

On editing two medieval chronicles¹

Aengus Ward
University of Birmingham

The business of editing medieval manuscripts has always been bedevilled with academic wrangling over the validity of the exercise in the first instance and the validity of practical solutions which flow from theoretical choices made by editors who dare to undertake such hazardous work. Editing necessarily involves an on-going dialogue between theory and practice, and the present contribution to the debate arises precisely from the practical experience of editing, in this case two medieval Iberian chronicles, the *Estoria delos Godos* and the *Sumario Analístico de la Historia Gothica*. In consequence, what follows deals with the practical solutions employed to resolve those problems which arose in the act of editing these particular chronicles. However, although this will involve the extrapolation of theory from practice this cannot be described as a fully rounded statement of editorial theory. In the first instance, and as a consequence of the individual nature of each edition, it is not clear that the practical solutions arrived at *necessarily* have a theoretical value beyond the edition in question; furthermore, it is clear that no edition can be described as definitive, for which reason the statement of editorial theory provided must be sufficiently dynamic to allow for the possibility of change, or indeed, human frailty on the part of its designer. Nonetheless, particular solutions arrived at in response to concrete problems may help offer a way forward. I attempt to locate the choices made in the light of current approaches to the question of the theory and practice of editing medieval Iberian texts.

For the purposes of this discussion I have divided the examination of practice into questions of what could be termed strategy and tactics, where the former is understood to relate to general questions of editorial approach and the latter to specific matters of editorial detail flowing from them. Before dealing in depth with specific issues arising from my editorial praxis, however, I would like to present an overview of the theory of textual editing, an overview in which the examination of the priority (or not) of textual criticism (understood to be a poor English equivalent of *crítica textual*) is central. At issue here is the relationship between texts, their hierarchy and the relationship between text and testimony (or –etic and –emic levels in the terms of a recent MEDTEXTL debate [O'Donnell]).

Theoretical framework

Editors, whether wittingly or not, will always find themselves somewhere on what could be termed the Lachmann-Bédier scale. I appreciate that this is a serious misrepresentation of both positions, however as the name of the former has come to be associated in the minds of many with attempts to recover an archetype, and the latter with the priority of manuscripts, they stand as the opposite poles of textual theory. Many editors, of course, fall somewhere in the middle.

In the case of editions of Hispanic medieval texts, the Lachmannian approach has been dominant. In practice, this generally involves some variation on Dom Quentin's ecdotic approach, and can be encapsulated in Blecua's definition of "crítica textual", namely "el arte que

¹ The thoughts outlined here have benefited from the critical attention of various colleagues. In particular I would like to thank Alan Deyermond, Jane Whetnall and all the members of the Medieval Hispanic Research Seminar of Queen Mary, University of London, for their comments on a seminar I gave at that institution.

tiene como fin presentar un texto depurado en lo posible de todos aquellos elementos extraños al autor. Debería atender, en primer lugar, a los errores de la copia” (18-19). Greetham, quoting Housman’s felicitous phrase, refers to this as “the science of discovering errors in text and the art of removing them” (346). Leaving aside for the moment the question of how the editor is to decide what constitutes error and what the category of author might be, thorny problems in themselves, it is clear that the aim of such editions is that of clearing the fog of individual testimony in the hope of arriving at the promised land of uncorrupted text. Since the method itself grows out of Biblical scholarship and a concomitant Germanic and idealist search for original meaning (in a field in which such things matter), it is not surprising that the elimination of error is a key element. It might however be asked if such an approach is appropriate to the edition of texts for which the establishment of Ultimate Truth is not necessarily so important, or indeed desirable. In addition, the question of where Ultimate Truth is to be found in such texts is far from clear. Nonetheless, it would be a major disservice to (neo-)Lachmannian editorial practice to suggest that the method has not evolved since its establishment. On the contrary, many thoughtful studies have been written, some of which will correctly point out that contrary to popular belief, the reconstruction of authorial original is not (necessarily) the aim of textual criticism, instead of the *ideal* the aim is the *possible*, i.e. the construction of an archetype based on existing evidence.

The key to understanding the basic purpose of such editions lies in the question of editorial judgement. Thus, while humanist editing of texts relied on the emendation of a *textus receptus* on the basis of reading from other testimonies,² thereby relying on the judgement of the editor, the Lachmannian method aims to cut out, where possible, all editorial interpretation; by the establishment of stemma and the consequent creation of a hierarchy of testimony, the editor may only use his or her judgement when variants are of equal status. The aim, at least at the outset, is the mechanical establishment of an ideal text.

Blecua, however, points out that in practice, editors of medieval texts honour these principles more in the breach than in the observance when he comments:

Aunque como método se considere anticuado, la noción de *codex optimus* resulta imprescindible a la hora de seleccionar el testimonio que servirá de base en el cotejo. La noción de *emendatio ope codicum*, que, como hemos visto, va ligada a la de *codex optimus* o *editio vulgata* y que, en principio, carece de sentido desde la crítica lachmanniana, sigue siendo perfectamente válida en la mayoría de las ediciones de textos vulgares, y en especial en los medievales, puesto que habitualmente se toma como base el que la crítica considera el *codex optimus*, que con frecuencia se identifica con el *antiquior* o con la *editio princeps* (43).

Here Blecua appears to be willing to concede that in certain circumstances particular manuscripts have priority over others, merely on the basis that “la crítica” considers them to be prior, and despite the possibility that such readings as the *codex optimus* might supply could be less appropriate (in the Lachmannian sense) than those of manuscripts less blessed by “la crítica”. The use of editorial judgement is therefore permitted, but only if we accept collective responsibility.

² Blecua points out that this could be *codex vetustissimus* or *antiquior* or *codex optimus* and that the procedure itself could take the form of *emendatio ope codicum* or *emendatio ope ingenii* (31).

The neo-Lachmannian approach also finds an echo in Anglo-American textual theory and practice, and in particular the Greg-Bowers methods of textual editing. Although not designed with manuscript culture in mind, the approach shares many of the founding principles of Lachmannian criticism. In this sense, the principal responses to them can also serve as a critique of Lachmannian textual criticism. By far the most formidable comes from the pen of Jerome McGann. The essence of his objections to the textual criticism approach can be summed up in his dictum that “[t]o edit a text is to be situated in a historical relation to the work’s transmissions, but it is also to be placed in an immediate relation to contemporary cultural and conceptual goals” (1991, 47). The implication of this is, of course, that since each manuscript is directly a product of the contexts of its production, to establish an edition merely on the basis of the supposed relationship between texts deemed to be related to each other by virtue of their formal similarity is to do a disservice to individual manuscripts which, after all, come to mean in ways which can be very different. The Lachmannian approach then sees meaning of texts principally in terms of origins, and editions produced in this way limit the range of possible interpretations to those felt to be original or in some way essential. In manuscript culture, which is by its nature creative, this might be felt to be a significant drawback.

For McGann then, the notion of scientific objectivity allegedly inherent in Lachmannian approaches is illusory, since each generation (in both senses of the word) will necessarily produce new meaning and even the most stable of texts will be read in different ways at different times. But since, as he puts it, “no stability in the material object can be assumed with respect to texts”, which are, undoubtedly socially and historically relative, any scholarly study must take account of the “socialization of the text”; in consequence scholarship cannot elide interpretation since scholarship *is* interpretation (1991, 98).

