The depiction of Alfonso X as a bumbling astrologer king who lost his throne because of his preoccupation with the stars is a fabrication that, while cleverly connecting Alfonso's cultural zenith with his political nadir, is more harmful than helpful inasmuch as it deviates from an accurate presentation of historical fact. This study examines the hitherto unexplored relatedness of two aspects of this nadir and zenith - namely, the connection between Alfonso's chancery, that writing chamber from which issued his statute law, and his royal scriptorium, that writing chamber from which issued his cultural legacy, his various treatises on astronomy-astrology, history, and law, his *Cantigas de Santa Maria*, and his treatise on board games. Rather than two chambers, what actually may have existed was a dual chamber or possibly, and more simply, a single chamber.

The Alonsine prologue -- the prologues found in his royal scriptorium treatises produced under his aegis and surviving today in several extant royal scriptorium codices -- offers an important bit of evidence on how Alfonso viewed his work. As Margo Ynes Corona de Ley has observed, "The prologue can be seen as the point of contact of the author, the text, and the audience." [1] Although the question of audience is important too and is discussed later, the first two elements of this triad, showing the relationship between the author Alfonso and his text, form the special interest of this study. An examination of this author/text duality, combined with information from recent studies treating his
historical texts (as well as [91] from another study in which I establish a nexus between the royal scriptorium prologue and a foral or local statute document known as the privilegio rodado), permit observations that tie the studies together. These observations also suggest motives for Alfonso's more than thirty years of sustained scholarship, which produced what might be viewed as his cultural journey toward empire.

The question of authorship in Alfonsine royal scriptorium redactions has a long history. Despite the more than seventy years since Antonio Solalinde's seminal article on Alfonsine intervention, [2] however, we are far from a comprehensive picture regarding the monarch's personal intervention as author. This assessment does not belittle what has been done, but rather signals the great amount remaining to be done before we have a complete understanding of Alfonso's specific role in the production of his works. Solalinde's findings merit repetition. The first passage he cites hails from the General estoria and explains how Alfonso viewed regal authorship:

Regarding the redaction of these words, you have heard in the beginning of this chapter how Our Lord stated that he would write them; and here he states in the twenty-fourth chapter of Exodus that he ordered Moses to write them; and you also will have heard in the book called Deuteronomy . . . that says that Our Lord himself wrote them. And it seems that these statements are contradictory. Concerning this contradiction Master Peter speaks and explains thus: [92] he says that all is correct, and that we can understand and say that Our Lord composed the content of the commandments, and that he had authorship and credit therefrom, because he ordered them to be written, although Moses wrote them; thus we have said many times: a, king makes [writes] a book, not because be wrote it with his own hands, but because he composes its arguments, and emends them, and makes them uniform, and rectifies them, and shows the way they should be done, and thus he whom he [the king] orders writes them, but we say for this reason that the king writes the book. Also, when we say the king makes a palace or some work, this is not said because he himself makes it with his hands, rather because he ordered it made and provided the things necessary for it. And he who does this, that person receives credit for doing the work; and we thus, I see, are accustomed to speak. [3]

Alfonso not only presents here his view on regal authorship but also provides an example of the kind of revelatory gloss lurking within all of his prose. Francisco Rico notes in the last nine words a contrast between the use of the regal first-person plural "we" (nos) and the first-person singular of the verb "I see" (veo) and suggests that this may be a specific example of Alfonsine dictation. [4] I would add as more evidence of direct Alfonsine intervention a passage, one of several possible, from the Libro del saber de astrologia, or LSA, which I am currently editing. Although this passage is less remarkable because it lacks the contrasting features as seen above, it nevertheless shows that Alfonso goes beyond his source, even in his scientific treatises, and adds a very personal element in these nonliterary works. The treatise on the construction of the Açafeha in the LSA compendium offers the following:

We the king, the aforesaid don Alfonso, seeing the usefulness of his saphea which is generally for all latitudes, and how this instrument is very complete and perfect, and how it is difficult to calibrate, and that many men could not fully understand the manner in which it is made according to the words that the sage who composed it spoke, we ordered it to be illustrated in this book. And we ordered that all those circles called almadarat be done in black ink . . . And also so that these circles may be better recognized and more distinct from the others, we had the space between
them tinted in saffron. And we also ordered the circles that are called *almamarrat* in Arabic, that go from one terrestrial pole to the other, [done] in vermilion, and the circles of longitude that are parallel to the zodiac and in a direct line with it, and also the circles of the latitudes that go from one pole of the signs to the other. And these two kinds of circles are to the zodiac as the other two are to the equator. And these four kinds are all the circles drawn on the surface of the lamina. And because there are many and they resemble one another, we distinguished them with different colors as stated. [5]

[93] Solalinde takes his second passage, one long known, concerning Alfonso's editorial intervention, from the same *LSA*. The passage does not survive in its royal scriptorium form since that portion of the *LSA* codex has been lost. Its actual existence, however, is attested by its survival in three variant copies. Solalinde cites the following passage from the first edition:

And afterward the above-mentioned king rectified it and had it fixed. And he removed the words he thought were superfluous and duplicated and that were not in true Castilian *castellano drecho*. And he put those others which he thought completed the work. And as for the language, he himself corrected it. [6]

This evidence and that previously cited suffice to show the accuracy of Evelyn Procter's summary regarding Alfonso's role as author:

If taken together, the prologues of all these astronomical and astrological works show that Alfonso was more than a mere patron: that he sought for books, initiated projects, allotted work among his collaborators, gave them their instructions, and to some extent revised their work; finally he was a scholar who could appreciate the results of their labours. [7]

This stance is distinct from and much more acceptable than George McSpadden's unsubstantiated claim that Alfonso was author of all his prologues, [8] or George Sarton's pronouncement, also unsubstantiated, that Alfonso was author of ten prologues. [9] Even Alberto Porquera Mayo's hypothesis that "Alfonso X's prologues are probably his own work" [10] is unacceptable to the extent that it stresses probability.

The most thorough treatment of the Alfonsine prologue occurs in the study cited above by De Ley, "The Prologue in Castilian Literature between 1200 and 1400," which asserts nothing concerning Alfonso's role as author of the prologue. For our concerns, it is more important that her examinations of topics, techniques, and terms reveal little uniformity among the various prologues. Because of the non-belletristic nature of the Alfonsine treatises, creative variety is not an expected quality as it might be in works of a more literary nature. The lack of uniformity, thus, suggests absence of a fixed plan for his prologue, and possibly that more than one author composed them. One prologue constant from De Ley's point of view is Alfonso's preoccupation with the transfer of learning (*translatio studii*): "Insistence on this is so frequent and so emphasized in his prologues that it amounts to an obsession on his part." [11] This transfer, that is, the handing down or the preservation of knowledge, is important, for the motive behind it is consistent with nearly all aspects of the literary activity espoused by the king.

