

Theodemundus, Theodericus or Theodemirus: the *Nomina Regum Sueuorum*

Rodrigo Furtado

Abstract:

In 1749, in the fourth volume of his *España Sagrada*, Enrique Flórez (1701–1773) published a long diatribe against the so-called *Diuisio Wambae*, at one point transcribing a list of the kings of the Suevi. Almost all are well known: some were mentioned by Hydatius and others by John of Biclar. Isidore of Seville is the first author to refer to all of them in a single text. There is only one exception: the mysterious king “Theodemundus.” Flórez lists this king but he is not mentioned by any of these three late antique/medieval authors. The text cited by Flórez seems to indicate that this Theodemundus would have been the successor of the well-known king Remismund. But who was he? Is his existence likely? Where did this name come from? Should we include him among the kings of the Suevi? Does his name help us to fill the information gap for Suevic Galicia in the period 469–c. 569? This article aims to provide answers to these questions.

Almost all the manuscripts that transmit Isidore of Seville’s *Historia Sueuorum* (Díaz 120) have the following text after the reference to the conversion of the Suevi to Arianism in 465/6, under King Remismund: *multis deinde Sueuorum regibus in Arriana heresi permanentibus tandem regni potestatem Theodimirus suscepit* (*Hist. Sue.* 90). According to Isidore, “many kings of the Suevi” reigned between Remismund and Theodemirus, a period of about a century up to the 560s. Nowhere in his *Historia* is Isidore as imprecise as here: with the Goths and Vandals, he had faithfully followed the royal succession, without gaps. Perhaps he was less interested in the Suevic kings for whatever reason; or, most probably, he was ignorant of what happened during those hundred years.

In very few of the manuscripts that transmit Isidore’s *Historia* did a copyist try to fill or explain this century-long gap. In twelfth-century Iberia, not even the collections of chronicles that included the *Historia Sueuorum*, such as the *Liber chronicorum* by Pelagius of Oviedo (see Madrid, BN 1513, fol. 27va), the anonymous *Chronica Nairensis* (Madrid, RAH 9/4922, Part I, fol. 14v), or Lucas de Tuy’s *Chronicon mundi* (*Chron. mund.* 2.17) tried to fill the void with any information known or invented.

Isidore did not use a wide range of sources to write about the Goths, Vandals, and Suevi. His library in Seville included at least the *chronica* by Eusebius-Jerome, Prosper of Aquitaine, Hydatius of Chaves, Victor of Tununa, and John of Biclar. In addition to these chronicles, Isidore also had the *Historiae aduersus paganos* by Orosius and certainly the lost *historiola* by Maximus of Zaragoza (*Isid. De uir. ill.* 33).¹ For the *Historia Gothorum*, this *historiola* must have provided the information about the period between the end of the Hydatius’ chronical (in 469) and the beginning of John’s (566–567) (= *Isid. Goth.* 36–47). However, Maximus does not seem to have included any

¹ Unless one considers the anonymous text found in Paris, lat. 4873 to be a copy of Maximus’ *historiola*. This hypothesis was suggested by Collins 1994, pp. 355–356.

information about the Suevi for this period; if he had, Isidore would have used it. In fact, as in the *Historia Sueuorum*, the hundred-year period is never alluded to in the *Historia Gothorum* either.

No other known text allows us to reconstruct the political history in Gallaecia between 468/9 and 569. Jordanes, whose *Getica* Isidore did not read, also tells us about *Remismundum regulum*, but nothing after him (Jord. 44). Not even the texts by Martin of Braga, for example, refer to the Suevic kings before his arrival in Gallaecia in the mid-sixth century.

Certainly, it is possible to fill the gap with the imagination. Isidore himself did so: not knowing what had happened in Gallaecia during those hundred years but aware through Hydatius that there had been a Suevic king there in 468/9 (Hyd. 245 Burgess) and, through John of Biclar, that a certain “Theudemirus” was *Sueuorum rex* before 569 (Bicl. 14 Cardelle), Isidore supposed that, between these two dates, there had been “many kings of the Suevi.”

However, there are some sources that refer to other Suevic kings up to the middle of the sixth century. Isidore was not familiar with the work of Gregory of Tours; if he had read it, he could have added a Chararic, *rex Galliciensis*, precisely when Martin of Braga arrived in Gallaecia, in the mid-550s (Greg. Tur. *De uirt. S. Martini* 1.11). Martin himself does not mention him, Gregory’s story seemed credible to Antonio Ferreiro, who argued that this Chararic could have been responsible for the conversion of the Suevi to Catholicism.²

In addition to “Chararic,” the Acts of the I Council of Braga (May 1, 561) mention a *gloriosissimus Ariamirus*,³ whose name is close to Theodemirus and to Mirus (r. 569–584), the most important king of the Suevi in the sixth century.⁴ However, there is still many kings missing up to approximately the year 550.

In 1749, in the fourth volume of his *España Sagrada*, Enrique Flórez (1701–1773) published a long diatribe against a text known as the *Diuisio Wambae*, a list of the Iberian ecclesiastical provinces with their parishes, whose division would have been established at the XI Council of Toledo, gathered in 672 or 675, in the reign of the Visigothic king

² Ferreiro 1995. See also Lambert 1936, pp. 6–9; Barlow 1950, pp. 2–3, 5–6; Díaz Martínez 1986–1987, pp. 223–226; Beltrán Torreira 1989, pp. 69–71; Ubric, 2015. *Contra* Thompson 1980, pp. 84, 88.

³ Ferreiro 1995, p. 207, proposed adding these two names to the list of known Suevic kings. Torres 1978, pp. 197–204, and Thompson 1980, p. 88 deny their existence.

⁴ Mirus is referred to by John of Biclar (14, 21, 39, 65, 67) and by Isidore of Seville (*Sueu.* 91).

Wamba. When commenting on it, Flórez cites the following *Nomina regnum Sueuorum* copied therein:

*eam (sc. Legionensem sedem) dotaverunt Hermericus, Rechila, Maldra, Frumarius, Remismundus, Theodemundus, Suevorum Reges, et Theodemirus.*⁵

We know almost all of these kings: they are already mentioned by Hydatius and by John of Biclar. Isidore, however, is the only known medieval source that mentions them all in a single work. The only exception is “Theodemundus,” who is omitted by all of these authors. The *Diuisio Wambae* seems to consider Theodemundus to be Remismund’s successor; the compiler’s ignorance of the remaining names up to Teodomiro is evident in his simple reference to the “kings of the Suevi,” as Isidore had done.

With regard to “Theodemundus,” Reinhart considers that, “without doubt, there was a literary source at the origin of this name.”⁶ In this paper, I will discuss how this name came to be introduced among the Suevic kings, assessing its historical significance.

*

Flórez was not the first historian to raise doubts about the *Diuisio Wambae*. Since at least Pope Paschal II (1099–1118) its authenticity has been questioned (“nec a uobis nec a nobis autenticum creditur”).⁷ Against the claims of Pedro de Compostela, its authenticity was also contested in a letter sent by three bishops in 1182 to Pope Lucius III (1181–1185) from Tuy, John of Tarazona, Vital of Salamanca, and Ferdinand of Porto.⁸

A letter from Antonio Agustín (1516–1586) to Juan Bautista Pérez (c. 1534–1597) dated July 13, 1576 also expresses doubts about its antiquity:

there is a division of the bishoprics of Spain, with their delimitations, although it is not as complete as in the *Historia General* by King Alfonso the Wise. It seems to me that, although it says that it was made at the Council of Toledo XI under King Wamba, it does not coincide with the printed Acts of that Council, nor with what Archbishop Rodrigo says; those who respond to this division say rather that it is a text taken from the Moors.⁹

⁵ Flórez 1749, p. 227.

⁶ Reinhart 1952, p. 55.

⁷ Serrano 1936, vol. 3, pp. 132–133 (doc. 68).

⁸ Erdmann 1928, pp. 276–277 (doc. 91).

⁹ Antonio 1747, p. 683b (XXIV. *Carta de D. Antonio Agustín, Obispo de Lerida, electo Arzobispo de Tarragona, al Maestro Juan Bautista Pérez, Canonigo de la Santa Iglesia de Toledo, i despues Obispo de Segorbe, escrita en Lerida a 13 de Julio de 1576*). See also Flórez, 1749, pp. 182–183: “allí está una división de Obispos de España, con sus mojonos, aunque no está tan entera como en la *Historia General* del Rei Don Alonso el Sabio, i me parece, que, aunque dice que se hizo en el Concilio de Toledo XI del tiempo del Rei Bamba, no concuerda con los Actos de aquel Concilio impresos, ni con lo que dice del el Arzobispo Don Rodrigo; antes los que responden a esta división dicen que es escritura sacada de Moros.”

Pérez answered, confirming Agustín's suspicions: "As far as the Division of Wamba is concerned, it shows many signs of being a new and counterfeit thing. I am even more sure that it is a Moorish thing."¹⁰

After Nicolás Antonio¹¹ and Jerónimo Contador de Argote,¹² and based on an unpublished "tome in a quarto of 172 pages" by Juan Antonio Mayans y Siscar (1718–1801),¹³ Flórez also considered the *Diuisio Wambae* to be a forgery. The last editor of the *Diuisio*, Luiz Vázquez de Parga, argued that it must have been written in the late eleventh or early twelfth century, in Osma or Toledo.¹⁴

Based on a version of the *Diuisio Wambae* which circulated in documents from Aragon and referred to a see of "Senona" (a name invented to give the illusion of great antiquity to the eleventh-century monastery of Santa María la Real, in Nájera), Pio Beltrán argued that the very first version of the *Diuisio* was elaborated in Nájera itself, before 1079.¹⁵

Recently, David Gazel did not suggest a date for the *Diuisio* but seemed to point to an earlier composition, perhaps as early as the beginning of the eleventh century.¹⁶ In any case, the text already existed in 1097, when Bernard of Toledo claimed Burgos as a suffragan diocese of Toledo, by using the *Diuisio Wambae*¹⁷ ten years before Paschal II doubted its authenticity.¹⁸ In 1123, however, Callixtus II used it to assess the limits of the diocese of Segovia.¹⁹ The *Diuisio* is referred to in the Acts of at least two Church councils,

¹⁰ Antonio 1747, p. 685a (XXV. *Carta de D. Antonio Agustín, Obispo de Lerida, electo Arzobispo de Tarragona, al Maestro Juan Bautista Pérez, Canonigo de la Santa Iglesia de Toledo, i despues Obispo de Segorbe, escrita en Lerida a 30 de Agosto de 1576*): "En lo que toca a la Divissión de Vamba V. M. da muchas señales de ser cosa nueva i fingida, i tanto más me confirmo que sea cosa de moros".