Greetham comments that McGann’s approach is more or less unattributed gloss on Macherey’s “the work is not created by an intention (objective or subjective); it is produced under determinate circumstances”, and Fish’s view that textual meaning is constructed by a social contract within which the transmitted text operates, rather than by appeal to the intentions of a now absent author (Greetham 337). Greetham notes that this places McGann close to the *Annales* view of the book as cultural artefact within the wide context of national history, a view which brings with it an allied rejection of literature as special class of writing, indeed of writing as a privileged form of discourse. Whatever the theoretical status of writing, to take a solely textual approach, either as prior to or in the absence of an examination of the particular contexts of the individual witnesses, is to take an unnecessarily limited view of a highly fluid phenomenon. The question remains however: how can a print edition take account both of a stable text fixed in writing and the movable discourse represented by an array of manuscripts offering what are potentially diametrically opposed readings, without suggesting that any one of them is inherently superior to another?

McGann, in addressing these dilemmas in the abstract, provides a four-point manifesto to guide the choice of editing strategies, and which is worthy of citation here:

[F]aced with the existence of multiple legitimate options, the critical editor should not seek to impose upon them a system which pretends to distinguish one ideal, eclectic text. Rather he must come to a judgement about which of the legitimate texts to choose given the demands which are made upon the work from the following quarters: (a) the current state of textual criticism in general, both as to theory and to practice; (b) the current understanding of the textual history of the

work in question, including its composition, production, reproduction, and reception histories; (c) the deficiencies which current critical practice has served to promote and (finally) reveal in the received texts; (d) the purposes of the critical edition's text, both immediate and projected. (1992, 104-05)

What McGann is aiming for here is the avoidance of some kind of "ideal text" and in consequence getting away from authorial intentions / copy text in the Greg / Bowers sense, or in Greetham's words, to distance editorial practice from "the establishment of the text that never was, but by implication, ought to have been" (McGann 1992, 104; Greetham 337), that is, the neo-Lachmannian archetype and Greg / Bowers copy text. This seems a laudable approach, although one might wonder what such an edition would look like in practice.

Indeed, the most logical conclusion to all of this might be to take a resolutely neo-Bédierist approach, a view expressed by Bernard Darbord, Michel Garcia and René Pellen; one in which each manuscript is treated entirely on its own merits. The logic here lies in the view that fixing texts of a culture in which they were not fixed is inappropriate, principally because editors are almost always inconsistent in their attempt to do so. They propose the "primacía de la versión existente" since "cada versión es un documento auténtico", all the while bearing in mind that "una copia debía mirarse con una visión crítica" (Darbord et al.300-01). For this reason they criticise the introduction of capitalisation, modernisation of graphs in any form, punctuation, accents, etc. And while they agree that all scholarship should contribute to our understanding of medieval texts, the question of which approach is to be prior (and its corollary: in what form should the prior version be presented) is answered firmly by the preservation of as many of the characteristics of manuscript as is possible.

For the purposes of the two editions I will refer to shortly, what has just been outlined of the respective approaches of McGann and Darbord is highly relevant. Nonetheless, it would be remiss to suggest that neo-Lachmannian criticism has no possible rejoinder. Among the more thoughtful of recent works to come from that direction is a lengthy article by José Manuel Lucía Megías. Although the view advocated is that "crítica textual" is the first, and implicitly most important editorial operation, the author nonetheless recognises the value of all possible approaches to the study of medieval texts, indeed, as he states, "ni la crítica textual ni la hermenéutica pueden ni deben considerarse disciplinas independientes" (418), but rather different tools working in tandem, the absence of either leading to a necessarily partial (in both senses of the term) conclusion. Thus, the editor, recognising that each text is formed by a "código signico que ha nacido en un contexto de producción en donde se defiende un determinado discurso ideológico, que, de tener éxito, acaba impulsando un cuadro de relaciones genéricas, que permitirá al crítico de hoy identificar una serie de espacios textuales en donde tales textos adquieren un sentido" must take account of each of these things (419). But for Lucía Megías, the *text* is prior, and must first be established before any other operations can be performed. He is careful to point out that the object of textual criticism is not the reconstruction of texts, but rather an "acercamiento al pasado". Nonetheless, the existence of medieval texts (made of a variety of codices) is stoutly defended, as is the method of their modern establishment.

Part of the rationale for this view is Lucía Megías' point that the categories of text and author were valid ones in medieval culture and that to fail to recognise this is to create a false impression of the nature of the texts in question. Thus, not all readings are equally valid and not all difference is said to be due to the unconscious error of a supposedly joyfully creative scribe.

In this view of medieval text the only “variance” to be respected is that due to the intentionality of the scribe, and any other form of alteration is to be regarded as error to be ruthlessly hunted down and excised. Here, of course, we enter into a hermeneutic minefield. If the object of the edition is the restoration of original meaning, then such an approach may appear valid. On the other hand, if the object of the exercise is also that of recognising the historicised reception of the text in question (understood both as its rewriting and its subsequent reading) then one might ask just how a medieval reader was supposed to distinguish between the categories of unconscious error and scribal intent and how, indeed, as editors we are to take account of them. The logical conclusion of this may appear to lie in different editions for different purposes, an approach to which Lucía Megías himself ultimately leans in his thoughtful advocacy of electronic editions. He provides a schematic outline of what such an edition would look like, taking care to ensure that the non-linear possibilities offered by electronic media account for all the possible approaches (image of manuscript, Bédieriste transcription, etc.) while all the time privileging the Lachmannian “established” text. This core to the edition would benefit from the fruits of both internal and external evidence and supply a text that is, in its own way, both provisional and definitive. Lachmannian criticism therefore has moved on. For Lucía Megías “texto crítico y aparato forman una unidad que, junto con el resto...se denomina edición crítica”, itself to be understood as a hipótesis (440). This type of edition would recognise the historical character of texts and operates in a way which is not mechanical, but rather methodical, allowing both *iudicium* and *variance* to have their place, but placing the responsibility for interpretation and ultimate meaning with the editor and not, as in the Darbord view, with the reader.

The by now centuries-old debate has therefore moved on. Although there are those who advocate the extremes of my Lachmann-Bédier scale, there is a general recognition that in their own terms, all approaches are valid and, since the object of the exercise cannot be the re-creation of medieval reading, all involve some form of adaptation of what is, after all, our only evidence, namely manuscript text. To the responsible editor, nonetheless, falls the responsibility of avoiding hoodwinking the reader. To this end, two points seem fundamental. First, the recognition that any editorial outcome is necessarily provisional and contingent on a whole host of contextual factors, in consequence, any apparent fixing of our medieval material, whether in print or electronically, is merely a function of contemporary media, and not a reflection of inherent authority of the solutions arrived at; and second, that all editorial decisions must be transparent.

Having recognised the validity of the different approaches however, two further difficulties arise. The first is, which is to be prior? And the second, is it possible to take account of any or all of these issues in print form, given that most editions continue to be produced in print rather than electronically, at least for the moment? In what follows, I attempt to address each of these areas in turn.

The *Estoria delos Godos* is the name given to a thirteenth-century translation of Rodrigo Ximénez de Rada’s *De Rebus Hispaniae*. There are four principal manuscripts.³ BNM 302 is the

³ For a complete description of the manuscripts see my forthcoming editions of the two texts. The following is an abridged version.

1) Biblioteca Nacional (Madrid) 302 (*Olim*. Catedral de Toledo F196, 26-23).