[94] Antonio Ballesteros Beretta muses over the plausibility of the idea that Alfonso developed a bent for the Galician lyric, the medium of his profane and Marian poems, as a youth raised in northwestern Spain. [12] Similarly, Alfonso's infatuation with knowledge and letters must have begun at an early age under the guidance of the best tutors, as John Keller and E. N. van Kleffens claim. [13] Charles
Faulhaber indicates that the *Epistolarium*, an *cars dictaminis* or rules of letter-writing by Ponce of Provence, points toward the possibility that "Alfonso himself studied *dictamen* with one of the best-known teachers of that art." [14] Even Alfonso's claim that he finished the *Setenario* at his saintly father's request is in keeping with what must have been his father's interest in his preparation. [15] Van Kleffens even claims that one of Alfonso's tutors was the Bologna-trained jurisconsult Jacobo de la Junta, ultimately known as Jacobo de las Leyes, [16] though the information provided by Jean Roudil would appear to make this unlikely. [17]

Alfonso's own education may - and I stress that I am conjecturing here- be reflected in his *Siete partidas*. The second partida states that kings and queens should teach their royal offspring, besides the decorum detailed in previous laws, other things:

and this is reading and writing, which is very advantageous to the one who knows how, for learning more easily the things he wants to know, and to better safeguard his secrets. [18]

Another passage explains why a king should be eager to know how to read and learn everything possible:

The king should be eager to learn the arts because by them he will understand the basis of things and will better know how to work with them, and also by knowing how to read he will better know how to guard his secrets and be lord of them, which in any other manner he would not be able to do well, because by the inability to know these things he would necessarily have to involve another who knows how. And it could come to pass to him what King Solomon said, that he who places his secret in another's power makes himself that person's slave; and he who knows how to keep it to himself is lord of his heart, which is very appropriate for a king. [19]

These laws certainly could explain in part Alfonso's interest in knowledge, and might well mirror his own youthful experiences. As such, they reflect a part of the influence that Fernando III had on his son.

This paternal influence manifests itself in other areas and is worth noting because it provides valuable insights for the raison d’être of Alfonso's royal scriptorium legacy. To begin with, Alfonso inherited not only his father's chancery but also the use of the vernacular in chancery documents. Although Spanish became the norm in Alfonsine documents, [20] Fernando had used Spanish in documents as early as 1 January 1214, [21] more than two years before Alfonso was born. When Alfonso ascended the throne, his chancery was essentially that of his father. Van Kleffens writes:

The labours, in the field of law, of Kings Ferdinand the Saint and Alfonso X his son, have to be seen as a continuous creative process, borne along by that single preoccupation these monarchs shared: to bring about more legal unity and uniformity, and to improve the law generally. [22]

If they shared a common goal, it was a goal initiated by Fernando III and inherited, albeit perhaps expanded, by his firstborn.

The benefit that educated men provide the commonwealth is no secret, and thus, in a charter dated 6 April 1243, Fernando III wrote: "Because I understand that it is to the benefit of my kingdom and of my land, I grant and order that there be schools in Salamanca." [23] Eleven years later, in a charter dated
8 May 1254, Alfonso continues this favor:

And with the great desire that I have that the university [studium] be more advanced and improved, I heeded those things they asked of me; and I took my counsel and my accord about those things with the bishops and archdeacons and with other good clergy who were with me; and having that counsel that understood the benefit and honor to me and to my kingdoms and to the scholars and to all the land, I followed it and ordered it and held it as good. [24]

The founding of an institution of higher learning (studium) in Salamanca promotes Fernando's "benefit of my kingdom and of my land," whereas favoring the same studium becomes Alfonso's "benefit and honor to me and to my kingdoms." I discuss elsewhere other echoes found between Fernando's 1243 charter and Alfonso's. [25] Not only did Fernando's influence go from charter to charter, however; since those charters constitute a source for the Siete partidas, that influence extended directly into Alfonso's lex legum, and specifically into his so-called Educational Code, [26] as partida II, title 31, laws I-II. [27]

Law II of that title holds particular interest for this discussion of Alfonso's attitude toward education, for in it he provides for a stationer (stationarius), so that the university might be complete. The stationer's main responsibility was to provide good, true, and legible books so that [96] students could copy from them, emend the ones they had, and so on. The rector of the university was responsible for choosing a qualified stationer and for insuring that the texts the stationer provided met the stated criteria-good, true, and legible. The rector, in consultation with the university people (the masters not the students), [28] set the price.

The great detail given in the matter of the stationer points to what had to be a major problem for any medieval university, the accessibility of texts. And it raises the question why Alfonso, given his interest in education, did not confront the problem of texts directly. He had at his disposal, in the scholars assembled for his scriptorium, the wherewithal to produce "good, true, and legible" texts for the university. Valeria Pizzorusso has edited, for example, an An dictandi for rhetoric, which Alfonso had apparently commissioned and destined for use at the university at Salamanca. [29] Procter adds the following information:

The Castilian translations of the Quadripartitum and of the compendium of Ibn-al-Haitam have perished, but are known from Latin translations made from the Castilian, and the Libro de los juicios de las estrellas was also twice translated into Latin by Alfonso's command under the tide Liber magnus et completus de iudiciis astrologiae. [30]

Were the texts to which Procter refers translated for the university as well? Alfonso, it appears, could have supplied it with official texts, but chose not to when he opted for use of the vernacular in his royal scriptorium texts.

Did he choose the vernacular as his medium, as Juan Gil de Zamora states, "so that all could very clearly observe, and in every way understand, things which appear even to the erudite [only] under the embellishments of the Latin language and in a closed and recondite form"? [31] Procter, from whom I cite, affirms that Latin was not at a low level, but rather:

It is probable, indeed, that Alfonso aimed at reaching a wider audience, composed of laymen as well as clerics, than was possible through the medium of a classical
language, but the use of the vernacular seems also to have had behind it national pride and a definite element of propaganda. [32]

I leave Alfonso's reasons for using the vernacular to those who care to speculate. It is not unlikely, however, that the example set in his father's chancery initiated the momentum toward the vernacular. As Julio González has noted:

By the time Fernando III began to reign, the vernacular was vigorously on its way; it appeared with growing frequency and more or less integrity in private [97] documents and was appearing in royal commands; during his [Fernando III's] period, it would end up by dominating in the last decade. [33]

Use of the vernacular provides a link not only between Fernando's and Alfonso's chanceries, but also between Alfonso's chancery and scriptorium.

