

البحافري Al-mu'áferi; others البغافري Al-mugháferi; a few,—like the author of a fragment translated in the Appendix D. (p. xlvi).—البحاوي Al-mu'áwi, which is no doubt meant for one of these two.

Ibnu Khaldún calls him at times النجعي An-naja'í, at other times النجيني An-najaghí; Adh-dhobí and Ibnu Hayyán النفزي An-nefezí. Most of the Arabian writers simply call him 'the Berber,' and such he must have been if he really was a *mauli* or liberated slave of Músa, in which case the patronymic 'Al-mugháferi,' being that of an illustrious Arabian tribe, is in nowise suited to him.—On the other hand, if he was an African by birth, how could his name be Tarif, (an Arabic word meaning 'an elegant and comely youth,' 'a man who is descended from a long series of ancestors,') and that of his father Málik? This difficulty, however, can easily be obviated by supposing that both he and his father received new names on their embracing the Mohammedan religion, as was customary in such cases.

<sup>19</sup> I read in the *Reyhánu-l-albáb* that Ilyán met Músa at Cairwán, and spoke to him at length on the best means of invading Spain and making the conquest of the land.

<sup>20</sup> The same variance which I have said existed with regard to Tarif's name and patronymic, as written by the historians of Mohammedan Spain, is to be found in that of Tárik. Idrísí (*clim. iv. sect. 1*) calls him Tárik Ibn 'Abdillah Ibn ونمو Wanmu, or Unmu; Ibnu Bashkúwál, Tárik Ibn 'Amru, of the tribe of Zenátah; Ibnu Khaldún gives him the patronymic النفزي An-nefezí; others call him Al-lakhmí, no doubt because he was a *mauli* of Músa, who himself belonged to the tribe of Lakhm.

<sup>21</sup> I have preserved in this, as well as in many other instances, the word مولي *mauli*, because its meanings are so many and different that it is impossible to find an equivalent to it in English. A *mauli* signifies a man who attaches himself to another for the sake of protection, and who places himself under a species of bondage to him; it means also a liberated slave, who in the act of obtaining his manumission becomes comprised in that category. In the first wars of Islám it was customary for the Arabian generals to grant freedom to all those captives who embraced the Mohammedan religion; and in this manner Músa is said to have had several thousand *maulis*. See Appendix E., page lxxxiii.

<sup>22</sup> If the ninety-second year of the Hijra began to be counted on the 28th October, A.D. 710, the month of Sha'bán, which is the eighth of the Mohammedan or lunar year, commenced on the 23rd May, 711, and ended on the 20th June. Tárik's disembarkation, according to the writer here quoted, must therefore have taken place on the 23rd or 30th of May, or the 6th, 13th, or 20th of June, which happened to be Saturdays, and not in August, as here stated; but the writer knew that August was the eighth month of the Christian year, as Sha'bán was the eighth of the Mohammedan.

أَجَارَهُمْ يَلِيَانُ الِى سَاحِلِ الْاِنْدَلُسِ فِى مَرَاكِبِ التِّجَارِ مِنْ حَيْثُ لَا يَعْلَمُ بِهِمْ اَوَّلًا <sup>23</sup>

Such is the reading in all the copies; but, on fuller consideration, I do not think myself justified in translating as I have done. It might mean as well 'Ilyán made them cross in merchant vessels, whence (from what port) is not ascertained;' for although it has been said (p. 253) that Tárik sailed from Tangiers, the author here transcribes the words of another historian. Paulus Diaconus, an Italian writer who was

contemporary with these events, says clearly that the expedition sailed from Ceuta. See Paulus Diaconus, *De rebus gestis Longobardorum*, lib. vi. cap. 46, p. 503. The historians consulted by Conde (vol. i. p. 28) say that Tárík sailed from Tangiers to Ceuta, and thence to Spain, which accounts for the discrepancy.

Another account, which I have omitted in the translation, says that the vessels thus employed were only four, which would imply no increase of navy since the preceding year. But is it probable that the Arabs, masters of the Mediterranean from Tripoli to the Straits, and who had already made repeated incursions on the shores of Spain, could not muster more than four vessels to convey an army of twelve, or at least seven thousand men? What had become of the two hundred and seventy sail with which, according to Rodericus Toletanus (*De Reb. Hisp.* lib. iii.), they had only a few years before ravaged the coast of Spain? There is another circumstance in this account which to me is inexplicable. Why are Ilyán's vessels said to have been 'merchant vessels?' The Archbishop says (lib. iii. cap. xix.) *quos separatim duxit in Hispaniam in navibus mercatorum ne causa transitus perciperetur*; but although Ilyán, or even Taríf, with their small force, may have wished to land stealthily, it is not credible that Tárík, at the head of a numerous army, should have contemplated such an idea.

<sup>24</sup> وركب اميرهم طارق اخرهم This may be understood in two different ways; namely, that Tárík was the last man to embark, or that he was the last man to come on shore and mount his horse. The former, however, is more natural, and agrees better with the expressions employed.

<sup>25</sup> راي وهو نائم 'He saw in a dream.' My copy only says that he had a vision.

<sup>26</sup> *Muhájirin*, from *hájara*, 'to flee,' 'to migrate,' are those Arabs who accompanied the Mohammedan Prophet in his flight from Medina to Ethiopia. Another account says that what Tárík saw were angels in armour. Ibn Khallekán, in the life of Músa (*Tyd. Ind.*, No. 758), says that he saw the Prophet Mohammed and the first four Khalifs.

<sup>27</sup> See Appendix D., p. xlvii. Cardonne (*Hist. de l'Afrique*, vol. i. p. 73,) relates also this anecdote, which he no doubt borrowed from our author.

<sup>28</sup> A spot similar to that which is here described is considered as a proof of good luck among the Eastern people.

<sup>29</sup> Most of the Arabian writers state the forces under Tárík at twelve thousand men; for those who, like Ibnu Hayyán, make them consist at first of seven thousand only, say that they were afterwards joined by five thousand more.

<sup>30</sup> The same date above assigned, p. 266.

<sup>31</sup> This passage not being in the volume of Ibnu Khaldún's work preserved in the library of the British Museum, I had not the means of collating it. At first sight it would appear to invalidate the accounts of all the historians here quoted, since it purports that Taríf and Tárík invaded Spain at the same time; but, if attentively examined, it will be found not to contain sufficient evidence to impair the authority of other writers. He does not distinctly state that Taríf had not, previously to his joining Tárík,

invaded Spain alone. Taríf, leading the van of the army, might have preceded him: such indeed appears to have been the case, for it is not to be supposed that the forces that preceded Tárík landed without a general at their head.

<sup>32</sup> See a previous note, p. 519. النجني النجني The author of the *Reyhánu-l-albáb* says that Tárík, after coming down from the rock, "marched to Wáda-l-'asel (Rio de la Miel), whence he moved and "pitched his tents close to Algesiras." ثم رفع قُبُل به علي وادي العسل ثم خيم بقرب المدينة الخضراء

<sup>33</sup> It would appear from the accounts both of the Christian and Mohammedan writers, that from the time of Tárík's landing on the coast of Spain to the battle of Guadalete there was a succession of skirmishes. See Appendix D., p. xlvi.

<sup>34</sup> I have purposely deferred until now the investigation of the precise period of Tárík's landing, that I might more easily pass in review the various dates assigned by the Mohammedan writers. About the year of the Hijra no doubt can be raised, every historian of the conquest agreeing in fixing it in the year 92; for although there are not wanting some who place that memorable event either in 91 (Idrisí, *clim.* iv. *sect.* 1) or in 93 (Appendix D., p. xlvi.), it is evident that the former allude to Taríf's invasion, and the latter to the arrival of Músa, by whom and in whose time Spain was finally conquered. As to the Christian writers themselves, Masdeu has satisfactorily proved by a series of ingenious arguments that all those of some note have referred or meant to refer it to the era 749, which corresponds to the 92nd Mohammedan year. But if this first part of my inquiry be easily settled, it is not so with the month and the day in which Tárík set his foot on the Spanish shore, since on these points there exists some discrepancy between the best writers of Mohammedan Spain.