302 is the sole complete medieval codex of the *Estoria*, and until the recent appearance of Res/278 (see below), the principal source of information on the text. The physical characteristics of the text, as described by PhiloBiblon, Simón Díaz, and the *Inventario general de manuscritos de la Biblioteca Nacional* are as follows: 75 folios of

manuscript most commonly associated with the *Estoria*. Two editions were produced in the late nineteenth century based around this manuscript. Two other manuscripts, BNM 12990 and the Hispanic Society of America exemplar are later copies of this codex. BNM 302 is an early manuscript (although not a translator's original) and it is rather difficult to read in sections. Thus, although BNM 12990 does not contain any supplementary text as such, in common with 302 the manuscript contains only the *Estoria*, its readings can help to clarify those of the early codex on occasion. Until 2002 these were the only known exemplars of the *Estoria*. For this reason, choice of manuscript to serve as the base of an eventual edition did not present grave difficulties. However, the emergence that year of a further exemplar of the chronicle presented a significant challenge to the editor. The manuscript in question is BNM Res/278, a fifteenth-century copy of the *Estoria*, albeit one with significant variations from the text of 302. The *Estoria* as known to us until the emergence of Res/278 is a significantly abbreviated version of Rodrigo's chronicle.

vellum, with two paper guard sheets at the beginning and one at the end. Folio size 225mm x 140mm, text box 162mm x 109mm. 28 lines per folio. A nineteenth-century binding has been added (for full detail see Faulhaber).

The hand is a gothic miniscule, and rubrics are picked out in red ink. A later hand has added chapter numbers and foliation. The same hand has also made some corrections and marginal additions, principally concerning the numbering of the councils of Toledo. These alterations must be from the eighteenth century, or prior to it, as they have been incorporated into the text of BN12990, which dates from that century. The codex also contains some comments from the pen of Amador de los Ríos on the nature of the text.

302 resided for some considerable time in the library of the Cathedral of Toledo, and may indeed have been copied there, although there is no evidence beyond the circumstantial to confirm this. 302 was probably one of the 300 manuscripts moved to the Biblioteca Nacional during the 1st Republic. Although it is the earliest of the manuscripts of the known codices of the *Estoria*, it is not an original copy. On the contrary, comparison with Res/278 shows that 302 suffers from a significant number of defective readings. However, it has been chosen as the base text for the current edition, as it does contain the complete text of the *Estoria*. It also served as the base text for the Lidfors edition and the Paz y Melia transcription which is based upon it.

2) Biblioteca Nacional (Madrid) Res/278.

In 2001 the Biblioteca Nacional acquired a further version of the *Estoria delos Godos* from Subastas Velázquez, and with an ex-libris of José Menéndez Pidal y Álvarez. The codex consists of 105 folios of paper 262mm x 172mm, the text box is 27 lines per folio, 220 x 140mm, in what is thought to be a fourteenth-century hand. Rubrics are picked out in red ink, and initials in what is now a faded lilac. The section beginning "Que peccados..." sees the use of calderones picked out in red. Foliation is provided in both Arabic and Roman numerals. The opening folio is badly damaged as are the final folios, and folios 18, 19, 21, 39, 40, 42, 59 and 90 are missing. The text of the *Estoria* runs from folio 2r to 100r, and the remaining folios are occupied by the beginning of a further chronicle which starts: "Esta es la generacion delos Reyes & delos primeros padres como uino de padres en hijos...".

3) Biblioteca Nacional (Madrid) 12990.

This manuscript, 195 folios of parchment, appears to be a copy of 302, as it states on the title page "Historia de España Escrita en Latin por Rodrigo Ximenez, Arzobispo de Toledo Y traducida en castellano antiguo por un Anonymo Sacada de un Ms antiguo en pergamino en forma de 4o que se guarda en la libreria de la Santa Iglesia primada de Toledo Caj 21 num 15 Año de M.DCC.LII". Carol Ann van der Walt in her doctoral dissertation says of this that "[t]he codex reference given here does not equate to any known reference for BN302. However, as Sánchez Alonso notes, 'no es de extrañar que en aquella librería se multiplicasen las copias de obras de un prelado tan esclarecido'" (1925, 342).

4) Hispanic Society of America HC 385/274.

This manuscript is described fully by Faulhaber in *Medieval Manuscripts in the Library of the Hispanic Society of America. Religious, Legal, Scientific, Historical, and Literary Manuscripts*, I, pp. 484-86, item 485; it is dated 1752 and states it was copied in Toledo by Francisco Javier de Santiago y Palomares. It consists of 140 folios on paper, 304mm x 201mm, text size 235mm x 140mm, with a guard sheet at the beginning and end. From Faulhaber's description, it can be identified as a copy of BN 302.

Indeed, despite its title, the section dealing with the history of the Goths is the most highly abbreviated of all, as a result of which the *neo-goticismo* of the Latin is greatly reduced in the translation represented by 302. The title *Estoria delos Godos* therefore is one which derives almost certainly from a direct translation of the title *Historia Gothica* rather than as an attempt to describe its contents. Res/278 differs substantially from the 302 version. Although the title is the same, and the history of the Peninsula after the deposition of Wamba all but identical to that of 302, the early sections are a new translation of the Latin, one which follows Rodrigo very closely. Res/278, a more accurate reflection of the title *Estoria delos Godos* than is 302, is therefore a different text. To complicate matters even further, where the two manuscripts do coincide, it is Res/278 that provides the better readings, as it frequently demonstrates more careful attention to its source codex than does 302. This presents the editor with a grave problem. There must have been a common source for 302 and Res/278 (though not necessarily the same codex), a Lachmannian archetype if you will. Yet the representative closest in time to it is the manuscript which provides the most defective readings. And the manuscript which provides the best readings shows itself to be dissatisfied with the ideological outlook of the “archetype” and consequently re-writes the whole first section...

The solution adopted is as follows: the base text adopted for the edition is that of BNM 302. The reason for this is that (a) it is the earliest manuscript, having been written within 50 years of the Latin and it is therefore the sole thirteenth-century performance of the *Estoria* and the only one written close to the context of its composition, thought to be in the Cathedral of Toledo; (b) it is the sole medieval representative of the “original” *Estoria delos Godos*, i.e. that which abbreviates the origins of the Goths. Note that the reason for choosing this manuscript is not that offered by Blecua, that textual history has ingrained in us all the idea that 302 is the *Estoria delos Godos* (although this is also the case), but rather that by choosing this manuscript I am aiming to examine the *Estoria* “in action” as it were, recognising its textuality as manuscript. The co-incidence between Blecua’s comments and my approach is accidental, since I choose to follow one manuscript consciously, rather than as a function of precedent. The result is the privileging of testimony over text, not least because I am unconvinced that there is a “text” to speak of in this case. Note, however, that the criteria employed here apply only to this edition.

For this reason I have avoided attempting to reconstruct an archetype based on the whole of Res/278’s account of the original *Estoria* supplemented by 302 where Res/278 adds its own translation. That is, the base of the edition is the “performance” of 302, not only for the negative reasons adduced by McGann, namely that the contrary would be the creation of the text that “ought” to have been, rather than the recognition of those that did exist; but also because doing so is an acknowledgement of the nature of medieval textuality.

However, as mentioned above, it would be a foolish editor who believed that the modern representation of such a performance were equivalent to a medieval act. Furthermore, a transcription of the text of 302, however palaeographic, is not an edition and it would be unwise to consign the advantages of scholarship, not to mention those conferred upon us by the rest of the textual tradition associated with the *Estoria*, to the scrap heap. For this reason, I have attempted to maintain the importance of the 302 manuscript without dispensing with the valuable information provided by a variety of other medieval and non-medieval sources.

