EDITING THE «ESTORIA DE ESPANNA»[*]

AENGUS WARD

There is a supreme irony in the study of medieval Iberian historiography. Since the 1990s, and as a result of the incomparable philological labours of Diego Catalán and Inés Fernández-Ordóñez, the textual traditions of narrative historical prose have become amongst the best understood in ibero-medievalism. And of all of the myriad of historical writings produced in the late medieval peninsula, the text whose tradition is best understood is undoubtedly Alfonso el Sabio's history of Spain, composed in the learned king's scriptorium alongside a general history of the world and a host of legal, cultural and scientific texts. And herein lies the irony: despite the wealth of knowledge and understanding garnered over the last 30 years or so, Alfonso's *Estoria de Espanna* is known and cited most widely through a printed edition whose misleading title (*Primera crónica general* henceforth *PCG*) is still employed regularly in scholarly works.[1]

This is not, of course, to denigrate the erudition of its editor, the outstanding scholar Ramón Menéndez Pidal. However, the edition represents a state of knowledge about medieval Iberian chronicles in general, and the Alfonsine project in particular, which has been surpassed by more recent scholarly activity. The *PCG*, which is fundamentally a representation of one composite manuscript, should therefore be treated with

care. And yet, it continues to represent the principal (if not the only) source of access to Alfonso's chronicle for a wide range of scholars.

The *Estoria de Espanna Digital*, a project financed by the AHRC and run at the University of Birmingham, aims to address some of these issues by constructing a digital edition of the Estoria. In order to illustrate the aims of the project, and to demonstrate why the digital edition is the only way to account for the complexity of the *Estoria*, it is necessary to re-visit the question of the object of study.

Thirty years ago, one might have said that the *Estoria de Espanna* (or, what is more likely, the *Primera Crónica General*, as few referred to Alfonso's work in any other way)[2] was a chronicle composed around the year 1272 by, or under the direction of, Alfonso X el Sabio, king of Castile and Leon between 1252 and 1284. The history of Spain from its origins until the death of Alfonso's father, Fernando III, el Santo, in 1252, the *Estoria* is conceived as the history of the peoples who exercised the legitimate lordship of the Peninsula and it provides a vision of the governance of the territory as a line of rulers beginning with Hercules and Espan and ending with Alfonso himself. It thereby demonstrates a continuous line of legitimate lordship, passing through Roman consuls and emperors, and Visigothic kings whose legitimate successor governs at the moment of enunciation of the chronicle.[3] But while one might still, with no little justification, subscribe to all of the above, the straightforward conception of the *Estoria* that one might have avowed on the subject in the 1980s is no longer accepted as a sufficiently nuanced understanding of Alfonso's history, for at least two reasons.

The first is because we now understand that there was not a single *Estoria de Espanna*, but several. The philological research of Diego Catalán and Inés Fernández-Ordóñez revealed more than 20 years ago that the principal manuscript, a two-volume royal codex residing in the Real Monasterio de San Lorenzo de El Escorial known to all as E, is a compound manuscript formed in the time of Alfonso XI (1311-1350) and comprised of sections composed at three different moments, of which only one was in the lifetime of the supposed author, Alfonso X.[4] As a

---

[2] It might also be noted that the naming traditions are not medieval in origin; something which has given rise to significant inconsistency amongst modern scholars.

[3] See in particular I. Fernández-Ordóñez, *Las Estorias de Alfonso el Sabio*, Madrid, Istmo, 1992.

[4] D. Catalán, *De Alfonso X al Conde de Barcelos; Cuatro estudios sobre el nacimiento de la historiografía romance en Castilla y Portugal*, Madrid, Editorial Gredos, 1962; Id., *De la silva textual al taller historiográfico alfonsí: Códices, crónicas, versiones y cuadernos*

result, it can safely be said that Menéndez Pidal's edition, which is fundamentally a transcription of E emended with reference to certain other manuscripts, does not represent Alfonso's *Estoria*. Furthermore, and without taking into account subsequent spin-offs of the *Estoria* such as the *Crónica de Castilla* or the *Crónica de 1344*, Inés Fernández-Ordóñez's catalogue of manuscripts of the *Estoria* shows that there are at least 39 extant medieval codices of the chronicle:[5]

A	BNE 8817
A'	Universidad de Salamanca 2497
Ae	BNE 643
B	Universidad de Salamanca 2022
C	BNE 12837
Cah	RAH Madrid 9/5651
Ce	BNE 1526
Cf	Universidad de Salamanca 2684
Cs	BNE 1865
E	Comprised of E1 Escorial Y-I-2 y E2 Escorial X-I-4
Eg	BNE17769
Eh	BNE 1487
Ei	BNE 1195
Ej	RAH Madrid 11.13.3
F	Universidad de Salamanca 2628
G	Escorial X-I-11
I	BNE 10134
J	BNE 1347
L	BNE 1298
Min	University of Minnesota Z946.02/fC88I
N	Palacio Real Madrid II/2063

de trabajo, 1. ed., Madrid, Fundación Ramón Menéndez Pidal/Universidad Autónoma de Madrid («Fuentes Cronísticas de La Historia de España», 9) 1997; Id., *La Estoria de España de Alfonso X: Creación y evolución*, Madrid, Seminario Menéndez Pidal/Universidad Complutense de Madrid/Fundación Ramón Menéndez Pidal /Universidad Autónoma de Madrid («Fuentes Cronísticas de La Historia de España», 5), 1992; *Alfonso X El Sabio y las crónicas de España*. ed. I. Fernández-Ordóñez, Valladolid, Secretariado de Publicaciones e Intercambio Editorial/Universidad de Valladolid/Centro para la Edición de los Clásicos Españoles, 2000.