It has been said that Ibnu Hayyán refers the landing of Tárík to a Saturday of the month of Sha'bán, that is to say, to May 23, 30, or June 6, 13, or 20; other writers place it in Ramadhán, while the generality of historians have fixed that signal event to the month of Rejeb. But if we examine these accounts with attention we shall find that the difference is neither so great nor so irreconcilable as it would at first sight appear. Between the 5th of Rejeb, the earliest date assigned, and the beginning of the month of Ramadhán, only one month and twenty-five days elapsed. It has been said elsewhere that Tárík had only four vessels to transport his army to Andalus,—that he was the last man to go on board,—and all writers, Mohammedan as well as Christian, agree in saying that a long series of skirmishes, protracted for several days, preceded the fatal engagement by which the Gothic empire was overthrown. It is therefore evident that those authors who placed that event after the month of Rejeb alluded to some incursion made by Tárík as soon as his men had all been put on shore, or to his starting from the rock where he first landed. The month of Rejeb being once fixed upon, it will not be difficult to ascertain the precise day. Ibnu-l-khattíb says on the 25th, an anonymous writer on the 24th, Adh-dhobí on the 8th, Conde and Casiri, or their authorities, on the 5th. But, first of all, Ibnu-l-khattíb never said (as stated p. 268) that Tárík landed on the 25th Rejeb, for, in the two historical works which we have by him, he gives different dates. In his chronology of the Khalifs (*apud* Casiri, vol. ii. p. 182,) he clearly asserts that Tárík set his foot on the rock of Calpe on a Thursday, the 5th of Rejeb, A. H. 92. In his history of Granada the same author states وكان دخول طارق بن زياد الأندلس يوم الاثنين لخمس [ليالي] خلون من رجب سنة ٩٢ و قيل في شعبان و قيل في رمضان موافق شهر أغسطس من شهر العجبية "and the entrance of Tárík into Andalus happened on a Monday, five days being elapsed of the month

“ of Rejeb of the year 92 ; others say in Sha'bán, others in Ramadhán (beginning July 21), answering to “ the month of August of the Christians.” It is evident from what precedes, that instead of *لخمس خلون* “ five nights being elapsed,” the copy of Ibnu-l-khattíb consulted by Al-makkarí read *لخمس بقين* “ five nights remaining,”—a mistake of frequent occurrence in Mohammedan books. The same observation is applicable to the date of the 24th Rejeb, since the Mohammedans counting by nights, not by days, the author who read “ five nights remaining ” (Rejeb having thirty days) might think that the event was fixed to the 24th. It now remains for us to ascertain which of the two dates, the 5th or the 8th, is the right one. We have in favour of the first, Abú-l-fedá, Ibn Khallekán, Ibnu-l-khattíb himself, besides the writers translated or consulted by Rodericus Toletanus and Conde. The second is defended only by Ibnu-l-abbár and Adh-dhobí, but in my opinion it is the right one, and my reasons for thus believing are these. It is clear that Ibnu-l-khattíb was guilty of a contradiction, since the 5th of Rejeb could not be a Monday and a Thursday at once. By looking at the chronological tables of the Mohammedan or lunar year drawn up by the indefatigable Masdeu, I find that the fifth of Rejeb was a Monday, and therefore the Thursday immediately following it was the 8th. I may therefore advance, without fear of contradiction, that the landing of Tárik on the rock of Gibraltar took place on Thursday, the 8th of Rejeb, A. H. 92, answering to the 30th of April, A. D. 711.

<sup>35</sup> The same obscurity is observed respecting this as the other actors in this interesting drama. Most of the ancient chroniclers call this general Sancho, others Enecus (Eneco or Iñigo), both names which are not Gothic but Basque. Isidorus calls him *Theodomir*, and adds that he was the same general who, on a previous occasion, (during the reign of Egica,) had inflicted defeat on the Mohammedans, while the Arabs say that the general who came to the assistance of the besieged at Ceuta was named Alfonso. How are these accounts to be reconciled?

<sup>36</sup> See Appendix D., p. xlvi., where the landing of Tárik is given more in detail.

<sup>37</sup> All the historians of Spain, Mohammedan as well as Christian, agree in placing Roderic away from his capital, engaged in war, when the news of Tárik's invasion reached him; none, however, has specified the cause or occasion of it. It is probable that he was employed in quelling some rebellion excited by the partisans of the sons of Wittiza.

<sup>38</sup> See p. 208, and Note 25, p. 487. This was a palace which Theodofred, Duke of Cordova, who is supposed to have been Roderic's father, had built during his exile to that city. The ruins of it were still visible in the time of Morales. *Antig. de España*, fo. 197.

<sup>39</sup> *باكاناف شقندة بعدوة نهرها قبلة القصر* Thus in the text, but I suspect that *قبالة* ought to be substituted for *قبلة*. If so, the translation is as follows: “ they encamped under shelter of Shakandah, “ on the banks of the river there opposite to the palace, &c.” I read in the *Cronica del Moro Rasis*, “ *fasta que llegó á una aldea de Cordova que llaman Segunda y yaze sobre Cordova tres millas.*”

The word *شقندة* which is not pointed in any of the copies, might also be pronounced *Shekundah*, and be meant for the *Secunda* of Rodericus Toletanus (*De Reb. Hisp.* lib. iii. cap. xx). If such be the case, the patronymic of the historian whose epistle is given at p. 32, *et seq.*, ought to be written *Ash-shekundí*, as he was a native of that town.

<sup>40</sup> Rodericus says the same. But his authority is of little or no value in corroborating the statements made by the Mohammedan authors whose works he read and translated.

<sup>41</sup> That the Arabs, who believed without criticism the accounts of the Christians, should make Roderic a descendant from *اشبان* Hispan, which word they transformed into *اصبهان*—may easily be understood; but that the royal author of the *Cronica General*, who pretended to be issued from the same stock, should a few centuries after assert the same, passes all belief.

<sup>42</sup> In the number of men under the orders of Tárík I find the Arabian writers generally agree, although some make them amount to twelve thousand at the time of his landing. It is evident, however, that those authors are more correct who reduce them to seven thousand in the first instance, since, owing to the scanty number of their vessels, they could not all be conveyed at once to the Spanish shore; and since, as the author rightly observes, Tárík received reinforcements from Africa between the time of his landing and the battle that ensued, an interval of nearly three months.

<sup>43</sup> *اهل البلة النصرانية*—literally 'the people or the ministers of the Christian sect.'

<sup>44</sup> *ابن الخبيثة* An expression of contempt, meaning 'the son of a low female.'

<sup>45</sup> *قد غلب علي سلطاننا و ليس من اهله و انها كان من اتباعنا* Tárík's followers are here called *الطارقون* At-tárikún.

<sup>46</sup> I have given elsewhere (Note 23, p. 512,) the names of the sons of Wittiza after the historian Ibnu-l-kúttiyah, who claimed descent from one of them. I find, however, that the anonymous author of a work on the conquest of Spain by the Arabs, entitled *اخبار مجبوعة في فتح الاندلس* 'collection of records relating to the conquest of Andalus,' an English version of which, together with some extracts, has been kindly lent to me by the Earl of Munster, calls one of them *شثيبرت* Shithibert, (Sigisbert?) But as fuller mention of these princes will be made by the author, I leave the investigation of this obscure point for the present.

<sup>47</sup> *كلباً من كلاب ابينا* 'a follower and a servant.' Another account calls him *كلباً من كلاب ابينا* 'a dog, from among the dogs of our father.'

<sup>48</sup> *صفاياء الملوك* It is said by the Arabian writers that the sons of Wittiza demanded and obtained as the price of their treason all the private domains which had belonged to their father. This would show that Wittiza was not dead when Roderic usurped the crown, but lived for some time in exile, as Isidorus Pacensis, a contemporary writer, tells us; and that the states claimed by the sons had been allotted to him by the usurper. There is, however, one word in this sentence which renders this conjecture improbable. *صفاياء الملوك* *Safáyá-l-molúk*, literally translated, means 'the portion of the spoil allotted to the princes;' and it cannot be supposed that their father's inheritance should be so called by the Arabs.

<sup>49</sup> There can be no doubt that the river now called *Guadalete* is the Chrysos of the ancients, but how it came by its modern name it is by no means easy to determine; for in no Arabian writer which I have consulted have I found the river called "Guadalete." Ibnu-l-khattib (*apud* Casiri, vol. ii. p. 183,) calls it وادي لدة *Wáda Led* and وادي لكة *Wáda Lekeh*; Rodericus Toletanus, *Vadilac*, *Vadaleke*, and *Vadalak*; Conde, *Guadaledé*; Ar-rázi, *Leke*. Cardonne (vol. i. p. 74) is the only writer who calls it *Léthé*; but in this, as well as in many other instances, the French translator substituted his own conjectures for the readings which the manuscripts afforded him: knowing that some of the Spanish antiquaries, misled by the similarity of the names, had advanced that the river Guadalete was the same as the Lethe of the ancients, he translated *Wáda Lek* by 'Léthé.' As to the opinion entertained by some writers, (see Florez, *Esp. Sag.* vol. ix. p. 53,) that Guadalete is a compound of two words, meaning 'river of joy,' and that the Chrysos was so named from the great satisfaction which the Arabs experienced on its banks when they had defeated Roderic, it is not to be admitted, unless the name of the river be found written thus, وادي لذة *Wáda-ledhdhah*, and the cause of its being so called be satisfactorily stated.