What, one might ask, would such an edition look like? As I stated, the basic text for the edition is that provided by BNM 302. However, I have attempted to take on board the testimony of other sources where this appears to illuminate the testimony of 302. The reason for this is not because they are all part of the same work obscured by the fog of scribal practice, but rather

because they can help our understanding of 302's performance of the *Estoria*. In the case of a translation such as 302, this means that the *avant texte* (the Latin text) can be just as valuable in clarifying 302 as can the *après textes* of Res/278 and the other manuscripts. What is more, by employing this approach, it is possible to gather evidence from other quarters, not merely those exemplars of what is known to us as the *Estoria delos Godos*. This is not for a minute to suggest that the textual history of a manuscript such as Res/278 is not important. Quite the contrary, for Res/278, as separate manuscript text, is equally important as 302. But the context of this edition is not the place to deal with it; rather it deserves a full treatment of its own (though given the economic realities associated with the production of editions this may be something of a vain hope). Thus, for the purposes of this edition (but this alone) Res/278 is supplementary. There is another reason for taking this tack. Not only it is another performance in the manuscript sense, its status as historiographical text, and therefore generator of an alternative ideological viewpoint means that it would be incorrect to treat it as merely a variant *Estoria* manuscript.

The privileging of 302 brings with it a number of responsibilities for the editor. The first and most important of these relates to the use of material from other sources, employed to illuminate the 302 text. In all cases when material is added to the 302 text it must be clearly marked. The solution arrived at is by the use of different fonts. For example, where Res/278 supplies text which (usually for reasons of homoteleuton) is missing from 302, this is supplied in the text in bold print. Similarly, emendations made from other sources are in italics or underlined. Where readings are considered to be better (usually by reference to *De Rebus*) in the supplementary material, the 302 reading is placed in the endnotes.⁴ The only other justification for emendation is illegibility in 302. Thus, any emendation of the text is clearly marked without seriously interrupting its flow, and the nature of the emendation clarified in the notes (with the exception of illegibility). In the case of the *Estoria*, this is made easier by the limited numbers of manuscripts which can provide alternative readings, nonetheless, it should not be difficult to devise a similar system even where there are multiple manuscripts providing alternative readings.

The following example, drawn from the chapters of 302 dealing with the elevation of Fernando III and his subsequent actions, illustrate the editorial procedure in question:

Como alçaron rey a don Ferrando.⁵

| En tanto oyo la reyna doña Belenguera *que* el rey de Leon entraua por | Castiella por ganar el regno τ *con conseio* del conde don Alvaro *quel* aiu-darie el, *que* lego a Castiella. La reyna enuiol dezir τ rogar con los obispos | [fol.72v] | *que* non enbargase el regno asu fijo don Ferrando, *que* en cabo maguer *que* quisiese **no podrie**; pero | el non lo delexo por eso, paso Prisuerga τ quando lego a Burgos fallo y don Lop Diaz τ | todo el poder de Castiella; τ uido *que* andaua en uano τ tornose para Leon. El⁶ rey | don Ferrando alçado rey, los estremadanos enuiaron prometer *sus seruitios* granados a | la reyna, Auila τ Segouia τ todos los otros. Estonz la reyna enbiol a los obis-pos de Castiella a don Alvaro *que* les diese el

⁴ This procedure is open to the criticism that the method is not scientific but based on the editor's judgement. While this is, in fact, the case, it is also true that there is no truly mechanical manner of emendation which does not rely on editorial judgement. What I have tried to achieve is emendation based on coherent and consistent policy.

⁵ Again, the organizational principles of *EG* differ significantly.

⁶ *DRH*: VIII.vi

cuerpo del rey don Enric por enter-_rar; fueron τ reçibieron el cuerpo τ uinieron con el a Palençia. Quando salieron luego | cerçaron un castiello *que dizen* Muño τ fico y el rey don Ferrando *con* las huestes, y su | madre doña Belenguera fue enterrar su hermano⁷ a Burgos τ pues *que* torno ya ala | çerca falo ya el castiello priso. Despues prisieron Lerma τ Lara, *que* tenie el conde | don Alvaro. Desend tornaron a Burgos τ reçibieron los *con* proçesion. Pues⁸ la rey-_{na} espisiera todos sus tesoros; puso mano a oro τ a plata laurada τ por la-_{urar} *que non* cumplien las rentas por dar a caualleros. Estonz prisieron Uilforado τ | Naguera τ tornaron a Burgos. Los castillos⁹ *que* tenie el conde don Garcia **como eran fuertes nonlos quisieron cercar, dona Berenguela τ so fijo don Fferando seyendo en Burgos. El conde don Alvaro τ el conde don Garcia con sus a-_yudadores** pasaron por Otor de Aios τ por Quitana τ destruyeron a Uilfora-_{do}, asi *que* peso el rey τ ala reyna τ asi tornaron *asus* lugares. Entanto el | rey τ la reyna pusieron por yr a Palencia *con sus* ricos omnes de Castiella; aca | el conde don Ferrando puso sus azes enla carrera, el conde don Alvaro puso en | Ferrera por enbargar¹⁰ a los *que* pasasen.

Dela prision del conde don Alvaro

| El miercoles adelant, *que* era *quatro* temporo de setiembre, el rey τ su madre | la reyna dieron *que* curiasen los paños *que* se tenien del conde don Alvaro, | τ salieron ala **don** Suer Telez τ el conde don Alvaro salio de Ferrera por fazer | ueyrayre τ *contenent* τ grandia ala reyna de grand poder. τ pues Suer Te-_{lez} τ Alfonso Tellez pusieron se entre la uilla τ ellos prisieron al conde don | Alvaro sin ferida τ sin golpe τ asi lo aduxieron ala reyna τ al rey, preso | ante si. *Con* esto entraron a Palencia, pues¹¹ tornaron se a Burgos τ pusie-_ron al conde en prision. Entanto pusieron pleyto *que* diese el conde los castiel-_{los} *que* tenie de Castiella τ *que* fuese suelto: Conte, Alarcon, Amoya, Echare-_[fol.73r] | do, Çesare, Uilla Franca, la torre de Uil Forado, Naguera, Pancrudo τ *que* fuese quito. | El conde don Ferrando tenie Castro Xeriz τ Orzeion. τ el conde don Alvaro asu costa τ asu | mision deve traher çient caualeros τ aguardar al rey fata o combrase¹² el rey | estos castiellos sobre dichos. Al conde don Alfonso diole por guarda a don Garcia Royz | fasta *que* diese estos castiellos. Entre tanto el rey don Ferrando cerço al conde don Ferrando, asi *que* pleteo *con* el *que* **deuino**¹³ su uasallo *con* la *que* tenie τ asi fue. Toda esta tribulation | ouo cabo **en** vj meses, *que* cuydaron *que* nunca lo abrie τ pus fue Dios loado **asaz**¹⁴ | bien. Entanto¹⁵ los condes uieron se abaxados del poder *que* solien, comencaron de | correr toda Campos; aca el rey don Ferrando *con* su madre τ *con* los ricos omnes | **fueron** contra ellos τ salioles al ual *que* **dizen**

⁷ DRH: “fratrem suum”

⁸ DRH: VIII.vii

⁹ 302, N: “castellanos”

¹⁰ 278: “enpeçer”

¹¹ DRH: VIII.viii

¹² N: “ocombrase” marg: “que combrasse pro cobrassse”

¹³ 302, N: “enuio”

¹⁴ 302: “aca”

¹⁵ DRH: VIII.viii

de Junquera,¹⁶ ellos uieron *que non* podrien | aturar al rey, fueron se *para* Leon τ conseiaron al rey *que* guerrease asu fijo, | τ començo la guerra el rey. Entanto algunos de Castiella *que* entrauan **contra** Sala-|manca falaron al rey *con* grand poder τ pusieron como dizen en Medina de Can-|po τ el rey cercolos ali. El *conde* don Alvaro començo de calçar sus brasoñeras | τ prisol grand mal. Alli fablaron de paz τ de *concordia* entre padre τ fijo τ | tornose el rey *para* Leon. τ el *conde* don Alvaro leuantolo enfermo a Colero,¹⁷ τ reci-|bio y el abito de Ucles τ fino τ fue pues enterrado en Hucles. Su herma-|no el *conde* don Ferrando, fuese a Miramonin τ fue y bien reçibido τ adolescio en | Elbora, un burgo cabo Marruecos τ *con* todo eso fizo se leuar a Maruecos; | τ ali priso el abito por mano de frey Gonzalo del Espital, familiar del papa Innocen | çio iij^o τ fino y; pues fue aducho τ soterrado, **en Fitero**¹⁸ **en** el obispado de Pa-|lencia τ fue y su muger doña Mayor τ sus fijos τ muchos otros.