⁵ I. Fernández-Ordóñez, «La transmisión textual de la "Estoria de Espanna" y de las principales "crónicas" de ella derivadas», in *Alfonso X El Sabio y Las Crónicas de España*, cit., pp. 219-264: 222-223. It might be noted that, thanks to the excellent work of the Biblioteca Digital Hispánica, the images of no fewer than 16 of these manuscripts are available to be viewed freely. (As of October 2014: A, Ae, Ce, Cs, Eh, Ei, I, J L, O-F, Q, Uu, V1, V2, Vv, Xx).

Nn	Palacio Real Madrid II/1264
O-F	BNE 828
Q	BNE 5795
Qq	Escorial Z-III-3
R	Palacio Real II-2038
Ss	Caja Duero Salamanca 39
St	Stockholm, Biblioteca Real, D.1262.a
T	Biblioteca Menéndez y Pelayo M-550
To	Biblioteca de Castilla-La Mancha 104
U	Universidad Complutense 158
Uu	BNE 645
V_1	BNE 1343
V_2	BNE 1277
Vv	BNE 8213
X	BNE 10214/10214
Xx	BNE 7583
Y	Escorial Y-II-11
Z	Escorial X-I-7

If each of these contains the *Estoria*, and given that variation (or per-haps variance) is a primordial condition of medieval textuality, then it is clear that a printed edition could hope to represent neither the complexity of the chronicle nor a hypothetical original version (one which, as is well known was never completed in Alfonso's lifetime). In addition to the relatively large number of manuscripts of varying (but generally extensive) length, recent philological research has revealed the existence of two major recensions of the chronicle composed during Alfonso's reign, and another composed, at least in part, under the direction of his son Sancho IV.[6] The first of these, known as the *versión primitiva* (but which itself can be demonstrated to have at least two realisations – known as the *regia* and *vulgar* respectively), is the product of the years around 1270 and represents the historiographical world vision of a king who, albeit in constant conflict both internally and externally, nonetheless is probably at the peak of his powers and ambitions. The second, known as the *versión crítica*, is a significantly different historiographical vision, composed under the direction of an ill and defeated king, effectively de-throned by his son Sancho and abandoned by the majority of his people. Yet another redaction is the partial re-write of some of the second half of the chronicle in 1289 under the reign of Sancho. This

---

[6] Fernández-Ordóñez, «La transmisión», pp. 219-221.

recension was destined to be used as the royal record of the chronicle, although it presents a worldview with which Alfonso might justifiably had more than a few quibbles. Each one of these recensions, not to mention the other less significant re-writings in the same period, reveals a range of anxieties with regard to the present of enunciation which demonstrate the value of discursive control of the past. And yet none of this appears in the much-cited print edition nor in the transcriptions of the Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies. In consequence, the answer to the question "what is the *Estoria de Espanna*?" is not a simple one.

The second reason for which the print edition (or indeed, any print edition) can no longer suffice emerges from this last point. Recent years have seen a burgeoning interest in the question of medieval textuality from a variety of theoretical perspectives, and in the case of the *Estoria de Espanna* in the contextual significance of historiographical discourse. Exemplified by the works of Georges Martin, Leonardo Funes and Peter Linehan amongst others, this line of inquiry has led to a general acceptance in the field that in order to reach reliable conclusions (provisional as they are) on the subject of medieval texts, their contexts of production, enunciation and reception must be taken into account.[7] All of this, of course, requires a detailed analysis of all of the available evidence – philological, historical, linguistic etc. Thus, the collation of codices is necessary not for the traditional philological task of elimination of error, but rather to permit the comparative analysis of all of the exemplars, each one of which has its own contextual value. In the case of the *Estoria de Espanna*, Georges Martin's work has clearly demonstrated that the Alfonsine histories form a significant element in a very broad socio-political and cultural project. The edition of such texts can expand our knowledge of such socio-political contexts, though we must always be aware that the dialectical process by which the establishment of the edition is inflected by our knowledge of the wider historical context may lead us into self-fulfilling conclusions.

