Historia Arabum* proposed by Collins) and perhaps the *De comprobatione sextae aetatis* of Julian of Toledo.<sup>24</sup> This list has been rounded off recently by A. Moure<sup>25</sup> who added Eutropius and Orosius, perhaps in an epitome, and the *Liber Glossarum* attributed to Ansileubus, and detected a reference to a sermon of Augustine and another to the Aenead. It is obvious that few places in Spain could have provided such a collection of texts, and the Murcia region was not among them. Add to this the inscription taken from the walls of Toledo, and the case seems clear. López Pereira's hypothesis, however, is well-founded and must be considered. The passage on the minor rulers of Murcia is out of order in all the manuscripts of the chronicle, including the folios of Mozarabic origin in which it is preceded and followed by blank spaces. López Pereira not only suggested how this transposition might have occurred, but explained its nature, more appropriate to a historical monograph, and the reason for the blank spaces, postulating that a copyist working at a very early stage in the tradition decided to complete the text of the chronicle by adding a passage from the epitome by the same author.<sup>26</sup> Such interpolation of

<sup>21</sup> There is a detailed discussion of the various hypotheses and their defenders in López Pereira, *Estudio crítico*, pp. 13–15.

<sup>22</sup> López Pereira, *Estudio crítico*, pp. 14–16.

<sup>23</sup> *Arab Conquest*, pp. 57–9.

<sup>24</sup> López Pereira, *Estudio crítico*, pp. 49–3.

<sup>25</sup> In the article cited above, n. 20.

<sup>26</sup> López Pereira, *Estudio crítico*, pp. 40–3. The change of place is a result of the copyist's confusion between two caliphs of the same name, Alulit (Ulit Amir Almuminin), and of putting this passage in the reign of Alulit instead of Alulit II, which would have been correct.

historical texts is well known and plausible, but if this in fact occurred, it would point to an interest in Murcia on the part of the copyist, since this excursus would easily be explicable in a monograph containing a detailed narration of these events. Even though the author of the Mozarabic Chronicle mentions Bishop Fredoarius of Guadix, and granted his interest in Murcia, it seems more plausible to me that he came from this region but lived and worked in Toledo.

Having briefly introduced the Mozarabic Chronicle, I come to the central subject of this article: the discussion of its textual transmission.

### Surviving codices

The Mozarabic Chronicle survives in several codices. Some are recent (sixteenth century) and of little value for the reconstruction of the text. The Paris Codex (P), Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal 982, is also relatively late, being a fourteenth-century codex which brings together a series of historical writing relating to neighbouring countries. The text of this codex is very similar to the Matritensis and its editors agree in supposing them to be derived from the same original. Of more interest are the Codex Matritensis, the lost Alcobaciensis and the folios divided between London and Madrid.

The Matritensis, labelled M by editors, is in the Biblioteca de la Universidad Complutense in Madrid, Fondo Histórico 134 (*olim* 116-Z-46). Since the contents of the codices are important for placing them within their textual tradition, I will list the most important of the works it contains: the annals known as the *Chronicon Complutense*, *Chronicon Conimbrigense* or *Annales Portugalenses Veteres*, a detailed epitome of the chronicles of Eusebius and Jerome, the chronicles of Victor of Tunnuna and John of Biclár, the chronographic commentary of Q. Julius Hilarianus, a Gallic Chronicle of 511 attributed to Sulpicius Severus, the Carthaginian chronicle to 525, Isidore's chronicle and his *Historiae Gothorum Vandalorum Suevorum* (in a mixture of the long and short versions), the Mozarabic Chronicle of 754, Isidore's *De ortu et obitu patrum*, four works entitled *De viris illustribus* by Gennadius, Isidore, Ildefonsus and Jerome, and the chronicle of Ricardus Pictaviensis continued to the year 1244. Among these works there are a number of epitomes, *laterculi* and chronographic summaries.<sup>27</sup> On the reverse of the flyleaf, in lettering which Mommsen considered fifteenth- or sixteenth-century, is written *Libro de los antiguos de la Iglesia de Toledo*. C. Codoñer thought that the flyleaf might belong to

<sup>27</sup> For an (incomplete) account, Mommsen, CM 2, pp. 167–72.) Detailed description of this codex in my new edition of John of Biclár in the Corpus Christianorum.

another codex.<sup>28</sup> The note might nevertheless be correct, since Andreas Schott mentioned a codex with similar features to this one in 1583.<sup>29</sup> In the edition of Isidore's chronicle published by García de Loaysa in 1593, he said that in Guadalajara, where he was archdeacon, he owned an *epitome chronicorum Severi cognomento Sulpitii*.<sup>30</sup> This could be the codex M, which Loaysa, who had been a canon in Toledo, could have taken from that city to Guadalajara and then to Alcalá. Unfortunately, Loaysa was extremely vague about the codices he used, referring to them with expressions such as *omnium exemplarium scriptura* or *in alio m.s.* Flórez consulted it in Alcalá in the eighteenth century. From Alcalá proceed the catalogue numbers, also noted on the flyleaf, *Biblioteca Complutense Ildefonsina mss. Latinos E.1.C.2.N.8*, and *librería del colegio maior de Alcalá 24e*. In the nineteenth century it was moved from Alcalá to Madrid with the university library.