Another bond between father's and son's chanceries, again extending to Alfonso's chancery and scriptorium, is a type of foral document known as the privilegio rodado. This document corresponds to the French diplome [34] and is characterized by its "principal sign of validation . . . the royal signum-the rueda or signo rodado" [35] namely the large polychrome wheel dominating usually the interior third of its lower half and "incorporating the king's signum and heraldic devices in a blaze of color." [36] Procter describes the wheel in more detail; she makes clear that its use in Castilian and Leonese chanceries predated Alfonso X by nearly a century, and that those chanceries probably based their rueda on the papal rota. [37] Indeed, Julio González presents in his "evolution of the signo rodado" [38] four samples of Fernando's signum from 7 November 1217 to 30 November 1248. His last sample reveals the greatest similarity to the Alfonsine wheel as described by Procter and seen, for example, in the fifth and eighteenth plates at the end of allesteros Beretta's monumental Alfonso X el Sabio. [39] The significance of the wheeled charter is that Alfonso was not merely content to continue its use in his chancery; instead, he incorporated its formula into the prologue of his royal scriptorium texts. Procter has examined the formula in such a privilege in light of its description in the Siete partidas (III.18.2), and has listed constituent elements of the formula and frequency of occurrence. [40] I divide these formulaic elements into the following twelve components:
1. Invocation (a short phrase, such as In dei nomine) or a chrismon (both unusual).
2. Preamble (exceptional).
3. Formula of Notification (primarily "let it be known" [conocida cosa sea] until 1260 and predominantly "let all... know" [sepan cuantos] afterward).
4. Royal Superscription consisting of (a) a personal pronoun (singular until 1258 and plural afterward), (b) Alfonso's name and title, (c) a listing of his dominions, and (d) the statement that he reigns with his wife and children.
5. Prefatory Statement to the Seal.
6. Date and Place with (a) place, (b) day of the month, (c) year (according to the Spanish era), and frequently (d) day of the week. For (e) see 8.
7. Indication that the document was drawn up at the king's Command, which may be added to the date or to the redactor's Subscription.
8. Subscription of the redactor, after which we usually find the (6e) regnal Year.
9. Signal events (seldom found). [41]
10. Corroboration formula following the date, consisting of (a) the king's name, (b) mention of his wife and children, and (c) a list of dominions (not identical to that of the Superscription).
11. Royal Signum.
12. List of Cosigners, that is, confirmantes (a pro forma requirement, in that the persons named were not necessarily present or witnesses).

Reproducing the corresponding portion of a charter dated at Burgos, 28 December 1254, not only illustrates Procter's analysis but also shows the theoretical nature of the Siete partidas, in that the charter does not conform exactly to the prescribed formula from partida III.18.2:

[3. Notification] Let it be known to all men who see this letter [4. royal Superscription] that [a. personal pronoun] we [b. name and tide] Don Alfonso by the grace of God king [c. dominions] of Castile, León, Toledo, Galicia, Seville, Córdoba, Murcia, Jaén, and lord of all Andalusia [d. reigning with wife and children] together with the queen Doña Violante my wife, and with my daughters the princess Doña Berenguela and princess Doña Beatriz . . . [corpus] ... [6. Place and Date] Charter done [a. place] in Burgos [7. at king's Command] by order of the king, [6b. day of the month] the twenty-eighth day into the month of December [6c. the year according to the Spanish era] in the era 1292. [10. Corroboration] and I the aforesaid [a. king's name] king Don Alfonso [b. mention of wife and children] reigning together with the queen Doña Violante my wife, and with my daughters the princess Doña Berenguela and the princess Doña Beatriz [c. dominions] in Castile, Toledo, León, Galicia, Seville, Córdoba, Murcia, Jaén, Baeza, Badajoz, and in the Algarve, grant this privilege and confirm it and order that it prevail - [9. Signal event] [in] the year when Don Edward the first son and heir of King Henry of England received knighthood in Burgos from King Don Alfonso the aforesaid . . . [12. list of Cosigners follows] ... [8. Subscription of redactor] I, Juan Pérez of Cuenca, wrote it, [6e. regnal year] the third year that the king reigned.

Items lacking in this charter are the Invocation (No. 1) and the Preamble (No. 2) which, as noted, were usually absent; the Prefatory Statement to the Seal (No. 5); the day of the week (No. 6d), a minor omission; and the royal Signum (No. n). Absence of the royal Signum may be a question of modern editorial fancy rather than an actual absence in the original document. All in all, this document can be considered a typical wheeled charter.

Alfonso uses a very similar formula in every genuine royal scriptorium prologue. The Invocation and Preamble occur infrequenly in the privilege and in these prologues. Vestiges of an Invocation appear in two prologues. In Libro del fuero de las leyes, we read, "We begin this book in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." Does this come from its source? The Iudizios states: "Let us render praise and thanks to God the Father," and later "in the name of God." These two works constitute the exception rather than the norm, and one has to question whether or not presence of the Invocation derives from their source. The Albateni, for example, attributes such custom precisely to its source: "Mahomat, son of Gerber Albatheni, said that the first thing a man should do in beginning a book is to praise God and extol Him." Similarly, Cruzes appears to be citing its source in the rubric for its first chapter, which reads: "In the name of God. This is the book of crosses in the judgment of the stars that Queydaella explained." Whatever may account for an Invocation in the prologue of Leyes and Iudizios, it simply does not form an integral part of either Alfonso's privileges or his royal scriptorium treatises. If preamble means the introductory part of a constitution or statute that usually states the reasons for and intent of the law, little room exists for such in the prologues to the various treatises. If preamble means simply an introductory statement of what is to follow, however, something like that manifests itself in nearly all the prologues under consideration. In some instances, it is a brief one-line synopsis as in EE I, in others, it is substantially more, as in Alfonso's Lapidario.
Although Procter is not specific with regard to the use of the pronoun in the Corroboration, the Superscription and the Corroboration seem essentially identical and can thus be discussed jointly. As Procter points out, the basic difference between the two is that the list of dominions differs slightly in the Corroboration: "En el Algarbe ends the list from the first year of the reign, and Badajoz and Baeza are sometimes included." With the exception of Cruzes, it would appear that Alfonso derives the list of dominions in his prologue from the Corroboration rather than from the Superscription, since his earliest texts, even those prior to 1260, include y del Algarbe. The Superscription and the Corroboration offer the strongest parallels between chancery documents and royal scriptorium treatises. The personal pronoun occurs in five of the thirteen prologues examined (QS, Acedrex, GE I, EE I, and Q). Only in GE I is it singular. Name and title are evident in all prologues except in the treatise on the Quadrante sennero, which contains name only: "And thus, we Don Alfonso the aforesaid, ordered Rabiçag." This results from its being an interior or intratextual prologue, and occurs in others of this kind. Combined with the line "we have spoken thus far in this book on the manners of planetary equations, and by what computation each was done," this suggests strongly that the QS should be dealt with as a part of a larger compendium, rather than as an independent treatise as all of its editors have done. Only three of the thirteen prologues lack a listing of the dominions: the two treatises on quadrants, by virtue of the fact that they are intratextual prologues, and Albateni, an oddity which will be examined subsequently. It should be stressed that Cruzes does not list the dominions either, but alludes to them in a novel fashion: "the very noble king, Don Alfonso of Spain." Iudizios adds "and of Badajoz" after the traditionally last phrase "of the Algarve." Procter indicates a similar occasional inclusion not only of Badajoz but also of Baeza. Finally, rather than mentioning his wife and children in the prologues, Alfonso names his parents-the most common formula being "son of the very noble king, Don Fernando and of the queen Doña Beatriz." Mention of his predecessors, however, is wanting in four prologues (Albateni, Iudizios, and the two intratextual treatises on the quadrants). The term "family" in the prologues denotes progenitors, whereas in the chancery documents it signifies wife and progeny. The reason for this difference may be that the prologues look toward the noble lineage from which Alfonsois descended, perhaps for added prestige, perhaps to honor them, or again, perhaps because they and in particular Fernando III initiated Alfonso into the world of knowledge. The foral (local statute) documents, on the other hand, look toward the future, toward regal heirs, thereby assuring the stability of that legal authority.