Como caso el rey don Ferrando con doña Beatriz¹⁹

| Todas estas guerras *fechas*²⁰ finco el regno²¹ | en paz al rey don Ferrando, **et asu madre, y ella demostró maneras deso auuelo por tener la tierra en paz** τ asi lo touo fasta los xxv años *que* regnaua. Pus | adelantose²² casamiento *con* doña Beatriz, fija del rey Felip, electo *que* fue enperador | de Alimaña τ fijo de doña Maria, fija *que* fue de Corsar, enperador de Costantino-|pla, *que* fue muy fermosa; τ fueron por ella don Mamio,²³ obispo de Burgos τ don | Pedro, abbat de Arlanca τ don Rodrigo, abbat de Rio Seco, Pedro Odario, prior del Espital. Estos | [fol.73v] | uinieron se a Frederico *que* era electo enperador τ demandaron gela *que* el la tenie en co-|mienda τ alongo la respuesta bien **iiij**²⁴ meses; en cabo enuiola *con* muchas | dones.²⁵ τ uinieron por Françia τ recibioles bien el rey Felip. La reyna doña Be-|lenguera *con* los obispos *con* muchos ricos omes, salieron la a reçebir *alende*²⁶ Uic-|toria τ uinieron a Burgos. τ el rey seye y esperando *con* grand poder τ oyeron | su misa enlas Huelgas *tres dias*²⁷ ante de Sant Andres. Dixo la el obis-|po don Mauriz. Dicha la misa, **cinjo**²⁸ su espada sobre el altar τ su ma-|dre *descinio*²⁹ gela. A terçer dia *pus* de Sant Andres dixo la misa el obispo | en Santa Maria de Burgos τ uelolos aly; fueron todos los prelados τ los ricos | omnes, de cada uilla los mayores. A³⁰ pocos dias de *pus*, enuio por Ruy | Diaz, *que* fiziese de derecho

¹⁶ 302, N: “diablo nunca”

¹⁷ N: “cabro”

¹⁸ 302: “enfermo”

¹⁹ DRH: VIII.x

²⁰ 278: “apaciguadas”

²¹ 302: “fizo el rey” corrected by same hand.

²² 278: “andaronle”

²³ N: marg: “mauriz”

²⁴ 302, N: “tres”

²⁵ 302: “dodones”

²⁶ 302: “dende”

²⁷ 302: “d”

²⁸ 302, N: “si uio”

²⁹ 302: “dauio”

³⁰ DRH: VIII.xi

delos malos fechos *que* fiziera τ fezie, | τ dela tierra *que* tenie. Don Rodrigo era cruzado por yr a ultra mar τ uino a Ua-|ladolit τ fue muy mal conseiado; quitose dende *que* se non espidio del | rey. El rey fue irado τ toliol la tierra. Don Rodrigo retouo lo *que* pudo las | fortalezas, *que* gelas non quiso dar menos de xiiij. mill *marauedis*. *que* de-|mandaua por retenencias. A cabo del año don Garcia Perez de

The examples of emendation are divisible into 3 principal categories: (i) major additions of text (in practice these come almost exclusively from Res/278, as this manuscript provides the most coherent of readings); (ii) minor additions of text for reasons of lack of (physical) clarity or missing text in 302; and (iii) replacement of text which is semantically unclear. The two examples of the first of these (the first of which probably involves a homoiteleton) are justified by reference to the Latin source, that is, the text supplied by Res/278 and added in bold reflects equivalent text in *De Rebus* which has been missed by 302, and which also becomes key to the understanding of the passage as a whole. The second of my categories, represented in the above passage by the addition of (for example) “contra” and “don” represents additions to the text of 302 in cases where the 302 text is not physically clear. The other emendations, for example “deuino”, “asaz” and “dizen de Junquera” represent occasions in which the Res/278 text is semantically clearer; these emendations are, again, justified by reference to the Latin original. The advantage offered by the different fonts is that it is possible to posit the reading of the *Estoria* which lies behind the 302 text while also allowing the reader to see just what the 302 reading looks like. The greatest disadvantage is that of legibility, to which I return below.

This form of editing is not new. Mary Speer comments, not entirely favourably, on a similar approach to editing (albeit of poetry) in the case of Pickens’ edition of Provençal verse. Although she lauds the effort in general, she objects that the form the particular edition takes privileges the authorial text, thereby giving the impression that this is what is most important. It should be noted however, that in the case of the *Estoria delos Godos*, the 302 text is foregrounded not for any essentialist reasons of innate superiority, but rather because, it is older and more representative (but only, of course, in my subjective view) of the particular phenomena in which the edition in question, but only the edition in question, has an interest. And if, as Speer notes, messy texts, and editions such as this are a proving ground for theories about the nature of texts, just as they are expressions of (unacknowledged) theoretical viewpoints, then at least this edition can contribute to the discussion of what editions are for, if nothing else (10).

Alternative readings appear in this edition, then, only if they clarify something about 302 (of course in practice all such variants can be seen in this light, even evidence provided by the Latin precursor). The reader must rely on the fallible editor for decisions as to what is to be regarded as significant, but since all such editorial decisions are at least in part conditioned by the subjectivity of the editor, the possibility of a truly scientific method is reduced. In this line of reasoning, the only sin is that of subterfuge: all emendations made must be clearly noted, and ultimately the reader can decide if the judgement of the editor was correct. This manner of proceeding has the added advantage of stating which are significant additions, and who decides i.e. the editor (13). It also takes account of Uitti’s comment (quoted in Speer 14) that editing is defined by the text to be edited, in this case, I do it this way because it is the most coherent way of fulfilling the requirements of edition without betraying the variant nature of manuscript culture.

There are (at least) three objections to this way of editing: (i) these two versions of the *Estoria* have been known as the *Estoria delos Godos* and considered part of the same work,

given the same title, for some considerable time. This complicates the issue, for although they are quite different they have been constructed / thought of as the same “text”; furthermore (ii) this approach could be construed as a return to an authorial original, and its concomitant search for truth and perfection, and finally (iii) the resulting printed text can be hard to read. It is true that the principal manuscripts have both been considered to be part of the same textual tradition. Nonetheless, textual examination reveals that they are quite different, in which case the only scholarly approach is to treat them as such, not as unrelated, but not as variants of the same almighty “text” either. Equally, it could be stated that the addition of “better” text to the 302 exemplar, whether in replacement of pre-existing text or in addition to it may appear to be an attempt to reconstruct the “perfect original”. However, the fact that any additions are made clearly in an alternative font means that the ultimate judgement is left to the reader. The editor offers a range of interpretations and privileges one, but this does not preclude the establishment of an alternative, since all the evidence upon which the editorial judgement is based is clearly available in a way which does not require disentangling cryptic textual notes. In this, I go against Lucía Megías for whom the editor is the ultimate arbiter. The third objection has no such simple answer: the printed text is harder to read than a plain printed page. However, since this is designed for specialists, the objection is hardly a damning one. The benefits of such editorial practice outweigh the undoubted immediate difficulty.