<sup>50</sup> Most of the Arabian historians compute Roderic's army at ninety thousand; a few at seventy thousand; Ibnu Khaldún is the only writer whose estimation is so low as forty thousand.

<sup>51</sup> "He himself came in a litter." The word سرير *serír* means a 'throne,' a 'couch to recline on,' a 'chariot,' a 'litter.' It was probably the latter. The author of *Cartas para ilustrar la historia de España*, Mad. 1796, translates the word *serír* by 'couch,' and quotes a passage of Adh-dhobi, by which it would appear that the Gothic monarch, then in his eighty-fifth year, was prostrated by sickness. هو بن خسس و ثباين سنة و كان مريض يومئذ The circumstance of the chariot being drawn by two, others say three white mules, instead of the spirited horses best suited to a warrior, is very much in favour of the statement; but when the principal events of that momentous period remain enveloped in darkness and confusion, how can we expect to dissipate the shades that cover the minor details? Thomas Newton, the author of a history of the Saracens, quoted by Mr. Southey (*Don Roderic*, xviii.), says that "Roderike was ryding in a horse-litter of ivorie, drawne by two goodly horses." The word which I have translated by 'awning' is ظلّ *dhollo*, whence the Spaniards have made *toldo*.

<sup>52</sup> This address of Tárík to his soldiers will be found entire in the Appendix E., p. lxx. Both Conde (vol. i. p. 31) and Cardonne (*Hist. de l'Afr.* vol. i. p. 76) give the beginning and the substance of it. Were we to draw any inference from the language used by Tárík on this occasion, we might say that the Berbers under his command had been put to flight by the Christians. Otherwise, *cui bono* those words, "Whither can you fly?" If the contest lasted a whole week of continual skirmishing, as all the Arabian historians assert, the invaders might easily have been defeated in some partial engagement.

<sup>53</sup> غريق في الحديد—a very fine metaphor, of frequent occurrence in 'Antar and other Arabian romances.

<sup>54</sup> The word used is ملك—which I have already observed (see Note 11, p. 415,) means 'princes' or 'feudal lords.'

<sup>55</sup> The historians of Mohammedan Spain designate all the Christian monarchs, who at various times were opposed to them, under the generic appellation of *طاغية* *Tághiyah*, a word apparently not Arabic, and which conveys a meaning similar to that of *rípavvos*.

<sup>56</sup> This answer made by the Moslems to their general is not in all the copies of this work. The address itself is not in Mr. Shakespear's manuscript, or, if it is, that gentleman omitted the translation of it.

<sup>57</sup> The word here used is *كبة* *kubbah*, which is the origin of the Spanish *alcoba*, *cupula*, *alcubilla*, &c.

<sup>58</sup> The light bow formerly used by the Arabs, and which they called *kausu-l-'arab*, was different from the cross-bow of the Christians.

<sup>59</sup> My copy adds—"Look at him, reclining on yonder soft couch." See above, Note 51.

<sup>60</sup> There are some writers, like the author here mentioned, who would have Roderic to have fallen by *Tárik's* hand; but, as I shall observe hereafter, there is every reason to suppose that the Gothic king died an obscure death.

<sup>61</sup> Instead of 'the middle of Ramadhán,' *في منتصف* I think that *منسلخ*—that is, at the end of Ramadhán,—is to be substituted; such is the reading in my copy, and it agrees better with the account of another historian lower down, who places the battle on the 28th day of that month. The month of Ramadhán, which is the ninth in the Mohammedan or lunar year, began to be counted on the 21st of June, and ended on the 20th of July, 711.

<sup>62</sup> One of the copies reads *وادي لك*—the Rich MS. *وادي لك*—I have already observed elsewhere that this word is differently written by the Arabian writers. All, however, agree in making the second letter a *ك* not a *ط*—*Ibnu-l-kúttiyyah* says that the battle was fought on the banks of the *Wáda Bekkah* or *Bekkeh* (now *Rio de Vejer* or *Vadalmedina*), close to *Medina-Sidonia*.

<sup>63</sup> It is generally believed that the battle which decided the fate of the Gothic monarchy was fought in the plain of *Xerez*, on the southern bank of the *Guadalete*; but I shall be able to show in the course of these notes that the engagement took place much nearer the seashore, and not far from the town of *Medina-Sidonia*.

Leaving, however, for another place the investigation of this important fact, I shall merely discuss now what the author means in this passage by *ناحية شيدونة*—or, as may be read elsewhere, *كورة شيدونة* (the district or province of *Shidúnah*), as the settling of this point,—one of considerable difficulty,—will help us on to a knowledge of the other. When the Arabs invaded Spain, the city of *Assido* (now *Medina-Sidonia*) was the capital of an extensive district, and the see of a bishop. *Assido*, or rather *Assidone* in the ablative case, was corrupted by the Arabs into *Shidone*, or *Shidoniáh*, and the district or province over which that city extended its jurisdiction was consequently called *Kúrah Shidúnah*, the territory of *Sidonia*. This, according to *Abú-l-fedá* (*Geog. fo. 43*) and *Idrisi* (*clim. iv. sect. 1*), comprised the cities of *Arcos*, *Xerez*, *Algesiras*, *Tarifa*, *Cadiz*, and *Bejer*; that is,

from the spot where the Guadalquivir discharges its waters into the ocean down to the Straits of Gibraltar. In the course of time, however, the city of Xerez received also the name of Shidonia: according to Ar-rází, because it was built with the ruins of Assido, but, in my opinion, from its having become the spot where the Arabs from Shidúniah (Sidon) in Palestine were ordered to settle during the government of Hosám Ibn Dhirár; for the former conjecture is hardly probable, the distance between the two cities being too great. Be this as it may, certain it is that soon after the conquest Xerez was also called *Shidoniah*. It is so asserted by all the historians and geographers of Mohammedan Spain; and Florez (*Esp. Sag.* vol. x. p. 21) has given, besides, deeds of the thirteenth century, corroborating that statement, and calling that city Xerez-Sadunia. It is therefore quite demonstrated, that by the province of Shidúniah the Arabian geographers meant all that country extending between the mouth of the Guadalquivir and the Straits of Gibraltar; that *Medínah-Shidúniah* (or the capital of the district of Assido) is the present town of Medina-Sidonia; lastly, that Xerez was likewise called *Sidonia*, either from one of the causes above specified, or from some other not yet ascertained.

<sup>64</sup> This account is to be found in Rodericus Toletanus, the *Cronica General*, and the work of San Pedro Pascual.

<sup>65</sup> Tárik, like Cortés, is reported to have set fire to his fleet in order to take away from his followers all possibility of escape, and induce them to fight strenuously. I read in the *Reyhánu-l-albáb*, "Tárik said to 'his men, 'You are placed between two enemies, the spears of the infidels and the sea. Let then those 'among you who expect the favours of the Almighty behave well on this occasion.' He then gave orders 'to set fire to all the vessels in which they had crossed.'" The fact, however, though asserted by Idrísí (*clim.* iv. sect. 1), and by the author of the fragment translated in the Appendix D. (p. xlvii.), may reasonably be questioned.

<sup>66</sup> This is a strong proof in favour of my conjecture (see above, Note 63, p. 525,) that the battle was fought nearer Medina-Sidonia than Xerez. M. Marlés, the author of a species of *rifacimento* of Conde's *Hist. de la Dom.*, asserts, on what authority it is not stated, that the battle took place "à deux lieues de Cadíz et près de la place où s'élève aujourd'hui Xerez de la frontera." But the statements of this writer, whose numerous blunders I shall often have occasion to expose, are very seldom to be relied upon. In one page only of his book (vol. i. p. 68) I find the following glaring mistakes. He says that *Ben Chaledún* (Ibnu Khaldún) wrote a life of Músa Ibn Nosseyr, confounding, no doubt, the African historian with the Arabian biographer Ibn Khallekán; and that *Bab-Alzakák* (*Bábu-z-zakkák*) means 'la porte du chemin' instead of 'the mouth of the Strait of Gibraltar.' He says that the port of Algesiras was so called by the Arabs because there were once two islands opposite to it. He invariably writes *Guarda* instead of *Guada* (Wáda), and seriously informs us that *Guard-alete*, *Guard-iana*, &c. are Arabic words. I should never end were I to point out the innumerable errors into which this writer has fallen whilst pretending to correct the work of Conde.