¹¹ Antonio 1747, pp. 483–484.

¹² Contador de Argote 1734, vol. 2, pp. 759–772.

¹³ It corresponds to the second tome of the unpublished *Historia de España*. Juan Antonio Mayans' brother, Gregorio de Mayans, had sent it to Flórez with a letter dated October 8, 1746. See ms. Valencia, Biblioteca Archivo Hispano Mayansiano, Colegio del Patriarca, fol. 303 ("Tomo segundo de los Apuntamientos Varios pertenecientes a la Historia de España").

¹⁴ Vázquez de Parga 1943, pp. 92–93. For other authors defending the position that the *Diuisio Wambae* is a forgery, see: Sánchez Albornoz 1929–1930, pp. 29–83; García Villada 1932, vol. 2.1, pp. 215–216. See also, among the scholars who granted (at least some) authenticity to the *Diuisio Wambae*: Fernández Guerra 1875, p. 158; Fernández Guerra 1879, p. 51; Blázquez 1907a; Blázquez 1907b; Giménez Soler 1935, pp. 361–404. David 1947, p. 3, considers that, even if the narrative framework of the *Diuisio Wambae* is not credible, "on peut en toute sécurité reconnaître dans ces listes l'état de l'Église hispanique dans la seconde moitié du VII^e siècle."

¹⁵ See Mestre 2000, pp. 141–148.

¹⁶ Gazel 2022, § 77: "on nous accordera de mettre en sommeil la question de la datation de la DW."

¹⁷ Bull by Urban II (July 15, 1097) in Serrano 1936, vol. 3, pp. 96–98 (doc. 44).

¹⁸ Bull by Paschal II (April 14, 1107 or 1108) in Serrano 1936, vol. 3, pp. 132–133 (doc. 68).

¹⁹ Bull by Callixtus II (April 9, 1123) in Colmenares 1637, vol. 1, pp. 111–112; edited by Villar García 1990, pp. 51–52 (doc. 8); see Martín Postigo 1979, pp. 113–114.

those of Carrión (1130)²⁰ and Burgos (1136),²¹ by King Alfonso VII (1124),²² and by popes Innocent II (1139),²³ Hadrian IV (1158),²⁴ and Alexander III (1163²⁵ and 1172).²⁶ Before that, in the first half of the twelfth century, it was known in Oviedo, where it was used by Bishop Pelagius.²⁷ At least at the end of the twelfth century, the *Diuisio* was in the metropolitan see of Braga, where it was copied into the *Liber fidei*.²⁸ In 1182, it was referred to in Tuy during the territorial dispute between Braga and Compostela.²⁹

When Flórez wrote about the *Diuisio Wambae*, he did not consult an ancient manuscript. For his arguments, he followed Mayans' text;³⁰ for the Latin text, he transcribed García de Loaysa's edition (1534–1599).³¹ However, he knew about the text's history: he knew that Loaysa had copied the *Diuisio* from the "Itacius of Oviedo and another copy from Toledo."³² Flórez was also aware of the Castilian translations of the *Diuisio Wambae* included in Alfonso X's *Primeira Crónica General* (which had used Lucas de Tuy's *Chronicon mundi*) and in the *Corónica general* by Ambrósio de Morales (1513–1591),³³ who had read the *Chronicon mundi* "and the chronicle by Itacio and others."³⁴ As for Lucas de Tuy, he would also have used "the Itacio of Oviedo."³⁵ Flórez did not see this "Itacio," but he knew it through "a manuscript by Morales," and that it was "written in gothic letters, [and] is called Ovetensis because it was found in the holy church of Oviedo."³⁶ In turn, Morales had compared this "Itacio" with a codex owned by Garcilaso de la Vega (1503–1536), "which is called of Batres," with another manuscript

²⁰ Serrano 1936, vol. 1, p. 410; Vázquez de Parga 1943, p. 44.

²¹ Serrano 1936, vol. 1, p. 417–418; Vázquez de Parga 1943, p. 44.

²² Quoted by Colmenares 1637, vol. 1, p. 112.

²³ Bull by Innocent II (March 18, 1139) in Colmenares 1937, vol. 1, p. 123; Fita 1888, p. 239.

²⁴ Bull by Hadrian IV (June 22, 1158) in Kher 1928, pp. 404–407; Almagro 1956, pp. 100–103.

²⁵ Bull by Alexander III (July 9, 1163) in Fita 1888, pp. 237–238; Villar García 1990, pp. 111–112, doc. 64.

²⁶ Bull by Alexander III (January 22, 1172) in Arruego 1653, pp. 674–678.

²⁷ Pérez de Urbel 1952, pp. 161–162; Catalán 2005, p. 83. On Pelagius of Oviedo, see Fernández Vallina 1995, pp. 231–401.

²⁸ See below. Cf. Sánchez Albornoz 1929–1930, pp. 66–73; Vázquez de Parga 1943, pp. 67–69.

²⁹ Erdmann 1928, pp. 276–277 (doc. 91).

³⁰ Flórez 1749, p. 182. Cf. n. 11 above.

³¹ Loaysa 1593, pp. 135–142.

³² Flórez 1749, p. 212. Cf. Loaysa 1593, p. 135.

³³ Flórez 1749, p. 211. Cf. Menéndez Pidal-Catalán 1977, pp. 294–295; Morales 1577, vol. 12, fols. 172r–177r.

³⁴ Morales 1577, vol. 12, fol. 173r: "y de la coronica de Itacio y otros."

³⁵ Flórez 1749, p. 211.

³⁶ Flórez 1749, p. 195.

by Florián de Ocampo (c. 1499–1558) and with a *liber antiquissimus Complutensis*, which “does not exist today.”³⁷

THE MANUSCRIPTS

To navigate this tangle of testimonies, one needs to list the manuscripts of the *Diuisio Wambae* that included the names of the Suevic kings. Luis Vázquez de Parga distinguished two main families of this text: one from Aragon, and one related to the scriptorium of Pelagius of Oviedo.³⁸ Gazel argued that the latter family should better be called Asturleonese, because although it was related to Oviedo, the collection in which the *Diuisio* circulated was not produced in Pelagius’ scriptorium and was probably much earlier than Pelagius’ floruit.³⁹

Starting with Flórez’s manuscripts where Theodemundus was included as king of the Suevi, he mentions the following:

G Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, 1513 (*olim* F-134), 1210–1220, Toledo. PEL. OVET. *Lib. chron.* (fols. 4ra–72va). The oldest copy of the longer version of Pelagius of Oviedo’s *Liber chronicorum*. The *Diu. Wamb.* is inserted into the *Chronicon Adefonsi III – ad Sebastianum* version (fols. 38vb–42ra). This is the manuscript of “Batres” referred to by Flórez, which would have been used by Morales.⁴⁰

V Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, Vitr. 15-5 (*olim* Toledo, Biblioteca Capitulare 15-22), *post* 1253, Toledo. *Notule de primatu, nobilitate et dominio ecclesie Toletane* (fols. 1v–13v), *Liber priuilegiorum super primatu Toletane ecclesie* (fols. 14r–32v), *Diu. Wamb.* (fols. 34v–37r, without title). The *Diu. Wamb.* was copied onto the final blank folios. Flórez does not mention it and it was not used by Vázquez de Parga either.⁴¹

W Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, 10040 (*olim* Toledo, Biblioteca Capitulare 15-23), s. XIV, Toledo. *Notule de primatu, nobilitate et dominio ecclesie Toletane* (fols. 1r–13r), *Liber priuilegiorum super primatu Toletane ecclesie* (fols. 13v–34r), *Diu. Wamb.* (fols. 35r–36r, without title). A copy of V. It is the manuscript “from Toledo” referred to by Loaysa and Flórez. Vázquez de Parga also used it.⁴²

R Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, 1346 (*olim* F-58), s. XVI². It is the “Morales manuscript” known to Flórez. Fols. 1v–96r were copied *ex uetustissimo codice* [*Ovetensi*] (cf. fols. 7r, 23r, 43r, 59r, 75r, 90v, 93r).

³⁷ Flórez 1749, p. 195. Flórez cites what Morales himself had written in the ms. Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, 1346, fol. 113r: “Tuue otro libro no tan antiguo como estos dos [el Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, 1513; y el *codex uetustissimus Ovetensis*], al parecer que fue de Florián de Ocampo, y me lo prestaron los frayles de San Francisco de Çamora. Tuue otro de la librería del Collegio de aquí de Alcalá de Henares harto antiguo, el qual Florián auía bien rebuelto, y en el quaderno que juntó de los preuilegios lo llama Memoria libri antiqui Complutensis.”

³⁸ Vázquez de Parga 1943, pp. 59–73, 92–93.

³⁹ Gazel 2022.

⁴⁰ It belonged to Fernán Pérez de Guzmán (c. 1370–c. 1470) and later to his grandson, Garcilaso de la Veja (c. 1498–1536). This manuscript was listed by Morales in the Index of the Library of Batres: Cifuentes 1793b, p. 107; Amador de los Ríos 1861, vol. 2, pp. 157–159 n. 1; Sánchez Alonso 1924, pp. 19–24; Pérez de Urbel 1952, pp. 165–168; *Inventario general de Manuscritos de la Biblioteca Nacional* 1958, vol. 4, pp. 401–404; García Álvarez 1962, pp. 20–48; Fernández Vallina 1995, pp. 336–337; Galván Freile 1997, pp. 479–497; Rodríguez Díaz 1998, pp. 46–47; Jerez Cabrero 2006, 74–96; Furtado 2014, 450–456.