The oldest text of the Mozarabic Chronicle is in the folios preserved in London, British Library, Egerton 1934 (two folios) and Madrid, Biblioteca de la Academia de la Historia 81 (four folios). The folios are written in three columns of forty-one lines each, in a Mozarabic hand which, according to Díaz, dates from the beginning of the ninth century, certainly before the tenth.<sup>31</sup> J. Gil also dated them to the ninth century.<sup>32</sup> Thanks to Juan Bautista Pérez, the learned bishop of Segorbe (c. 1534–1597), the date of their discovery is known:

Ephemerides arabum, quas ex testimonio Vasaei puto esse J. Paces., descripsi ex libro pergameneo sed recentiori eccles. oxomen., et castigavi maiorem partem ex fragmen. sex foliorum in membran. gotthico scriptorum collegii Complutensis, quae A. Morales restituenda acceperat, reliqua erant furto sublata. Erant scripta ternis column. Itaque creduntur fuisse ad finem libri gotthici etymologiarum. Inde descriperat Lic. Joann. Vazquez del Marmol qui mecum contulit.<sup>33</sup>

Although the exact date when Ambrosio de Morales, Philip II's chronicler, received these folios, is unknown, it must certainly be during the

<sup>28</sup> C. Codoñer Merino, *[El 'de viris illustribus' de] Isidoro de Sevilla*. (Salamanca 1994) p. 99.

<sup>29</sup> That the codex collated by Schott was M was Mommsen's hypothesis (p. 167). Schott sent this collection to Arnaud de Pontac, who used it for his edition of Jerome's chronicle.

<sup>30</sup> *Chronicon D. Isidori archep hisp. emendatum, scholisque; illustratum per Garciam de Loaisam, Sacrae Theologiae D. Archidiaconum de Guadal., Ecclesiae Toletanae canonicum*, Taurini, apud Io. Baptistam Beuilaquam 1595. The reference is to the commentary to paragraph 107 and is cited by Mommsen, CM 2, p. 167.

<sup>31</sup> M.C. Díaz y Díaz, 'Sobre la transmisión [textual del Biclarense]', *Analecta Sacra Tarracomensis* 33 (1963), pp. 57–76 at pp. 72–2.

<sup>32</sup> Gil, CSM, p. 15.

<sup>33</sup> J.L. Villanueva, *Viage literario [a las iglesias de España, tomo III]* (Madrid, 1804), pp. 215–16. On the later history of these folios, see Mommsen, CM 2, p. 330.

second half of the sixteenth century. Mommsen thought that these folios were the remains of the lost Alcobaciensis, which is known through Johannes Vasaesus' reference.

### The lost Codex Alcobaciensis

Vaseus was a native of Bruges and studied in Louvain, whence he moved to Spain in 1522 with Ferdinand Columbus. Later he taught at the university of Salamanca, where his *Chronici rerum memorabilium Hispaniae* was published in 1552,<sup>34</sup> a treatise on the history of Spain in chronicle form, collating for each year events derived from different authors. Vaseus specified the source of each notice. The work was well-received at the time, as demonstrated by three reprintings in Cologne and Frankfurt during the next fifty years.<sup>35</sup> In the prologue, he listed the books and manuscripts he had used. Most useful, he tells us, was a codex from the monastery of Alcobaça, brought to his attention by Georgius Coelius (Jorge Coelho), secretary to Don Henrique of Portugal and abbot of Santa Cruz de Coimbra. Thanks to Don Henrique, then the commendatory abbot of Alcobaça, Vaseus was twice able to take the codex to Salamanca in order to work from it.<sup>36</sup> Vaseus refers several times to its contents, but without giving a description of the codex, nor any reference to the type of script or its approximate age. He says that the Alcobaça codex contained the following works (without specifying their order): Eusebius–Jerome,<sup>37</sup> Prosper, Victor of Tunnuna (with marginal annotations, perhaps derived from a consular list), John of Biclar, Hydatius, Isidore's chronicle and Histories, the *De viris illustribus* of Isidore and Ildefonsus,<sup>38</sup> the Gallic

<sup>34</sup> Vaseus, Ioannes, *Chronici rerum memorabilium Hispaniae. Tomus prior*, Salamanticae, excudebat Ioannes Iunta, 1552. I quote this first edition (hereafter cited as Vaseus).