The choice of strategy, and ultimate aim of the edition, necessarily has an impact on the tactical decisions made in the practice of editing, where this is understood as the establishment of systematic procedure in punctuation, capitalisation, etc. If one manuscript is to be privileged, then the physical characteristics of that codex, its bibliographical codes, must be recognised in some way. Print editions are notoriously bad at representing these, and here the development of electronic editions which permit some form of examination of images of manuscripts is promising. Nonetheless, print editions can also give some indication, at least to the sensitive reader, of the construction of the text. To this end, I have maintained an indication of all MS 302’s line and folio divisions in the edited text. Although it would have been more appropriate to attempt to mirror the physical characteristics of the folio, even the most Bédieriste of editors must bow before economic realities...

The other key question, that of punctuation, must also be addressed. The two theoretical poles are those represented by Darbord *et al.* who see no reason to alter any scribal forms (beyond presumably their manuscript nature) and Sánchez-Prieto Borja whose question “¿por qué razón ha de renunciar el editor a transmitir lo más claramente posible esa comprensión del texto? ¿por qué hay que obligar al lector a recorrer el mismo camino que él ha recorrido ya?” smacks of something approaching indignation with those who refuse to adopt his approach (158). Given that I choose to follow a particular manuscript, it would be less than consistent if I were to alter scribal practice at the level of detail with which we are concerned here.

The most straightforward answer to Sánchez-Prieto Borja’s plea is “because it is not necessary nor indeed useful to do so”. Since he himself recognises that, as far as syntax is concerned the “regla general ha de ser la necesidad de respetar los rasgos genuinos de organización de sintagma”, it would appear rather perverse to apply a different set of criteria to punctuation (184). However, the function of any punctuation in a modern edition must always be that of attempting to clarify for the modern reader something about the medieval text, and as such, any punctuation introduced by an editor is necessarily a function of that editor taking an interpretative stand on the text in front of him.

There are, of course and as always, a number of options open to the editor. In the first instance, one can take the Darbord approach, and not introduce any punctuation or capitalisation, etc. The problem with this tactic is that modern readers, including many educated ones, are not usually equipped to follow the vagaries of medieval punctuation, some of which can be highly idiosyncratic. Still another approach involves the imposition of modern punctuation. The problem here is that this is to force the square peg of a medieval text into a round hole for which it was certainly not designed. The solution I have arrived at is along the lines of that proposed by Orduna. for their edition of the chronicles of Ayala: that is, limiting the use of punctuation to an attempt by the editor to clarify the meaning of the text, without the requirement of following modern norms. The understanding here is clear, however: where there are indications of sense divisions in the text, usually calderones, these are respected; where punctuation (in the editorial judgement) can clarify the meaning of a specific passage for a modern reader, then minimal punctuation has been employed. Along the same lines, no attempt to alter orthography has been made, no accents have been added or word divisions made, the educated reader with a little effort should be able to follow medieval orthography. The only exceptions to this rule are those associated with capitals (which have been introduced for proper nouns) and the realisation of abbreviations, which are, nonetheless, clearly marked as such in italic font. Of course, this alters the text fundamentally from its medieval incarnation, and in consequence introduces a significant element of editorial interpretation, which can hardly be termed mechanical, since the editor is taking a view of the meaning of the text. Taking a view, however, does not imply fixing, for once it made clear just what falls into the category of editorial intervention and what is scribal (in this case, punctuation marks as opposed to calderones) once more the possibility is open to the vigilant reader to re-interpret the text in different ways, as well as to appreciate just what the editor has done. The ultimate answer to Sánchez-Prieto Borja's question as to why the reader should be obliged to travel the same path as the editor is that such a path is offered, but does not have to be followed. Editorial intervention, then, should only be allowed where it is explicit, and where it is suitably transparent as to permit the reader to form an alternative view.

By contrast with the *Estoria delos Godos* the challenge facing the editor of the *Sumario Analístico de la Historia Góthica* is rather different. In the first instance there is only one codex containing the text of the translation, BNM 10046. Furthermore, the text itself is less a faithful translation of Rodrigo's chronicle than a severely abbreviated version of *De Rebus*. Nonetheless, it is far from clear just what the object of study is to be for, as in the case of the *Estoria*, there is a major complication in the composition of the text, a complication which, in this case, is not a question of assessing different versions in different codices, but rather what are in effect different versions within the same codex.³¹ The problem is two-fold. On the one hand, as can be seen from a cursory examination of the manuscript, the text of the chronicle is supplemented with extensive marginalia, some of which appear to be in the same hand as the main text, or at least composed at the same time. What is more, there are indications that other marginal notes, subsequently

³¹ The manuscript contains a series of other works. The following description is an abridged version of that contained in the forthcoming edition:

Biblioteca Nacional (Madrid) 10046 (*olim.* Hh-48 Tol. 47-4).

Physical description (Octavio de Toledo and PhiloBiblon): 2 + 1-91; columns: 2; lines: 50; hand: gótica minúscula rústica / gótica minúscula. Leaf: Height 374, Width 248 mm. Material: Parchment generally in good condition.

This is the sole extant manuscript containing the *Sumario* and it also contains a variety of other texts. These are described in the *Inventario general de manuscritos de la Biblioteca Nacional XIV (9501-10200)*, and recently updated in Jerez Cabrero. The manuscript was in the possession of the Cathedral of Toledo for some considerable time. As Jerez notes it was already in the cathedral in the first half of the fourteenth century.

incorporated into the text, have been erased. The text itself appears to have been composed as a translation of Rodrigo's chronicle, but supplemented by material drawn from other works in the same codex. The contexts of production of the text in question are therefore rather complex and the editor must make some effort to take these into account.

In the absence of alternative readings to those provided by BN 10046, the task of the editor should become, on the face of it, more simple. The only acceptable readings are those provided by the manuscript and all editorial intervention must clearly be marked as such. The nature of the codex in question renders the editorial task more problematic, however. In the first instance, the manuscript text we possess is incomplete, and where we have a relatively complete text, some of this is provided by contemporary marginal additions. The solution adapted to this problem is as follows: where the marginal additions can be seen to have been designed to fit the flow of the main text (this is generally indicated in the manuscript by the addition of an insertion mark) the text in question, underlined, has been added in the edition from the point of the insertion mark. Other marginal text appears in the footnotes. Any emendations which have been made by reference to information external to the codex have been marked in italics (for example, where the source text, *De Rebus*, has been used, as this is a case in which the *avant texte* is well known, but the final product obscure) or in braces (for editorial emendations made on the basis of contextual understanding). Such emendations are either the result of unclear readings (these are explained in the footnotes) or in response to a gap in the text of 10046. Substantial gaps in the 10046 text are commented on in the footnotes (for example folio 78^v, col.2) and no attempt has been made to reconstruct the missing lines, although the probable content of them, where a reasonable attempt at this can be made, is indicated in the footnotes. As the language of the text is, in itself, significant, no attempt has been made to regularize orthography, or to standardize the use of individual graphs. As in the case of the *Estoria* the bibliographical codes of the manuscript are marked (generally in subscript), no accents have been added, and punctuation has been kept to a minimum in order not to impose modern standards on a medieval text which would fit ill within them. Calderones, as contemporary markers of sense division, are maintained, as is the tironian sign (as τ), however all this is done in such a manner that permits the reader to arrive at his / her own conclusions as to the ultimate meaning of the text.