Furthermore, it is widely recognised that the search for origins – in this case a supposed Alfonsine original informed by our knowledge of contexts – is no longer the sole reason to undertake an edition (nor even per-

[7] See, amongst the plentiful bibliography on the subject, G. Martin, *Les Juges de Castille: mentalités et discours historique dans l'Espagne médiévale*, Paris, Publications du séminaire d'études médiévales hispaniques de l'université de Paris XIII-Klincksieck, 1992; L. Funes, *El modelo historiográfico alfonsí: Una caracterización*, London, Queen Mary and Westfield College, 1997; P. Linehan, *History and the Historians of Medieval Spain*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1993.

haps a reason to do so at all). For if we use the evidence provided by non-Alfonsine codices merely to establish a list of variants that no-one will ever read – an occasional hazard of printed editions – we limit the study of our medieval evidence to internal, philological, contexts and we lose the possibility to analyse the evidence as product of its own contexts of production, enunciation and reception. Of course, it is necessary to systematize our understanding of textual relations, *recensio* is still an important philological labour. But neither this necessity nor the remnants of a nineteenth-century idealist search for origins should be permitted to relegate to a lower plane all the evidence that does not aid in the search for origins. In consequence, the ideal solution would be an edition which provided a fluid dialectic working text in which each component in a system of textual relations can be understood both as a function of its internal context, that is, its contribution to the system, and also as a function of its relations to the external contexts mentioned above. Print editions cannot hope to offer much by way of such dialectics, and the consequence has been the implicit hierarchization of the contexts and also of the codices. The recognition of the value of such external contexts has not been seen (or perhaps desired) in print editions beyond the occasional provision of brief contextual introductions. Herein lies, perhaps, the greatest advantage of digital editing. But digital editing also brings with it theoretical challenges.

The edition of historical documents (in the broadest possible sense of the term *historical*) fell into something approaching disrepute in the late twentieth century. From the high point of what Christopher Baswell termed the «heroic age» of text editing in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the exercise of the philological art (or do I mean science?) came under increasing scrutiny from diverse methods in literary criticism associated with the wave of postmodern approaches to text and was generally found lamentably lacking.[8] So before attempting

---

[8] Quoted in L.A. Finke and M.B. Schichtman, «Profiting Pedants: Symbolic Capital, Text Editing and Cultural Reproduction», in D.R. Shumway and C. Dionne (ed.), *Disciplining English: Alternative Histories, Critical Perspectives*, Albany, SUNY U.P., 2002, pp. 159-178: 159. For a view on the state of the question twenty years ago, see the debate on the subject in the pages of *Romance Philology*, in particular M. Speer, «Editing Old French Texts in the Eighties: Theory and Practice», *Romance Philology*, 45.1 (1991), pp. 7-43. More recently, the notion of a post-philology which revives the tools of traditional philology in the context of post-colonialism has been advocated by M.R. Warren, «Post Philology», in P. Clare Ingham and M.R. Warren (ed.), *Postcolonial Moves: Medieval Through Modern*, London, Palgrave, 2003.

to justify the need for a digital edition of the *Estoria*, one might have to address the question of why attempt to edit it in any form whatsoever. In order to answer such a question, it is necessary to raise two central questions: 1) who would use an edition and to what end? and 2) where could the theoretical justification be found for any edition of the *Estoria*? In the case of the former, the problem is a particularly large one. There are, of course, as many different types of edition and there are editors, and in the case of a medieval chronicle there is a clear difference between the demands of (say) a historian and an expert in historical linguistics. The editor is therefore faced with either choosing a readership or attempting to accommodate all of them – not an easy task in a print edition. In the latter case, each editor, must justify his/her own editorial practice by reference both to the audience and to a particular theoretical frame and methodological approach. But attempting to cover all the bases becomes increasing difficult in print culture, hence the production of different editions for different purposes. But with theory and practice in constant tension or, in the words of David Hult in the face of constant oscillation between the treatment of individual cases and the consideration of theoretical and methodological concerns, the role of the editor is a conceptually difficult one.[9]

Most will recognise here the by now venerable debate whose extreme poles have come to be encoded, most probably incorrectly, in the names of Lachmann and Bédier. The former, again in Hult's words, is associated with «the reconstruction of an author's original text as based on the genealogical classification of manuscript exemplars into groupings known as families [with the aim of] provid[ing] a mechanical (i.e. objective) means of eliminating those readings erroneously introduced into the author's text and reconstructing the lost original» while the latter «involves the detection of a single "best" manuscript ... and printing that exemplar with as little editorial intervention as possible».[10] Many advocates of a neo-Lachmannian approach would bristle at the search for origins and point out that the hypothesis of a text produced by the neo-Lachmannian editor is representative not of an authorial original but rather an editorial possible (a significant distinction). Nonetheless, many would also subscribe to some version of Blecua's definition of

[9] D.F. Hult, «Reading it right: The Ideology of Text Editing», in M.S. Brownlee, K. Brownlee and S.G. Nichols (ed.) *The New Medievalism*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins U.P., 1991, pp. 113-130.

[10] Hult, «Reading», cit., pp. 118-119.

crítica textual as «el arte que tiene como fin presentar un texto depu-
rado en lo posible de todos aquellos elementos extraños al autor».[11] The
two extremes of this debate, over- and mis-represented to the point of
caricature – the conflict between German idealism versus French mate-
rialism was hardly a dull academic one in the first half of the twentieth
century – came in the past to be associated with a questions for which
the two possible answers appear irreconcilable: what is most impor-
tant, the manuscript and its scribal contexts or the text from which all
exemplars must have ultimately emerged? Who has the authority to speak:
author or scribe? To what should editions give priority: the material cre-
ation of manuscripts or the original text of which they are supposedly a
representation? Of course, although the answers may seem irreconcil-
able, both sets of answers have their own value.[12] As scholars we learn
from both approaches. But alongside the existence of strongly held the-
oretical views as to what constituted an edition, part of the reason for
the continued existence of the debate in such black and white terms
was the impossibility of fulfilling all of the possible aims in a single edi-
tion. In the case of a text such as the *Estoria de Espanna*, the aim of ana-
lysing all of the evidence of 39 manuscripts both on its own contextual
merit and also for its value in providing a hypothesis of an Alfonsine
version is a tempting one, but one which could simply not be catered for
in print. And herein lies one of the reasons for adopting the digital
format: one may at least attempt to address a set of aims which had hith-
erto been considered incompatible in the same edition, for electronic
editions allow one to study precisely what the scribes have done and try
to understand why, while in parallel presenting a constructed or recon-
structed text.