<sup>35</sup> With a continuation by Francisco Tarafa, entitled *Rerum Hispaniae memorabilium annales*, Coloniae, apud Ludovicum Alectorium & haeredes Iacobi Soterii, 1577, in *Rerum Hispanicarum scriptores aliquot, quorum nomina versa pagina indicabit. Ex Bibliotheca clarissimis viri Dn. Roberti Beli Angli (...) Tomus prior*, Francofurti, Andreae Wecheli, 1579, Vaseus' work appeared with the title *Ioannis Vasaei Brugensis rerum Hispanicarum Chronicon* at pp. 434–610; in vol. I of Schott's *Hispania illustrata: Hispaniae illustratae seu rerum urbiumque Hispaniae, Lusitaniae, Aethiopiae et Indiae scriptores varii*, Francofurti, apud Claudium Marnium & haeredes Johannes Aubrij', 1603, Vaseus' book appeared under the title *Ionnis Vasaei Brugensis rerum hispanicarum Chronicon* at pp. 572–6.

<sup>36</sup> 'D. Henricus Cardinalis (...) non solum Alcobaciensem codicem ex monasterio illo suo bis mihi iussit adferri, sine quo libro irritus in hoc negotio conatus meus futurus erat...' (Vaseus, p. 10).

<sup>37</sup> Vaseus, fol. 8.

<sup>38</sup> For all these authors, see Vaseus, fol. 4. For the version of Isidore's Histories in the Alcobaciensis, see C. Sánchez Albornoz, 'San Isidoro, [Rasis y la Pseudo Isidoriana]', *Cuadernos de Historia de España* 4 (1946), repr. in *Investigaciones sobre historiografía hispana medieval [siglos VIII al XII]*, (Buenos Aires, 1967), pp. 365–7.

chronicle of 511 transmitted under the name of Sulpicius Severus,<sup>39</sup> the Carthaginian chronicle of 525,<sup>40</sup> the Mozarabic Chronicle (to which he refers as the work of Isidore Pacensis),<sup>41</sup> and the annales known as the *Chronicon Conimbrigense*.<sup>42</sup> Vaseus' allusions are the only way of ascertaining even approximately the contents of the Alcobaciensis. Unfortunately, Vaseus altered the texts he quoted,<sup>43</sup> and he was interested only in notices concerning Spain. Proper names, however, he copied with great precision,<sup>44</sup> so that these are in effect the only basis on which the parentage of this codex can be established.

One may see from this list that its contents were similar, if not identical to those of M, which has led scholars to formulate several hypotheses. Mommsen suggested that this is the codex to which Pontac referred in the preface to his edition of Eusebius–Jerome. According to Arnaud de Pontac, Andreas Schott (1553–1638) consulted a codex in Toledo on 12 July 1583, from which he took notes referring to Prosper and Jerome which he sent to Simon Barravius in Toulouse, who in turn lent them to Pontac.<sup>45</sup> I think, as I have already said, that this in fact referred to codex M,<sup>46</sup> which was in Toledo before it went to Alcalá. Another of Mommsen's hypotheses, and the one which has received most support is that the six folios mentioned above come from this Alcobaciensis.<sup>47</sup> Consequently he gave them the letter A which the most recent editors have retained. Díaz<sup>48</sup> has also picked up this hypothesis, expanding it with the supposition that Vaseus' reference to this codex drew attention to it, thus provoking its removal. The date of the edition of Vaseus' book (1552) and the appearance of the six folios in the second half of the same century noted by J.B. Pérez, fit in well

<sup>39</sup> Vaseus, fol. 9.

<sup>40</sup> For this chronicle, a compilation of the chronicles of Jerome and Prosper and Rufinus' Ecclesiastical History, as yet unedited, see Mommsen, CM 2, p. 171.

<sup>41</sup> Vaseus, fol. 54.

<sup>42</sup> Edited by A. Brandão from, among others, the codex Alcobaciensis, *Terceira parte da monarquia lusitana*, (Lisbon (Pedro Craesbeck), 1632), appendix; facsimile: *Monarquia lusitana. - Reimpr. fac-similada*, introduction by A. de Silva Rego, notes by A. Dias Farinha and Eduardo dos Santos, (Lisbon, 1973). Edition of the different versions of these annals in P. David, *Etudes historiques [sur la Galice et le Portugal du VI<sup>ème</sup> au XII<sup>ème</sup> siècle]*, Lisbon and Paris, 1947, pp. 291–312.