<sup>67</sup> وَالتقت الجيشان بالبحيرة—"and the two armies met near the lake or gulph,"—for the word *buheyrah*, whence the Spanish *albuhera*; partakes of either meaning. In this instance, however, the lake of la Janda, near Medina-Sidonia, is intended. The writer here quoted is not the only one who asserts positively that the engagement took place on the banks of the lake near Medina-Sidonia. I may, besides, adduce the testimony of many others, as the author of the *Reyhánu-l-albáb*, (Arab. MS. in my possession,) who says that the armies met on the bank of the river Barbát, وادي برباط—not far from

the lake. Now the river called Wáda Barbát by the Arabs, because it reached the sea near a town of that name, was also called وادي بكة Wáda Bekkeh, because it passed through or close to another town called 'Bekkeh', now Bejer. (Compare Abú-l-fedá's Geography; Idrísí, *clim.* iv. *sect.* 1; and *Hist. del Moro Rasis*.) I confess that when I first learnt that Wáda Bekkeh was the same river as the Wáda Barbát, and that some authors, like Ibnu-l-kúttiyah, had placed the site of the battle on its banks, the idea struck me that the present name of the river Guadalete, for which I cannot in any other manner account, might have originated in a series of corruptions.

Every one acquainted with the peculiar character used by the Arabs of Africa and Spain in their writings, knows how easy it is to write لطة instead of لكة—the letters ط and ل being almost alike in their alphabet. On the other hand, the letter د may, by a mere stroke, be transformed into ل Wáda Bekkah, or Wáda Bekkeh, might thus, by a series of corruptions, have been changed first into 'Wáda Lekke,' and thence into 'Guadalete.' Those among my readers who are unacquainted with the Arabic language, may possibly think my conjecture rather hazardous; but I appeal to the judgment of those who are conversant with the writings of the Arabian historians and geographers, in which numerous instances occur of words once ill written having retained their corrupted form, not only in writing, but even in conversation. For instance, the town of Tenzert, a word meaning 'encampment' in the language of the Berbers, is at times written *Benzert* or *Benizert* in Idrísí; in Abú-l-fedá, *Nebzert*; in

Leo and Marmol, *Biserta*. Instead of بحر بنطس *Bahr Bontus*, or the Pontus Euxinus, there is not one single Arabian geographer, Idrísí himself not excepted, who does not write بحر نيطس *Bahr Nitus*, by the transposition of the points in the first two letters. I might multiply examples of this kind, but I shall merely mention another flagrant instance of a proper name thus corrupted becoming, as it were, riveted upon its bearer. The celebrated traveller, Ibn Battúttah, in treating of the Greek emperor who was reigning in Constantinople at the time he visited that city, calls him *Tekfúr*, and gives the spelling

of his name thus, تكفور. Such is the reading in all the copies of the epitome consulted by Professor Lee, as well as in those of Paris; to which I may add, that a transcript of the original Travels in my possession, made by a learned copyist from a very ancient copy preserved in the great mosque at Fez, affords the same reading. But who does not see at once that the word تكفور *Tekfúr* having in the first instance been written for تكفور *Nekfúr* (Nicephorus Gregoras), gave rise to that singular blunder? It may be objected, that similar corruptions are not likely to take place so easily with regard to the names of towns and places; yet I believe that the words طليطلة شلوانية اوربوانة and many more in Spanish geography, all originated in similar corrupt readings, being meant for طليطنة شلوانية اورجانة Toletana (urbs), Salambenia, Orcela, or Orcelis, the Roman names for those towns.

Even supposing the Wáda Bekkah and the Wáda Lekke to have been two distinct rivers, the former being meant for the river of Bejer, and the latter for the Guadalete, this in no manner opposes my conjecture that the memorable encounter took place near the sea, and close to Medina-Sidonia, since the battle having lasted eight days, as is unanimously agreed by Christian and Mohammedan writers, might have commenced between Bejer and Medina-Sidonia, and ended near the Guadalete, the intermediate distance being only about twenty English miles.

<sup>68</sup> The author of the *Reyhánu-l-albáb* says, "The two children whom Roderic had deprived of the empire were also in his camp; they agreed to give way with the right and left wing, that Roderic

“ might be left alone and killed.” That the sons of Wittiza were at the time in Spain, nay, that Roderic entrusted to them the command of the two wings of his army, is an assertion not only improbable, but one which may easily be refuted. Setting aside the circumstance already recorded of their being mere children when their father died and Roderic usurped the power (A. D. 709), which would incapacitate them from assuming the command of troops in 711, Adh-dhobí and the best Arabian writers say that they crossed over to Africa in order to obtain Músa's assistance in the reconquest of the throne of their father; and although, their request being granted, they might have returned to their native country, it is more natural to suppose that they joined Tárík, than that they placed themselves in the hands of their personal enemy, who must have been informed of their treason. If defection there was in the Gothic army, as the Mohammedan and Christian writers universally agree, and as is affirmed by Isidorus (*Esp. Sag.* vol. viii.), the Monk of Silos, and other Christian chroniclers, it must have been on the part of Oppas, and others of their secret partisans, whom fear, or the wish of better accomplishing their treason, still retained under Roderic's orders.

<sup>69</sup> *Et equus qui Orelia dicebatur*, says Rodrigo (*De Reb. Hisp.* lib. iii. cap. xxiii.); on what authority it is not easy to say.

<sup>70</sup> أثقله الجراح—his wounds exhausted him—perhaps both. In the fabulous chronicle of Rodrigo (cap. ccxxxviii.), it is said that the Gothic monarch fled along the banks of the Guadalete, until his horse having stuck in the mud he was obliged to dismount and proceed on foot, leaving behind him his ornaments and royal insignia, for fear of being discovered.

<sup>71</sup> Whether Roderic was slain by Tárík as asserted (p. 273), whether he perished in the waters of the river close to the field of battle, or contrived, as some historians assert, to fly from the field and take refuge in Portugal, where he is said to have led a life of penance and contrition, are questions which have hitherto exercised in vain the ingenuity of Spanish critics. Among the Mohammedan writers the prevailing opinion is that Roderic was killed, although his body was never found. There are, it is true, historians, like the one translated in the Appendix E. (p. lxxi.), those consulted by Conde (vol. i. p. 32), and the anonymous writer translated by Casiri (*Bib. Ar. Hisp. Esc.* vol. ii. p. 326), who assert that Roderic's head was sent to Músa, who immediately dispatched a messenger with it to the Khalif; but is it likely that a fact of this importance, resting on good authority, should have been omitted by subsequent historians? Among the Christians, Isidorus of Beja, and the continuator of the *Chronicon Biclarense*, the only two contemporary writers, say that Roderic died on the field of battle. Sebastian of Salamanca, a writer of the tenth century, was the first who, on the faith of an epitaph said to have been discovered two hundred years after that event, advanced that Roderic escaped from the massacre, and retired to Viséu in Portugal, where he passed the remainder of his days in penitence and prayer. The story has been credited by the generality of the Spanish historians, from Rodrigo of Toledo down to Masdeu, but it is no doubt one of the many pious frauds of which the tonsured chroniclers of the middle ages were often guilty. Where was Roderic when Lusitania was overrun a year after by the Arabs? Why did he not seek for refuge in the mountains of Asturias, where the relics of the Gothic nobility had congregated for defence?

<sup>72</sup> This 28th day of Ramadhán answers to the 19th day of July, A. D. 711, which was a Sunday. The 5th of Shawwál, therefore, fell on the 26th of the same month, likewise a Sunday.

<sup>73</sup> By "slaves" the author means the vassals or menials of the Gothic noblemen.

<sup>74</sup> This would imply a severe loss on the part of the Moslems, whose numbers before the battle are elsewhere computed at twelve thousand. Tárík's address to his soldiers, and the continual skirmishing which preceded the general engagement, prove that the Gothic monarchy fell not without a struggle. The Monk of Silos estimates Tárík's loss during the seven days at sixteen thousand men, a fourth more than he is reported to have had.

<sup>75</sup> It is difficult to say whether Sidonia is here meant for Medina-Sidonia or for Xerez, which some years afterwards received also the name of *Shidúniyah*. (See above, Note 63, p. 525.) Had the writer given us the name of the town at the time of its reduction by Tárík, instead of that which it afterwards received, much uncertainty might have been avoided. I think, however, that Xerez is here understood.