Unlike chancery documents, only seven of thirteen Alfonsine prologues contain a Date of compilation, and three of these are from interior prologues of the Libro del saber: In general, minimal chronological information occurs in the prologues, consisting of the year in the form of the era, plus either the anno Domini or the regnal year (and sometimes both, as in Formas). Cruzes also presents the dates, in Arabic terms. Even less commonly found in the prologues, perhaps influenced by its invariable absence in the wheeled privilege, is the date of actual completion, a date perhaps more appropriate for the concluding colophon than for a prologue. Its omission is inconsequential for the latter; nevertheless, a date of completion would be very welcome and useful for the bulky treatises, which indubitably required more than one sitting for their scribing. Only three prologues give dates of completion: Leyes (28 August 1265), Cruzes (26 February 1259), and Lapidario (1250). On the last folio of text, the Acedrex offers the date 1283 and the place Seville, but it is unclear whether this date signifies the time of inception or completion or both. The only prologue to indicate place (Burgos) is that of the Açafeha. The prologue to the Espera offers the day of week, Thursday. Day and month can be found in all but the Formas, Lapidario, Açafeha, and Quadrante. The Lapidario uniquely dates itself with a signal event: "It was concluded in the second year that the noble king Don Fernando won the city of Seville,"
Cruzes alone provides the Arabic chronology. Only two provide the anno Domini: *Formas* as 1276-1279 and *Quadrante* as 1277. Here too, there exists a general mirroring of the formula used in the wheeled charter - although to a significantly lesser extent, since dating is explicit in only five distinct texts (of seven explicit dates, three are found in treatises of the *Libro del saber*). While a date was imperative for legal effectiveness, unfortunately no similar need existed for the dating of Alfonso's scriptorium treatises.

The seventh element of the wheeled charter indicates that the document was drawn up at the king's command. As one might expect, every Alfonsine prologue so indicates. This appears most commonly in the third-person singular (employed twenty times), as in "he had it done" or "he had it translated." First-person plural follows as a distant second, used five times, as in "we had this book done" or "we ordered it compiled." First-person singular occurs in only one text, the *GE I*. Finally, two texts, the *Iudizios* and the *Açafeha*, use the phrase "by order of," duplicating the formula used in the charter to state that a document was drawn up at Alfonso's behest. This listing strongly suggests that at best Alfonso himself wrote perhaps six detailed prologues - those using the first person pronoun, singular or plural. Since the choice of the formula employed can be accounted for in a number of ways, only further detailed analysis of these six compared with the others may determine whether this was in fact the case. The Alfonsine prologues offer no information regarding the names of the scribes who actually sat down to write the texts. The names of Alfonso's collaborators do, however, appear in the prologues and have been studied by several scholars.

The introductory passage to the *Canones de Albateni* is worth examining. It reads: "Here begins the book of the *Canones de Albateni* which the very noble king don Alfonso, to whom may God give life and health for much time, ordered written"; and it is followed immediately by chapter rubrics. Examination of a facsimile copy of the codex of the *Albateni*, housed in the Seminary of Medieval Spanish Studies, suggests that it lacks a listing of dominions because the first folio is a later replacement, written in a Gothic script much rounder than that of subsequent folios, which display the square, compact, squat Gothic script present in all genuine Alfonsine codices. Folio 2r, which is genuinely Alfonsine, contains 47 lines per column, whereas folio IV, the apparent addition, contains 51 lines in the first column and 52 lines in the second. This is not the Alfonsine way. Reconstructing the chapter rubrics on this folio would have been a simple matter of retrieving them from subsequent folios; but reconstructing the prologue according to the formula presented above was another matter, for it would have required: (I) awareness that such a formula existed and (2) access to another royal scriptorium text from which to copy it. Not even the headings that occur on either side of the second folio were copied onto the first folio in the *Albateni*.

It is not clear when the treatises contained in the Paris Arsenal MS 8322 were completed. Bossong in his edition of the *Cañones de Albateni* merely, but prudently, states that the text hails from the second half of the thirteenth century. A matter worth considering at this point concerns the similarity between the script found in an Alfonsine foral document dated 1260, on the one hand, and the script in that Paris codex in a portion tided *Las tablas d'Albathani* and beginning at fol10 28v. The scripts are substantially similar but not identical. It nevertheless seems plausible that an Alfonsine scribe trained in the cursive hand seen in the 1260 document could be responsible for penning the text beginning on fol10 28v and continuing on in that style in the Paris Arsenal manuscript. If so, the *Albateni* offers plausible evidence for contact between chancery and scriptorium. Juan Manuel del Estal provides many plates displaying a Gothic minuscule very comparable to the squat, square, compact style found in bona fide royal scriptorium codices. Again, this script is similar and not identical, being somewhat less compact and less squat. Did Alfonso employ the scribes of his chancery in the production of his royal
scriptorium texts? Procter has uncovered evidence that encourages an affirmative answer, in the persons of Juan de Cremona and Gil de Tibaldos (Egidius de Tebaldis), who seem to have collaborated in both chancery and royal scriptorium. That there were others as well must remain conjectural, a conjecture that is nevertheless plausible and not unreasonable to maintain. One other bridge between chancery and scriptorium exists: the obvious connection provided by the legal documents issuing from Alfonso's chancery and the royal scriptorium legal documents, notably the Siete partidas. Recall that in some instances chancery documents provide the basis for portions of the Partidas.

That Alfonso inherited the chancery from his father, that Alfonso essentially inherited his legal program from his father, that the father commissioned the historical treatise de rebus Hispaniae which Alfonso used as one of the main sources for his Estoria de Espanna and that Alfonso continued using the vernacular, a practice begun by his father -- all make clear that Alfonso essentially continued the impetus provided by his father, and that his royal scriptorium found many of its roots in the chancery which, again, was inherited from Fernando III.

Alfonso's choice of the formula found in the privilegio rodado as a constant in his royal scriptorium prologue was not due to chance, for both Francisco Rico and recently John Dagenais show clearly that Alfonso was aware of what was called an introduction to the authors (accessus ad auctores). Rico cites a passage from Alfonso's General estoria which states:

Many of the masters, when they want to read their books in the universities, require at the beginning of them a certain number of things and others more, some five things, and others six, and there are others (who require) even more.

Alfonso describes here what Edwin Quain calls "the custom of medieval commentators on classical authors of prefixing to their works a schema generally called an accessus. ... In such a prefatory note they treated of items such as the following": the author's life, title of the work, purpose of the writer, matter, utility, and branch of philosophy to which it pertains. Alfonso X does not use such an introduction, obviously because he does not view himself as glossing an author. Gloss he does and refer to authors, too, but to a different end. There is no question that he treats his sources in much the same way that a master at any medieval university would. He presents his material (in writing - at the university, it would be read); he then glosses (the masters did the same). Regarding this, Rico accurately states: "The General estoria -- I believe -- does not offer as much a translation as it does an enarratio [interpretation] of the auctores Alfonso's procedure is the same, but his intention is different.