<sup>43</sup> 'Horum auctororum, Idacii, dico, Ioannis Abbas, S. Isidore & Sancti Alfonsi quacunque de rebus Hispaniae reperire potui, simul cum Victore Tunnunensi Africae episcopo, propediem deo bene iuvante, a mendis, quibus scatent, quoad eius fieri potuit, repurgata & scholiis nostris illustrata in lucem dabimus...' (Vaseus, p. 4r).

<sup>44</sup> E.g. his commentaries: '*Masdra (quem D. Isidorus nunc Masdram nunc Maldram appellat, nisi mendosus est liber*, ad. a.458; *Eboricus filius sive Eburicus*, ad a.582, *Leovigildus (Lemieldus mendose ibi legitur)*, ad a.585.

<sup>45</sup> Mommsen, CM 2, p. 166.

<sup>46</sup> Díaz y Díaz, 'Sobre la transmisión', p. 72, n. 54. See also, below, n. 58 Sumner's observations on the text of Vaseus.

<sup>47</sup> Mommsen, CM 2, p. 330.

<sup>48</sup> Díaz y Díaz, 'Sobre la transmisión', pp. 70–1.

with this hypothesis. López Pereira<sup>49</sup> deduced that Vaseus did not return the codex to Alcobaça, and that it disappeared in Salamanca.

However, all these hypotheses overlook a fact brought to light by Dom Fortunato de São Boaventura<sup>50</sup> in 1827; when A. Brandão was preparing his edition of volume II of the *Monarchia lusitania* between 1622 and 1632, he saw in Alcobaça a *Summa chronicorum Eusebii*.<sup>51</sup> David<sup>52</sup> presumed that Brandão saw the Matritensis, but this was in Spain at that date, where A. Schott and G. de Loaysa had used it at the end of the sixteenth century. Besides, as A. Nascimento observed,<sup>53</sup> the version of the *Chronicon Conimbrigense* edited by Brandão differs from M. They cannot, therefore, be the same codex. Diaz supposed, without much conviction, that the Alcobaciensis had a twin, and that Brandão and Vaseus saw different codices. Mommsen rejected São Boaventura's data, as he was unable to find a reference to this codex in Brandão's work. A. A. Nascimento arrived at a solution to this problem, consulting Brandão's manuscript he found the following two notes which do not appear in the printed edition:

Alcobaça em hum livro de mao que tem por titulo Summa Chronicorum Eusebij Caesaeriensis, o qual eu vi e ha puoquos anos que desapareceu.<sup>54</sup>

Alcob. in codice magno cui titulus Summa Chronicorum Euseb. Caesariensis. Contem o Tonnutense, o Abbade de Valclara, Severo Sulpicio, Idacio e outros.<sup>55</sup>

Brandão's notes leave no room for doubt: the codex which he consulted in Alcobaça is the one Vaseus saw.<sup>56</sup> Brandão was able to use it in his

<sup>49</sup> López Pereira, *Estúdio crítico*, pp. 9 and 11.

<sup>50</sup> *Historia chronologica e critica da Real Abbadia de Alcobaça*, (Lisbon, 1827), pp. 70–2.

<sup>51</sup> 'Escritura primeira. Que he a historia dos Godos, serue para muitos lugares desta historia; ha dous exemplares della, o que aqui vay impresso foy do Mestre Andre de Resende & o tem em seu poder o chantre de Evora Manoel Severim de Faria. Outro mais breue, cujas palauras por esa mesma causa allego mais uezes se tirrou de Alcobaça, & Sta. Cruz de Coimbra.' 'Alcobaça em hum liuro de mao, que tem por titulo Summa Chronicorum Eusebii Cesariensis.' Frei António Brandão, *Terceira parte da monarchia lusitana*, (Lisbon (Pedro Craesbeck), 1632), appendix; facsimile: *Monarquia lusitana*. - Reimpr. facsimilada, introduction by A. de Silva Rego, notes by A. Dias Farinha and Eduardo dos Santos, (Lisbon, 1973), p. 271 in the title and the margin respectively.

<sup>52</sup> In a discussion of the *Annales Portugaleses Veteres*, in P. David, *Etudes historiques*, p. 263.

<sup>53</sup> A.A. Nascimento, 'Em busca [dos códices alcobacenses perdidos]', *Didaskalia* 9 (1979), pp. 279–88, and n. 20.

