

THE TUBAL FIGURE IN EARLY MODERN IBERIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY, 16TH AND 17TH CENTURY

MATTHIAS GLOËL
UNIVERSIDAD CATÓLICA DE TEMUCO
CHILE

Date of receipt: 16th of May, 2016

Final date of acceptance: 13th of September, 2016

ABSTRACT

This study is dedicated to the use of the biblical figure Tubal in early modern Iberian chronicles. The focus will be centered on how it is used in different ways in the different kingdoms (Castile, Aragon, Catalonia, Valencia, Portugal and the Basque Provinces and Navarre) and what the authors are trying to achieve through this. Results show that while Castilian authors try to prove Spanish antiquity with the Tubal settlement, in other kingdom, especially in Catalonia, Portugal and Navarre there is a more regional use of the myth. Most of these authors try to prove that their own kingdom is the territory where Tubal settled, which would give a pre-eminence of antiquity to it in comparison to the other Iberian territories.

KEYWORDS

Early Modern History, Chronicles, Myths, Spanish Monarchy, Tubal.

CAPITALIA VERBA

Prima Historia Moderna, Chronica, Mythi, Monarchia Hispanica, Tubal.

1. Introduction

Myths have always played an outstanding part in human history and they are without any doubt much older than science. This is also valid for chronicles or historiographical works. Christian historians in particular broke up the division between myth and history, which had been established by classical historiography.¹ Only pagan stories remained myths, while the Bible gained the recognition of true history.²

Early Modern chronicles from the Iberian Peninsula are no exception to this phenomenon. These historians pretended to write the history from the beginning of the world based on the historical Christian periodization of the six ages, established for the first time by Saint Augustine around the year 400. The historians were aware of the lack of sources or documents, so they had to fill these gaps with myths or heroic stories without having any evidence. The events and happenings they describe mostly have year dates, which means that the chroniclers had a very precise idea of the time in which these things happened. Points of reference are usually the creation of the earth, the Deluge or the birth of Christ. This kind of historical writing was nothing new in early modern times, but a continuation of a medieval tradition. As Eduard Fueter points out, this phenomenon was to be found in almost any part of Europe, because neither the Iberians nor the Germans or Scots could accept that their pre Christian history was not able to keep up with the ancient Rome.³ Even the Romans themselves searched for their origins in Aeneas of Troy who came to Italy to become the progenitor of all Romans.

The myths were important for the prestige of monarchs and their dynasties, but also to define the identity of families, towns or even kingdoms. Now, to a Christian there could not be any origins more ancient than the Deluge. The most important Iberian myth in the late Middle Ages and Early Modern Period is certainly Tubal, grandson of Noah and the first to populate the Iberian Peninsula after the Deluge and founder of a mythical dynasty of kings that ruled Iberia for centuries.

The Tubal figure belongs to the Generation of Noah (or Table of Nations) that appears in the Bible (*Genesis*, 10).⁴ According to post Deluge history Noah divided the continents among his three sons, giving Asia to Shem, Africa to Ham and Europe to Japhet. Just what Noah did on a global level, Japhet did within Europe and he gave specific parts to his sons to repopulate them. In this way Noah's grandson Magog settled in Scandinavia and started the history of the Goths. His brother Javan was supposed to begin the settlement in Greece and, as we already said, Tubal is

1. Caballero, José Antonio. "Mito e historia en la 'Crónica General de España' de Florián de Ocampo", *Memoria de la Palabra. Atcas del VI Congreso de la Asociación Internacional Siglo de Oro (Burgos, La Rioja, 15-19 de julio 2002)*, María Luisa Lobato, Francisco Domínguez Matito, eds. Burgos: Iberoamericana, 2002: I, 398.

2. For the Spanish case see the very recently published book by: Simon i Tarrés, Antoni. *La Bíblia en el pensament polític català i hispànic de l'època de la raó d'estat*. Barcelona: Abadia de Montserrat, 2016.

3. Fueter, Eduard. *Geschichte der neueren Historiographie*. Munich: Oldenbourg, 1936: 222.

4. See: Simon i Tarrés. *La Bíblia...*: 154-162 (Chapter 6.2: "Descendents de Noè. Els remots "origens" nacionals").



related to the first settlement in Spain. This conception of population belongs to the ancient assumption that every nation can be traced back to one single progenitor. These particular nation specific myths were developed independently from the bible, given that these more specific settlements are not mentioned any more.

The analysis of Tubal is usually one of the key aspects in researches on myths and mythic past in Spain.⁵ In spite of this importance, until 2013 there had been no study dedicated exclusively to this very important figure of early modern historiography. Mateo Ballester came to this very same conclusion:

*No se ha realizado, por lo que sabemos, ningún estudio dedicado en exclusiva a analizar la historia y evolución de este mito, en la cultura y en el imaginario colectivo hispanos, desde su origen hasta su desaparición ya en el siglo XX. Este artículo pretende cubrir este vacío.*⁶

At least, as far as early modern chronicles are concerned, Ballester's article is not able to keep this promise. His focus lies almost exclusively on Castilian authors and works, which do not represent the view of all Spanish (or Hispanic) kingdoms. The only alternative theory on Tubal he deals with is the Basque one. The Basque Provinces and Navarre belonged to the Crown of Castile although they were not part of the kingdom of Castile.⁷ Ballester explicitly ignores Catalan and Portuguese historiographical works, which do have different points of view on the Tubal figure and his arrival to the peninsula. The same tendency is to be found in general studies on the mythological origins in Spanish chronicles. In particular, the Portuguese ones are usually completely excluded, which cannot be accepted especially for the 16th and 17th century.