The possibilities offered by digital editions are, as yet, unexplored. But
two separate, if related, trends in current scholarship may help to push
the boundaries. The first is exemplified by Michelle Warren's article on
Post Philology, in which the tools of traditional philological enquiry are
revived in the light of theoretical advances made in literary and textual
analysis, and the second, specifically related to the possibilities of dig-
ital editing is summarised in the recent article by Farkas Gábor Kiss,
Eyal Poleg, Lucie Doležalová, Rafal Wójcik who bring the Lachmann/

---

[11] A. Blecua, *Manual de crítica textual*, Madrid, Castalia, 2001, p. 18.
[12] For a rather more eloquent analysis and an explanation of why the Lachmann/
Bédier debate is underpinned by a false dichotomy, see I. Fernández-Ordóñez, «El texto
medieval: propiedad y uso», *Medioevo Romanzo* (forthcoming).

Bédier debate up to date in the light of New Philology and demonstrate just how the apparently incompatible aims and methods of traditional editing can be accommodated in a single digital edition.[13] Both of these trends, however, require a conceptual shift. In the case of editing, as Kiss et al. note, the early stages of digital editing have been characterised by a mindset informed by the physical page. Rather in the case of early printed books whose physical appearance was so similar to the manuscripts of which they were destined to be the inheritors, digital editions have relied heavily on the conventions of printed books. But the transitional stage of digital editing is now well advanced and the non-linear edition of multiple readings and starting points is becoming embedded in editorial practice.[14] Quite whether it is justifiable to think of this as akin to medieval reception is another question.

In consequence, it is now possible to conceive of an edition which provides transcriptions of medieval manuscripts, with multiple entry points and collation tools, and linked to high resolution images of the manuscripts themselves. Although this apparent democratization of access (in a host of different ways) is to be celebrated, it may also lead us into (to mis-quote Bourdieu) the illusion of cultural communism, since behind every edition (however open) will still lie an editor. But the fact that images are provided, that the transcription is given next to them and that the way in which the transcription was conceived is generally explicit, allow the reader, if he or she wishes, to investigate further and question every single decision. This was not possible before digital editions. In consequence, the possibilities offered by xml encoding and manuscript imagery mean that a text such as the *Estoria de Espanna* is ideal matter for digital editing.

The digital mode of editing may well the only one capable of representing the diversity and complexity of the *Estoria de Espanna* tradition, but the digital editor, just as the print editor, is faced with a significant number of prior questions about the practicalities of establishing the edition. The aforementioned diversity is to be considered an advantage

---

[13] F. Gábor Kiss, E. Poleg, L. Doležalová, R. Wójcik, «Old Light on New Media: Medieval Practices in the Digital Age», *Digital Philology*, 2.1 (Spring 2013), pp. 16-34.

[14] An even greater mind-shift is represented in P. Spence, «Siete retos en edición digital para las fuentes documentales», *Scriptum Digital* 3 (2014), pp. 153-181 (http://scriptumdigital.org/documents/6-_Spence_-_CHARTA-III-.pdf) which calls for a greater appreciation of the possibilities of digital editing, not least the separation of preparation and presentation.

rather than an obstacle to the presentation of a hypothesis of a medieval *Estoria*, but it also gives rise to a range of practical difficulties. The first of these is a fundamental one: given that it has been established that there is not a single *Estoria de Espanna*, what exactly is it that the edition aims to represent? In one sense, there is no simple answer to this question, since the establishment of the edition has, in theory at least, no end. That is, one of the advantages of the digital platform is that the edition itself can be constantly updated and new features (and indeed transcriptions) added. Alongside this, the data and metadata compiled for the edition will be available for use in other projects in the future, so what is begun in the *Estoria* edition may eventually lead to rather different outcomes than those imagined at the beginning of the project.

A digital edition is, for now at least, the sole means of representing the internal and external complexity of the *Estoria de Espanna*, but it is by no means a panacea for those who are searching for an ideal representation of a medieval chronicle. One might indeed suggest that the digital mode of presentation is adding to the complexity of textual relations. Textual complexity is, of course, no longer seen as an impediment to access to medieval texts and the culture from which they emerge, so in one sense the very complexity of digital means of editing, allied to their apparent surface simplicity, may help us to understand something of the nature of textual relations at a theoretical level. On a more practical note, however, that apparent simplicity may mask the nature of the editorial judgements that are taken at each moment in the editing process.