<sup>54</sup> Alc. 116, fol. 310v., quoted by Nascimento, 'Em busca', p. 284.

<sup>55</sup> Alc. 116, fol. 311r., quoted *ibid.*, p. 285.

<sup>56</sup> Brandão's testimony is supported by Hierónimo Román, which Nascimento also found in the manuscript of his *Historia del Religiosissimo y Real Moesterio d'Alcobaça*, Biblioteca de Lisboa, Pombal Cod. 686 fol. 178, which indicates that Román saw this codex in Alcobaça in 1589 (Nascimento, 'Em busca', p. 284).

edition of the *Chronicon Coimbrigense*, as an appendix to volume III of the *Monarchia lusytana*. Therefore, the codex disappeared after Brandão began his work in 1622,<sup>57</sup> and the six folios divided between London and Madrid, which had already appeared before 1600, could not come from it. So a ninth- or tenth-century date for the Alcobaciensis must be rejected.

Almost simultaneously with Nascimento's article appeared one on the same subject by Sumner, who came to the same conclusion, although following a different line of enquiry.<sup>58</sup> Sumner went over the passages assembled by Vaseus and found readings common to M and P but different from A. They are the following:

different dates for an eclipse: Era 757 in Vaseus, M and P, Era 758 in the folios from London and Madrid;  
 a variant name: *Maule* in Vaseus, M and P, *Mauié* in A;  
 an interpolation common to Vaseus, M and P of a fragment referring to Cixila, bishop of Toledo.

For two other names, the spellings noted by Vaseus are not the same as in the other two codices, which reinforces the hypothesis that the Alcobaciensis is not the same codex as M:

Vaseus, fol. 103, has '*Eodem anno Abubacar defuncto Emer Arabum succedit imperio (...) Alii Homer appellant, sed Isidorus Pacensis Emer constanter nuncupat.*' Of the five instances where the caliph Umar is named, only one appears in the London and Madrid folios, where it is spelt Amer. M gives Emer once and Amer four times. Vaseus, fol. 105, notes *Hic Attuman Isidoro Pacensi dicitur, & Attoman*. A has *Attuman*, *Atthuman* and *Attoman*, M has *Actuma*, *Autuman* and *Attoman* and P has *Attuman*, *Auttuman*, *Attoman*.

In evaluating Sumner's observations, one must remember Vaseus's great accuracy in recording names and dates.<sup>59</sup>

It is necessary to establish what can be ascertained about the lost Alcobaciensis. Brandão correlated his text of the *Chronicon Conimbri-gense* with the version contained in a homiliary from Santa Cruz de

<sup>57</sup> In the prologue to his work, published in 1632, Brandão mentioned that he had been working on it for ten years.

<sup>58</sup> G.V. Sumner, 'El perdido códice alcobaciense y la Crónica Mozárabe de 754', *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia* 177, 2 (1980), pp. 343–6.

<sup>59</sup> See above, n. 45. On Vaseus' accuracy in transmitting dates, see A.A. Nascimento, 'Três notas alcobacenses: um Códice perdido: um Livro de Milagres: Concordancias Biblicas', *Didaskalia* 12 (1982), pp. 185–94 (confirmation of Sumner's data at pp. 185–8).

Coimbra.<sup>60</sup> This same brief recension (the last notice is of the year 1093), appeared in the codex consulted by Brandão in Alcobaça and also in the Matritensis. Therefore the Alcobaciensis was a codex from, at the earliest, the beginning of the twelfth century, and a near contemporary of the Matritensis. J. Gil, the only person so far not to accept that the folios labelled A come from the Alcobaciensis, nevertheless thought that the Alcobaciensis was the original of M and P. In contrast, A. Nascimento observed that the text of the *Chronicon Conimbrigense* in M is the same as in the homiliary of Santa Cruz, while the Alcobaciensis version collected by Brandão is not.<sup>61</sup> Thus the Alcobaciensis and the Matritensis were probably twin codices. The presence of the *Chronicon Conimbrigense* in both codices points to a common model which was either written at Coimbra or passed through there.