5. Spain has to be understood as a geographical concept and synonym to Iberian Peninsula, see, in particular: Gloël, Matthias. *Monarquía imaginada. Eine Untersuchung zu Vorstellungen von der Monarchie auf der Iberischen Halbinsel im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert*. Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovac, 2014: 31-42. For researches on Iberian myths see: Estévez, Juan Antonio. "Aproximación a los orígenes míticos de Hispania". *Habis*, 21 (1990): 139-152; Caballero, José Antonio. "El mito en las historias de la España primitiva". *Excerpta Philologica*, 7-8 (1997-1998): 83-100; Caballero, José Antonio. "Desde el mito a la historia", *Memoria, mito y realidad en la historia medieval: XIII Semana de Estudios Medievales (Nájera, del 29 de julio al 2 de agosto de 2002)*, José Ignacio de la Iglesia, José Luis Martín, eds. Logroño: Instituto de Estudios Riojanos, 2003: 33-60. For an understanding of the political structure of the kingdoms as part of the monarchy, see the concept of composite monarchy, fundamentally: Koenigsberger, Helmut Georg. "Monarchies and parliaments in early modern Europe. *Dominium Regale or Dominium Politicum et Regale*". *Theorie and Society*, 5/2 (1978): 191-217; Elliott, John H. "A Europe of composite monarchies". *Past and Present*, 137 (1992): 48-71.

6. "As far as we know there hasn't been a research exclusively conducted to analyse the history and the evolution of this myth in the Spanish culture and imaginary from its origins to its disappearance in the 20th century. The aim of this article is to cover this vacuum". Ballester, Mateo. "La estirpe de Tubal: relato bíblico e identidad nacional en España". *Historia y Política*, 29 (2013): 222. Ballester does mention another article by María Rosa Lida de Malkiel from 1970 (Lida de Malkiel, María Rosa. "Tubal, primer poblador de España". *Abaco. Estudios sobre literatura española*, 3 (1970): 9-48), which remained unfinished because of the author's death. Besides the article does not really focus on Tubal's arrival to Spain, but on Jewish and American myths.

7. In early modern Spain different kingdoms or other territories such as duchies or principalities could form a Crown (for example, Crown of Castile or Crown of Aragon). Two or more crowns could be part of the same monarchy.



2. The origins of the Tubal myth

As we already stated, the mythical period in early modern historiography is strictly orientated on the bible. This is also the case of Tubal, who according to biblical mythology, is one of Noah's many grandchildren.⁸ According to Julio Caro, Tubal's name was the origin of the *theobeles*, a nation, that with time converted to *iberos*,⁹ which would be the Iberians in English. In this way, Spain got a biblical past and the Hispanics became descendants of the family of Noah. The antiquity of a kingdom or a territory was very important in that time. The more antique the origins were, the more nobility was given for the corresponding territory. The Tubal myth does also appear in other parts of Europe, such as Italy, Germany or even Russia, where he and his brother Mesec supposedly arrived in Siberia. This settlement is tried to be proved with the existence of the ancient capital Tobolsk, which is supposed to be named after Tubal.¹⁰ We will see the importance of toponymy to prove a myth in several Spanish cases as well.

The Bible itself does not say whether Spain was given to Tubal to populate it, or that he went there on his own to do so. It does not connect him to the Iberian Peninsula at all. But already by the end of the 1st century there are sources establishing such a connection. The 1st century Jewish-Roman scholar Flavius Josephus states that Tubal was the founder of the *Thobelites*, which in his time were called *Iberes*.¹¹ Nevertheless, it is not certain if Josephus referred to the Spanish Iberians or the Caucasians ones, which were located in the territory that today corresponds to Georgia.¹² But at the end of antiquity and beginning of the Middle Ages the association of Tubal with Spain became clearer. Saint Jerome in the 4th century is part of the first pieces of evidence for this and Isidore of Seville would express the same idea at the beginning of the 7th century in his *Etymologiae*: "Tubal, from whom came the Iberians, who are also the Spaniards, although some think the Italians also sprang from him".¹³ Isidore still mentions a possible Italian descendency from Tubal, but to him it already seems to be the opinion of a minority. In the following centuries the Tubal myth has not always been present among chroniclers and theologians, but it would appear again with strength towards the end of the high Middle Ages.

8. Among the great number of studies on Noah and his offspring in the first part of the 20th century the work of Allen stand out: Allen, Don Cameron. *The legend of Noah: renaissance rationalism in art, science and letters*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949. The author explains how early modern authors around Europe tried to convert irrational parts of the Bible into reasonable historical episodes. A more recent approach is: Bizzocchi, Roberto. *Genealogie incredibili: scritti di storia nell'Europa moderna*. Bologna: Il Mulino, 1995 (republished with an additional chapter in 2009). For Early Modern Times, especially the third part (of three), is especially interesting, where the author points out that the genealogists around Europe in spite of knowing better insisted on the biblical myths as part of the human history.

9. Caro, Julio. *Las falsificaciones de la historia (en relación con la de España)*. Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1992: 58.