In a digital edition, which may present itself as the neutral juxtaposition of medieval evidence, the very first such judgement, perhaps occluded to the eyes of the users concerns the manuscripts to be transcribed.

As we have a relatively complete understanding of the textual relations of the *Estoria* – that is, the way in which the aforementioned manuscripts relate both to each other and to the tradition as a whole – the choice of manuscripts to transcribe was rendered somewhat easier than might otherwise have been the case. E was chosen as the base text not only for the reasons mentioned below, but also because it is the most complete manuscript. The ultimate aim of the project is to provide the user with the possibility of accessing all of the manuscripts – the raw material of any study of medieval texts – but also to permit the user to access the text of the different recensions of the chronicle, in as much as this is possible. As the manuscript evidence is so extensive, it was not possible to transcribe all of the witnesses in the initial phase of the edition (although this is the ultimate aim). In consequence, a choice had to

be made with regard to which manuscripts should form the first stage of the edition. The codices chosen are the following:

E1 El Escorial	Y-I-2	c. XIII 197 fols. (+ 2-17 of X-I-4)
E2 El Escorial	X-I-4	c. XIV 359 fols.
Q BNE	Ms. 5895	c. XIV 178 fols.
T Bibl Men y Pel.	Ms. 550	c. XIV 201 fols.
Ss Salamanca	Ms.40:	c. XV 325 fols.

The rationale is straightforward. Alongside E, Q was chosen because it represents the *vulgar* tradition of the *versión primitiva*, and is therefore an alternative version of Alfonso's original 1270's text; Ss because it represents the *versión crítica*, Alfonso's second redaction of the *Estoria* and T because it contains text from the *versión enmendada de 1274*, a minor re-write between the two principal recensions. T also provides closer evidence of the Alfonsine text in the second half of the chronicle than is provided by E2. Sancho VI's *versión amplificada de 1289* is represented by E2. Within the limits of the project, the edition in its initial phase therefore covers as much of the textual variation of the *Estoria* as possible. The overall aims of the edition are therefore:

1) to provide transcriptions of the five aforementioned manuscripts in TEI-compliant xml. These will be linked, subject to archival permissions, to images of the manuscripts;

2) to provide a range of digital tools which will permit the collation of the transcriptions and ensure that the texts of the edition can be searched in a variety of ways;

3) to publish a digital edition made up of the aforementioned transcriptions and tools, alongside the possibility to access the text of the different recensions of the *Estoria* and a hypothetical primitive, Alfonsine, version; and,

4) to create a virtual community to allow academic exchange on the subject of the *Estoria*.

In order to complete these aims, a number of theoretical problems must first be worked out.

One might imagine that the choice of base text is the least problematic question to be resolved, given that E is an obvious candidate due its royal nature and canonical status. In the event, we have chosen E as the base text, in part for these reasons, but the question is not unproblematic. E, as is well known, is a composite manuscript made up of elements

composed at three different historical moments, only one of which is Alfonsine. In consequence, the base text contains elements that could never have figured in the Alfonsine original. The base text must therefore be treated with care; although it is the underlying material for the collation system, it should not be seen as having a superior status to other manuscripts and texts.

Although the basis of the edition is the transcription of each of the witnesses separately, in order for a full collation of all the witnesses to be effected correctly, it is clearly necessary for a numbering system to be in place. In the case of the *Estoria* edition, it was decided at an early stage that the rubrics of the royal manuscript E (made up of E_1 and E_2) would serve as the basic textual division and that these would be marked by the use of the <div> xml tag. There were two reasons for this choice. In the first instance, the only Alfonsine manuscript of any of the text is contained in E_1 and E_2 (partially in the latter case). In consequence the edition aims to respect, where possible, the earliest medieval textual disposition. The second reason to adopt this means of editorial organisation is to allow easy cross-reference to Menéndez Pidal's print edition which has served so many studies for so long. Thus, although the <div> numbers do not correspond exactly to the numbering of the *PCG* edition, each <div> will be marked with the corresponding *PCG* chapter number.[15] This rationale, a fundamentally pragmatic one, may serve to illustrate the limits of editorial creativity. It is perfectly possible to invent an entirely new means of ordering the text of the *Estoria*, however, the multiplicity of chronicle names which have blighted the study of Iberian historiography point to the necessity of certain agreed standards. Of course, a great advantage of the digital edition is that it could account for all of the possible naming conventions in the same place.

The next level of numbering is that of anonymous blocks, marked by the <ab> tag, the next level down in our hierarchy of xml tags. In one sense, since the principal motivation for the division of the text into anonymous blocks is for the purposes of collation – that is, so that the text of all of the witnesses is readily comparable – there is no direct need for any agonising over where the division into anonymous blocks should be made; one could choose to divide the text of the different chapters (i.e. text enclosed in the <div></div> tags) of the *Estoria* in perfectly regular manner, irrespective of the meaning of the text. In the

---

[15] An additional, higher, level of textual division in some manuscripts will of course require a different tag.