<sup>76</sup> My copy reads *مدور*—those in the British Museum *مورور*—This I believe to be the modern town of Moron, which by the ancient chroniclers is written *Moror*.

<sup>77</sup> Rodericus Toletanus makes Tárík proceed first to Ezija, which must be a mistake, since Carmona lay on his road to that city. The authors translated by Conde (vol. i. p. 37) say that Ezija was not taken by Tárík, but by Zeyd Ibn Kesádi, one of his lieutenants.

Instead of a 'fountain,' Rodericus says a 'river: *resedit Taric juxta fluvium Cilofontis, qui ex tunc dicitur fons Tarici*, lib. iii. cap. xxii. See also *Cron. Gen. de España*, fo. cciv. No river, however, in the neighbourhood of Carmona bears now the name of that conqueror.

<sup>78</sup> This anecdote is no doubt borrowed from Ibnu-l-kúttiyyah, in whose work I have read it. San Pedro Pascual, who wrote towards the beginning of the fourteenth century, and who, during his captivity at Granada, had opportunity to consult the writings of the Arabs, gives it also word for word. Nearly a century before the Archbishop of Toledo had said, *audientes quod gens advenerat que Gothorum gloriam sua multitudine superarat et licet falso humanis vescabantur carnibus*.

### CHAPTER III.

<sup>1</sup> This advice of Ilyán, conceived in nearly the same expressions, may be found in the Spanish translation of Ar-rázi. See also Rodericus Toletanus, lib. iii. cap. xxii., and the *Cronica General*, fo. cciv.

<sup>2</sup> *الي غرناطة مدينة [كورة] البيرة* The expression is a remarkable one, as showing the meaning which the word *medínah* must have had in those ancient times. I have frequently observed that the word *مدينة medínah*, which is now generally translated by 'city,' was used by ancient writers for the capital of a district, province, or even kingdom. Al-beládhori, in his *Kitábu-l-boldán* (Ar. MS. in the Brit. Mus., No. 7496), furnishes me, within a few pages, with numerous instances of the word *medínah* used in that sense. He says (fo. 23), *ومدينة أندلس تسي قرطبة*, "and the *medínah* (capital) of Andalus

“is called Cordova;” and again, (fo. 23, verso,) *و قيروان هي مدينة افريقية* “and Cairwán is the *medínah* (capital) of Africa proper.” The historian Ibnu-l-khattib always calls Granada *مدينة كورة* “the *medínah* (capital) of the district of Elvira or Illiberis.” (See Note 69, p. 346.) The geographer Idrísí likewise calls Murcia the *medínah* (capital) of the land of Tudmír or Theodomir, *مُرسية مدينة دلال تدمير*. To which I may add, that some of the first coins of the Bení Umeyyah of Spain contain the following inscription: *بسم الله ضرب هذا الدرهم في مدينة الاندلس* “In the name of Allah, this dirhem was coined in the *medínah* (capital) of Andalus,” i. e. in Cordova. According to Conde (vol. i. p. 36), the division sent against Granada was under the orders of Zeyd Ibn Kesadí As-sekseki, who also took Ezija, and yet overtook Tárik before he reached Toledo.

<sup>3</sup> All this is very obscure. If Tárik himself took Ezija, his way to Toledo was not through Jaen, but through Cordova. On the other hand, Jaen was then too inconsiderable a town to attract the attention of the Berber general, while Ezija, the see of a bishop, a rich and wealthy city, where the relics of the Gothic army, trusting in the strength of its walls, made a gallant defence, must in the first instance have called his arms to that quarter. It is therefore probable that Jaen was taken by Zeyd, whose road to Toledo, after returning from Malaga and Granada, must necessarily have been through that town. According to Adh-dhobí and other historians, Tárik himself went to Cordova, and remained before it nine days, when, impatient of the delay, he intrusted to Mugheyth the siege of that city, and hastened on to Toledo. This appears not only probable, but at once removes the difficulty.

<sup>4</sup> A. says *تحت شجرة ارز شامخة* ‘under lofty pine trees.’ My copy *في غيضة ارز* ‘in a forest of pine trees.’ The word *erz*, whence the Spanish *alerze* with the article, means ‘a male pine.’ *Al-ghaydah*, ‘a forest,’ has likewise passed into the Spanish *alguada*.

<sup>5</sup> That is to say, on the banks of the Guadalquivir, for the Arabs often gave to the rivers of Spain names taken from the districts or towns through which they flow; so the Tagus was called “the river of Toledo, Alcantara, Lisbon,” &c. The town of Shakanda or Secunda, which, according to the authors of the *Cronica General*, fo. cciv. verso, stood at two miles and a-half from Cordova, was in time annexed to that capital. See above, Note 39, page 522.

<sup>6</sup> *Adillá*, the plural of *dalíl*, ‘a guide;’ in Spanish *adalid*.

<sup>7</sup> The text says *مع ضعفاء من اهلها*—which might also be translated by ‘the inhabitants untrained to arms.’

<sup>8</sup> All this is to be found word for word in the Spanish translation of Ar-rázi. It is contained likewise, with very slight verbal alteration, in the works of the Archbishop Rodrigo, and those who followed him. See *Rer. in Hisp. Gest.* lib. iii. cap. xxiii.; and the *Cron. Gen.* fo. cciv. verso.

<sup>9</sup> Ar-rázi, who calls this church San Jorge, says that it stood to the west of Cordova.

<sup>10</sup> The Arabs brought to Spain many black slaves, the fruit of their conquests in Sús-al-aksá and other provinces bordering upon Súdán.

<sup>11</sup> My copy reads *في جنان* 'in some orchards.'

<sup>12</sup> The words translated by 'hard brush' are *الحبل الحراشي*—literally 'a rope made of the skin of a snake or any other substance having a rough surface.' I believe it is the same thing now used throughout Spain as a scouring cloth, and is made of the filaments of the *esparto* or broom plant.

<sup>13</sup> 'The church of the burned' would be more correct. Ar-rázi calls it *la Iglesia de los Cautivos*.

<sup>14</sup> The text reads *نظيرة* or *طلبيرة*—now Talavera de la Reina. This town, however, is at too great a distance from Cordova to lead to the supposition that Mugheyth would leave his army behind, and ride off so far in pursuit of his enemy, who, in the fabulous chronicle of King Roderic, is called Pelistes. Ar-rázi says that Mugheyth overtook him at *Collera*, which he describes as a small hamlet not far from Cordova. See also Amb. Morales, *Cron. Gen. de Esp.* vol. iii. p. 205.

<sup>15</sup> The word *أصفر* (whence the Spanish words *azafran*, *azafranar*, *azafranado*, are derived) means 'yellow,' but applied to a horse it signifies 'black.' The translator of Ar-rázi, not being aware of this distinction, made the Christian governor ride a yellow horse, "*un caballo amarillo*." One proof more of the genuineness of the translation.

<sup>16</sup> Other accounts place the taking of Malaga after the arrival of Músa. Rodrigo, however, whose work is for the most part a literal translation from the Arabic, as it is easy to discover even from the Oriental turn of his sentences, followed the former account. He makes Malaga, as well as Murcia and Granada, fall by the hands of Tárík's lieutenants.

<sup>17</sup> Compare what I have said Note 69, p. 346, and Note 2, p. 529. The name of this city is here written *كرناتة Karnáttah*.

<sup>18</sup> The practice so universally observed by the invaders of intrusting to the Jews the defence of the cities and fortresses taken from the Christians, would, in the absence of any other fact, show that a previous understanding must long have existed between them and the Berbers under the orders of Tárík, and that the discontent or the ambition of Ilyán, the wrongs done to the sons of Wittiza, and the troubled state of the Gothic monarchy, were not the only causes of the conquest of Spain. That the Jews of the Peninsula had at different times been suspected of holding communication with those of Africa,—that in the reign of Egica they had actually been accused, and to all appearance convicted, of inviting the Arabs to make the conquest of Spain,—is sufficiently attested by the national writers. I have shown elsewhere (Note 15, p. 511), on the authority of Ibnu Khaldún, that most of the Berber tribes inhabiting the northern shores of Africa professed the Jewish religion; and although we are told that the twelve thousand men which Músa placed under the orders of Tárík had previously been converted to the Mohammedan faith, and duly instructed in all the duties of their new religion by theologians appointed for that purpose, there is every reason to suppose that their conversion was neither so sudden nor so sincere as to blot out immediately all recollection of their former habits and religious ceremonies, and that they felt great sympathy for their former brethren. Hence, on the invasion of Spain by the Berbers, the Jews, who expected to be delivered by them from the state of oppression in which they lived, every where made common cause with them.