⁴¹ Loaysa 1593, p. 135; Martínez Díaz 1966, p. 197; González Ruiz 1985, pp. xviii–xix; Linehan 1993, pp. 358–368; González Ruiz 1997, pp. 200–201; Henriot 2004, pp. 92–101.

⁴² Vázquez de Parga 1943, p. 53; Martínez Díaz 1966, p. 198; González Ruiz 1985, p. xx; González Ruiz 1997, p. 201.

Within the *Liber de nominibus Sueuorum, et Euuandalorum, Alanorum et Gotorum ab era CCCV. Vocatus est liber iste Itacium* (fols. 7r–11r), the *Diu. Wamb.* is copied on fols. 9r–11r.⁴³

Lost and dismissed manuscripts

The *codex* owned by *Florián de Ocampo*, referred to by Morales and Flórez but now lost, may have been a working manuscript, copied during Ocampo's travels through Spain and Portugal to prepare his *Coronica General de España*. It later belonged to Ambrosio de Morales, who continued Ocampo's work. According to Morales, "it seemed to have been copied from the Batres, as it follows it in almost everything."⁴⁴ According to Juan Bautista Pérez, in the sixteenth century Ocampo's manuscript was held in the library of the Monastery of San Francisco de Zamora.⁴⁵

The *Book of Itacius of Oviedo* referred to by Flórez was copied in a codex in Visigothic minuscule that was housed in the Biblioteca Capitular of Oviedo until the sixteenth century, when with nine other codices, on September 10, 1557, it was loaned to Pero Ponce de León (1509–1573), bishop of Ciudad Rodrigo.⁴⁶ Morales had it for a few months, in 1563,⁴⁷ and copied part of it into one of his working manuscripts (= *R*), before returning it to Ponce de León. He called it *Codex uetustissimus Ouetensis*.⁴⁸ He made an index of this manuscript in *R* (fol. 116r).⁴⁹ After Ponce de León's death, Morales was no longer able to find this codex in Piacenza. According to Morales' index, after a *Numerus sedium Hispaniensium* was copied the *Liber de nominibus Sueuorum, Vandalorum, Alanorum et Gotorum. Vocatus est liber iste Itacium ab illo qui eum scripsit nomen accepit*. This is the text referred to by Flórez as the "Itacius of Oviedo"; fortunately, it was copied by Morales in *R* (fols. 7r–11r).⁵⁰ It is not known who or what this "Itacius"

⁴³ Cirot 1924, pp. 59–91; Pérez de Urbel 1952, pp. 143–152; Gil 1972, pp. x–xx; Catalán 2005, pp. 61–87; Jerez 2008, pp. 51–61. In contrast, Fernández Vallina 1973, pp. 214–215, argues that the Morales codex depends from a lost manuscript of the ninth or tenth century.

⁴⁴ Madrid 1346, fol. 113r: "parecia trasladado del de Batres, según se conformava en casi todo."

⁴⁵ Madrid, Archivo de la Biblioteca del Instituto de Historia del CSIC. Fondo Fotográfico Sánchez-Albornoz, AEHCaja III/Segorbe, fotografía 542 (= fol. 313v): "ex alio recentiore qui fuit Floriani d'Ocampo, qui habent fratres Franciscani Zamorenses. Qui liber uidebatur descriptus ex illo Batrensi."

⁴⁶ Cf. Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, 1321 (*olim* Dd-143), fol. 130r. See Cirot 1924, p. 99; Vázquez de Parga 1943, p. 61 n. 1; Catalán 2005, p. 66 n. 13.

⁴⁷ I follow the analysis of Catalán 2005. See also Gil 1972, pp. x–xv.

⁴⁸ Cf. Madrid 1346, fols. 7r, 23r, 43r, 59r, 75r, 90v, 93r, 113r.

⁴⁹ This index was later published in Risco 1793, pp. 366–68 (app. XL). It was also copied in a now lost manuscript by Morales, once kept in the Library of El Escorial, and copied in the eighteenth century into Madrid, BN, 5938 (*olim* Y-197 = Q-318), fols. 334r–335v.

⁵⁰ In addition to the *codex uetustissimus Ouetensis*, in Oviedo there was a second lost codex of chronicles, which also transmitted the *Liber Itacii*. It was mentioned in the *Relación de las Reliquias, Enterramientos Reales y Libros antiguos* sent by the Church of Oviedo to Philip II in April/May 1572. This is not the *codex uetustissimus*, which was then in Piacenza (see ms. Escorial & II.15, fol. 216r, mentioned by Catalán 2005, p. 74). Morales, who knew the *codex uetustissimus*, also saw this other manuscript in the Library of Oviedo

was. It is not to be confused with Hydatius, as Morales himself noted.⁵¹ Miguel Cortés y López's suggestion that "itatio" was just a common noun ("itatio, -onis") designating a "fixing of limits"⁵² was promptly rejected by Vázquez de Parga.⁵³

Finally, the *manuscript from Alcalá* was, according to Valerio Cifuentes, "a very old book from the library of the Colegio Mayor here in Alcalá de Henares. It seems to have been written more than four hundred years ago, and it does not have a continuous subject, but very brief records of some very old things from Spain."⁵⁴ This is ms. Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, 1358 (*olim* F-86), a manuscript copied in San Juan Bautista de Corias between 1160 and 1188, from a shorter version of the *Liber chronicorum* by Pelagius of Oviedo; later it was taken to Compostela. In the sixteenth century, it was taken to Alcalá de Henares, where it was seen by Morales, who copied part of it on fols. 96r–112r of ms. Madrid, BN 1346.⁵⁵ However, contrary to what Flórez thought, this manuscript does not transmit the *Diuisio Wambae*.⁵⁶

OVIEDO – IN THE SCRIPTORIUM OF BISHOP PELAGIUS

The *codex uetustissimus Ouetensis*, copied in part by Morales in ms. *R*, and ms. *G*, the main representatives of Pelagius of Oviedo's *Liber chronicorum*, which comes from Pelagius' scriptorium.

in June 1572 and described it as a "book of many stories which contains everything that is in the other book by Pelagius" (Flórez 1765, p. 97). According to Morales, this codex also transmitted "the book of Itacio dealing with many parts of the history" (Cifuentes 1793b, p. 103). However, this text was not copied by Morales, or by any other author. Therefore, I am not sure if this time Morales was referring to Hydatius' chronicle or to the *Liber Itacii*. In 1606, Mauro Castellá Ferrer also saw this manuscript. He stated that "[la *Cronica de Alfonso III*] es la que tiene en antigua letra gótica la santa iglesia de Ouiedo, junto con otras del obispo Itacio, y de los arçobispos san Isidoro, y Iuliano en un volumen" (Castellá Ferrer 1610, fol. 288v). In his ms. Madrid, BN 1237, he writes again: "nostrorum pontificum Isidori, Ildefonsi, Iulliani, Idacii atque Sebastiani Salmanticensis historias gothicis characteribus scriptas inveni" (fol. 1v). Castellá had only the *Chronicon Adefonsi III* (*ad Sebastianum* version) copied from this manuscript. This chronicle still lacks the numerous interpolations copied in the *codex uetustissimus* and in the codex of Batres (*G*): in fact, for instance, in these two codices the *Diuisio Wambae* was inserted into the *Chronicon Adefonsi III*, but not in the codex seen by Castellá. Hence, Catalán argued that this last codex was older than the others and had probably provided the model used by Pelagius of Oviedo to interpolate its own texts, thus originating the *codex uetustissimus* and *G* (Catalán 2005, pp. 84–87). See also Jerez Cabrero 2006, pp. 62–65.

⁵¹ Morales 1577, vol. 11, fol. 67r: "quien vee nombrar aqui a Itacio y a su coronica, no piense que es el mismo y la misma historia de Itacio." In the margin of ms. Madrid 1346 (= *R*), fol. 7r, regarding the title *Liber Itacii*, Morales noted: "fallitur. Idacii chronicon differt ab hac diuisione Wambe." See also Flórez 1749, pp. 195–196.

⁵² Cortés y López 1835, vol. 1, p. 29.

⁵³ Vázquez de Parga 1943, p. 36.

⁵⁴ Cifuentes 1793a, pp. 411–412: "un libro viejísimo de la librería del Colegio Mayor de aquí de Alcalá de Henares; ha más de quatrocientos años que se escribió como en él parece, y no tiene cosa seguida, sino memorias muy breues de algunas cosas muy antiguas de España."

⁵⁵ Madrid, BN 1346, fol. 96r: "esto se trasladó del libro antiguo de la librería de Alcalá de Henares, y se comprouó muy bien con el original."

⁵⁶ See Rodríguez Díaz 1998.

Morales copied the *Liber Itacii ex vetustissimo Ovetensi* into his manuscript *R*. This *Liber Itacii* is a collection of different lists of kings and episcopal sees, with only a very tenuous narrative. It begins with the lists of the (i) Vandal and the (ii) Suevic kings; then it presents the (iii) ecclesiastical provinces of Gallaecia, which would have been established at the First Council of Braga (= *Parochiale Sueuum*); then, it proceeds to the (iv) Second Council of Braga, in the time of King Miro, and to the bishops who attended it; eventually, it also presents the (v) names of the Visigothic kings up to Wamba. Only after this was the (vi) *Diuisio Wambae* copied.