case of poetry one might imagine that both verse and metre would be a significant element in deciding how the text is to be divided for the collation. And since the users of an edition of verse might very well be interested in comparing texts at this level, it is a central concern for those who make editorial decisions. In the case of prose however, the considerations are rather different. Once the higher level of chapter (in this case <div>) has been established it could be suggested that there is no particular need to mirror apparent medieval structural considerations in the xml-structured text, not least because the division at this level may be of no interest to many users. Although the basic function of the <ab> tag is that of permitting the implementation of the collation system without any particular reference to the internal or semantic structure of the base manuscript, it was decided to attempt to replicate some of the medieval structuring devices in the use of the <ab> tag. The reason for this was to permit future users to employ the xml tags (<ab> in this case) to analyse the dynamics of the text, and since some division using <ab> tags was necessary in any case, it was felt that a system which recognised medieval practice to some extent, had advantages that a more mechanical approach did not. Medieval punctuation is frequently considered as an obstacle to editing (if considered at all), and yet it serves as part of the textual evidence. So the solution adopted was to attempt to mimic, where possible, the structural characteristics of the *Estoria* represented by the scribes' punctuation. This, of course, requires a degree of editorial judgement and there is no guarantee of consistency, particularly since there is no Castilian equivalent of Parkes' *Pause and Effect* to establish a semantic basis for a division which at least casts a nod in the direction of medieval punctuation. It seems clear that in the manuscript text from around 1270 and 1289 (that is, the Alfonsine scribes and their immediate inheritors working in royal scriptoria) there is a relatively standard usage of punctuation, although this in practice may mean no more than the use of *litterae notabiliores* and/or *paraph*/*calderón* to mark the beginning of a sense division. Using the punctuation of these sections as a basis for the <ab> divisions therefore seems perfectly reasonable; but it is not without hazards. For one, E (the base text on which all the <div>, <head> and <ab> tags are based) is a composite text which includes some fourteenth century sections. Although the *usus scribendi* in the thirteenth century sections seems quite consistent it is clearly less so in those parts composed in the fourteenth century. Furthermore, even when the punctuation is coherent, on occasions (particularly with regard to dates) it is done in such a

way that would prevent useful collation. The editor must then make a judgment whether or not to respect the textual structure. Of course, the marks themselves appear in the transcription, so they are still perfectly usable by any scholar. But it is clear that the use of the xml tags to mimic medieval textual structure is not without its problems. Another issue arising is the relationship between the base text and the transcription of E. E is a manuscript of the *Estoria*, like any other, and provides us with a structure for collation and transcription. But E and the base text are not the same thing. Following E in the establishment of <ab> (and <div>) has a logic, because this tries to respect the sense divisions of the medieval text. But in consequence, having a base text for collation means that all other codices (all but one of which are non-Alfonsine of course) must fit into the <ab> division of the base text (itself derived from E), and this may subvert the textual logic of these texts in their own contexts of composition and consumption. That is, if one accepts the reasonable proposition that a base text is necessary for the purposes of collation one also accepts that some form of structuring device (in this case the use of <head>, <div> and <ab> tags is necessary. It is perfectly possible, however, that this textual structure does not represent the textual dynamics of each individual witness. It may be that the underlying xml structure presents no particular difficulty in this regard, since each codex is transcribed separately. But one cannot get around the structural question without transcribing all of the texts individually according to their own internal textual logic. And in doing this, the possibility of collation becomes (at least in current technology) a chimera, because there is no basis for comparison, since computers need tagging which tells it the text to be compared.

Thus each element of the text can be identified by a unique number made up the hierarchical <div> (roughly "chapter") and <ab> (roughly "semantic unit") within which it appears, and although these are not immediately visible to the end user, they may (with certain reservations) be of some use to scholars in their analysis of the *Estoria*.

The next element in the hierarchy of editorial decisions concerns the level of transcription itself. Every act of transcription pre-supposes editorial judgement. The sleight of hand involved in digital transcription lies in its apparent fidelity. That is, in transcribing the *Estoria* we attempt to represent digitally that which exists in manuscript form and we therefore run the risk of being accused of occluding the act of editing which is presupposed by each keystroke. If traditional print editions were accused of presenting as authentic and authoritative that which

was presented in print, there is a different but parallel danger with digital transcriptions. It could be said that this danger is not a relevant one for digital editions; for users will always be able to compare the transcriptions with the manuscript images that accompany them. In this sense, digital editions are a major step forward in the presentation of medieval texts. But each edition must also establish a set of clear principles for transcription. In the case of the *Estoria*, we aim to provide both a diplomatic transcription and an expanded one of each of the witnesses (it is hoped to add transcriptions of other codices in subsequent stages of the edition). Note that although the former attempts to mirror as closely as possible what is on the manuscript page, it is not a graphetic transcription; we do not attempt to mimic variant letter shapes, for example, although we do attempt to represent punctuation. The use of xml tags allows us to expand scribal abbreviations and also to note any form of scribal variation. In many cases, this is unproblematic. For example, the use of the tags q<am>-</am><ex>ue</ex> to represent q macron, or <am> τ </am><ex>e</ex> to represent the tironian sign, should not cause difficulties. But not all such decisions are so straightforward. Although many of these may not have a direct incidence on the users of the edition, there are many cases in which editorial judgement is required in deciding on the expansion. An early example of this was identified by Polly Duxfield, Marine Poirier, and Christian Kusi Obodum, and it concerns the expansion of the following abbreviation from manuscript E_2:[16]