10. Ballester, Mateo. "La estirpe de Tubal...": 223.

11. Josephus, Flavius. *The Genuine Works of Flavius Josephus*. Philadelphia: Isaiah Thomas, 1809: I, 23.

12. Ballester, Mateo. "La estirpe de Tubal...": 224.

13. Isidore of Seville. *Etimologies*, ed. Stephen A. Barney, W. J. Lewis, J. A. Beach, Oliver Berghof. Cambridge (UK)-New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006: 193.



3. The Tubal myth in Castile

By far the most important work is the *Historia de rebus hispaniae* written by Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada (1170-1247), archbishop of Toledo for almost 40 years.¹⁴ This chronicle, written in medieval Latin was commissioned by the Castilian King Fernando III and recounts Spanish history until 1243. Rada's work was the first one that could be considered as a history of Spain and it has been pointed out several times as a turning point of Spanish historiography.¹⁵ In other parts of Europe there had been general histories for a couple of centuries and only on the Iberian Peninsula they had not appeared yet, an emptiness Rada would start to fill. Rada refers to Saint Jerome and Isidore as his sources on Tubal matters and just like them he declares him as the origin of the Iberians and Spaniards.¹⁶ Rada's contemporary Lucas de Tuy (1236, *Chronicon Mundi*), for example, does not yet mention Tubal as the one to populate the Iberian Peninsula. This is one more sign that it is actually Rada who relaunches the myth.

Rada does not only contribute strongly to the final establishment of the Tubal myth in Iberian historiography. He also marks the way Castilian chronicles would present Iberian history in the late middle ages and the early modern period. Rada's title indicates that he wants to tell the history of Spain, but what he actually does is tell the history of Castile and the Castilian Kings. Rada had a decisive influence on the appropriation of the name 'Spain' by Castilian humanists in the following centuries. Georges Martin gives Rada the credit for the 'invention of Castile', claiming that it was him who assigns Castile a political identity for the first time.¹⁷ He establishes a genealogical connection between the Castilian kings and the descendants of Noah. The other important Castilian chronicle from the 13th century is the *Estoria de España* written in the 1270s under the guidance of King Alfonso X, who was also an active collaborator on the chronicle. The work is mainly based on Rada, especially the initial part about Tubal and the other mythical kings. According to José Caballero the acceptance of Rada's mythology by Alfonso X means the consecration of biblical myths in Castilian historiography.¹⁸

14. For more information on Rada, see the recent works: Pérez de Rada y Díaz Rubín, Francisco Javier. *El arzobispo don Rodrigo Giménez de Rada*. Madrid: Fundación Jaureguizar, 2002; Crespo, Mario. *Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada*. Madrid: Fundación Ignacio Larramendi, 2015.

15. Caballero, José Antonio. "Desde el mito...": 38.

16. To compare the exact sayings of the three authors, see: Estévez, Juan Antonio. "Aproximación a los orígenes...": 144.

17. Martin, Georges. "La invención de Castilla (Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada, *Historia de rebus hispaniae*, V). Identidad patria y mentalidades políticas". *Archives ouvertes en Sciences de l'Homme et de la Société*. 12 November 2006. 9 May 2016 < <https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00113284/document> >: 1-16.

18. Caballero, José Antonio. "El mito en las historias...": 89. For a general overview on Late Medieval chronicles in Spain, see: Tate, Robert Brian. "La historiografía del reinado de los Reyes Católicos", *Antonio de Nebrija: Edad Media y Renacimiento*, Carmen Codoñer, Juan Antonio González Iglesias, eds. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad Salamanca, 1994: 17-28. See also his classical work: Tate, Robert Brian. *Ensayos sobre la historiografía peninsular del siglo XV*. Madrid: Gredos, 1970.



The 14th century is marked by a lot of internal trouble for Castile, mainly caused by two underage kings (Fernando IV and Alfonso XI) and in 1369 the dynastic quarrel that brought the Trastámara to the throne also impeded a similar cultural development as there had been in the 13th century and as there would be again in the 15th and following centuries. But Rada's legacy and the Tubal myth would not get lost in the meantime. The newly upcoming general chronicles kept following the schemes of the bishop of Toledo. Authors such as Alfonso de Cartagena (1456) or Diego de Valera (1482) continue the tradition of Tubal populating Spain. Also the concept of the Castilian primacy among the Spanish kingdoms is present again. Sánchez de Arévalo (1470) for example establishes a ranking for the different kingdoms pointing out that Castile and Leon would be the main Spanish kingdom before Aragon, Navarre, Portugal and Granada.¹⁹

The Italian Giovanni Nanni or Annius of Viterbo and his *Antiquitatum* (1498) would make another very important contribution for future of the Tubal myth. In his work he includes a document which he claims to have found in lost books written by Berossus, a Babylonian writer from the 3rd century B.C. The text is important, not only because he also tells the population of Spain by Tubal, but because it goes a lot further than a simple arrival and settlement. According to Annius, Tubal brought civilization to Iberia by introducing natural laws, letters and even poetry. Having all this at that particular point of history implies a superiority to ancient Greece and Rome which developed these indicators of civilization many centuries later. Despite the fact that these Berossus texts were false they had a very considerable impact on Spanish historians.²⁰

What Annius possibly does is confusing Tubal (son of Japhet) with Tubal-cain, the son of Lamech and descendent of Cain (son of Adam and Eve). Tubal-cain would have lived long before the Deluge and is basically unrelated to the other Tubal. According to the Bible, Tubal-cain was a "forger of all instruments of bronze and iron" (*Genesis*, 4:22), so he could be considered as the inventor of modern techniques of metal elaboration. These aspects of skills and civilized forms of craftsmanship of Tubal-cain may have been added to the other Tubal character Annius presents to us.