The *Nomina regum Sueuorum* reads as follows:

Post hoc, Reges coeperunt regnare Sueui. Primus rex Sueuorum Ermericus cepit regnare. Quo mortuo, Reccila filius eius regnavit pro eo. Quo mortuo, Rectarius regnavit pro eo. Quo mortuo, Maldram [sic] regnavit pro eo. Quo mortuo, Frumarium [sic] regnavit pro eo. Quo mortuo Remismundus regnavit pro eo. Quo mortuo, Theodericus regnavit pro eo. Era DV. Rex iste fuit catholicus et fecit celebrare concilium in metropolis Bracarum et diuisit omnem diocesim inter omnes episcopos Galletiae sicut hic scriptum est. (fol. 7v)

Here, a certain “Theodericus” (not “Theodemundus”) is listed as the successor of Remismundus. In *R*, fols. 8r–v, in the introduction to the Second Council of Braga, the same “Theodericus” is mentioned again: *post mortem Theoderici regis Mirus successit in regnum*. In the *Diuisio Wambae*, Wamba confirms the division of the province of Braga, which had previously been established by “Theodericus”: *sicut Theodericus rex diuisit et ordinavit sedes Gallaetiae* (fol. 9v). The *Liber Itacii* copied in the *codex uetustissimus Ouetensis* bore no reference to King “Theodemundus” but to a certain “Theodericus” who was unknown to Hydatius, John of Biclar, and Isidore of Seville.

Ms. *G* is the oldest known testimony transmitting the so-called “Compilation B,” corresponding to the longest version of the *Liber chronicorum*.⁵⁷ In this manuscript, the *Diuisio Wambae* was not copied within the *Liber Itacii* (which is not included here) but inserted within the *Chronicon Adefonsi III* (in its *ad Sebastianum* version): when Wamba is mentioned, the text reports the gathering of a council in Toledo, in a context that recalls, but does not copy, the details transmitted by the *Liber Itacii*. The *Numerus sedium yspaniensium* was also copied, in a version identical to that found in *R* preceding the *Liber Itacii* (fol. 39r = *R*, fol. 7r), but the names of the Vandal, Suevic, and Visigothic kings, the references to the councils of Braga, and the *Parochiale Sueuum*, were omitted.

⁵⁷ See Jérez Cabrero 2008.

However, the compiler of the *Liber chronicorum* also knew the texts of the *Liber Itacii* copied in the *Codex uetustissimus*. In fact, in *G*, when referring to the ecclesiastical province of Mérida, he completed the information on the ancient Suevic dioceses mentioned in the *Diuisio Wambae*, and used the *Parochiale Sueuum*, as it had been transmitted by the *Liber Itacii*:

R: <i>Liber Itacii</i> (fols. 7v–8r) = <i>Parochiale Sueuum</i> = parishes of Lusitania divided by King “Theodericus”	R: <i>Liber Itacii</i> (fol. 9v) = <i>Diuisio Wambae</i> = division of the ecclesiastical province of Mérida attributed to King Wamba	O: <i>Liber chronicorum</i> (fol. 40r) = <i>Diuisio Wambae</i> = division of the ecclesiastical province of Mérida attributed to King Wamba
<i>ad Egitaniense tota Egitania Mene Cipio et Francos</i>	<i>Agitania teneat de Sala usque Nauam de Sena vsque Mauriellam</i>	<i>Egitania teneat de Salam usque Nauam de Sena vsque Mauriellam. Infra hos terminos suam hanc diocessim. Tota Egitania Mene Cipio et Francos.</i>
<i>ad Conibriensem ipsam Conimbriam Eminio Selio Lurbinae Insula Astusiane et Portugale castrum antiquum</i>	<i>Conimbria teneat de Naua vsque Borgam de Torrente vsque Loram</i>	<i>Conimbria teneat de Naua usque Borgam de Torrente vsque Loram. Infra hos terminos hanc suam diocessim Conimbriam. Eminio Selio Lurbine Insula Astusiane et Portugale. Castrum anticum</i>
<i>Ad Vesensem ipsum Viseum Rodomiro Submontio Osania Ouellione Tutela Coleia et Caliabria qui apud Gotos postea sedis fuit</i>	<i>Viseo teneat de Borga vsque Sortam de Bonella vsque Ventusam</i>	<i>Viseo teneat de Borga usque Sortam de Bonella usque Uentosam. Infra hos terminos totam hanc suam diocessim. Ipsum Viseum Rodomiro Submoncio Osama Ouellione Tutela Coleia Caliabrica qui apud Gotos postea sedis fuit</i>
<i>Ad Lamegum ipsum Lamegum Tuentia Arauca Cantabriano Omnia et Caminus</i>	<i>Lamego teneat de Sorta vsque Petram de Jara vsque Ortosam</i>	<i>Lamego teneat de Sorta usque Petram de Tara usque Ortosam. Infra hos terminos totam hanc suam diocessim. Ipsum Lamegum Tuencia Arauca Cantabriano Omma et Cammus.</i>

These are not the only examples that prove that the compiler of the *Liber chronicorum* was familiar with the *Liber Itacii*. When he referred to the ecclesiastical province of Braga, he added a short note, making Wamba recall the previous division of Gallaecia: *sicut Theodericus rex Sueuorum Catholicus apud metropolis Brachare concilium celebravit et diuisit unicuique sedi diocesseos que erant inter omnes episcopos Gallecie* (*G*, fol. 40v). Again, this is a copy of the *Parochiale Sueuum* as it was transmitted by the *Liber Itacii* (= *Parochiale Sueuum: rex iste fuit catholicus et fecit celebrare concilium in metropolis Bracharae et diuisit omnem diocesim inter omnes episcopos Galletiae*; *R*, fol. 7v). Therefore, it is confirmed that “Theodericus,” not “Theodemundus,” was the name of the king known in Pelagius’ scriptorium in Oviedo.

I add another testimony to this set: the *Chronica Naierensis* (= *N*). This is a collection of chronicles assembled in Santa María la Real, in Nájera, between 1190 and 1194. Enrique Jerez Cabrero and Gazel argued that it used a source close to the Pelagian texts, but did not derive from them.⁵⁸ It is certain that the compiler of the *Chronica Naierensis* had access to some codices from Asturias-León, since he used versions of Isidore’s texts⁵⁹ and the *Diuisio Wambae* similar to those circulating in this region.

This is the structure of the texts in these three manuscripts:

		<i>R = Codex uetustissimus</i>	<i>G = Liber chronicorum</i>	<i>N = Chronica Naierensis</i>
<i>Numerus sedium</i>		x	x	
<i>Liber Itacii</i>	<i>Nomina regum Vandalorum</i>	x		
	<i>Nomina regum Sueuorum</i>	x		
	<i>Concilium Braccarense I</i>	x		
	<i>Parochiale Sueuum</i>	x		
	<i>Concilium Braccarense II</i>	x		
	<i>Nomina regum Gothorum</i>	x		
	<i>Concilium Toletanum</i>	x	x	x
<i>Diuisio Wambae</i>		x	x	x

Like that of the *Liber chronicorum*, the compiler of the *Chronica Naierensis* was only interested in the *Diuisio Wambae*, and not in the entire content of the *Liber Itacii*: in Nájera, the *Diuisio Wambae* was even inserted in the same place in the *Chronicon Adefonsi III*, although the compiler did not copy the *ad Sebastianum* version, preferring to use the Rotensis version, which circulated in the region (its main representative is ms. Madrid, BRAH, cod. 78). He also omitted the *Numerus sedium*. The only reference to the Suevic kings appears when Wamba recalls the division of the province of Braga at the time of king “Theodericus” again (= *Chron. Naier.* 1.197).

Pelagius’ model was a now-lost manuscript seen by Mauro Castellá Ferrer (1567–1612) in 1606.⁶⁰ The model used in Nájera is referred to as *y* by Jerez and as **λ* by Gazel;⁶¹ especially Gazel insists that the compiler in Nájera did not use Pelagius’ chronistic collection. However, it would be strange that the *Diuisio Wambae* was inserted in the same place in the *Chronicon Adefonsi III* (even if in a different version) if the compiler from Nájera had not known Pelagius’ *Liber*.

⁵⁸ Jerez 2007, pp. 101–118, 127–140; Gazel 2022, §§ 40–41.

⁵⁹ Cf. Rodríguez Alonso 1975, pp. 154–155; Furtado 2014, pp. 456–460.

⁶⁰ Catalán 205, pp. 84–87; Jerez 2006, pp. 64–69.

⁶¹ Jerez 2007, pp. 127–140; Gazel 2022, §§ 81–91.

In fact, *G* and *N* do not depend directly from the *codex uetustissimus Ouētensis*, whose text was copied in *R*:

e.g. ad Artam R Artam G N; Jara R Tara G N; de Cobello usque Mustellam de Mustella usque Nampia R de Cobello usque Mustellam de Lotica (Lericam G) usque Tallam (Tollam G) de Mustella teneat usque Nampia G N.

However, *G* still shares with *R* very significant errors and omissions, in view of the generally more correct text of *N*. In fact, the compiler of *G* certainly knew and used the texts also transmitted by *R*. They certainly share a common model, independent of *N*:

*Exara teneat de Bordel usque Paladam, de Montesa usque Portellam. Gerunda teneat de Palada usque Iustamat, de Alcosa usque Pinna N Exara teneat de Bordel usque Palada (-m G), usque Mant, de Alcosa usque Pinna G R; Legio, que nunquam fuit subdita ad ullum archiepiscopatum, teneat per suos terminos antiquos, per Pireneos montes, per Pennam Rubeam una cum media Lauaci N Legio teneat per Pirineos montes, per Pennam Rubeam una cum media Leuana G R.*⁶²

In addition, the text transmitted by *G* also significant additions that were not copied in *R*.⁶³

Therefore, the archetype of the *Diuisio Wambae* known in Oviedo (I will call it α) was at the origin of two copies produced in Pelagius' scriptorium: one that was copied into the *Codex uetustissimus Ouētensis*, and another that was inserted into Pelagius' *Liber chronicorum*. In Nájera, another copy of the *Diuisio Wambae* also dependent from the same archetype α was at the origin of the version integrated into the *Chronica Naierensis*; but I assume that the latter also had some connection with Pelagius' *Liber chronicorum* and its compiler knew how the *Diuisio Wambae* was inserted into the *Chronicon Adefonsi III* therein.