It is clear that the token in question is the result of the development of Latin MULIEREM (Mod. Cast. *mujer*). In principle, one could take the view that since 1) E provides us with our base text, and 2) it is (in parts) the earliest attestation for the *Estoria*, we should follow the practice of the manuscript. The issue in this case is: should this be expanded as *mugier* or *muger*, since both are attested in the manuscript (127 times and 106 times respectively). E_1, which is entirely text from the 1270's Alfonsine *taller*, also has attestations of both, with a marked preference for *mugier*. E2 is of course a composite manuscript. A large proportion

---

[16] The basic issue is discussed in the project blog at http://estoria.bham.ac.uk/.

of the attestations of *muger* come from the folios of the text which we know to have been compiled in the 1340's, while the opposite is true of *mugier*. In this light we seem to be witnessing an example of the evolution of a particular orthographic variant (and perhaps palatal consonants). In which case, one might ask what rationale should be used for the expansion. In principle, one might suggest that the Alfonsine practice should be followed. But although this might lead to a rule of following the earliest variant, in this case the Alfonsine practice seems not to have been especially consistent. Of course, the same problem exists for print editors, and one might take the view that it is less significant in digital editions since the user will be able to consult the manuscript image in the same place as the transcription. But whether users do in fact do this, or tend to rely more heavily on the transcriptions without reference to the images is not clear. A similar point could be made with respect to the graph "ñ". One could take the view that the graph which exists in modern Castilian should be used to represent what is clearly a palatal nasal, since it appears this way frequently in the manuscript. But Alfonsine practice seems to have leant towards the graph "nn" rather than "ñ". If the principle established for the project is that expansion decisions are to be taken relying heavily on the Alfonsine evidence, then "ñ" will always be expanded to "n*n*" in the xml tags and therefore in the version of the transcription that has the abbreviations expanded. An editorial decision is therefore being made on the basis of the *usus scribendi* of one codex, chosen among all the codices for a range of perfectly valid, and transparent, reasons. However, the consequence of this is that expansions will also be made in the transcriptions of other manuscripts. Some of these are fourteenth or fifteenth century scribal compositions, and it is perfectly possible that, say, the graph "nn" never appears in these witnesses. As a result, the expanded transcriptions of these manuscripts may contain readings which never appear in the *usus scribendi* of the codex. An editor could choose to have different expansions for different manuscripts, but such an editor would have to develop some consistent rationale for choosing particular expansion. In itself, this need not be a problem; the expansion resulting from the xml tags are necessary for a variety of reasons; not least to account for scribal variation within each manuscript. Provided the users of the edition are aware of this, and understand that the images of the manuscript and the diplomatic transcriptions are the most accurate representations of the text of the manuscripts and the only ones valid for historical linguistic functions, then any danger of confusion is reduced. But the point remains that digital

editions, like any other, suppose the existence of an editor and editorial decisions. The full list of editorial conventions and norms, alongside the rationale for their use will of course be published with the edition.

A final theoretical question, specific to the *Estoria* arises. With the partial exception of the *versión crítica*, represented by the fifteenth-century copy Ss, none of the manuscripts contain the complete text of any of the recensions, so in order for the users to be able to access the text of any or all of the recensions, a composite transcription will have to be provided. This is, as stated above, one of the aims of the project; that is, each user should have the possibility to access a transcription of the individual manuscripts and also the manuscript text of the two principal recensions, the 1270s *primitiva* and the 1282 *crítica* (and indeed the 1289 recension). The project is designed in such a way as to permit the subsequent addition of transcriptions of the remainder of the codices of the *Estoria*; something which may alter our understanding of the textual relations of the manuscripts. Foregrounding manuscript text (or at least twenty-first century transcriptions of manuscript text) is, in itself, a laudable aim as it places the material dimension of medieval culture at the heart of the object of study as well emphasising the variability of medieval textuality and the importance of contextual understanding of each manuscript. However, it is also possible to present a hypothesis of an Alfonsine *Estoria*, and this is the final aim of the project.[17] For a variety of reasons, we have chosen to attempt a hypothesis of the *versión primitiva*; Alfonso's 1270's text that was never completed in full. Inés Fernández-Ordóñez's philological research reveals that the text of the *primitiva* (itself divisible into two sub-families, the *regia* and the *vulgar*) can be represented in the following way:

Versión primitiva
1. Beginning to end of reign of Eurico: E1 (regia) Q (vulgar)
2. Gothic kings to the third year of Pelayo: E1 (regia) T (vulgar/enmendada después de 1274)
3. Third year of Pelayo to year 18 of Alfonso II: E1/E2ª (regia) T (vulgar/enmendada después de 1274, partially)
4. Year 18 of Alfonso II to end of Alfonso II: E2ᵇ (regia) T
5. Ramiro I a la muerte de Vermudo III: T, indirect evidence from E2
6. Castilian and Leonese monarchs to the capture of Córdoba in 1236: indirect evidence E2 (no direct testimony for this section)[18]

---

[17] For an example of this procedure in practice, see L. Funes and F. Tenenbaum, *Mocedades de Rodrigo: a Critical Edition*, Woodbridge, Tamesis, 2004.