This would already be seen in the first important early modern work in Castile, the first four books of the *Crónica general de España*,²¹ published in 1543 by Florián de Ocampo, the official chronicler of Charles V (Charles I in Castile and the Crown of Aragon). His task, commissioned by the Castilian Parliament or *Cortes*, was to write down the *grandes cosas y hazañas hechas por los reyes de Castilla, de gloriosa memoria*.²²

19. Sánchez de Arévalo, Rodrigo. *Compendiosa Historia Hispanica*. Rome, 1470. Available at: Sánchez de Arévalo, Rodrigo. "Compendiosa Historia Hispanica". Universitat de València. 14 May 2016<http://roderic.uv.es/uv_ms_0411>..

20. On this impact, see: Caballero, José Antonio. "Anno de Viterbio y la historiografía española del siglo XVI", *Humanismo y tradición clásica en España y América*, Jesús María Nieto, ed. Leon: Universidad de León, 2002: 103-120.

21. "General" usually meant that the work would tell the history of all times, beginning with the Deluge. Caballero, José Antonio. "Mito e historia en la 'Crónica General de España'...": I, 397-405.

22. "great achievements accomplished by the Castilian kings of glorious memory". Samson, Alexander. "Florián de Ocampo, Castilian chronicler and Habsburg propagandist: rhetoric, myth and genealogy in



His work only spanned to the Roman period and would be continued afterwards by Ambrosio de Morales. But despite the fact that Ocampo does not arrive at the proper Castilian history, he connects the Castilians with Tubal by saying that *del qual descendemos y delos que con el vinieron, todos los que della son verdaderamente naturales* [from Spain].²³ Ocampo also adopts Annius' aggregation to the Tubal myth as the carrier of civilization by claiming that he taught the secrets of nature, music, mathematics, sciences and even introduced a calendar.²⁴

Only five years after Ocampo, Pedro de Medina published his *Libro de grandezas y cosas memorables de España*. Nevertheless, Medina's work does not contain a lot of own work, given that most of it is copied from other authors, mainly the Valencian Pere Antoni Beuter (we will refer to him later) and Ocampo, from whom he took basically everything concerning the arrival of Tubal to the peninsula. Nevertheless, he does not quote neither Beuter nor Ocampo, but refers directly to the false Berossus document itself.²⁵

A contemporary of Ocampo and Medina was Lorenzo de Padilla (1485-1540; this means he died before Ocampo published his work). He wrote a book that would remain unpublished until 1669. He would refer directly to the Berossus document to explain the arrival of Tubal to Spain after the Deluge. Padilla states that he would basically follow him because Saint Jerome and Josephus would have proven him correct.²⁶ José Pellicer who published the books more than a century after the author's death explains in his introduction that Padilla handed his manuscript over to Ocampo before he died. According to Pellicer, Ocampo, instead of publishing it took over the ideas and used them for his own historiographical work.²⁷

In 1592 the Jesuit Juan de Mariana wrote his famous *Historiae de rebus Hispaniae Libri XXX*, which he would translate into Castilian and publish it again in 1601 under the name *Historia general de España*. His work would become the prototype of Spanish history for about 200 years, until the publishing of Modesto Lafuente's *Historia General de España* (1850-1867).²⁸ Mariana refuses all the myths to which other historians were referring. According to Mariana, they wanted to ennoble the past of the people they were writing about and to achieve this they invented a lot of fables and tales. He also takes a position against *las opiniones y sueños del libro que poco ha salió con nombre de Beroso*, a book, as Mariana insists to be *compuesto de fábulas*

the historiography of early modern Spain". *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 42 (2006): 339.

23. "we all descend from him and the ones who came with him and so we are all true naturals [from Spain]". Ocampo, Florián de. *Los quatro libros primeros de la cronica general de España*. Zamora: Juan Pablo Colomer, 1543: 6v.

24. Ocampo, Florián de. *Los quatro libros...*: 19.

25. Medina, Pedro de. *Libro de grandezas y cosas memorables de España*. Madrid: Luis Gutiérrez, 1568: 3.

26. Padilla, Lorenzo de. *Libro Primero de las Antigüedades de España*. Valencia: without publisher, 1669: 6v.

27. Pellicer, José. "Motivos de esta edición", *Libro Primero de las Antigüedades de España que escriuió Lorenzo de Padilla*, ed. José Pellicer. Valencia: without publisher, 1669: 5v-6r.

28. Simon i Tarrés, Antoni. *Construccions polítiques i identitats nacionals. Catalunya i els orogens de l'estat modern espanyol*. Barcelona: Abadia de Montserrat, 2005: 98-99.



y mentiras.²⁹ Now, despite the fact that Mariana does not believe in the Berossus document or a mythical past at all, this position does not include Tubal. As he rejects the so called 'false Berossus' it seems to be logic that he does not characterize Tubal as the carrier of science, music and civilization. But Mariana has no doubt about the fact that it was Tubal who started the population of Spain after the deluge. To prove his point, he eludes to the fact that very important authors have confirmed it, so that the arrival of Tubal could be considered *averiguada cosa y cierta*.³⁰ As Caballero states, Mariana criticises the other historians only to end up doing the same thing they did.³¹ Mariana on the one hand surely contributed to the perdurability of the Tubal myth, but on the other hand his criticism of Annius and his Berossus document did not imply a decline of its use.