De Ley's observation concerning Alfonso's "obsession" with the transfer of learning is worth recalling, for that translatio is intimately related to another, the translatio potestatis or translatio imperil (transfer of power or of empire) that Rico has pointed to in his chapter titled "Alfonso X y Jupiter." Rico appropriately finds it significant that of all the great modern kings that could have been named, Alfonso (who if not he?) mentions explicitly only his great grandfather Barbarossa and his uncle Frederick II: that is, the two great emperors of the house of Swabia, from which emanated his own imperial rights and ambitions.

In a brilliant study, Charles Fraker treats the Estoria de Espanna with three problems hitherto unexamined: (I) the chronologies of the later chapters employing the regnal year of the Roman emperor, (2) the favorable portrait of Charlemagne not found in Alfonso's sources, and (3) the stress on the Roman section in this work "with its largely 'Gothic' emphasis." Fraker also convincingly points to a solution in an imperial theme: "that the Crónica was to have ended
sounding loudly the note of Alfonso's Roman and imperial heritage." [81] In another excellent study, Fraker shows how the Estoria de Espanna and the Fet des Romains are both "vernacular works . . . in part translations with commentary of ancient texts; they are not simply amplified versions of Lucan or Sallust, but have the look of a text plus gloss or scholia." [82] The transformation is from "history as spectacle" to "history as example:

Different Latin texts are combined, details added, changes made, at times schemes of motivation are supplied, all to create virtually new narratives which yield these various emphases, these patterns of exemplarity. [83]

Fraker clarifies how the exemplarity makes clear to "the great of this world the practical art of leadership, in peace and especially in war." [84] Similarly Rico, in his usually perceptive manner, states regarding a portion of the GE:

Of course, it is a fact that a good portion of those that could be treated as "digressions" (glosses, meditations and incidental remarks that do not strictly constitute an explication of the account) allude to themes that would fit wonderfully in any treatise on the education of princes. [85]

The practical purpose of history is stated in the prologue of the GE: "so that from the deeds of the good, men would take example in order to do good, and from the deeds of the evil that they would receive a lesson to know what to refrain from doing." [86] Despite or perhaps in addition to that practical purpose, the lesson Fraker extracts from the EE as well as the [105] lesson seen in the GE by Rico is not appropriate for everyone. Such is the case for the audience of Alfonso's scientific treatises. The Lapidario (his earliest work, if the date provided is trustworthy) claims on its first folio that Alfonso had it translated "from Arabic into Castilian so that men would understand it better and better know how to take advantage of it." [87] The requisites for understanding this text, however, make it clear that los omnes, or men, are not everyone. Rather they are the select few: (I) who knew astronomy (which included astrology), (2) who knew how to distinguish between the subtlety of stones, and (3) who knew the art of medicine. [88] An interesting study by John Nunemaker, "Obstetrical and Genito-Urinary Remedies of Thirteenth-Century Spain," [89] treats remedies for these types of ailments and points to the practical reason for having such a work translated. It is no accident that Yhuda Mosca el Menor, Alfonso's own physician, [90] was the man selected to translate this work. Even Alfonso's latest and most scientific text, the LSA, is replete with references to omnes entendudos, or intelligent, learned men for whom such knowledge is intended. Again the audience is not everyone. Three other early codices translated from Arabic -- the Canones de Albateni, the Iudizios, and the Cruzes -- are astrological and thus eminently practical.

If knowing the past was important, how much more practical would be predicting the future? José Sánchez Pérez's remarks concerning the Cruzes are appropriate: "The Libro de las cruzes is an astrological work with the deliberate intention of gathering only those judgments of judicial astrology that can most affect the person of a king and the politics of his kingdom." [91] The ludizios falls into a similar category. The Albateni, on the other hand, seems more astronomical in a modern sense; but astronomy was merely the handmaiden of astrology, a necessary means to the end, since astrology constituted a major cultural fiber in the tapestry of Alfonso's cultural milieu when "the rise and fall of the Christian west were subjects of earnest calculation." [92] Alfonso stayed within Christian orthodoxy by making the stars the servants of God, since, according to Alfonso, God made
These figures [the constellations] all and in such a manner, and placed them there where He understood it would be best. And He gave them virtue and power so that by them men would be able to help themselves in their deeds and in the things for which they had great need, also for knowing the past as well as the future. Because this - knowing things that are to be before they are - is something that man's soul greatly desires. [93]

Thus, history and science, one looking backward for exemplarity, the other looking forward, constituted a potential Janus of knowledge that any [106] prudent king would want to utilize, especially one living in Alfonso's bellicose era. Not only did the infidel constantly threaten, but Alfonso also had to contend with an unruly nobility and the complications of his claim to Holy Roman emperorship. [94] For Alfonso not to have connected a *translatio studii* to a *translatio potestatis*-learning and power yoked-both from his ancestors to him and especially a *translatio* from him to his progeny, would have been impractical if not foolhardy. From Alfonso's viewpoint, as evident in the *Partidas*, the practicality of centralized Roman law over the fractured and partisan foral statutes in effect needed no elaboration.

Even two works that seem to stress delight rather than utility, the *Cantigas de Santa María* and the *Libro de acedrex & dados & tablas*, take on practical characteristics. Joseph Snow has elucidated perceptively two supremely practical motives for the *Cantigas*: on the one hand and ultimately, Alfonso's own quest for salvation, but on the other hand, the more earthly and immediate assistance from the Mother of God. [95] The basic formula in each miracle is that the Virgin provides succor to her devotees. John Kellerhas noted twenty-eight miracle accounts that "relate miracles performed by the Holy Virgin for King Alfonso or for members of his family." [96] Alfonso's last commissioned work, his treatise on games, also takes on a utilitarian appearance as manifested in its beginning words:

> Because God wished that men have every kind of joy for its own sake, so that they might be able to bear cares and labors when they happened, therefore men sought many ways by which they might fully secure this happiness. [97]

This is "recreation" to enable man better to endure the hardships of this world. It was commissioned in Seville, which had maintained its fidelity during Alfonso's troubles with his usurping son Sancho. Completed apparently in the first half of 1283, in the thirty-second year of his reign, when Alfonso was 61 and about one year before his death, it describes various kinds of pleasures-equestrian pastimes, fencing, wrestling, batting a ball, and other games that can be played day or night by

- women who do not ride horseback and are enclosed . . . and also *those men who are old and weak*, or those who wish to take their pleasures privately in order to avoid disturbances or worry; or those who are in foreign power such as prison or captivity or who travel on sea. [98]

Even this final work, a treatise on games, rises from a foundation of practical motives. [107] The question of Alfonsine authorship is a major puzzle that welcomes any piece that any scholar can possibly add. Pragmatism certainly characterizes Alfonso's relationship to his text. His interest in knowledge no doubt began with the education his father afforded him as a prince. His interest in the Galician lyric appears to have been the result of youthful experience. His interest in law is directly attributable to Fernando III. He inherited from his father the use of the vernacular in his chancery documents, as he did his signum in the wheeled charters. The possibility that his royal scriptorium rises from his chancery also seems likely, and certainly his use of the formula of the wheeled charter in his
royal scriptorium treatises derives from his chancery. Using that formula implies an attitude toward the treatises that is much more practical, perhaps political, than if, for example, he had used a standard introduction to the authors (accessus ad auctores), of which he was aware.