Era .dcc.x.iiij. Fue fecho sancto Alifonso arçebispo de Toledo, enel .ix. año que re-gno Reçensuyndo.³² *Et en aquel tiempo Claudio τ Pelayo, uenientes de partes de Francia, começa-ron a predicar. τ peruertieron muchos en Espana en fando la uirginidat de santa Maria. Et sancto Alifonso, quando lo oyo, começo a pre-dicar contra ellos τ prouan-dolios por muchas escripturas τ por leyendas uen-ciolos τ prouoges que dician falsidat, τ fuxieron de España confundidos.*³³ τ enla fiesta de sancta Ma-ria,³⁴ que es .viiij. dias antes dela fiesta de Tri-nidat, estando muchos clerigos τ muchos le-gos presentes, dio sancta Maria a sancto Alifonso una cassula τ dixole: "Toma esta uestedura delos thesoros de mj fiijo que en esta uida seas en-trado conla uestimjenta de gloria,

³² Detail from *Anales Toledanos III^{os}*; although the remaining information appears equally annalistic, it is in fact from *DRH*.

³³ Marginal addition in same hand.

³⁴ The inclusion of this account represents the translator's first departure from the previous editorial policy of recounting bare details alone.

*con que reuistas en las fiestas de myo fijo τ en las myas.*³⁵ Et sancto Alifon-*so* fue arçobispo .ix. annos. τ dos meses. Conprido el decimo ochauo anno que regno Reçensuyndo sen su padre Cjndasuyndo, morio en Toledo x kalendas februarij, que son .x. dias por andar del mes de enero.³⁶

Del rey Banba³⁷

Era .dccc.xiiij. años. Muerto Recensuyndo regno el rey Banba, que era de mucho alto sangre delos godos, τ regno .ix. años τ un mes, τ fue consagrado en rey en la egleſia de Toledo [de] sancto Quirico, que era estonçe arçobispo. τ este Banba fue muy buen rey τ fizo muchos bienes, τ fue señor de toda la tierra fasta el Ruedano, τ adobo la cerca della villa de Toledo, τ³⁸ fizo escriuir estos uessos en marmol: “Erexit factore deo Rex inclitus urbem Banba sue celebrem portendens cuntis honorem”.³⁹ τ en memoria delos sanctos que iaçen en Toledo, puſso estos otros verssos: “Res dñj sci ques hic presencia fulget | Hanc urbem τ plebem solito saluate fauore”⁴⁰ τ el rey Bamba fizo facer el .xi^o. concilio en Toledo, seyendo Quiriaco ende arçobispo. τ começo longe latec,⁴¹ quelos obispos uecinos deuian morar seños⁴² messes en Toledo. Et este rey fue empoçonado τ perdio el se-*so* τ entro enel monesterio de Pampliga τ morio hi, τ iogo hi soterado fasta que el muy noble rey don Afonso lo mando desentrar de aquel lugar hu iazia, τ fiçolo aduçir ha enterrar a Toledo.⁴³ [Fol. 65v Col. 2]

Era⁴⁴ .dcc. τ .xxiii. años. Muerto el rey Bamba re-gno Eruigio, sobrino de Recesuyndo, τ regno por forcia, ca Recesuyndo dexo un su fijo pequeno que deuiera a regnar que auia nonbre Theudefre-do. τ el sobredicho Eruigio entrose el regno por fuerça τ regno .vij. años. τ este fizo fazer xij. concilio en Toledo, seyendo don Juliano arçobispo de Toledo, enel .iiii^o. año. que regno Erui-gio. τ despues fue celebrado .xij. concilio en Toledo so esse mismo arçobispo, τ el x^o .iiii con- cilio fue fecho enel .v. año del dicho

Once more, the physical characteristics of the manuscript are accounted for, and any emendation is justified by reference to the Latin chronicle of which this is ostensibly a translation. The emphasis is therefore on the manuscript text. In the case of the *Sumario*, this is particularly important, as the text of the *Sumario* is supplemented by passages from other sources internal to the codex.⁴⁵ Indeed, it could be said that the *Sumario* only truly attains its full meaning in the light of the contents of the codex as a whole. Here, I have chosen to confine my interest to the

³⁵ Marginal addition in the same hand. DRH: “ut iam in hac uita uestimento glorie adoreris et ea in meis et Filii mei sollempnitatibus uestiaris”.

³⁶ The explanation of the dates is the initiative of the translator.

³⁷ DRH: III.i

³⁸ DRH: III.xii. There is a significant leap in what is translated here, and all reference to the rebellion of Paulo is removed. What is retained all concerns the city of Toledo.

³⁹ DRH: “Erexit factore Deo rex inclitus urbem Bamba, sue celebrem partendens gentis honorem”.

⁴⁰ DR: “Vos, domini sancti, quorum hic presencia fulget, hanc urbem et plebem solite saluate fauore”.

⁴¹ DRH: “cum longe lateque”.

⁴² DRH: “singulis”

⁴³ Alfonso’s re-interment of the remains of Bamba give the terminus a quo for the chronicle of 1274.

⁴⁴ DRH: III.xiii

⁴⁵ For a detailed examination of this see Jerez Cabrero.

translation of *De Rebus*, as the manuscript in its entirety is soon to be the object of a complete edition at the hands of Francisco Hernández. Since there is no final product imaginable, all we have is access to a very incomplete performance of the chronicle, in these circumstances it would be absurd to attempt to propose a “text” in the Lucía Megías sense.

Although I have grave doubts about the possibility of definite conclusions from all this, there are a number of points arising which I would wish to highlight. In the first instance it is clear that each edition will necessarily require its own theoretical stance, depending on the range of evidence surviving, and the nature of that evidence, as demonstrated by two all but contemporaneous Romance translations of the same Latin chronicle.

While accepting that these efforts may fail on the basis of attempting to be all things to all men, I have in mind a number of specific objectives for them. First, while accepting that all clearly marked editorial approaches are valid, nonetheless I have come down on the side of an approach which prioritises manuscript text, all the while allowing the possibility of alternative interpretation. The reason for this is that to take an alternative approach is to deny, or elide the materiality of manuscript culture which forms so important a part of the construction of meaning. Although I do not suppose that the particular solutions arrived at come anywhere near to being an adequate representation of such materiality, nonetheless they keep in the mind of the reader the material dimension to what is being read. Second, any edition should also recognise (*pace* McGann) the weight of textual evidence which has been, or potentially may be, considered in the direct or indirect relationships between manuscripts and which may shed light on the manuscript in question. This does not mean that two manuscripts which have the same title must perforce be treated as exemplars of the same text, quite the contrary. Construction of a hypothesis is, of course, a valuable exercise in any scientific endeavour; however, that hypothesis should only appear as a clearly marked result of the comparison of the existing evidence. The use of differing fonts in the current editions is designed to ensure that no mistake can be made over the status of the text in question. However, considering manuscripts merely as a conduit to the construction of such a hypothesis seems to me to be a grave error. I appreciate that such a manner of proceeding is rather easy in these editions as there are few manuscripts with which to work. Ideally we need textual studies of all of them, but the point of these editions is to choose the one which seems the most significant for cultural history, both in term of context of production and contexts produced. Of course we must all the time bear in mind that we work in the dark somewhat, due to the fortuitous survival of certain testimonies, and we often have no idea how comparatively significant the fortunate survivors were, and what riches have been lost to us. Any conclusions arrived at will, of course and as always, be provisional. Third, although these editions prioritise testimony over text, there must also be room for the creation of a hypothesis of that text (although this may be asking the non-electronic edition to do too much). Nonetheless, the edition must not be a closing off of interpretation, but rather in the manner of the best translations must permit (just as the manuscripts themselves do) an opening out to wider interpretation, where the reader is permitted the space to make alternative judgements. In this the editorial interpretation should avoid giving the impression of prescription of meaning. Each editing is a performance, albeit not in the sense of a medieval one. Hult’s analogy of medieval text as *langue / parole* may help here (120), we need to example the *parole* to be able to say something useful about the *langue*. However, the danger here is that just as *langue* begins to attain the properties of standard language so the Lachmannian approach may “discover” non-existing text and which bears the marks of the *langue* of textual practice all the while presenting itself as authentic to the unwary reader. And all of this when it is not clear that the reason for treating the individual manuscripts