In 1597, five years after the publishing of the Latin version of Mariana's Spanish history, Gregorio López Madera brings to light his *Excelencias de la Monarchia y Reyno de España*. He probably refers to Mariana when he says that there are a few important authors who think that the Berossus document is feigned and untrue. But at the very same time López states that the text is absolutely true about all the antiquities and details that it seems impossible to him that the text could be false.³² He also quotes the above named Josephus and Saint Jerome to claim that it is proven that it was Tubal who first came to Spain. Afterwards he also adds Isidore and Jiménez de Rada to the ones who would give credibility to the population of Spain by Tubal.³³

Very similar is the case of Pedro Salazar de Mendoza and his *Monarchia de España* (1618). He also quotes the three authors of the ancient world and adds that all the Spanish and foreign histories also would confirm that Tubal's arrival to Spain is true. He says that given all this literary authority it would be temerarious to claim the opposite.³⁴ This is what Salazar de Mendoza already explains at the beginning in his geographical resume of Spain. Later in a specific chapter on Tubal he gives more details and refers to him also as the one who gave laws to the Spaniards and that it had be him who gave the people a calendar of 12 months and 365,25 days, which would be valid until Julius Cesar erroneously changed it. From this moment on, according to Salazar, the royal monarchical government was introduced in Spain

29. "the opinions and dreams of the book that recently came out under of Berossus name"; "full of fables and lies". Mariana, Juan de. "Historia General de España", *Obras de Padre Juan de Mariana*. Madrid: M. Rivadeneyra, 1854: I, 7. On Mariana, see: Soons, Alan. *Juan de Mariana*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1982.

30. "investigated and certain thing". Mariana, Juan de. "Historia General de España...": I, 2, 7.

31. Caballero, José Antonio. "El mito en las historias...": 100.

32. López Madera, Gregorio. *Excelencias de la Monarchia y Reyno de España*. Valladolid: Diego Fernández de Córdoba, 1597: 5v. On López Madera, see: García Ballesteros, Enrique; Martínez Torres, José Antonio. "Gregorio López Madera (1562-1649), un jurista al servicio de la Corona". *Boletín de la Real Sociedad Económica Matritense de Amigos del País*, 37 (1998): 163-178.

33. López Madera, Gregorio. *Excelencias de la Monarchia...*: 18v-19r.

34. Salazar de Mendoza, Pedro. *Monarchia de España*. Madrid: Joaquín Ibarra, 1770: I, 1. On Salazar de Mendoza see: Gómez Vozmediano, Miguel; Sánchez, Ramón. "Pedro Salazar de Mendoza (1549-1629): cronista nobiliario y bruñidor de linajes". *Tiempos Modernos*, 31 (2015): 393-422.



and it would last forever.³⁵ As we can see, the image of Tubal bringing civilization to Spain clearly survived Mariana's critical words on the Berossus document. Another example for this persistence is Julián del Castillo in 1624. In his *Historia de los Reyes Godos* he almost exactly copies Ocampo's text on laws, sciences and nature, what Tubal introduced in Spain. Nonetheless, he does not quote Ocampo, but Medina, who, as we already explained, copied entire chapters from Ocampo.³⁶

So, there is no discussion in the Castilian chronicles as to whether Tubal was the one who populated Spain. The only aspect where there is no unanimity is the question where he started it. Nonetheless, most of the authors suppose or pretend to know that he arrived in Spain in Andalusia. Mariana is the only one who limits himself to explain that it is unknown where Tubal actually arrived and that he does not see the need to guess without knowing.³⁷ Medina admits that there is no certainty on this question, but that it would be very likely that Tubal arrived to Andalusia, from where he started the population of Spain.³⁸ Ocampo and Castro claim in favour of Andalusia, too. Salazar de Mendoza on the other hand explains that it was Asturias and Galicia where Tubal first settled and from where he would have moved on to Italy.³⁹ But despite these doubts and differences for all these authors it is clear that with Tubal the Spanish monarchy was created which lasted until their own days.

4. The myth in the Basque Provinces and Navarre

Although the Basque Provinces and the Kingdom of Navarre were belonging to the Crown of Castile, their chroniclers are treated separately from the Castilian ones in this work. During the 10th and 11th century these territories had been united as the Kingdom of Pamplona. This union lasted until 1076 and 1200, when the three Basque Provinces (Guipuzcoa, Alava and Biscay) fell to Castile, but unlike other territories that were integrated into the Castilian crown, the Basque Provinces maintained their laws, jurisdiction and rights (*fueros*). The rest of the kingdom of Navarre stayed independent, adopting this name since 12th century until 1515 when a part of it (Chartered Community of Navarre) was also incorporated into the crown of Castile, maintaining as well its *fueros*.⁴⁰ The other part, Lower Navarre, continued as the kingdom of Navarre until it got into a dynastic union with France in 1589.