### The Mozarabic textual tradition

Any attempt to establish the textual transmission of the Mozarabic Chronicle between the eighth and the tenth centuries must depend on its use as a source for two historiographical works from Al-Andalus. The first is the so-called *Historia Pseudo-Isidoriana*, a work of the second half of the twelfth century, written in Latin, which is a history of Hispania in the Roman and Visigothic periods up to the Muslim conquest.<sup>62</sup> The curious forms in which Latin names are recorded in this work shows that they have passed through an Arabic filter. The second work is the *Crónica del moro Rasis*. This chronicle was originally written in Arabic with the title *Gibar muluk al-andalus* by the Cordoban historian Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn Musa al-Razi (889–955) and translated into Portuguese Romance by order of King Dinis of Portugal (1279–1325). The authors of the Portuguese translation were Gil Pérez and a builder named Muhammad. This Portuguese version, the *Crónica do mouro Rasis*, was translated into Spanish in the

<sup>60</sup> The homiliary is preserved in Porto, BMPM 28 (Santa Cruz 4). On Brandão's text, see David, *Etudes historiques*, pp. 280–2. The facsimile mentioned above includes a Portuguese translation of this text by Albino de Faria, pp. (129–37).

<sup>61</sup> Nascimento, 'Em busca', p. 00, n. 20.

<sup>62</sup> Edited by Mommsen, CM 2, pp. 378–88, commentary p. 377. Mommsen dates it post-1000. R. Menéndez Pidal ('Sobre la crónica Pseudo-Isidoriana', *Cuadernos de Historia de España* 2–22 (1954), pp. 5–15), places its composition in Toledo in the first half of the tenth century, on the basis of external evidence; in the tenth century Toledo was fighting to preserve its autonomy against Córdoba, so a nationalist affirmation like the Pseudo Isidoriana appears a natural response. P. Gautier-Dalché, 'Notes [sur la *Crónica Pseudo-Isidoriana*]', *Anuario de Estudios Medievales* 14, (1984), pp. 13–32, basing his argument on place names used in the Pseudo Isidoriana which are later than Menéndez Pidal's suggested date for its composition, dates the chronicle to the twelfth century, most probably to the second half. His reasoning (pp. 23–6) is convincing. Gautier Dalché considers the author native to a port, because of his familiarity with maritime routes.

fifteenth century, perhaps by Pedro del Corral, who used it as a source for his *Crónica Sarracina* (c. 1430). The Spanish translation survives in three manuscripts.<sup>63</sup> The Portuguese version survived in a manuscript discovered in the mid-sixteenth century by André de Resende, which disappeared in the eighteenth century, probably in the Lisbon earthquake of 1755. All that remains are the passages quoted by Resende, some translated into Latin. The Arabic original is known only via quotations in the works of two later Arab historians, al-Maqqari (d. 1632) and al-Udri (1003–85). These quotations confirm the fidelity of the surviving Spanish translation. Both al-Razi and the anonymous author of the *Pseudo-Isidoriana* used the chronicle of Jerome and the Breviarium of Eutropius as their sources for Roman history, and Isidore's Histories (in a mixture of the long and short versions), John of Biclar and the Mozarabic Chronicle for the Visigothic period.<sup>64</sup> In places, both authors made the same errors of interpretation in citing these Latin sources, while at the same time each presented information derived from these sources which does not appear in the other. This led Sánchez Albornoaz to postulate an intermediate source, a Mozarabic compendium of Visigothic history, written in Latin or in Arabic, and based on the Latin sources listed above.<sup>65</sup> Sánchez Albornoaz's hypothesis seems more plausible if the conditions of the time are taken into account. The long caliphate of Abd al-Rahman saw a flourishing of culture. The caliph was concerned to renew cultural contact with Byzantium. In 948 the Byzantine emperor, Constantine VII Porphyrogenetes, sent him a letter accompanied by gifts which included a Latin codex of Orosius' Histories, and a Greek treatise on medicine, botany and pharmacopoeia by Dioscorides.<sup>66</sup> As there was no-one in Al-Andalus who knew Greek, Abd al-Rahman asked the emperor for a translator. Constantine sent the monk Nicholas, who arrived in Cordoba in 951.<sup>67</sup> Nicholas collaborated with the Jewish scholar

<sup>63</sup> Multitextual edn. by D. Catalán y M. S. de Andrés, *Crónica del moro Rasis. Versión romanizada hacia 1300 por Mahomad, alarife, y Gil Perez, clérigo, del Ajbar Muluk al-Andalus de Ahmad al-Razi (888–955)* (Madrid, 1974). My summary of the textual tradition comes from the introduction to this edn. by D. Catalán, 'La *Crónica do mouro Rasis y el Ajbar Muluk al-Andalus* de Ahmad ibn Muhammad al-Razi', pp. xii–cx, esp. xiii–xxix.

<sup>64</sup> On the sources for these chronicles, C. Sánchez Albornoaz, 'Fuentes latinas [de historia romana de Rasis]', Buenos Aires, 1942, repr. in *Investigaciones [sobre historiografía hispana medieval (siglos VIII al XII)]* (Buenos Aires, 1967), pp. 303–36 and *ibid.*, 'San Isidoro', pp. 337–75. On the sources for the Pseudo Isidoriana, see also P. Gautier Dalché, 'Notes', pp. 20–3 and F. González Muñoz, 'Una nota sobre las fuentes de la *Historia Pseudo-Isidoriana*', *Euphrosyne* 18 (1990), pp. 281–90.