Finally, his audience: who could this audience have been? Is it the Latinate ipsi sapientes of Juan Gil de Zamora or Alfonso's universal los omnes? Is it the wider audience of clerics and laymen, as Procter suggests on the basis of Alfonso's own words? The messages and the kinds of knowledge contained in his treatises, except perhaps for the Cantigas, do not seem entirely appropriate for everyone. In the case of all his treatises, especially the Cantigas, the largess required to produce these lavish volumes must have been enormous. The Lapidario, the Libro del saber, the Acedrex, the Cantigas, indeed nearly all his codices, even the unillustrated Iudizio, or the Cruzes, would have made and do make wonderful display books. For whom were these books intended? Certainly not the universities, as we have seen. If these texts "were deposited in the king's chamber," as Procter claims, [99] who besides members of the royal family and immediate nobility would have had access to them? The one scientific treatise that was copied ad infinitum, [100] it would seem, was the Alfonsine Tables. Emmanuel Poulle argues that it circulated in the form provided by fourteenth-century Parisian astronomers; [101] even so, its practical and utilitarian nature and its Latin form provided the impetus for this dispersion. The only vernacular texts that spawned myriad copies were the histories; their interest as records of a translatio potestatis and as guides for princes may account for this. For obvious reasons, the Siete partidas also survives in many codices; the vernacular scientific treatises, the Acedrex, and the Cantigas certainly do not. [102]

In conclusion: content, form, and housing seem to belie the notion that Alfonso in fact "set out to reach a wider audience in his own country than he could have reached through the medium of Latin." [103] Instead they [108] argue for a very practical motivation for his cultural endeavors, a bonding of translatio studii with the translatio potestatis. All this combines to argue in favor of considering Alfonso's chancery and scriptorium ideologically, if not physically, one.

Notes for Chapter Seven

[1] Margo Ynes Corona de Ley, "The Prologue in Castilian Literature between 1200 and 1400" (Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois, 1976; Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1988), 10. My thanks to Kathleen L. Kirk for improving the style of this study; remaining infelicities and errors are mine alone.
[3] All translations within the text are mine unless otherwise indicated. Here I translate from the Alfonsine text in Solalinde's "Intervención" (285 - 86) whose full context follows (emphasis mine).
"Dell escriuir destas palabras auedes oydo enel començamiento deste capitulo, como dixo Nuestro Sennor que el las escriuirie; e aqui dize en el XXXIIIº capitulo dell Exodo que las mando escriuir a Moysen; e auredes otrossi enel libro que a nombre Deuteronomio ...que diz que Nuestro Sennor que el mismo las escriuio. E ssemeia que son contrallas estas razones. E sobrestá contralla fabla maestre Pedro e departe desta guisa: Diz que todo es bien dicho, et que podemos entender e dezir que compuso Nuestro Sennor las razones délos mandados, e que oue ell auctoridad e el nombre dend, por que las mando escriuir, mas que las escruie Moysen; assi como diximos nos muchas uezes: el rey faze un libro, nonpar quel el escriua con sus manos, mas porque compone las razones del, e las emienda et yegua, e enderesca, e muestra la, manera de como se deuenfazer, e desi escriue las qui el manda, pero dezimos por esta razón que el rey faze el libro. Oatrossi quando dezimos el rey faze un palacio oí alguna obra, non es dicho por quelo el fiziesse con sus manos, mas por quel mando fazer e dio las cosas que fueron mester para ello. E qui esto cumple, aquel a nombre que faze la obra, e nos assi ueo que usamos de lo dezir."

"Nos Rey don Alfonso el sobredicho ueyendo la bondat desta açafeha que es generalmientre pora todas las ladezas. & de como es estrumenten muy complido & mucho acabado. & de como es caro de sennalar. & que muchos ombres non podrien entender complidamientre la manera de como se faz por las parablas que dixo este sabio que la compuso; Mandamos figurar la figura della en este libro. Et mandamos sennalar con tinta prieta todos los cercos que son llamados almadarat .. Et otrossi por que sean estos cercillos mas connoscudos & mas departidos d é los otros; fizimos tinnir lo que a entre ell uno & ell otro dellos con acafran. Et mandamos fazer otrossi los cercos que son llamados en arábigo almamarrat que uan de un polo del mundo al otro con uermeion. & los cercos de las longuezas que son en par zodiago. & en so derecho. Et otrossi los cercos de las ladezas que uan del un polo d é los signos al otro. Et estas dos maneras de cercos so[n] al zodíaco; como los otros dos primeros al eguador. Et destas quatro maneras son todos los cercos que a en la faz de la Lamina. Et por que se fazen muchos & se semeian los unos alos otros; fizimoslos sennalar con colores departidas segund es dicho." *Liber del saber de astrokgia*, fol. 109. With minor modifications, I cite all Alfonsine texts as found in the *Concordances and Texts of the Royal Scriptorium Manuscripts of Alfonso X* (above in ch. 1, n. 4).

The treatises (with title abbreviations used in this study indicated within parentheses) contain the prologues examined, and follow: *Canones de Albateni* (Albateni); *Estaría de Espanna*, part I (*EE I*); *General estoría*, part I (*GE I*); *Lapidaria* (same); *Libro conplido en los iudizios de las estrellas* (*ludizios*); *Libro de las formas e [de las] ymagenes* (*Formas*); *Libro de las cruzes* (*Cruzes*); *Libro de las leyes* (*Leyes*); *Libro del quadrante sennero* (*QS*); *Libros de ajedrez, dados e tablas* (*Acedrex*); *Libro del saber de astronomía* (*Libro del saber, LSA*). Not included in this study is the text of the so-called *Picatrix* because it is incomplete at the beginning, the *Tablas de Zarquiel*, the second part of the *Estaría de Espanna*, and the fourth part of the *General estoría*.

My rationale for the title for Alfonso's treatise on games is as follows. Although Alfonso provides no official title for his treatise on games, it seems (at risk of sounding unduly punctilious) that the title "Libro de acedrex & dados & tablas" most closely reflects what Alfonso would have called it, if we can trust Alfonso's written text: "mandamos fazer este libro en que fablamos en la manera daquellos que se fazen mas apuestos assi como acedrex & dados & tablas" (IV 13 C 16, emphasis mine). This title respects the unity of the treatise (libro, not libros) and its thirteenth-century form (both orthography and polysyndeton). *Formas*, strictly speaking, refers to itself as "libro délas formas & délas ymagenes" (Iri-2, emphasis mine). Also, the correct title is not *Libros del saber de astronomía* but *Libro del saber de astrologia*. I have clarified this in my study "A New Tide for the Alfonsine Omnibus on Astronomical Instruments," *La corónica* 8.2 (1980): 172-78. For the *Iudizios*, I follow Gerold Hilty's designation (see below), which is the correct one. For the three treatises found within the *LSA*, I use the titles taken from their texts: *Libro de la espera* (*Espera*); *Libro de la afafeha* (*Afafeha*); and *Libro del quadrante* (*Quadrante or Q*).