[18] Fernández-Ordóñez, «La transmisión», pp. 223-230.

The hypothesis of an Alfonsine primitive version will therefore employ the manuscripts above in each of the respective sections, and emended by reference to the other manuscript in each case, and also by reference to Ss, which provides the text of the *versión crítica*. At all moments, the hypothetical edited text will be cross-referrable to the text of each of the manuscripts. In subsequent phases of the edition, the hypothetical text will also cross-refer to that of each of the other witnesses added. The dynamic nature of digital editions will also permit emendation of the hypothetical, edited text as more textual evidence becomes available. In that sense, the hypothesis will be ever-evolving.

To make it clear that the neo-Lachmannian hypothesis of an Alfonsine text does not represent any of the individual witnesses, it will be presented in regularised form. The guidelines for graphic presentation have not as yet been fully worked out, but they are expected to be broadly in line with the CHARTA norms, as was done in the case of Leonardo Funes' hypothesis of the Mocedades de Rodrigo. These are:

Vocalic/consonantal u and v regularised
Vocalic/semivocalic/consonantal i and j regularised;
Use of y also regularised except when itrepresents the conjunction and finally
Vibrant transcribed as rr except after l, n and initially.
l and ll to represent alveolar and laterals respectively
ff, mm, cc, and ss (initially) simplified
c and ç regularised
q retained for /k/ in qual quando etc.
n for alveolars and ñ for palatals, macron realised as m before b, p, m
ph > f and ch > c
Tironian sign transcribed as e
Modern separation and union of words
Use of tilde on monosyllables to distinguished between conjunction and adverb
Modern use of capitalization and punctuation.[19]

The rationale behind most of these emendations is a phonetic one. That is, in creating an entirely artificial text (in the sense that no manuscript of the *Estoria* could ever have looked like this) the editors are aware that a major leap of faith is being taken, for it is assumed that the relationship between graph and phone is an entirely direct and unproblematic one. The hypothetical text that ensues must therefore be clearly marked as such. The temptation for most non-specialists will be to employ the

---

[19] Funes, *Mocedades*, pp. lxxi-lxxii.

easily readable and regularised text for the purposes of citation, thereby according to it a thoroughly unjustified authority. But the value of such a hypothesis lies in its lack of authority and absence of fixed readings. For as hypothesis, far more than is the case for the transcriptions from which it emerges, it is open to constant correction and updating. Perhaps this is where the greatest mind shift from print to digital must occur, for it is precisely in the text which gives the appearance of greatest authority that the greatest level of textual instability lies.

A final consideration for the project concern not the subject matter but rather the manner of its composition and it is, once more, an indication of the range of possibilities offered by digital editions, possibilities which do not, and indeed could not, enter into the mind of a print editor. The composition of the transcriptions, and indeed the collation of them, is a collaborative exercise in the *Estoria* project. The edition uses the Textual Communities project, based at the University of Saskatchewan, as a tool for transcription. As a result, it is possible for a range of transcribers to work at the same time on different parts of the same codex. There are two further consequences emerging from the use of Textual Communities. 1) As the edition is produced under Creative Commons, all of the materials (with the obvious exception of the images) will be freely available for use in future projects. As a result, the edition of the *Estoria de Espanna* is not, of itself, the end product of the project. On the contrary, and very much in contrast to the fixed nature of printed editions, the *Estoria* edition will not foreclose future re-interpretations but rather positively encourage them. In this sense, the edition is no longer a permanent fixing of the *Estoria*, but rather a reflection of the state of knowledge *at this time*. Cached versions will of course permit future scholars to understand that reflection as a product of the early twenty-first century academic context, but the ability of future scholars to modify that understanding, and to modify the raw material of the edition, will be a central part of the dynamic nature of the edition. In one sense, of course, the editorial decisions taken now (with respect to textual structure for example), may discourage alternative structuring of the material compiled for the project. But the discouragement produced by inertia does not necessarily lead to obligation to accept the editorial decisions made now, and future editors will be free to re-interpret and re-structure the transcriptions produced by the project. 2) The collaborative nature of the exercise, and the use of Textual Communities, brings another ancillary benefit: the possibility of expanding the transcribing community beyond the confines of academia and thereby

encouraging a wider range of interested parties to be involved in the act of transcription. To this end, the project has begun to employ crowd-sourcing (October 2014). It is unlikely that the *Estoria de Espanna* could ever reach the heights of, for example *Transcribe Bentham*, but it is possible that an educated community of interested parties could be mobilised. As such, the digital means at the very least allows for the dissemination of knowledge to a wider community than was likely with a print edition, both in the sense of the production of materials for the use of a non-specialist audience and in the sense of involving that community in the very construction of the edition itself.

The *Estoria de Espanna Digital* will therefore provide an edition of Alfonso's chronicle, but not one in the traditional sense, since it both reconfigures the object of study and the means of presenting it in a variety of ways. Alongside the production of a critical edition, we will also provide a full transcription guide, published as part of the edition, which may help to develop the standards for future editing of medieval Iberian prose. In this way, the sustainability of the edition lies as much in the willingness of future scholars to engage with the *Estoria* and its materials as in those involved in the current edition.