<sup>19</sup> اوريوالة *Ouriwélah*, now *Orihuela*, is supposed to be the 'Orcelis' of the ancients. It would appear from this, that Orihuela was then the capital of the kingdom, afterwards called 'the country of Theodomir.' Indeed, I read in the *Manáhiju-l-fakar*, a work on astronomy and geography (Brit. Mus., No. 7483, fo. 190), that the ancient name for Orihuela was *Tudmír*, and that the city was so called from its having been the residence of that chief. This by no means agrees with the account of Al-makkari (p. 68, and Note 18, p. 376,) and other writers, among whom is the celebrated Wizír Ibnu-l-khattáb, who pretend that Murcia and *Tudmír* were one and the same town. This contradiction can only be avoided by supposing Orihuela to have been called "the city of Theodomir," either from the gallant defence of that general, or from its having really become the capital of the states which he was allowed to retain by capitulation. Murcia having in time become the capital of the extensive province called by the Arabs بلاد تدمير 'the land of Theodomir,' was probably called مدينة [بلاد] تدمير 'the capital of [the country] *Tudmír*.' Rodrigo (lib. iii. cap. xxiii.) says 'ad urbem quæ tunc Oreola, nunc Murcia, dicitur.' But this could never be, Murcia and Orihuela being two distinct towns.

<sup>20</sup> We are not informed whether Theodomir was present or not at the battle of Guadalete. The whole of what follows is not only obscure but contradictory. If the forces dispatched against Malaga and Granada marched to Murcia after the taking of those cities,—if Theodomir made a gallant defence, and stood a siege in his capital,—how could the troops reach Toledo in time to take part in the siege?

I cannot pass in silence a very curious circumstance respecting Theodomir, which I read in the Spanish version of Ar-rází, or at least in the copy which I have always used. Theodomir, or *Tudemir*, as he is there called, is described as a renegade, who took the part of the Arabs, and fought under their banners. He is said to have been sent with an army against Orihuela, which he besieged and took by capitulation, after defeating its garrison in a sortie. Strange to say, the same stratagem which he is here said to have put in practice to save his capital from the invaders, or to obtain advantageous terms, is there attributed to the governor of the city besieged by Theodomir.

<sup>21</sup> The whole of these conquests are a few lines lower attributed to 'Abdu-l-'azíz, son of Músa, who did not arrive in Spain until one year after these events. The contradiction therefore is evident; and can only be avoided by supposing that either Theodomir or the Arabs broke the treaties by which they were mutually bound.

<sup>22</sup> This passage has been given in the original Arabic, with a Latin translation, by Casiri, vol. ii. p. 251. But, as usual, the learned librarian of the Escorial committed almost as many blunders as there are words in it. Instead of استجة *Ezija* he read سجة—instead of مغيث الرومي he printed معينا—and so forth.

<sup>23</sup> No Arabian writer that I know of has given the precise date of the taking of Toledo by Tárik; it is therefore next to impossible to determine what conquests were made by his lieutenants, during the period which elapsed between the battle of Guadalete and the surrender of the Gothic capital, at which we are told they were present. Lucas Tudensis, however, in his *Chronicon Mundi* (*apud* Schottum, *Hisp. Illust.* vol. iv.), says, on what authority it would be useless to inquire, that Toledo was taken on the Palm-Sunday of A. D. 712, that is to say, on the 11th day of Jumáda II., A. H. 93; namely, eight months or thereabout after the victory on the plains of Xerez. During the interval, the forces which Tárik dispatched to the west,

while he himself proceeded to the north, might easily have overrun, without subduing, the provinces of Malaga and Granada, which were not finally conquered until the arrival of Músa.

<sup>24</sup> The Christian chroniclers relate, that when Sindered, Bishop of Toledo, heard of the approach of the Arabs, he fled to Galicia, taking with him the ornaments and jewels of his church; most of the inhabitants followed his example.

<sup>25</sup> Lucas Tudensis (*loco laudato*, fo. 70,) says that the Jews opened the gates of the city to the Moslems, whilst the Christians were going in a procession to the church of Santa Leocadia, outside the walls.

<sup>26</sup> *وادي الحجارة* *Wáda-l-hijarah* or *Wáda-l-hajarah* is the 'annus lapidum' of Rodrigo. The city near to which it flows was formerly called by the Arabs *مدينة الفرج* *Medínatu-l-farj*; (the city of the pass?) as we learn from Abú-l-fedá. The name of the river was afterwards given to the city itself. This fact is corroborated by Rodrigo, who, in his *Hist. Arab.* p. 32, says *Medina Alpharagel que nunc dicitur Guadalafajara*.

Shehábu-d-dín Al-fási, in his *Kitábu-l-jumán fí akhbári-z-zamán*, attributes the conquest of Guadalajara to Mohammed Ibn Elias Al-mugheyli, one of Tárík's lieutenants.

<sup>27</sup> The word *فج* *fej* means 'a defile,' a mountain pass; what the Spaniards now call *puerto*. It is however but little used in this sense, and might in time have been replaced by *bib*, which has the same meaning and is more appropriate. Bib-Tárík therefore might easily have been corrupted into *Bibtrak* or Buitrago, a town which commands the mountain pass leading from New into Old Castile.

<sup>28</sup> Rodrigo, who derived most of his information from the Arabian writers, says, *mensam que habebat trecentos sexaginta quinque pedes*. I read likewise in the *Cronica General*, which is a compilation from the same sources, *e fallo una mensa lengua e molto ancha en que abia trezientos e sesenta pies*, fo. ccv. Ar-rázi, however, says only, *e falló una messa que era de esmeralda messa e pies*.

<sup>29</sup> Great obscurity prevails in the accounts of those writers who have mentioned the expedition undertaken by Tárík north of Toledo. Adh-dhobí says, that after the taking of Guadalajara, the Berber general turned to the west, and having approached the chain of mountains called *Ash-shérrát* (Sierra), crossed it by a pass to which he gave his name (*Fej-Tárík*). He then marched to the east, and took a city called "the city of the table," owing to his having found in it the table of Solomon. Thence he proceeded southwards, and entered a town called *ميدا* i. e. Maya or Moya. Conde's account (vol. i. p. 45) differs materially from this; he makes Tárík first cross the mountains, and take a city to which he gave his own name, then go to Guadalajara, &c. The Archbishop Rodrigo (lib. iii. cap. xxii.) and the author of the *Cronica General* (fo. ccv.) differ still more. The former says, that after the taking of Guadalajara, Tárík went to a mountain to which he gave the name of *Jebal Suleymán* (mountain of Solomon); for, although the text of the various editions reads *ad montem qui dicitur Gebelculeman, et imposuit ei nomen Gebeltaric*, it is evidently vitiated, and *Tarik* ought to be substituted for *Gebeltaric*: from thence to a city close to the mountain (*Jebal Suleymán*), where he found the table of Solomon, whence the place was by him called *Medinat Al-meydah* (the city of the table). After this, Tárík went to