The Basque language is still alive in the Basque Country and Navarre, parallel to Castilian, and already in the Early Modern Period the chroniclers had a particular

35. Salazar de Mendoza, Pedro. *Monarchia de España...*: I, 35.

36. Castillo, Julián del. *Historia de los Reyes Godos*. Madrid: Luis Sánchez, 1624: 63.

37. Mariana, Juan de. "Historia General de España...": 7.

38. Medina, Pedro de. *Libro de grandezas y cosas memorables...*: 3.

39. Salazar de Mendoza, Pedro. *Monarchia de España...*: I, 35.

40. The term *fueros* refers to certain rights and privileges a territory had and which could not be violated by the King.



view on the origins of Spanish history in comparison to the rest of the Crown of Castile. The Basque elites of the 17th century embraced the Tubal myth to justify an original natural independence of the Basque people.⁴¹

This idea is expressed in 1571 (although he had already written several volumes of his work between 1556 and 1566) by Esteban de Garibay. Unlike most Castilian chroniclers Garibay defends an entry of Tubal in northern Spain. He accepts Beuter's (a chronicler from Valencia, we will refer to him later) theory of an entrance in Catalonia, but rejects the idea that he also settled there. The settlement, which is the important part of the first population, takes place, according to Garibay, in Navarre and Cantabria.⁴² In the 16th century among intellectuals there is a widely known theory that located the ancient Cantabria within the Basque territory and close to Navarre.

The second important argument, besides the geographical location, is the language. There had already been a tradition since the 15th century related to the Basque language being the first and original one of Spain.⁴³ But Garibay would be a key figure for the connection of the Basque language and the Tubal myth.⁴⁴ Garibay claims that it was one of the 72 languages that appeared after the Tower of Babel and the following confusion of tongues and that Tubal brought it to Spain.⁴⁵ This means, that Basque would be the original Spanish language and also that the Basque people descend directly from Tubal.

As we already stated at the beginning, toponymy was a strong argument to prove ancient origins. Garibay uses this strategy to proof the Cantabrian settlement. There would be a lot of Armenian traces in the names of Cantabrian places and as Tubal came from Armenia to Spain, this would prove his point valid. One of these examples would be the name of *Albina* which Tubal copied from a city Noah founded in Armenia one year after the Deluge.⁴⁶

In another important aspect of the Tubal myth, Garibay does agree with most of the Castilian historians. Without quoting ancient or contemporary authors, he describes Tubal as the carrier of civilization, referring to the same points such as the secrets of nature.⁴⁷ The differences to the Castilian writers lies in the fact, that Garibay also in this point applies his Basque focus. He does not say, that Tubal brought civilization to Spain or to the Spaniards, but to the Cantabrians alone.

41. Vázquez Larrea, Iñaki. "Los orígenes del nacionalismo vasco". *Sociotam*, 16 (2006): 141-161, especially, 149.

42. Garibay, Esteban de. *Los quarenta libros del compendio historial de las chronicas y universal historia de todos los reinos de España*. Barcelona: Sebastian de Cormellas, 1628: I, 90-92. On Garibay, see: Caro, Julio. *Los vascos y la Historia a través de Garibay*. Madrid: Editor Caro Raggio, 2002.

43. Perea, Francisco Javier. "Esteban de Garibay y la hipótesis hebraico-nabucodonosoriana". *Estudios de Lingüística del Español*, 36 (2015): 177-195, especially, 178.

44. Perea, Francisco Javier. "Esteban de Garibay...": 178.

45. Garibay, Esteban de. *Los quarenta libros...: I*, 77.

46. Garibay, Esteban de. *Los quarenta libros...: I*, 74.

47. Garibay, Esteban de. *Los quarenta libros...: I*, 76.



Andrés de Poza and his work *De la antigua lengua, poblaciones y comarcas de las Españas*, published in 1587, focusses mainly on the language aspect when he refers the Tubal myth. To prove that Basque was the ancient Spanish language he quotes the Roman geographer Pomponius Mela who had stated that nobody, not even the Greeks or the Carthaginians, could conquer Cantabria, which Poza accepts as the proof that their language had never changed and because of this it had to be the original one. He also refers to a couple of towns who are named, according to him, *puramente Vascongados, del Vasconce que hoy dia se habla*.⁴⁸ Just as Garibay Poza refers also to the confusion of tongues as the origin of the Basque language and that Tubal arrived in Spain only twelve years later.⁴⁹

Baltasar de Echave explains in the prologue to his work *Discursos de la antigüedad de la lengua Cantabra Bascongada* that most chroniclers refuse to give Basque the credit for being the first and original Spanish language because unjustly they think of it as barbarian and impossible to pronounce. They would also say that it has never been spoken in whole Spain, but only in the few provinces where it is present currently. Echave claims that this ignorance has been the motivation for him to write this book.⁵⁰ The text itself is written as a monologue pronounced by the Basque language (the Basque language in first person) explaining its history. At the beginning it explains its purpose in one clear sentence: *Hanme negado todas las buenas partes de mi persona, mi antigüedad, singularidad, elegancia, nobleza, y universal posesion que tuve de toda España, como lo mostrare en los discursos y narración de mis querellas, a que os ruego me tengáis oydo*.⁵¹ Like Garibay, Echave accepts that Tubal entered Spain via Catalonia, but just like him he states that Tubal and his people moved on to settle down in Cantabria. This would be also the moment when Tubal introduced the Basque language to this region from where it would extend itself afterwards over the whole Iberian Peninsula.⁵²

The last two authors focus basically on the language and do not treat all the points, for example, Garibay does. This would change again with Lope de Isasti and his work *Compendio historial de la muy noble y muy leal provincia de Guipúzcoa* from 1625. After referring as well to the arrival through Catalonia and the settlement in Cantabria, Isasti quotes Ocampo and the introduction of all the important aspects of civilization to the Spaniards by Tubal, such as the secrets of nature, philosophy, geometry and laws to govern. He also explicitly rejects the arrival of Tubal in Andalucía by saying

48. "purely Basque which is spoken nowadays". Poza, Andrés de. *De la antigua lengua, poblaciones y comarcas de las Españas*. Bilbao: Mathias Mares, 1587: 2-2v.