as defective elements of a textual whole is in any way justified.⁴⁶ Fourth, the edition must also provide some form of argued interpretation of content. Although Lucía Megías points out the dangers of over-privileging the hermeneutic question in editions, nonetheless, any editorial act is already one of interpretation conditioned by the evidence at hand. Provided the evidence is treated consistently and the provisional nature of conclusions reached recognised, then the value of such interrogation of content seems to me to be absolutely the business of editors. This is not to suggest that textual criticism is in any way redundant, on the contrary, as McGann points out, what is to be criticised is not classical scholarship but its narrow application which leads to the de-socialization of our historical view of the literary text (1992, 119-21).

Lucía Megías' approach to electronic editions has much to recommend it, above all because it values all forms of editorial interpretation. While we agree on the result, the theory that underlies it provides a major point of disagreement. There is one final reason for this, and in favour of the prioritising of manuscript text. That is: as McGann suggests, all editing is interpretation, just as manuscript compilation is, and we must therefore attempt to account for contexts of production and editing. McGann's view denies the foregrounding of any form of discourse in theory, in a way that parallels Saussure's arbitrary linguistic sign; thus, in theory, each text and each discursive practice is equally valid. However, just as the sign is also paradoxically non-arbitrary so too certain forms of written discourse seem to me to be in practice different from others. In this category I would include the field of historiography, for away from the boundaries, we, just as our medieval readers, know a history when we see one. It is precisely because of the nature of historiographical texts that each manuscript must be treated on its merits, and not as an element in the construction of an Ur text. That is, each chronicle claims for itself the authority to speak because of its relation (or lack of it) to other texts, and through appropriating that authority is able to create a whole new and frequently dramatically different outlook on the world, all the time under the guise of what has gone before. I therefore find myself edging towards the view that historiographical texts are a particular form of discourse, perhaps conceptually different to literary texts (at least, non-oral ones) because each generation really does create its own, and this can be seen in a series of different iterations which then become very important on their own terms. For editions of these chronicles what is most important is less the elimination of error, but the examination of the creation of authority (to speak, to claim the past) inherent in the exercise and which permits modification of originals in a conceptually different way to that of literary texts, for example. Thus, by virtue of a procedure which I do not dignify with the term "method", the edition presents a hypothesis of a medieval work. It is therefore an edition which offers contextually justified emendations (by reference both to *avant* and *après textes*) in a manner which does not exclude alternative interpretation and which has as its base not an ideal text (although the final product may offer something looking like an archetype) but rather a close representation of one manuscript. The edition therefore begins with the manuscript and builds a series of contexts around it. One of the most important of these, and one with which I have not dealt here, is that of the contextual introduction, and which serves as a key element in the explanation of the hypothesis.

Editorial practice must take account of as many of these contexts as is possible. The subjectivity of the editor cannot be elided, but nor should it necessarily be foregrounded, editorial judgement is, after all, just that, a judgement; though it need not close off all possible

⁴⁶ In some cases, there are undoubtedly authoritative originals, but these are few and far between in our experience of medieval culture.

readerly interpretations. Editions which fail to take account of these ranges of contexts may risk missing the point of their object of study.

Bibliography

- Blecua, Alberto. *Manual de crítica textual*. Madrid: Castalia, 1983.
- Darbord, Bernard, Michel García, and René Pellen. "Respeto y manipulación de los textos: ¿cómo editar los textos medievales?". Eds. Cristoph Strosetzki, Jean-François Borrel, and Manfred Tietz. *Actas de I Encuentro Franco-Alemán de Hispanistas (Mainz 9.-12.3.1989)*. Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert Verlag/Iberoamericana, 1991. 297-304.
- Greetham, D.C. *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction*. New York & London: Garland, 1994.
- Hult, David F. "Reading It Right: The Ideology of Text Editing". Eds. Marina Scordilis Brownlee, Kevin Brownlee, and Stephen G. Nichols. *The New Medievalism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.
- Inventario general de manuscritos de la Biblioteca Nacional*. 15 vols. Madrid: Ministerio de Educación Nacional, Dirección General de Archivos y Bibliotecas, Servicio de Publicaciones, 1953-2002.
- Jerez Cabrero, Enrique. "El oficio historiográfico: los *Anales toledanos terceros* en su entorno". *La Corónica*. 32.3 (2004): 109-62.
- Lidfors, E. *Acta Universitatis Lundunensis* 7 (1871) and 8 (1872).
- Lucía Megías, José Manuel. "La crítica textual ante el siglo XXI: la primacía del texto". Ed. Lillian von de Wahlde Moheno. *Propuestas teórico-metodológicas para el estudio de la literatura hispánica medieval*. Publicaciones de Medievalia 27. México: UNAM/UAM/Medievalia, 2003. 417-92.
- McGann, Jerome. *A Critique of Modern Textual Practice*. Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press, 1992.
- . *The Textual Condition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- Octavio de Toledo, José María. *Catálogo de la Librería del Cabildo toledano: la parte: manuscritos*. Biblioteca de la Revista de archivos, bibliotecas y museos III. Madrid: Tip. De la Revista de archivos, bibliotecas y museos, 1903.
- O'Donnell, Daniel. Contribution to the thread "Sometimes a text is just a text (and sometimes it isn't)". MEDTEXTL Archive, <http://listserv.uiuc.edu/wa.cgi?A1=ind0312&L=medtextl>. 15 de diciembre, 2004.
- Orduna, Germán, ed. *Crónica del rey don Pedro y del rey don Enrique, su hermano, hijos del rey don Alfonso oncenno de Pero López de Ayala*. Buenos Aires: SECRIIT Ediciones INCIPIT, 1994.
- Paz y Melia, A. *Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de España*. LXXXVIII. Madrid: 1887.
- PhiloBiblon*. <<http://sunsite.berkeley.edu/Philobiblon/>>.
- Sánchez Alonso, Benito, "Las versiones en romance de las crónicas del Toledano". *Homenaje ofrecido a Menéndez Pidal: miscelánea de estudios lingüísticos, literarios e históricos*. 3 vols. Madrid: Hernando, 1925. I, 341-54.
- Sánchez-Prieto Borja, Pedro. *Cómo editar los textos medievales: criterios para su presentación gráfica*. Madrid: Arco Libros, 1998.
- Simón Díaz, José. *Bibliografía de literatura hispánica*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto "Miguel de Cervantes" de Filología Hispánica, 1960.
- Speer, Mary. "Editing Old French Texts in the Eighties: Theory and Practice". *Romance Philology* 44.1 (1991): 7-43.

- Van der Walt, Carol Ann. "A Critical Edition of the *Toledano romanzado*". PhD thesis. University of Birmingham, 1999.
- Ward, Aengus, ed. *La Estoria delos Godos*. *Medium Aevum* Monograph Series. Oxford: Oxbow Books. Forthcoming.
- . *Sumario Analístico de la Historia Gothica*. Papers of the Medieval Hispanic Research Seminar. London: Queen Mary College. Forthcoming.