Amaya or Moya, &c. So that while Conde, or the authors whom he followed, make Tárík cross the mountains twice, those consulted by Rodrigo, if his translation be correct, make no mention at all of his crossing that mountain range. Adh-dhobí, and most of the historians of Mohammedan Spain, place the city where the pretended table of Solomon was found on the other side of the Somosierra or chain of mountains which divide the New from Old Castile. Rodrigo and the author of the *Cronica General* put it on this side. How are these contradictory accounts to be reconciled? Could we but ascertain the real situation of the cities called *Medínat Al-meydah* and مايا Maya or امايه Amaya by the Arabian writers, we might, perhaps, hope to loose the knot of this difficulty. Rodrigo himself informs us, in his *Hist. Arab. ad calc. Erpen.* p. 9, that the city, where, according to the Arabian writers, the table of Solomon was found, stood close to Alcalá de Henares, at the foot of a mountain which in his time was called *Gebel-culeman*, and which still retains that name, though corrupted, in *Cuesta de Zulema*. I further learn from a passage of Adh-dhobí, that "the table was found at a spot not far from a city called *Medínat En-nahr*" (the city of the river)," which, from a strong castle in after times built for its defence, might easily have changed its name into *Al-kal'ah En-nahr* or Alcalá de Henares (the castle of the river), its present name; to which may be added, that the stream which waters its walls is also called "Henares," a corruption from *Nahr* or *En-nahr* (river). This would at once show that the table was found about three miles from Alcalá de Henares, on or close to the spot now called *Cuesta de Zulema*, where a town, known to the Arabs as *Medínat Al-meydah*, must have stood, though it might have been destroyed before the age of Rodrigo. To this place Sindered, and those among the Christian prelates and noblemen who quitted Toledo on the approach of Tárík, might have fled with the ornaments and relics of the churches, and Tárík have followed them in the hope of making a good booty. Among the objects which then fell into the conqueror's hands, was a table of precious materials, which some Jewish tradition referred to the sack of Jerusalem, whence the city was called "the city of the table," and the mountain close to which it stood *Jebal Suleymán* (the mountain of Solomon). There is nothing improbable in all this,—it bears even all the appearance of truth; but how are we to reconcile it with the accounts of the Arabs, who place the city where the table was found beyond the mountains of Somosierra, which they all agree Tárík crossed on this occasion,—by a pass, too, which still retains his name? There is still another difficulty to be surmounted in Rodrigo's account. How could Tárík go first to Guadalajara and thence to Alcalá, if he must inevitably have passed through the latter on his way to the former city? On the other hand, what do the Arabs mean by Maya,—Rodrigo by *Amayera* and *Amaya*,—the *Cronica General* by *Moya*,—the city where the relics of the Gothic government are said to have fled on the approach of Tárík? There is a place called Amaya on the limits of the province of Burgos and Santander, but this is too far for my purpose. A hamlet called Amayas, in the province of Guadalajara and the bishopric of Sigüenza, might be the town alluded to, were it not that it lies in an opposite direction from the route taken by Tárík, who, in crossing the Somosierra at Buitrago, went away from it. The town of Moya, long the capital of a considerable district, might well have been the place where the fugitives of Toledo fled for an asylum; it is thus stated by the author of the *Cronica General*; but there are two very strong objections to be put to the statement, namely, that Moya lies to the east, not to the west of Toledo, and that in order to penetrate thither Tárík must have crossed a different chain of mountains, namely, the *Sierra de Molina*. Secondly, that it is not probable that the people of Toledo should have fled in a direction which brought them nearer to the provinces already overrun by Tárík's lieutenants, whilst the road to Galicia or Asturias, which soon after became the bulwark of the Spanish liberties, was open to them. The author of *Cartas para ilustrar la historia de España*, p. liii., thought of remedying this difficulty by supposing the *Medínat Al-meydah* of the Arabs to have been a small castle called *Mesa*, which, at an early period of Spanish history, stood on the banks of a river called also *Rio*

*Mesa*, which divides the *Señorio de Molina* from the *Ducado de Medinaceli*. But this supposition, besides being a very gratuitous one, and resting on no other foundation than the curious coincidence of the names of the castle and of the river being a translation of the Arabic word *meydah* (table), by no means removes the objection. Others, like Masdeu, have imagined that the town of Medinaceli was the place where Tárík found the table; but Medinaceli is a corruption from مدينة سالم *Medinat-Selim*, as that town was called by the Arabs from the name of its founder, and has nothing in common with the *Medinat-Al-meydah* mentioned by the Arabian writers.

There is only one way of reconciling the different statements of these authors, which is to suppose that Tárík, on his way to Amayas or Moya (either town will do for my conjecture), went first to Alcalá, where he met with a party of fugitives, and seized upon the table of Solomon, and that on his return from his expedition he crossed the mountains at Buitrago, and proceeded to Galicia,—Guadalajara being, during this interval, reduced by a party of his men under the orders of one of his lieutenants, as has elsewhere been stated (Note 26, p. 533). This is rendered probable by the fact that most of the Arabian writers, as Al-makkari himself observes lower down, make Tárík march, without stopping, to Astorga.

<sup>30</sup> Various are the dates assigned by the Arabian writers for Músa's landing on the coast of Spain. All however agree that it took place in the year 93, with the exception of Cardonne (vol. i. p. 85), who by some unaccountable oversight places that event in 96. The anonymous writer translated in the Appendix E., p. lxxi., says on a Thursday of the month of Safar, a. h. 93, (that is to say, either on the 18th of November or on the 25th of the same month, or on the 2nd or 9th of December, which were Thursdays.) Ibn Habíb says in Jumáda i., 93, (February or March, 712;) while Conde (vol. i. p. 35) fixes it to the month of Rejeb, (April or June, 712.) In the fragment attributed to Ar-rázi by Casiri (*Bib. Ar. Hisp. Esc.* vol. ii. p. 319, *et seq.*) I find the date of Ramadhán, 93, (June or July, 712;) which is also that given by Rodrigo and the *Cronica General*. So that according to these various authorities the arrival of Músa happened between the 30th of November, A. D. 711, which was the first Thursday of the lunar month of Safar, and the 20th of July, which was the last day of Ramadhán, a period of about ten solar months. It is clear, however, that if Músa passed one month before Seville,—if the siege of Merida, protracted by the vigorous defence of its garrison, lasted some months,—if this latter city surrendered, as is generally asserted, on the first day of Shawwál,—the dates of Rejeb and Ramadhán cannot for a moment be thought of; since in the short interval of three months in the first instance, or of only one in the second, Músa could not have accomplished what on the testimony of all the Mohammedan and Christian writers occupied him several months. It now remains to ascertain which of the two dates, that of the anonymous writer translated in the Appendix or that of Ibn Habíb, is the correct one. Both authors are deserving of credit: the former, for the circumstantial evidence and numerous details he gives, which are not to be found elsewhere; the latter, because he flourished towards the middle of the ninth century, and because, having written a short treatise on the invasion and conquest of Spain by the Arabs, it is to be presumed that he considered his subject well before he fixed a date for an event of so much importance. We have, therefore, to choose between two authors equally well qualified, and both entitled to our consideration. Were I called upon to decide, I would pronounce in favour of Ibn Habíb; but I think that the discrepancy may be thus obviated. The anonymous writer translated in the Appendix does not say positively that Músa sailed in the month of Safar, but that he fixed the departure for a Thursday of that month: *و نادى في الناس و عسكر جيشاً عظيماً و ذلك* Besides, it is not *في صفر سنة ثلاث و تسعين وكان أحب الخروج إليه يوم الخميس اول النهار*

probable that in the short interval between the battle of the Gaudalete and his departure from Africa,—scarcely four months,—Músa could have collected together a sufficient number of vessels for the transport of twelve thousand horse, the lowest number at which his army has been computed. The operation might therefore have begun in Safar, and ended in Jumáda 1., a period of two months; and thus the accounts of the two historians might be reconciled.

<sup>31</sup> The opinion that Tárík did not on this occasion go further than Amaya or Maya is the most probable, as well as that which I find more generally entertained by the Arabian writers.

<sup>32</sup> The number of royal diadems said to have been found in the principal church at Toledo varies from twenty-four to twenty-seven. The anonymous writer translated in the Appendix E. (p. lxxii.) gives the former number; Al-khazrájí (Appendix D. p. xlvi.) and Ibn Habíb say twenty-five; Al-makkarí himself states them, as well as the padlocks, at twenty-seven, (see p. 262,) one for each king who reigned in Spain. It is evident that the latter computation is the most correct; for although it be true that including Theodomir and his son Althanagild, the number of kings of northern descent who reigned in Spain will be found to be thirty-six, as elsewhere stated (p. 27), yet if we consider that the first six ruled, properly speaking, in Gaul, not in Spain, and that neither Roderic nor his two successors are included in the list, we shall find their number reduced to twenty-seven.

<sup>33</sup> Rodrigo and the authors of the *Cronica General* adopted the former computation. The writers consulted by Conde (vol. i. p. 34) and Cardonne (vol. i. p. 18) say ten thousand infantry and eight thousand horse.

<sup>34</sup> This is the same individual mentioned at Note 3, p. 372. He was a *tábi'*, that is to say, second in rank to the *as'háb* (companions) who knew and conversed with the Prophet. Instead of *البجلي* *Al-bajeli*, the patronymic of the second *tábi'*, I find *الجبلي* *Al-jibli* in Ibn Habíb.

<sup>35</sup> Perhaps *ابن شماسة* Ibn Shammásah.

<sup>36</sup> *جبله* *Abi* in the Rich MS. My copy reads *جبله*.

<sup>37</sup> Several more *tábi'*s (followers) and *as'háb* (companions) are reported to have accompanied Músa on this occasion. In their number were Al-munayzir, 'Alí Ibn Rabi' Al-lakhmí, and Ibn Rejá At-temímí. But of this more will be said in the second volume of this translation.