*Libros del saber de astronomía*, Rico y Sinobas edn. (above in ch. 5, n. 18), 1:7, as cited in Solalinde, "Intervención": 287. "Et después lo endreço et lo mando componer este rey sobredicho; et tollo las razones que entendió eran soueianas et dobladas, et que non eran en castellano drecho; et puso las otras que entendi ó que complian, et quanto en el lenguaje endrecplo el por si se."

George E. McSpadden, "The Spanish Prologue before 1700" (Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 1947; Ann Arbor, Mien.: University Microfilms, 1976), 21.

"Los prólogos de Alfonso X serían probablemente obra personal suya." Alberto Porqueras Mayo, "Notas sobre la evolución histórica del prólogo en la literatura medieval castellana," Revista de literatura a (1957): 188. This statement becomes less satisfactory when "probablemente" is changed to "siempre" in the reprint in his El prólogocomo género literario (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1957), 80.


[16] Van Kleffens, Hispanic Law, 178-79, who calls him "de las Leyes" and ultimately "de la Junta," whereas Jean Roudil in his edition of the Summa de los nueve tiempos de los pleitos, vol. 1 of his Jacobo de Junta "el de las Leyes" (Paris: Klincksieck, 1986, p.13), reverses the order and calls him "Jacobo de la Junta -- le futur 'el de las Leyes.' "

[17] Roudil claims that Jacobo arrived sometime before the death of Fernando III (Summa de los nueve tiempos, 18). Alfonso García Gallo in his "El 'Libro de las leyes' de Alfonso el Sabio: del Espéculo a las Partidas" (AHDE 21 - 22 [1951 - 1952]: 425) finds it odd that, if Jacobo was a resident in Spain about this time, his name does not appear among those mentioned in the 1253 Repartimiento of Seville as being a part of Alfonso's court; Jacobo, however, is mentioned with distinction in the 1257 Repartimiento in Murcia.

[18] Partidas, II.7.10 (Real Academia edn., 2:52): "Et esto es leer et escribir que tiene muy grant proal que lo sabe para aprender mas de ligero las cosas que quisiere saber, et para poder mejor guardar sus poridades."

[19] Partidas, II.5.16(Real Academia edn., 2: 36 - 37): "Acucioso debe el rey seer en aprender los saberes, ca por ellos entenderá las cosas de raiz; et sabrá mejor obrar en ellas, et otrosi por saber leer sabrá mejor guardar sus poridades et seer señor dellas, lo que de otra guisa non podrie tan bien facer, ca por la mengua de non saber estas cosas haberie por fuerza de meter otro consigo que lo sopiese, et poderle hie venir lo que dixo el rey Salomón, que el que mete su poridat en poder de otro fácese su siervo, et quien la sabe guardar es señor de su corazón; lo que conviene mucho al rey."


[21] González, Reinado y diplomas de Fernando III (see ch. 2 above, n. 4), 2: 67, item 55.


[24] "Et yo con gra[n]d sabor que he quel estudio sea mas auanc,ado e mas aprovechado cate aquellas cosas que me ellos pedieron e oue mi conseio e mi acuerdo con los obispos e con arçidianos e con otros
clérigos buenos, que conmigo eran sobre ellas e auído el consejo aquello quelos entendieron que era pro e onrra de mi e de mios Regnos e dé los escolares e toda la tierra aquello fis yo e mande e toue por bien" (Ajo, *Universidades hisp á nicas*, 1: 438-39).


[31] Ibid., 3: "ut omnes possent evidentissime intueri et intelligere quoquo-modo illa, que sub lingue latine phaleris et figura tecta et secreta, etiamipsis sapientibus, videbantur."

[32] Ibid.

[33] "Ya cuando empezó a reinar Fernando III avanzaba con vigor la lengua romance; aparecía con frecuencia creciente, y con más o menos integridad en los documentos particulares, e iba irrompiendo en los mandatos reales; durante su época acabaria imponiéndose en la última década" (González, *Reinado y diplomas de Fernando III*, 1:19).

[34] "Castilian Chancery," 106.

[35] Ibid., 108.


[38] *Reinado y diplomas de Fernando III*, 1: 517.

[39] See also Juan Manuel del Estal, *Documentos inéditos de Alfonso X el Sabio y del infante su hijo don Sancho* (Alicante, Spain: Universidad de Alicante, 1984), 2: 209. The cover of his work sports a color reproduction of one of these ruedas.


[41] Procter admits to knowing of "only one event thus mentioned-the knighting by Alfonso X of his brother-in-law Edward of England which is commemorated in privileges from October 1254 to December 1255" ("Castilian Chancery," 108).

[42] In "Alfonso X and the *Studium Genérale*," I have discussed at length the theoretical nature of the *Siete partidas* as manifested in its Educational Code (II.31.1 - 2), as compared to the practical *fueros académicos* issuing from Alfonso's chancery. Stanley G. Payne, *A History of Spain and Portugal*, 2 vols. (Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1973) 1: 80, briefly but adequately discusses the ideal nature of the *Siete partidas*. 
Ajo, Universidades hispánicas, 1: 440-41. "Conoscida cosa sea a todos los ornes que esta carta vieren como nos d. Alfonso por la gracia de Dios, Rey de Castiella, de León, de Toledo, de Gallisia, de Sevilla, de Córdoba, de Murcia, de Jahen, é Señor de toda la Andalucía en uno con la Reyna Doña Violante, mi muger é con mis fijos la Infante Doña Berenguella e la Infante Doña Beatris . . . Fecha la carta en Burgos por mandado del Rey veintiocho días andados del mes de Deziembre en era de mili é docientos e noventa é dos años. Et yo [el] sobredicho Rey Don Alfonso, regnante en uno con la Reyna Doña Violante mi muger, é con mis fijas la Infante Doña Berenguella é la Infante Doña Beatris en Castiella, en Toledo, en Leon, en Gallisia, en Sevilla, en Córdoba, en Murcia, en Jahen [sic], en Baeza, en Badaloz, é en el Algarve, otorgo este privilegio et confirmólo é mando que vala, el año que Don Odoarte fijo primero é heredero del Rey Enrique de Anglaterra recebio caballería en Burgos del Rey don Alfonso el sobredicho . . . Johan Pérez de Cuenca la escribió el año tercero que el Rey regno." I have reproduced the text exactly as found, though there are several questionable transcriptions within.

"Comentamos este libro en el nombre del padre. & del spiritu sancto" (Leyes, fol. Ir29 - 30, in the Concordances and Texts).

"Laores & gracias rendamos a dios padre" (Iudizios, fol. in - 2, in the Concordances and Texts).

"En el nombre de dios" (Iudizw, fol. IV 13, in the Concordances and Texts).

Dixo Mahomat fijo de Gerber Albatheni que la primera cosa en que deue omne començar en cada libro es de loar a Dios & alauarlo" (Albateni, fol. 2166 -71, in the Concordances and Texts).