"Theodericus" is the name transmitted by α . I assume that my archetype α transmitted a copy of the collection which Gazel calls *Chronicon Ouētense cum Appendicibus*. This *chronicon* comprised the *Numerus sedium Hispaniensium*, the *Liber Itacii*, and the *Diuisio Wambae*:⁶⁴ these texts were also copied into the *Codex uetustissimus*.

⁶² *N* has the correct reading of this toponym, which is Lebanza (Palencia). See Martínez Ortega 1998, p. 314.

⁶³ See also Estévez Sola 1995, pp. xiv–lv.

⁶⁴ Gazel 2022, "Tableau 1: Fragments du COA dans les quatre témoins sélectionnés"; § 54.

Gazel offered very good arguments that this “new” *chronicon* was older than that of Pelagius of Oviedo⁶⁵ (which Gazel also defends against accusations of forgery):⁶⁶ it was perhaps forged in the time of Bishop Pons de Tabernoles (1028–1033)⁶⁷ in order to “legitimize the independence of the episcopal see of Oviedo through the figure of Alfonso II.”⁶⁸ This *chronicon* survives today in two major manuscripts: Madrid, BN 8592, fols. 158r–163r, copied in the late fifteenth century, of uncertain provenance,⁶⁹ and Madrid, BN 9317, fols. 1r–34v, which belonged to Juan de Ferreras (1652–1735) – it was copied in the early eighteenth century *ex vetustissimo codice Ovetensis Ecclesiae* (however, as Gazel argues, this was not the codex used by Morales).⁷⁰ In addition to these codices, parts of this *Chronicon Ouetense cum Appendicibus* also survive in other manuscripts, namely in the *Codex uetustissimus Ouetensis*, in the *Diuisio Wambae* copied in the *Liber chronicorum* by Pelagius, in the *Chronica Naierensis*, and in ms. Madrid, BN, Res. 35, pp. 136v–137v (mid-fifteenth century and perhaps connected to Alfonso of Cartagena).⁷¹

Among these manuscripts, Madrid, Res. 35, which Gazel considers close to the model of the *Chronica Naierensis*,⁷² conveys the form “Teodoricus” for the name of the king responsible for the ecclesiastical division of Gallaecia (fol. 136v *bis*; fol. 137r); ms. Madrid 9317 prefers the form “Theodemirus” (see below); and ms. Madrid 8592, fol. 158r, not even that: here the list ends with “Remismundus,” to whom is attributed the meeting of a council in Lugo to establish the ecclesiastical division of Gallaecia. In none of these manuscripts is “Theodemundus” mentioned as king of the Suevi.

SAN ISIDORO DE LEÓN – LUCAS DE TUY’S CHRONICON MUNDI

Between 1236 and 1238, Lucas de Tuy, then deacon in San Isidore of León, composed yet another chronistic collection, the *Chronicon mundi*, where he gathered and adapted many of the texts already collected by Pelagius of Oviedo and the *Chronica Naierensis*. The latter especially was among the main models of the new collection.⁷³

⁶⁵ Gazel 2022, §§ 72–76.

⁶⁶ Gazel 2022, §§ 61–65.

⁶⁷ Gazel 2022 §§ 78–79. Cf. Riu 1989.

⁶⁸ Gazel 2022, § 73: “légitimer l’indépendance du siège épiscopal d’Oviedo à travers la figure d’Alphonse II.”

⁶⁹ Gazel 2022, § 14.

⁷⁰ It was published by Ferreras 1727, pp. 59–66. See Gazel 2022, §§ 12–13.

⁷¹ Gazel 2022, § 16.

⁷² Gazel 2022, §§ 44–53.

⁷³ Cf. Valdés García 1996; Falque 2001; Jerez Cabrero 2006, pp. 119–154.

In Book III of his *chronicon*, Lucas inserted the *Chronicon Adefonsi III*, in the Rotensis version, and the *Diuisio Wambae* (3.11, 3.13–15, 3.17–20), just as the compiler from Nájera had done, expanding the text on the beginning of Wamba's reign (= *Chron. mundi* 3.11). In fact, Lucas (*CM* below) used the *Diuisio Wambae* in a version closer to *N* than to the text transmitted by *R*⁷⁴ and *G*. See the examples:

Exara teneat de Bordel usque Paladam, de Montesa usque Portellam. Gerunda teneat de Palada usque Iustamat (Inst- CM), de Alcosa (Alosa CM) usque Pinnas N CM
Exara teneat de Bordel usque Palada (-m G), usque Mant, de Alcosa usque Pinnas R G;
Legio (+que nunquam fuit subdita ad ullum archiepiscopatum N) quam condiderunt Romane legiones, que antiquus Flos fuit uocata, et per Romanum Papam gaudet perpetua libertate et a nostris predecessoribus extat sedes regia atque alicui metropoli numquam fuit subdita CM), teneat per suos terminos antiquos, per Pireneos montes, (+ et CM) per Pennam Rubeam una cum media Lauaci (Le- CM) N CM Legio teneat per Pirineos montes, per Pennam Rubeam una cum media Leuana R G.

Jerez and Gazel have argued with abundant examples that Lucas de Tuy must have used a common model with the *Chronica Naierensis*: both depend from the model *y* according to Jerez, and on **λ* according to Gazel (see above). It is also possible that the inclusion of the *Diuisio Wambae* in the *Chronicon Adefonsi III* in the Rotensis version already occurred as early as in *y/*λ*. After Bernard F. Reilly and Francisco Bautista,⁷⁵ Alberto Montaner Frutos suggested the presence in León of an *Exemplar Legionensis* of the *Chronica Naierensis*, known and used by Lucas de Tuy.⁷⁶ It is also possible that, as Montaner argues, when Lucas was composing his work in the 1330s there was a copy of the *Chronica Naierensis* in León. Lucas may have known it and followed it in inserting the *Diuisio Wambae* in the same place of the *Chronicon Adefonsi III*, also in the Rotensis version.

Lucas de Tuy thus knew the *Liber Itacii* (although not the version copied in the *Codex uetustissimus* but that of the *Chronicon Ouetense*, as Gazel argued). Hence, in contrast to the *Chronica Naierensis* but as in the *Liber Itacii*, he associated the *Diuisio* with some of the royal lists and the *Parochiale Sueuum* (3.12, 3.16): he copied the *Nomina regum Vandalorum*, and transferred there the text on the imaginary ecclesiastical province of *Lucus in Asturiis* (= Oviedo), already considered a Vandal foundation in the *Diuisio Wambae* transmitted by *R G N* (these manuscripts referred to this ecclesiastical province,

⁷⁴ See also Valdés García 1996, pp. liii–liv; Jerez Cabrero 2006, pp. 127–140. Flórez thought Lucas had copied the *Diuisio* from the *codex Ouetensis*: “D. Lucas la tomó con buena fé del Itacio de Oviedo [...] don Lucas lo sacó del código Ovetense” (1749, pp. 211, 212). I do not think he was right.

⁷⁵ Reilly 1976, pp. 134–135; Reilly 2007, p. 778; Bautista 2006, pp. 76–77.

⁷⁶ Montaner Frutos, 2009. This possibility was also defended by Jerez Cabrero 2006, pp. 144–145.

but within the *Diuisio* and only after the description of the province of León).⁷⁷ In doing so, Lucas explicitly associated Oviedo with the ancient presence of the Vandals in Iberia, assuring its precedence over Toledo. In addition to the *Nomina regum Vandalorum*, Lucas also copied the *Nomina regum Sueuorum*, and inserted here the references to a certain “Council of Lugo” in 569 (replacing the information about the I Council of Braga in the *Codex uetustissimus*).⁷⁸ He presented the ecclesiastical division of Gallaecia, which the *Codex uetustissimus Ouetensis* attributed to the I Council of Braga (= *Parochiale Sueuum*), to be a result of this Council of Lugo. This was also the version copied in the ms. Madrid, BN Res. 35, fol. 136v (the *Parochiale* was not copied into the *Chronica Naierensis*), and transmitted by the *Chronicon Ouetense*.⁷⁹

These are the *Nomina regum Sueuorum* according to Lucas de Tuy (3.12):

post Euandalos ceperunt regnare Sueui, quorum primus fuit rex Ermericus. Quo mortuo Riccila regnauit pro eo. Quo mortuo Ricciarius regnauit pro eo. Quo mortuo Maldra regnauit pro eo. Quo mortuo Frumarius regnauit pro eo. Quo mortuo Remismundus regnauit pro eo. Quo mortuo Theodemundus regnauit pro eo. Rex iste Catholicus fuit et fecit celebrare concilium in Gallaecia apud Lucensem urbem. Interfuit huic conclio cum ceteris episcopis Gallecie Adaulfus Legionensis episcopus ad subscriptam diuisionem roborandam, cuius prima diuisio facta est hoc modo [...]

Almost all of the manuscripts of Lucas de Tuy’s *Chronicon mundi* transmit the form “Theodemundus” rather than “Theodemirus,” as did Juan Mariana in his 1608 edition.⁸⁰ The only exception seems to be ms. León, Archivo-Biblioteca de la Real Colegiata de San Isidoro, 20, copied in the thirteenth century, precisely in Lucas’ scriptorium in San Isidoro de León.⁸¹ However, a closer analysis of the manuscript itself reveals that this is a correction: the copyist started to write “Theodemun,” and corrected it to “Theodemirus” (fol. 61rb), which was not the reading of the model he was using – that was surely “Theodemundus,” too. “Theodemirus” was the name used by John of Biclar and Isidore of Seville; and after this list of *nomina* where Theodemundus is listed, Lucas de Tuy actually referred to king “Theodemirus” in the *Diuisio Wambae* itself. The copyist of ms. León 20 probably knew this name and decided to correct the otherwise unknown “Theodemundus.”

⁷⁷ About this Lugo in Asturias, which was created to guarantee Oviedo’s precedence over León, see P. David 1947, p. 51.

⁷⁸ *R*, fol. 7v: *Rex iste catholicus fuit et fecit celebrare concilium in metropolis Bracharae*; Luc. Tud. *Chron. mundi* 3.12: *Rex iste catholicus fuit et fecit celebrare concilium in Gallaecia apud Lucensem urbem*.