49. Poza, Andrés de. *De la antigua lengua*...: 9v.

50. Echave, Baltasar de. *Discursos de la antigüedad de la lengua Cantabra Bascongada*. Mexico: Enrico Martínez, 1607 (see the prologue without page numbers). On Poza and Echave, see: Madariaga Orbea, Juan. *Apologistas y detractores de la lengua vasca*. San Sebastian: Fundación para el Estudio del Derecho Histórico y Autonomo de Vasconia, 2008: 112-156.

51. "It has been denied to me all the good parts of my person, my antiquity, my singularity, elegance, nobility and universal possession that I had over all Spain, as I will show in the discourses and narration of my complains, which I ask you to listen to". Echave, Baltasar de. *Discursos de la antigüedad*...: 2.

52. Echave, Baltasar de. *Discursos de la antigüedad*...: 6-8.



that there is no reason to believe that this really happened.⁵³ Furthermore Isasti uses the toponymy to fortify his argument. He refers a couple of town names of Armenian origin, which would prove that Tubal made his first Spanish settlements in Cantabria and Guipuzcoa.⁵⁴

Very few non Basque authors would follow these arguments exposed by these authors. Francisco de Cepeda from Oropesa, Toledo, is one of these few. In his *Resumpta historial de España desde el diluvio hasta el año 1642* Cepeda refers to Garibay when he explains the population of Spain after the Deluge. Following Garibay he explains that Tubal did not populate any other regions of Spain before Cantabria. He also attributes to him the introduction of the natural law and the twelve months calendar.⁵⁵

In the late 17th century José de Moret published his *Annales del Reyno de Navarra*, a book that is part of a wider historiographical dispute between historians from Navarra and Aragon on the antiquity of these two kingdoms.⁵⁶ He states that Navarre and the Basque territory have been the first ones populated by Tubal. He continues that Tubal and his people brought the Basque language with them,⁵⁷ which means that he also uses the language to prove the antiquity of the Basque people and that they are the most ancient population group of Spain.

Similar to the Castilian authors the Basques ones state that Tubal started the monarchical government in Spain, which means, that he was the first king and the founder of the first (mythical) dynasty of Spanish kings. The difference the Basque historians point out is that he settled in the north in Cantabria, supposedly an ancient Basque territory, and that he ruled Spain from there, which means, that the Basque territory was the centre of the first monarchy in Spain.

5. The myth in the Crown of Aragon

Middle Age historiography in the Crown of Aragon is mainly Catalan chronicles of specific Kings like the ones from Bernat Desclot, Ramon Muntaner and the two chronicles of the Kings James I and Peter the Ceremonios. All the works were about one single King and his reign, but did not constitute a history of the Catalan territory.

One of the first works with a different approach is the *Crónica de San Juan de la Peña*, written between 1369 and 1372 in Aragon by the royal secretary Tomás de Canellas. Although he does not mention him specifically, the mythical part is

53. Isasti, Lope de. *Compendio historial de la provincia de Guipuzcoa*. San Sebastian: Ignacio Ramón Baroja, 1850: 26.

54. Isasti, Lope de. *Compendio historial de la provincia de Guipuzcoa...*: 26.

55. Cepeda, Francisco de. *Resumpta historial de España desde el diluvio hasta el año 1642*. Madrid: Diego Diaz de la Carrera, 1654: 9-9v.

56. For a specific analysis of this conflict, see: Floristán, Alfredo. "Polémicas historiográficas y confrontación de identificaciones colectivas en el siglo XVII: Navarra, Aragón y Vassconia". *Pedralbes*, 27 (2007): 59-81.

57. Moret, José de. *Annales del Reyno de Navarra*. Pamplona: Martín Gregorio de Zabala, 1684: I, 4.



based basically on Jiménez de Rada.⁵⁸ The beginning of Spanish history therefore states the arrival of Tubal with a reference to Saint Jerome and Isidore. Because of Tubal the first name of the Spaniards was *Cetubals*, continues the chronicle.⁵⁹ There is no mention of Tubal bringing any kind of civilization to Spain, which is not surprising, given that the chronicle is more than a century older than the false Berossus document.

Unlike in Castile there is no reappearing of the Tubal myth in the 15th century, but only in the 16th. In the kingdom of Aragon even in the 16th century it is not very present, given the great influence of Jerónimo de Zurita. He was since 1548 the first official chronicler of the kingdom of Aragon.⁶⁰ Besides the great importance he is given by the historiography,⁶¹ he is a very singular case in the 16th century. At the beginning of his *Anales de la Corona de Aragón* he refuses all kind of fairy tails of origin the great empires use to have, which to him are nothing more than *cosas inciertas y fabulosas*.⁶² This seems to be a similar attitude to Mariana's, with the important difference that Zurita neglects even the Tubal myth when Mariana acknowledges him although he turns down the whole rest of the mythical dynasty.