"En el nombre de dyos. Este es el libro de las cruzes en los judizios de las estrellas que esplano Oueydalla" (Cruzes, fol. 4v25-28, in the Concordances and Texts).

Preambles occur with the following distributions: Cruzes, IV55-68; Leyes, 1R 65 - 1V3; Formas, 1R1-5; QS, 136R1-6, 13-21, 28-38; Acedrex, IV13-16; Iudizios, IR44-49; GE I, 1R59-66; EE I, IV 27; Lapidario,112 - 76; LSA: Espera, 24r 6-10; Açafeha, 106V10-2; Quadrante, 166v52-57. The only exception is Albateni, for reasons discussed below.

"Castilian Chancery," 108.

Ibid., 107.

"Et por esto nos don alfonso el sobredicho. Mandamos a Rabicag de Toledo nuestro sabio el sobredicho" (Quadrante sennero, fol. 136.8-40, in Concordances and Texts).

"Pablado auemos fasta aquí eneste libro en las maneras de las equaciones de las planetas. Et por qual razón fue fecha cada una dellas" (Quadrante sennero, fol. 136r7-13, in Concordances and Texts).

Millas, "Nueva obra astronómica" (ch. 5 above, n. 58), 59-92, though at 63 Millas does register its unity. The Concordances and Texts and Georg Bossong's edition of Los "Cañones de Albateni"(Tubingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1978, p. 6) also mention its unity.

"El muy noble Rey don Alfonso Rey despanna" (Cruzes, fol. 2r2o-2i, in Concordances and Texts).

"Et de Badajoz" (Iudizios, fol. ir28, in Concordances and Texts).

"Del Algarue" (Iudizios, fol. ir28, in Concordances and Texts).

"Castilian Chancer," 108.

Cruzes, fol. 202r73-78, in Concordances and Texts.

"Et fue acabado de trasladar el segundo anno que el noble Rey don Ferrando su padre gano la cibdat de Seuilla" (Lapidario, fol. 1V23-24, in Concordances and Texts).
"Mando fazer" (GE I, fol. In6, in Concordances and Texts).

"Mandólo trasladar" (Cruzes, fol. 2r68, in Concordances and Texts).

"Mandamos fazer este libro" (Acedrex, fol. 1v14, in Concordances and Texts).

"Mandamos auyuntar" (EE I, fol. 2V24, in Concordances and Texts).

GE I fol. 1r52, 59, 60, 63, in Concordances and Texts.

"Por mandado de" (Iudizios, fol. 1r41 and Acafeha, fol.106v22, in Concordances and Texts).

Procter, "Scientific Works," 22; Hilty, "El Libro completo" (ch. 5 above, n. n), 39; Romano, "Opere scientifiche," 677-711, especially 687-89.

"Aquí se comienza el libro délos Cañones de Albateni que mando escreuir el muy noble Rey don Alfonso a quien Dios de uida & salud por mucho tiempo" (Albateni, fol. 1r1-10, in Concordances and Texts).

Bossong, Canones, 6.

Zacarías García Villada, Paleografía española, 2 vols. (Barcelona: El Albir, [1923] 1974), 2: píate 56. I am grateful to John J. Nitti for bringing this to my attention, though the discussion is mine and does not necessarily reflect his views.

Documentos inéditos, 105,107-9,112,113, passim.


"Muchos de los maestros, quando quieren leer sus libros en las escuelas, demandauan en los comiences dellos unas tantas cosas e otros más, los unos .v. cosas, et los otros VI, e ay otros que aun más" (GE I, p. 4653, in Rico, Alfonso el Sabio, 180).


Rico, Alfonso, 97-120.

"Que, de 'todos los altos reyes' modernos que cabía citar, Alfonso quién si no?) sólo mencione explicitamente a su bisabuelo Barbarroja y a su tío Federico II: es decir, a los dos grandes emperadores de la casa de Suabia, de donde emanaban sus propios derechos y ambiciones imperiales" (Alfonso el Sabio, 113-14).


Fraker, "Empire," 101.

Fraker, "Fet,(in ch. 2 above, n. 33), 202.

Fraker, "Fet," 211-12.

Ibid., 213.
Desde luego, es un hecho que una porción importante de las que cabra tratar de 'digresiones' (glosas, meditaciones y obiter ateta que no constituyen propiamente una nota explicativa del relato) alude a temas que encajarían a maravilla en cualquier tratado de regimine principum" (Alfonso el Sabio, 100).

"Porque délos fechos délos buenos tomassen los omnes exemplo pora fazerbien. Et délos fechos délos malos que recibiessen castigo por se saber guardar délo non fazer" (GE I, fol. 1r, in the Concordances and Texts).

"De arauigo en lenguaie castellano por que los omnes lo entendiessen meior; et se sopiessen del mas aprouechar" (Lapidario, fol. ivi 8 -19, in the Concordances and Texts).

Lapidario, fol. IV 27 - 44, in the Concordances and Texts.


See Hilty, Procter, and Romano (n. 67 above) for an elucidation of Yhuda's identification and role in the Alfonsine venue; and see ch. 5 above, pp. 61ff.

"El Libro de las cruzes es un trabajo astrológico con el deliberado propósito de reunir únicamente los juicios de la astrología judiciaria que más pueden afectar a la persona de un rey y a la política de su reino." Sánchez Pérez, preface to Libro de las cruzes, ed. Lloyd A. Kasten (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas,1959), x. See also Sánchez Pérez, "El Libro de las cruces: una obra astrológica que don Alfonso X, rey de España, mandó traducir del árabe," Isis 14 (1930): 78.


"Estas figuras tantas & de tal manera. & las pusso allí o entendió que serie meior. Et dioles uertud& fuerca por que se podiessen los ombres ayudar jellas en sos fechos. & ennas cosas que ouiessen gran mester. tan bien en saber lo que era passado; comolo que auia de uenir. Ca esto es cosa que cobdicia mucho ell alma del ombre. saber las cosas que an de seer enante que sean" (Libro de la espera, fol. 15V5663, in Concordances and Texts).

Keller's Alfonso X (21-23, 34-37) and Payne's Spain (80-81) both give an idea of some of the political problems Alfonso had to face.


"Por que toda manera de alegría quiso dios que ouiessen los omnes en si naturalmientre por que pudiessen sofrir las cueytas & los trabaios quandoles uiniessen; por end los omnes buscaron muchas maneras por que esta alegría pudiessen auer complidamientre" (Acedrex, fol. 1r2-12, in the Concordances and Texts).

"Mugieres que non caualgan & están encerradas ... & otrossi Los omnes que son nietos & flatos, o los que han sabor de auer sus plazeres apartadamientre por que non reciban en ellos enoio nin pesar; o los que son en poder ageno assi como en prisión o en catiuerio o que uan sobre mar" (Acedrex, fol. 1r39-47, emphasis added; in the Concordances and Texts).


Pouille, "Les Tables alphonsines sont-elles d'Alphonse X?" in *De astronoma Alphonsi regis* (ch. 5 above, n. 1), 51-69.

The lack of entries corroborates this in the *Bibliography of Old Spanish*, compiled by Charles B. Faulhaber et al. (Madison, Wisc.: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, 1984).