⁷⁹ Gazel 2022, § 44; 54: “Le lieu du concile du *Parrochiale* était Lugo dans le prototype commun, à l’image des versions isolées. Seuls les textes pélagiens parlent de Braga.” Cf. David 1947, pp. 19–20.

⁸⁰ Mariana 1608, p. 56. This was the edition known by Flórez.

⁸¹ See Pérez Llamazares 1923, pp. 42–43; Falque 1998; Valdés García 1996, pp. cxv–cxvi; Falque 2001, pp. cviii–cix.

“Theodemundus” is also found in two other manuscripts: *V* (Madrid, BN Vitr. 15-5) is a cartulary from Toledo, and *W* (Madrid, BN 10040), a fourteenth-century copy of *V*. *V* was copied on May 14, 1253, when Sancho, brother of Alfonso X, was procurator of the archbishopric (fol. 33r). At the beginning of the manuscript is the *Notule de primatu*, composed around 1240, under Rodrigo Ximénez de Rada (1170–1247), as a kind of draft to prove the primacy of the Toledan see.⁸² Later in the thirteenth century, the *Diuisio Wambae* was added in folios left blank in *V*, and the *Nomina regum Sueuorum* into it.

In *V W*, these are the *Nomina regum Sueuorum*: :

Legio [...] teneat per suos terminos antiquos sicut eam dotauerunt Ermentus, Rictila, Richiarius, Maldra, Frumarius, Remismundus, Teodomundus, reges Sueuorum. (fol. 34v)

The source of this information is Lucas’ *Chronicon mundi* (3.11, ed. Falque). Hence, the copyist believed that there had been a king “Theodemundus,” not “Theodericus” or “Theodemirus.”

Loaysa also refers to several ancient texts transmitting the ecclesiastical division of Iberia:⁸³ from a manuscript he referred to as *C. M. S. literis Gothicis, Ecclesiae Ovetensis*,⁸⁴ Loaysa copied the *Numerus sedium Hispaniensium*:⁸⁵ this is the *codex uetustissimus Ouetensis*, which, as Jerez has shown, was owned by Loaysa.⁸⁶ He copied the *Diuisio Wambae*,⁸⁷ *ex libris M.SS. Ecclesiae Toletanae, & Ecclesiae Ovetensis, cuius titulus est Itacius*.⁸⁸ These are our ms. *V* (or *W*) and the *Liber Itacii*, whose variants he pointed out in the margin of his edition. Here, the excerpts with references to the Suevic kings are as follows:

*Legio [...] teneat per suos terminos antiquos sicut eam dotauerunt Hermericus, Rechila, Reccarius, Maldra, Frumarius, Remismundus, Theodemundus, Sueuorum reges, & Theodemirus.*⁸⁹ [...]

*Legio ciuitas Sacerdotalis, & regia, & Lucus quam Vvandali aedificauerunt in Asturijs, teneant, per suos terminos antiquos, sicut eis diuisit rex Theodemirus. Hae nulli subdantur Archiepiscopo uel Primati. Sedes etiam Portucaliae permaneant in sua diuisione, sicut eis diuisit rex Theodemirus cum his, etiam que nos eis adiecimus.*⁹⁰

⁸² Linehan 1993, pp. 358–367; González Ruiz 1997, pp. 200–201; Martin 2001, p. 284.

⁸³ Loaysa 1593, p. 131.

⁸⁴ Loaysa 1593, p. 133.

⁸⁵ Loaysa 1593, pp. 133–135.

⁸⁶ Jerez Cabrero 2006, pp. 49–51.

⁸⁷ Loaysa 1593, pp. 135–142.

⁸⁸ Loaysa 1593, p. 135.

⁸⁹ Loaysa 1593, p. 136.

⁹⁰ Loaysa 1593, p. 137.

Therefore, for his edition of the *Diuisio Wambae*, Loaysa used a manuscript from Toledo (V or W), from which he copied the reference to “Theodemundus” (he did not use Lucas de Tuy’s *Chronicon mundi*). It was certainly Loaysa himself who added to the *Nomina regum* the name of “Theodemirus.” He himself admits, at the end of the transcription that “haec omnia [...] ut potui melius emmendata.”⁹¹ This was the text read and commented on by Flórez.

Loaysa’s texts of the Council of Lugo and the *Diuisio Wambae* were later copied by José Saenz de Aguirre (1630–1699) in the second tome of his *Collectio maxima conciliorum* (Rome, 1694),⁹² by Jerónimo Contador de Argote (1676–1749) in *Memorias para a História Ecclesiastica da Arcebisado de Braga* with Latin text and Portuguese translation (Lisbon, 1734),⁹³ and by Giovanni Domenico Mansi (1692–1769) in the *Sacrorum conciliorum noua et amplissima collectio* (Florence, 1763).⁹⁴ All of them keep “Theodemundus” in the list of the Suevic kings.

However, it is clear that this “Theodemundus” is not an ancient name: it appears only in Lucas de Tuy’s *Chronicon mundi* and in texts that depend from it. Most likely, “Theodemundus” is an error in the archetype of the *Chronicon mundi*’s entire manuscript tradition; or perhaps a creation of Lucas himself, who either himself made a mistake or for some other reason decided to include this previously unattested “Theodemundus” in his list of kings. In fact, the name “Theodemundus” is a combination of the names of Remismund and Theodemirus, the two kings who supposedly preceded and succeeded him.

NORTHWESTERN IBERIA – OLD KINGS AND OLD BOUNDARIES

After the twelfth century, references to the councils of Braga or to a supposed Council of Lugo held in the time of the Suevi became very common, in a context of increasingly frequent disputes over ecclesiastical boundaries. When referring to these councils, several texts also mention the kings of the Suevi.

⁹¹ Loaysa 1593, p. 144.

⁹² Saenz de Aguirre 1694: “Concilium apud Lucum a Theodomiro principe habitum. Era DCVII. anno Christi DLXIX” (pp. 299–300), “In nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi. Incipit numerus sedium Hispaniensium” (pp. 302–303), “Divisio terminorum dioecesium & parochiarum Hispaniae, à Wamba rege facta” (pp. 303–307).

⁹³ Contador de Argote 1734: Council of Lugo, pp. 803–805 (Latin text), 806–808 (Portuguese translation); *Diuisio Wambae*, pp. 809–813 (Latin text), 815–820 (Portuguese translation). Commentary, pp. 753–772 (he does not refer to “Theodemundus”).

⁹⁴ J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum noua et amplissima collectio*, vol. 9, Florentiae, 1763. Council of Lugo (cols. 815–816); *Numerus sedium* (cols. 818–819); *Diuisio Wambae* (pp. 819–825).

a. The *Chronicon Iriense*, probably composed after 1120⁹⁵ to prove the great antiquity of the seat of Iria/Compostela, includes such a claim, reporting the ecclesiastical division of *Gallaecia* in the time of the Suevi. It attributes it to King Mirus, who had first ruled in Lugo and had succeeded King “Ariemirus” in Braga. Mirus would thus have presided over the Second Council of Braga:

Mirus, Sueuorum rex, catholicus factus est [...]. Quia duo reges dominabantur Gallecie: Mirus Lucum et Ariemirus rex Bracaram obtinebat. Qui Ariemirus post tertium annum defunctus est, et Mirus cepit Bracaram et fecit concilium Bracarensem secundum, ubi Andreas fuit, in era DCX. (Chron. Iriense 1, ed. García Alvarez)

Needless to say, there is no early information about this succession in Suevic Gallaecia, and the *Chronicon Iriense* has always sparked debate over its content, which the anonymous author reformulated and reinterpreted without much critical judgement. This can be seen in this passage: Mirus was, of course, a well-known king (the penultimate king of the Suevi), mentioned by John of Biclar and Isidore of Seville; and Ariemirus was mentioned in the Acts of the I Council of Braga. The author of the *Chronicon Iriense* simply combined these two men in his narrative.⁹⁶ Neither “Theodericus” nor “Theodemundus” is mentioned as holding any council in Gallaecia.

b. The *Liber fidei*, a charter from Braga that was copied in the second half of the thirteenth century in “Caroline scripture with a strong Gothic influence,”⁹⁷ mentions King “Theodemirus,” but identifies him with king Mirus (John of Biclar and Isidore had distinguished these two kings). Very early in the codex, there is a copy of the Acts of the so-called Council of Lugo of 569, which supposedly established the *Parochiale Sueuum*. It starts as follows:

Tempore Sueuorum sub Era DCVII die Kalendarum Ianuariarum, Theodemirus princeps Sueuorum concilium in ciuitate Lucensi fieri precepit. (fol. 4r)

⁹⁵ Isla Frias 1984. Other opinions by Gómez Moreno 1917, p. 19 (AD 984); Sanchez Albornoz 1948, p. 95 n. 5 (AD 984); Mansilla 1971, p. 74 (AD 984); Sánchez Albornoz 1958, p. 25 n. 73 (‘avanzado el siglo XI’); García Alvarez 1963, p. 90 (c. 1080); Barrau-Dihigo 1919, p. 66 n. 98 (12th s.); David 1947, p. 50 (12th s.); Sáez 1949, p. 64 n. 112 (12th s.); Pérez de Urbel 1952, p. 179 (12th s.); Falque 2016 (12th s.).

⁹⁶ García Alvarez 1963, pp. 131–132. García Alvarez argues that the author of the *Chronicon Iriense* identified Mirus with Theodemirus, considering that there was only one king (as in the *Liber Fidei*). Hence, he uses only one of the names (pp. 127–129).

⁹⁷ Costa 1965, p. xix.