<sup>38</sup> Al-makkarí was here guilty of two unpardonable blunders: first, in supposing that 'Jebal Músa' (the mountain of Moses) took its name from Músa Ibn Nosseyr, instead of the Jewish legislator; secondly, in placing it in Spain instead of Africa. This glaring error, however, cannot be solely charged on Al-makkarí, since it may also be met with in Idrísí, and other writers of note. Al-bekrí (fo. 76) and other African geographers treat of a sea-port between Tangiers and Ceuta called *Mersa Músa* (the port of Moses), owing to the neighbouring seas abounding in fish of the species called by Ad-demírí and other naturalists *Hút Músa* (the fish of Moses). A mountain close to it was also called 'the mountain of Moses.' According to Abú Hámid Al-andalusí, "Moses and his servant Joshua started once on a

“ journey in search of Elias : having arrived at a spot called *Majma'u-l-bahreyn* (the meeting of the two seas) they were taken with hunger, and caught a fish, half of which they ate, throwing away the other half into the sea, where God permitted that it should live, generate, and shape its course through the waves as before. I once saw the fish,” adds Abú Hámid; “ it measured about one cubit in length, but no more than one inch in thickness; one of its sides was provided with fins, and with large and small bones as the other fishes; its intestines, as well as its eyes, were covered with a very tender and delicate skin; its head was only the half of one.” It is further related by the Kádi 'Iyádh in his history of Ceuta, “ that Moses and his servant Joshua met with Elias (Al-khadhr) at *Jezírah Al-khadhrá* (Algesiras), which spot was since denominated after that prophet.” Hence the author, misled by the similarity of the names, thought that *Jebal Músa* received its name from the conqueror of Spain.

العلاج الادلا اصحاب يليان<sup>39</sup>—literally ‘ the barbarians acting as guides from among the people of Ilyán.’ Another account makes Músa say to them: ما كنت لاسلك طرايق طارق و لا اقفو اثره ‘ I shall not take the same road which Tárik took, or follow his footsteps.’ The author of the *Reyhánu-l-lebáb* says that it was Ilyán in person who acted as guide to Músa.

This being the last time that Ilyán is mentioned by Al-makkarí, I have purposely delayed until now the statement of my opinion on that individual, from a wish to collect together and compare the various accounts given by the Arabian writers. In the present note, therefore, I propose to investigate the following points. i. At what period, and by whom, was the name of Ilyán first introduced into Spanish history? ii. Did a man so called ever exist? iii. What were his country and religion? iv. Was he an independent prince, or a tributary of the Gothic monarchs? v. What part did he take in the conquest of Spain by the Arabs?

i. I have already observed that Ilyán thus written يليان could never have been intended for Julian by the Arabian writers; for, although I have met with that name written in a variety of ways, owing to the mistakes of the copyists,—بلبان *Balbán*, بليان *Balyán*, البليان *Al-balyán*, and اليليان *Al-ilyán*,—I have not found it once written يولييان—the real spelling, had Julian been meant. The most common, and I believe the most correct way of writing his name, is اليان<sup>40</sup> *Elyáno* [*Ælianus*?]—Thus I find it in Al-bekrí, Shehábu-d-dín Al-fásí, and occasionally in Ibnu Khaldún; but as Al-makkari invariably writes it Ilyán,—as both the author of the *Cronica General*, and San Pedro Pascual, (*In sectam Mahometanam*, cap. vii. p. 48,) who borrowed their narrative from Arabian sources, have Illan,—I have not hesitated in writing it as above, although, had I merely consulted my own inclination, I should undoubtedly have printed *Elian*.

The Monk of Silos, who wrote towards the beginning of the twelfth century, and who was the author of a chronicle beginning with the invasion of Spain by the Arabs, and ending with the reign of Alfonso VI., is the first Spanish author who mentions Ilyán, whom he calls *Julianus*. Neither Isidorus Pacensis, nor the continuator of the *Chronicon Biclarense*, two contemporary writers, nor Sebastianus Salmanticensis, who flourished towards the middle of the ninth century, nor the Monk of Albelda, who wrote in A. D. 883, make the least mention of him. From this fact, Masdeu and most of the modern Spanish critics have concluded that the character of Ilyán or Julian was altogether one of that chronicler's invention, and that no such person ever existed. Others, like the author of *Cartas para ilustrar la historia de España*, who, though an Arabic scholar, was not much of a critic, being unable to deny the

fact of the name of Ilyán occurring in the writings of the Arabs long before the age of the Monk of Silos, have imagined that Julian was a corruption for *Khulán*, the name of a Berber general who entered Spain at the same time with Tárik, and who, having afterwards revolted with the troops under his command, was taken prisoner and executed in A. H. 101. But I shall be able to prove that the assumption of the latter author is as unfounded as the charge brought by the former against the Christian chronicler.

The mere inspection of this part of the *Chronicon Silense* (Florez, *Esp. Sag.* vol. xvii. p. 278) is sufficient to impress one with the conviction that the account there given of Count Julian could not have originated in the head of its author, but must have been either read in the work of some Arabian writer, or communicated to him by some Christian well versed in the writings of the Moslems; and no one who peruses with attention the extracts printed in the Appendix D., and compares them with the eighteenth chapter in Rodrigo's work, will for a moment hesitate to say that the whole of the latter is a literal translation from some Arabian writer. But were this not sufficient to repel the imputation cast upon the author of the *Chronicon Silense*, and to convince those who believe the whole account to be a forgery of the Christians, who communicated it to the Arabs, some unanswerable proofs might be brought to bear in favour of my proposition. Besides Ibnu Hayyán, who preceded the Christian writer upwards of one century, I can adduce the testimony of Al-bekrí, a writer of the eleventh century, of Ibnu-l-kúttiyyah and Ibn Haukal, who wrote in the tenth, and of Ibn Khordádbah and Al-beládhori, geographers of the ninth century, all of whom mention more or less explicitly the existence of a man living in Africa, and named Ilyán, who helped the Arabs to make the conquest of Spain; to which I ought to add, that the rape of Ilyán's daughter, and the circumstances attending it, may also be read in detail in the Mohammedan authors who preceded the Monk of Silos.

As to the opinion entertained by the author of *Cartas para ilustrar la historia de España*, p. xiii. et passim, that a Berber, named *Khulán*, (a word, he says, afterwards corrupted into *Julian* by the Arabs,) gave rise to the fabulous episode of Ilyán, it is certainly not entitled to more credit. *Khaulán*, (for such was his name, not *Khulán*,) if a Berber, must have received that name from his being adopted by the Arabian tribe of the Bení *Khaulán*, to which belonged many of the conquerors of Spain, and the head of which was As-samh Ibn Málik Al-*khauláni*, the third governor of Mohammedan Spain, after the assassination of 'Abdu-l-'aziz by the orders of the Khalif Suleymán. Some individual of that illustrious family was probably the founder of a castle which Abú-l-fedá, in his Geography, calls *Kal'ah Khaulán* (the castle of *Khaulán*), and which once stood close to Algesiras; the name of which suggested to Father Labat, who visited its ruins in 1731, the idea that it had been once the residence of Don Julian. See *Voyages en Espagne et en Italie*, chap. vii.

Having so far proved that the episode of Ilyán was not altogether an invention, and that if fiction was mixed with it, it is to be ascribed to the Arabs, not to the Christians, I shall now proceed to examine what amount of historical evidence in its favour may be gathered in the writings of the Arabs.

II. That a man named Ilyán, whom some, like Ibnu-l-kúttiyyah, call "a merchant" (see Note 23, p. 512), others "a king of the African tribe of Ghomárah," and the greater number "Lord of Ceuta and Tangiers," ruled as master from the port of Los Velez (or Ghomárah as the Arabs call it) to the Straits of Gibraltar many years before the first invasion of Spain by the Arabs, is a fact resting on too good authority to be at all brought into question. Al-bekrí, Idrísí, Ibnu Hayyán, Ibnu Khaldún, and the best writers of Mohammedan Spain, assert that "when 'Okbah Ibn Náfi' invaded Western Africa, the "Governor or Lord of Ceuta, whose name was Ilyán, the same who years afterwards led Tárik into "Spain, came out to meet him with presents, and asked for peace, which the Arabian general granted, "leaving the Christian in possession of the city and of his other estates." The first-mentioned writer (Brit. Mus., No. 7534, fo. 77), in his description of Ceuta and the surrounding districts, often speaks of