<sup>65</sup> Sánchez Albornoaz, 'Fuentes latinas', *passim*.

<sup>66</sup> F. Dölger, *Corpus [der griechischen Urkunden, Kaiserurkunden. Abt. I, I. Teil von 565–1025]* (Munich and Berlin, 1924), p. 82.

<sup>67</sup> F. Dölger, *Corpus*, p. 83.

Hasdai ibn Shaprut in an Arabic translation, widely copied, which became one of the foundations of medical studies in Al-Andalus.<sup>68</sup> Translation by teams of scholars was already well known in Cordoba. Some years before, Qasim ibn Asbaq al Bayyani, formerly the teacher of al-Hakam, the heir to the throne, had translated Orosius' Histories in collaboration with the judge of the Christians of Cordoba.<sup>69</sup> This 'Hurusyus', which is heavily interpolated, was also a common source for al-Razi and the Pseudo-Isidoriana. Al-Hakam, later the caliph al-Hakam II, was a noted bibliophile, and devoted the long years before his accession (he came to the throne in 961, at the age of 46) to scholarship.<sup>70</sup> It is not, therefore, preposterous to suppose that he might also have commissioned a resumé of the history of the Peninsula before the invasion, based on Latin sources.

It is interesting to observe that in Al-Andalus in the ninth or tenth centuries there might have been a compendium of the history of the Peninsula before the Arab conquest whose sources were the same four works which are included in the Alcobaciensis and the Matritensis: the chronicles of Jerome and John of Biclár, the Mozarabic Chronicle, and Isidore's Histories. A detail discovered by Sánchez Albornoz,<sup>71</sup> that the version of the Histories used as a source was a mixture of the long and short versions, is revealing, since this is both the version of the Alcobaciensis cited by Vaseus, and of the Matritensis.<sup>72</sup> I dare to suggest, therefore, that the folios preserved in London and Madrid came from a collection similar to that which the Alcobaciensis had also comprised, which survives today in the Matritensis.

A study of the compilation presented by the Matritensis offers some additional information. The chronicles of Eusebius-Jerome, Prosper, Victor of Tunnuna and John of Biclár, and Isidore's Histories are also found in a Visigothic codex which Jorge de Beteta, the mayor of Soria, gave with several others to Philip II for his library at El Escorial, which is usually called the Soriensis after its immediate provenance. The other five codices given by Beteta, which still survive, all date from the ninth or tenth centuries, are written in Visigothic script and

<sup>68</sup> E. Levi-Provençal, *Histoire [de l'Espagne musulmane. II. Le califat umayyade de Cordue (912-1031)]* (Paris and Leiden, 1950), pp. 150-1. One exemplar of this translation to Arabic survives, see C. E. Dubler, 'Sobre la Crónica', p. 341, n. 2.

<sup>69</sup> One exemplar of this translation also survives, see Levi Della Vida G., 'La traduzione araba delle Storie di Orosio', *Al-Andalus* 19 (1954), pp. 257-93 (repr. from *Miscellanea Giovanni Galbiati* 3 (Milan 1951), pp. 185-203, with additions and emendations by the author).

<sup>70</sup> Levi-Provençal, *Histoire*, pp. 119 and 169.

<sup>71</sup> Sánchez Albornoz, 'San Isidoro...' pp. 365-7.

<sup>72</sup> Mommsen, *CM* 2, pp. 261-2.

come from a Spanish monastery, perhaps San Martín de Albelda.<sup>73</sup> The *Soriensis* may have been of similar age and characteristics. It was collated by Juan Bautista Pérez and disappeared in the fire of 1671.<sup>74</sup> It seems that it comprised a very similar collection of texts. Comparing Pérez' notices with the text of the *Matritensis*, it is possible to determine that it shared a common tradition with the historiographical texts under consideration: in both, the first part of the chronicle of Victor is replaced by an epitome of Eusebius and Jerome and the continuation of Prosper,<sup>75</sup> and the Chronicle of John of Biclar is preceded by the words *Ab hinc historiam ducit uenerabilis pater noster Iohannes abbas monasterii Biclarenensis fundator*, which appears in the margin of the *Soriensis* and integrated into the text of the *Matritensis*. In the eighth century the tradition divided. A chronological summary dated 742 (Era 780) appears in the *Matritensis* but not in the *Soriensis*. Next, the Chronicle of 741 was added to the texts in the *Soriensis*,<sup>76</sup> while the Mozarabic Chronicle appears in the collection with which this study is concerned.