The charter also transmits a letter, interpolated into the text, about the opening of the Second Council of Braga,⁹⁸ where the king introduces himself:

Ego, Teodemirus rex, cognomento etiam Mirus, Gallecie tocius prouincie rex. (fol. 4v)

Doc. 551 in the *Liber fidei* is a second copy of this Council of Lugo, this time minus the letter.⁹⁹ The beginning of the text presents the same name:

Tempore Sueuorum sub Era DCVII, Theodemirus princeps idem Sueuorum concilium in ciuitate Luco fieri precepit. (fol. 146v)

Pierre David doubted the authenticity of these texts about the Council of Lugo: he argued that it must have been forged in this city, using the *Parochiale Sueuum* to corroborate the territorial claims of the metropolitan see of Lugo, sometime before the twelfth century.¹⁰⁰

Still, there are also texts in the *Liber fidei* in which the division of the diocese of Lugo is copied separately. One of these texts was attached to doc. 551. Here it is explicitly said that the diocesan boundaries were defined *in praesentia domini et gloriosissimi Mironis regis sub Era DCX* (fol. 147r). Another version of the *diuisiones et termini Lucensis diocesis* can be seen in doc. 553, where they are established *in presentia domini et gloriosissimi Mironis regis cognomento Theodemiri sub Era DCVII* (fols. 147v–148r).¹⁰¹

The *Liber fidei* also refers to the delimitation of Braga. The copyist simply copies the introduction to the Council of Lugo:¹⁰²

Hec est terminatio episcopii Bracare. Tempore Sueuorum sub Era DCX, die Kalendarum Ianuarium, Teodemirus princeps Sueuorum concilium in ciuitate Lucensi fieri precepit. (fol. 9r)

Another version of the division of Braga ensures the antiquity of the province, dating it to the time of “Archbishop” Martin and King Theodemirus:¹⁰³

suos terminos abscripsimus cum cristianissimi regis Sueuorum Theodemiri intercessione tum Lucencis episcopi Nutigii religione eidem episcopo Nitigio Martinus ego totius Gallecie prouincie archiepiscopus. (fol. 147v)

⁹⁸ *Liber fidei* docs. 10–11, fols. 4v–6v; ed. Costa 1965, pp. **Páginas da Edição**.

⁹⁹ *Liber fidei*, doc. 551, fols. 146v–147r; ed. Costa 1978, pp. 298–300. In fols. 3r–4r, the *Liber fidei* also transmits a version of the *Diuisio Wambae*, however it mentions no king other than Wamba.

¹⁰⁰ David, 1947, pp. 64–67.

¹⁰¹ *Liber fidei*, doc. 553, fols. 147v–148r; ed. Costa 1978, p. 302.

¹⁰² *Liber fidei*, doc. 15, fols. 9r–v; ed. Costa 1965, pp. 32–33.

¹⁰³ *Liber fidei*, doc. 552, fols. 147r–v; ed. Costa 1978, pp. 350–351.

The *Tumbo Viejo de Lugo* (Madrid, Archivo Historico Nacional, cod. 1043B), copied in the thirteenth century, also transmits the so-called Council of Lugo (fols. 6v–7r). The beginning of the text is identical to that in Braga:

Tempore Sueuorum sub era DCVII, die kalendarum Ianuarii Teodomirus princeps idem Sueuorum, concilium in ciuitate Luco fieri precepit.

The text of the Council of Lugo is also copied in ms. Santiago de Compostela, Archivo de la Catedral, Tumbillo de tablas, de privilegios y constituciones, fols. 133v–134v, from the fourteenth century. The text of this manuscript is close to the *Liber fidei*, doc. 10 and refers to King “Teodomirus”:¹⁰⁴

Tempore Sueuorum, sub era DCVII, Teodomirus princeps eisdem Suevis Concilium in ciuitate Luco fieri praecepit ad confirmandam fidem catholicam, vel pro diuersis Ecclesie causis.

This division from the time of King “Theodemirus” was already being invoked on December 18, 1078, in a dispute between Braga and Ourense about the territory of “Baronceli.”¹⁰⁵ In 1101, a bull by Paschal II concerning the limits of the diocese of Coimbra mentions it, too.¹⁰⁶ In 1114, Paschal again guaranteed the limits of Braga, in place since the time of king “Mirus.”¹⁰⁷

Joannes Vasaesus (1511–1561) is the first humanist to refer to this council, and does so based on the *Liber fidei*:¹⁰⁸

Hoc concilium Lucense circa hunc annum celebratum est calendis Ianuariis, sub Theodomiro Rege Sueuorum [...] Ex archiuis Ecclesiae Bracarensis. (fols. 64r–v)

Loaysa also published the text of the Council of Lugo in his *Collectio conciliorum Hispaniae*.¹⁰⁹ He used the *Tumbo Viejo*, of which the bishop of Lugo, Juan Ruiz de Villarán (?–1591) sent him a copy. The title Loaysa affixed to the text is clear: *Concilium apud Lucum a Theodomiro principe habitum: Era AD.VII*. In his commentary on the council, he gives the list of the Suevic kings he knows:

¹⁰⁴ Risco 1796, pp. 341–343. See also López Ferreiro-Fita 1882, pp. 49–50; David 1947, p. 22 (text D).

¹⁰⁵ *Liber fidei*, doc. 21, fols. 12r–12v; ed. Costa, 1965, pp. 42–43; Costa 1997, vol. 2, p. 392. Another copy in *Liber fidei*, doc. 619, fols. 162v–163r; ed. Costa 1990, p. 44; Costa 1997 pp. 392.

¹⁰⁶ Bull by Paschal II (March 24, 1101): *Liber fidei* doc. 5, fol. 2v. Ed. Erdmann 1927, p. 155, no. 2; Costa 1965, pp. 8–9.

¹⁰⁷ Bull by Paschal II (December 4, 1114): *Liber fidei*, doc. 554, fols. 148r–v. Ed. Costa 1978, pp. 353–354). Erdmann 1927, p. 162, no. 10, publishes it with the date December 4, 1108, and destined to Bishop Gerald of Braga, considering it a fake.

¹⁰⁸ Vasaesus 1552.

¹⁰⁹ Loaysa 1593, pp. 128–129 (transcription), p. 130 (commentary). Cf. David 1947, pp. 20–21 (text A).

Hermericus, Rechila, Reccarius, Maldra, Frumarius, Remismundus, qui haeresi infectus et cum uniuersa Sueuorum gente; & eadem labes per fere annos centum est propagata, usque Theodomirum, siue Ariamirum.

Loaysa's list is taken from Isidore., The only difference is here the identification of Theodemirus with Ariamirus. Loaysa did not include the "Theodericus" of the *Liber Itacii* or the "Theodemundus" of the *Chronicon mundi*.

In all cases, Theodemirus is the king mentioned in Gallaecia, most of the time identified with "Mirus" (seldom with "Ariamirus"). Neither "Theodemundus" nor "Theodericus" is mentioned as responsible for the ecclesiastical division of Gallaecia. One should not give too much importance to the name "Theodemirus" either: when in Gallaecia someone decided to reconfigure the *Parochiale Sueuum* to bring it in line with Lugo's political pretensions, he attributed it to a Suevic king, a contemporary of Martin of Braga of unquestionable antiquity and catholic faith.

c. Lucas de Tuy's *Chronicon mundi* also referred to Theodemirus. "Theodemundus" had already been mentioned when Lucas copied the *Nomina regum Sueuorum* (see above); yet later, when he copied the *Diuisio Wambae* itself, mentioning again the metropolitan sees of Lugo (in Asturias), León, and Braga, the name he used was "Theodemirus," which was not mentioned by the *Diuisio Wambae* in this context:

Lucus quam Vandalis edificauerunt in Asturiis teneat per suos terminos antiquos sicut eis diuisi Theodemirus rex Sueuorum, et nulli unquam subdantur archiepiscopo uel primati. Sedes etiam Portugalie permaneant in sua diuisione sicut eis diuisit rex Theodemirus cum his etiam que nos adiecimus. Sedes Bracarensis metropolis, sicut eis ordinauit Theodemirus, ita eas ermanere mandamus. (3.16–17)

Therefore, in the *Diuisio Wambae* Theodemirus becomes responsible not only for the first ecclesiastical division of Gallaecia (at the Council of Lugo), but also for the division of the provinces of "Lugo in Asturias" and León. This is a change introduced by Lucas de Tuy. He wanted to affirm the greater antiquity of these sees *vis-à-vis* Toledo; for this reason, in addition to attributing the foundation and division of the ecclesiastical province of Oviedo to the Vandals, in the *Diuisio Wambae* he transferred the information about Lugo in Asturias and León to a context before Wamba, at least a hundred years before the council held in Toledo: he identified king "Theodemirus" as the man responsible for this division, most surely because he knew the text of the Council Of Lugo (which he also

mentioned in the *Chronicon mundi* – see above): here, “Theodemirus” is always the name used.

Dependent from Lucas de Tuy, the mss. *V W* reveal the same discrepancy between the list of Suevic kings and the text on the division of dioceses of Lugo, León, and Portugal, which is attributed to “Theodemirus”:¹¹⁰

Legio ciuitas sacerdotalis et regia et Lucus quam Euandali hedificauerunt in Asturiis hee teneant per suos terminos antiquos sicut eis diuisit rex Theodemirus. Hee nulli subdantur archiepiscopo uel primati. Sedes etiam Portuli [sic] permaneant in sua diuisione sicut eis diuisit rex Theodomirus cum his etiam que nos eis adiecimus.

Years later, around 1270, Alfonso X’s (1221–1284) historians also referred to the Suevic division of the Iberian ecclesiastical provinces:

Despues de los Vuandalos regnaron en Gallizia los Suevos, y el primeiro rey dellos fue Ermerigo assi como dixiemos ya; despues de Ermerigo regno Riquila, desi Ffranta, empos este Remismundo, despues deste regno Theodemiro, e este fue muy buen rey et catholico, et fizo fazer concilio en Gallizia en la cibdad de Lugo, e fue en este concilio Adaulpho, obispo de León, con todos los otros obispos que eran y de gallizia pora confirmar ell escripto del dipartimiento otorgo despues el rey Bamba. E el departimiento que el rey Theodomiros fizo fue este: [...].