### Conclusions

In the mid-eighth century the author of the Mozarabic Chronicle appended his work to a collection of historical writings that already comprised an epitome of Eusebius–Jerome, the chronicles of Prosper, Victor of Tunnuna and John of Biclar, and Isidore's *Histories* in a mixture of the long and short versions. This group of texts was used by a compiler of a history of Roman and Visigothic Spain, by al-Razi in the second half of the tenth century, and by the anonymous author of the *Historia Pseudo-Isidoriana* in the twelfth. A Mozarabic exemplar of this compilation must have reached Santa Cruz de Coimbra, where the Mozarabic Chronicle it contained served as a source for the *Annales Portugaleses Veteres* written on the flyleaf of a homiliary.<sup>77</sup> To date this a little more precisely, one should take into account the foundation of the monastery in 1131 and the first evidence for its scriptorium in

<sup>73</sup> G. de Andrés, 'Los codices visigóticos de Jorge de Beteta en la biblioteca del Escorial', *Celtiberia* 51 (1976), pp. 101–7.

<sup>74</sup> '... un gótico antiquísimo, que está juntamente con el cronicón de Eusebio en S. Lorenzo el Real, que fue de D. Jorge de Vetea, caballero de Soria', Villanueva, *Viage literario*, p. 197.

<sup>75</sup> Discussion of the original appearance of the Chronicle of Victor would digress too far from our theme. See my edition of the Chronicles of Victor of Tunnuna and John of Biclar, forthcoming in the *Corpus Christianorum*.

<sup>76</sup> On the other works contained in the *Soriensis*, and their value for reconstructing its textual history, see Díaz y Díaz, 'Sobre la transmisión', pp. 65–8.

<sup>77</sup> J.E. López Pereira, 'El Elemento godo en los 'Annales Portugaleses Veteres': un problema de crítica textual y de fuentes', *Revista Portuguesa de Historia* 16 (1978), pp. 223–6.

1140. The redaction of the annals must date from these early years, since they stop in 1093. These annals in their turn must have been copied into the codex of chronicles, perhaps on the flyleaf, which explains why it is found at the beginning of the Matritensis. The lost Alcobaciensis, the Matritensis and the text of the Paris codex were all derived from the Coimbra exemplar. It is also possible that Rodrigo Ximénez de Rada (1170–1247, archbishop of Toledo from 1207), who used the Mozarabic Chronicle extensively as a source,<sup>78</sup> had at his disposal a codex of Mozarabic origin. Although the codex M was in Toledo in the fifteenth century, it could not have been taken there by Rodrigo, since it includes the chronicle of Ricardus Pictaviensis continued to 1244, and is written in a single hand.<sup>79</sup>

Thus there is evidence for three exemplars: one in Córdoba, perhaps in the tenth century, one in Toledo at the beginning of the thirteenth, and another in Coimbra in the twelfth. These three exemplars could be the same text at three different moments in its history. I am inclined, nevertheless, to postulate the existence of at least two different Mozarabic exemplars, since its editors agree that M could not be a copy of the surviving Mozarabic folios, but rather of a twin.<sup>80</sup> Unfortunately, there is no evidence for the provenance of the manuscript from which they were torn. At least three copies of the Mozarabic exemplar from Coimbra were made: P, in the fourteenth century, M in the thirteenth and the lost Alcobaciensis, which must have been similar to M. This Alcobaciensis cannot be identified with the folios labelled A, nor with the model for M.<sup>81</sup>

*I would like to express my gratitude to the editors of Early Medieval Europe for their constructive criticism of the first version of this article. This article is dedicated to my dear friend and teacher José Eduardo López Pereira.*

*Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Munich*

<sup>78</sup> See the introduction by J. Fernández Valverde to his edition of *Roderici Ximeni de Rada Historia de rebus Hispaniae sive Historia Gothorum*, CC CM 72 (Turnhout, 1987), pp. xxxiii–xxxiv. Unfortunately, Fernández Valverde has been able to conclude only that the text used by Jiménez de Rada must have been earlier than the sixteenth-century copies.

<sup>79</sup> P. Ewald, 'Reise nach Spanien im Winter von 1878 auf 1879', *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 6 (1881), pp. 217–398, at p. 323.

<sup>80</sup> In at least one place M has a better reading than A; see J. Gil, *CSM*, p.15 and López Pereira, *La Crónica* pp. 10–16.

<sup>81</sup> This article was translated from Spanish by Ann Christys.