Their dependence on the *Chronicon mundi* is evident.¹¹¹ Alfonso X’s history copied its structure, and translated its *Nomina regum Vandalorum* and *Nomina regum Sueuorum*. However, they amended the name “Theodemundus,” which was in the *Chronicon mundi*, to “Theodomiro,” probably preferring to include the name of a king attested by other sources, rather than a “Theodemundus” that no one else mentioned.

d. In the *Coronica General de España*, Morales also referred to the ecclesiastical division of Gallaecia. He used Vasaeus’ text on the Council of Lugo, which he had seen “in the archives of the church of Braga,” only adding the comment: “in the chronicle of Itacius there is no mention of this council. He [Itacius] attributes this division to the first council of Braga.”¹¹² Morales also transcribed the beginning of the text copied in the *Tumbo Viejo* of Lugo (fols. 68v–69r).

¹¹⁰ *V W* exclude the ecclesiastical province of Braga as they consider it part of Portugal.

¹¹¹ See *Primera Crónica General* 4a: *mandamos ayuntar quantos libros pudimos aver de istorias en que alguna cosa contassen de los fechos d’Espanna, e tomamos de la crónica dell arçobispo don Rodrigo, que fizo por mandado del rey don Fernando nuestro padre, e de la de maestre Luchas, obispo de Tuy.*

¹¹² Morales 1577, vol. 11, fol. 68v (“en la coronica de Itacio no ay mencion deste concilio, atribuyendo este author la division de las diocesis al primero de Braga”).

Concerning Wamba, Morales translated and published the *Diuisio*, without the additions transmitted by the *Liber Itacii* in the version of the *Codex uetustissimus*.¹¹³ He did use the *Liber*, however, and the *Chronicon mundi*,¹¹⁴ and attributed the first division of the province of Braga to King Mirus, whom he also identified with Theudemirus:

La diuision del rey Myro de los Suevos (fol. 174r); cuando llega el rey Vuamba a esta division de Braga, dize, que no tiene que repartir de nuevo en ella: por estar muy bien distribuydos los terminos de sus diocesis, por el concilio que mando celebrar el rey Myro: assi las dexa en aquella misma particion. [...] No señalo el rey Myro los terminos de las diocesis por los quatro lados, como el rey Vuamba. [...] En la diuision primera de Myro, estuuu esto de Braga muy diferente de lo de agora. (fol. 174v)

e. In Alcobaça, in 1609, Bernardo de Brito translated into Portuguese some “fragments” of the Council of Lugo,¹¹⁵ “in the form that we have in Alcobaça, together with the works of Saint Isidore in an old volume, as Ithacio, Morales, and Garcia de Loaisa refer to them.”¹¹⁶ “Theodomiro” is, once again, the king responsible for convening the Council of Lugo:

Concilio que se celebrou em Lugo, em tempo del Rei Theodomiro, ao primeyro de Ianeiro, era DCVII, que he anno de Christo 569. No tempo dos Suevos, correndo a era de seiscentos & sete, ao primeyro dia de Ianeyro, mandou o proprio Theodomiro Principe dos Suevos, aiuntar Concilio na cidade de Lugo [...]. (fol. 194rb)

However, Bernardo de Brito knew the name “Theodemundus.” He wrote: “when one lists some [of the Suevic kings], one discovers another, almost unknown by our authors. This is Theodomundo, who Laymundo calls Theodiso, implying that he was the father and immediate predecessor of Theodemiro. Due to the little memory that remains of these princes, it is significant to discover any record of them, especially all those who reigned when they lived in Arian blindness.”¹¹⁷

f. Ms. Madrid, BN 9317, fols. 1r–34v, which I referred to above, is a manuscript that belonged to Juan de Ferreras, copied at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Gazel

¹¹³ Morales 1577, vol. 12, fols. 172r–173r (introduction), 173r–177r (translation and commentary). This translation is mentioned by Flores 1749, p. 211.

¹¹⁴ Morales 1577, vol. 12, fol. 173r: “Seguire los originales antiguos que tuue muy buenos de don Lucas de Tuy, y de la coronica de Itacio, y otros.”

¹¹⁵ Brito 1609, fol. 194rb.

¹¹⁶ Brito 1609, fol. 194vb. Cf. David, 1947, pp. 22–24 (text E).

¹¹⁷ Brito 1609, fol. 197ra: “Nomeando alguns [reis suevos], nos descobre outro, de que nossos Autores fazem pouca lembrança, que he Theodomundo, o qual Laymundo chama Theodiso, dando a entender que foi pay & immediato antecessor de Theodemiro, que pera a pouca memoria que ha destes Principes, he cousa consideraueel descobrir qualquer lembrança sua, quanto mais todos aquelles que reynarão no tempo em que estiueraõ na cegueira Arriana.” The “Laymundo” referred to here is a “Laymundo Ortega,” probably the invented author of a text supposedly housed in Alcobaça.

considers it the best representative of the old *Chronicon Ouetense cum Appendicibus*. It thus transmits the *Liber Itacii*. This manuscript was copied from a “Chronicon of the Church of Oviedo” that belonged to Pedro Núñez de Guzmán, Marquis of Montealegre (1615–1678).¹¹⁸ The *Nomina regum Sueuorum* therein reads as follows:

*Post (+ hos corr. sup. lin.) reges ceperunt regnare Sueui. Primus Rex Sueuorum Helmericus cepit regnare. Quo mortuo, Recilla filius eius regnauit pro eo. Quo mortuo, Reccarius regnauit pro eo. Quo mortuo, Maldrum (-s corr.) regnauit pro eo. Quo mortuo, Furmarium (-s corr.) regnauit pro eo. Quo mortuo Remi***dus (-smun- corr.) regnauit pro eo. Quo mortuo, Theodemirus regnauit pro eo. Era DCV. Rex iste fuit catholicus et fecit celebrare concilium in Gallecia apud Lucensem urbe et diuisit omnem diocesim inter omnis [sic] episcopos Gallecie sicut hic scriptum est. (fols. 2r–v)*

If Pierre David and Gazel are right, Lugo was probably the location of the first council; Braga occurs only in manuscripts directly dependent from Pelagius’ scriptorium (*Codex uetustissimus, Liber chronicorum*). After the *Parochiale Sueuum*, the Acts of the Second Council of Braga again name “Theodemirus”: *Post mortem Theodemirus suscepit regnum era DCXVII* (fol. 3v), as does the *Diuisio Wambae, sicut Theodemirus rex diuisit et ordinauit sedes Gallaetia* (fol. 6v). “Theodemirus” would thus have been the name copied in the *Nomina regum Sueuorum* in its earliest version, as transmitted by the *Chronicon Ouetense*.

Conclusion

The Acts of a supposed Council of Lugo held in 569 with a list of the parishes of Gallaecia were circulating in northwestern Iberia from at least the eleventh century: the so-called *Parochiale Sueuum*. Manuscripts from Braga, Lugo, and Compostela attribute both to king “Theodemirus.” This is the only credible name for a Suevic king, since it is the only name mentioned by John of Biclar and by Isidore. The origins of the other variants are difficult to determine; however, they certainly result from misreadings of the various manuscripts, from corruptions of “Theodemirus.”

In Oviedo, the so-called *Chronicon Ouetense cum Appendicibus* also transmitted this traditional name. The *Diuisio Wambae* was part of the *Chronicon*. For some reason, probably a simply scribal error, a copy of this *Chronicon Ouetense* introduced a variant reading (“Theodemirus” > “Theodericus”) : this is our archetype α . α was copied into a manuscript later known as *Codex uetustissimus Ouetensis*. The *Diuisio Wambae* also transmitted by this codex was incorporated into the *Chronicon Adefonsi III* (*ad*

¹¹⁸ Gazel 2022, § 11.

Sebastianum version) in Pelagius' *Liber chronicorum* (ante 1145). In Nájera, another copy of α was also integrated into the *Chronicon Adefonsi III*, but in the Rotensis version, becoming part of the compilation usually known as *Chronica Nainerensis* (c. 1190).

None of these copies (refers to a "Theodemundus" or a "Theodemirus"; all refer to a "Theodericus," to whom they attribute the ecclesiastical division of Gallaecia.

Lucas de Tuy's *Chronicon mundi* drew on a huge set of sources: Isidore of Seville's *Chronicon* and *Historia*, Petrus Comestor's *Historia Scholastica*, the *Chronica Adefonsi III* (both versions), the *chronica* by Sampirus and Pelagius, and the *Historia seminensis*. Lucas was perhaps also familiar with Eusebius/Jerome's *Chronica*, Orosius' *Historiae*, and some of the texts of the so-called *Chronica Albeldensia*.¹¹⁹ None refers to a "Theodemundus" or a "Theodericus" as king of the Suevi. However, in his text of the *Diuisio Wambae*, Lucas introduced elements taken from the *Liber Itacii*, including the structure of the *Nomina regum*, but not in the version of α . It is Lucas de Tuy who first referred to Theodemundus as "king of the Suevi" after Remismund. All texts referring to Theodemundus depend from Lucas' *Chronicon mundi*.

Other names circulated for the hundred years between the reigns of Remismund and Theodemirus: one must also reject Ermeric II and Rechiarius II, mentioned in the passion of St. Vincent of León, found by António Yepes in a "very old book of the house of San Claudio de León."¹²⁰ We are left with the "Veremundu rege" of the inscription of São Salvador de Vairão, which Alberto Ferreiro accepted as a reference to an unknown Suevi king.¹²¹ It is, however, very little for a hundred years.

¹¹⁹ Valdés García 1996, pp. xiii–lxx; Falque 2001, pp. xxxiii–cv; Jerez Cabrero 2006, pp. 119–160, 172–179.

¹²⁰ Yepes 1609, fols. 174v–177r: "libro antiquissimo de la casa de San Claudio de León" (fol. 175r–v).

¹²¹ Ferreiro 1997, pp. 263–272; *contra* Barroca 2000, pp. 83–92; Collins, 2004, 32 n. 59. See also Dias 1997; Velázquez Soriano 2000.