Despite his great influence and distribution among his coevals, in the long run his rejection of Tubal would not be imitated, not even in his own kingdom. The Aragonese Martín Carrillo confirms in 1620 the Tubal arrival and that he became Spain's first king. He says that among other authors, Ocampo and Mariana had it proven to be correct. He agrees with the Basque authors that the first settlement was made in the Pyrenees.⁶³ He refers a couple of cities which might have been Tubal foundations because of the similarity to his name, but does not want to confirm any of them. What he does confirm is the validity of the Berossus document. He uses it, for example, as a confirmation for Noah's visit to Spain after Tubal's settlement.⁶⁴

Luis López from Saragossa differs from Carrillo, with regards to their ideas on the first settlement. His work is not a fluent text, but more chronological tables of facts and happenings. The entries are rather short. The first one is about Tubal and that he came from Armenia to Spain. The difference with Carrillo is that López claims

58. Orcastegui Gros, Carmen. "Crónica de San Juan de la Peña (Versión aragonesa), edición crítica". *Cuadernos de Historia Jerónimo Zurita*, 51-52 (1985): 419-569, 421.

59. Orcastegui Gros, Carmen. "Crónica de San Juan...": 422.

60. The Kingdom of Aragon is not the same as the Crown of Aragon. The Kingdom of Aragon is part of the Crown of Aragon, which also includes the Kingdom of Valencia and Catalonia, as well as the Majorca islands and the territories reached thanks to the Mediterranean expansion. See: Sabaté, Flocel, ed. *The Crown of Aragon, a singular Mediterranean Empire*. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

61. Several biographies reflect this importance, the newest one is: Extravís, Isabel. *Jerónimo Zurita (1512-1580): un esbozo biográfico*. Saragossa: Institución Fernando el Católico, 2014.

62. "uncertain and fabulous things". Zurita, Jerónimo de. *Anales de la Corona de Aragón*. Saragossa: Institución Fernando el Católico, 1967: I, 3.

63. Carrillo, Martín. *Annales y memorias cronológicas*. Madrid: Imprenta de la viuda J. Pérez Valdivielso, 1620: 8v.

64. Carrillo, Martín. *Annales y memorias...*: 9.



that Tubal entered in Catalonia.⁶⁵ What he does not tell is if he stayed there or if he moved on to settle somewhere else, just as the Basque historians believed.

In Valencia historiography shows certain similarity with the Basque one concerning the settlement. The first important chronicle in the Kingdom of Valencia is the one from Pere Antoni Beuter in 1538. According to him, Tubal came to Spain from Armenia and his first settlement was in the Pyrenees. At the same time he rejects other theories on possible first settlements in Andalusia or Catalonia.⁶⁶ In 1538 Beuter published his chronicle in Catalan. In 1546 he published a translated version in Castilian, which is also modified in several parts. With regards to the Tubal myth he adds a reference to Berossus which explains that the peninsula was firstly called Cetubalia, after Tubal himself.⁶⁷

A very similar view is found with Francisco Diago (1613). He explains that the arrival of Tubal can be taken as truth and he quotes Josephus and Saint Jerome to prove his point. Diago says that he is not sure where Tubal entered Spain, but it seems very likely to him that it was the Pyrenees.⁶⁸ Neither Beuter nor Diago refer to Tubal as the carrier of civilization, despite the fact that at least in Beuter's case, there are references to the Berossus document.

Very different is the case of Gaspar Escolano (1610), who seems to be one of the few who agrees with Jerónimo Zurita. According to him, until the time of the Carthaginians there is no author nor memory that proves the existence of all the kings which are mentioned as possible rulers of Spain.⁶⁹ Escolano dedicates a whole chapter to Annus of Viterbo and his false Berossus document. The purpose of the chapter is to prove that the whole document is a falsification.⁷⁰ He also rejects the Basque theory of their language being the one Tubal brought to Spain. He argues that there are many ancient names completely unrelated to the Basque language, which would make it impossible for it to be the first language in all Spain.⁷¹

In Catalonia, as in the Basque Country and Navarre, the use of the Tubal myth would take a particular path and an intent of the Catalan authors to usurp it somehow for their purposes. The first Catalan chronicle focussing on the territory instead of a single reign is written in 1438 by Pere Tomic, although it remained unpublished until 1495. As for the majority of Iberian authors, the population of Spain starts with Tubal after the Deluge. Tomic does not say where exactly he arrives,

65. López, Luis. *Tablas Chronológicas Universales de España*. Saragossa: Hospital Real y General de Nuestra Señora de Gracia, 1637: I.

66. Beuter, Pere Antoni. *Primera part de la Història de València*. Valencia: Generalitat Valenciana, 1995: 56-57. On Beuter, see: Ortolà, Àlvar; Redondo, Jordi. "Elements mitològics i folklòrics a la Crònica de Pere Antoni Beuter". *Estudi General*, 23-24 (2004): 261-282.

67. Beuter, Pere Antoni. *Primera parte de la Coronica General de toda España y especialmente del Reyno de Valencia*. Valencia: Pedro Patricio Mey, 1604: 25.

68. Diago, Francisco. *Anales del Reyno de Valencia*. Valencia: Pedro Patricio Mey, 1613: I, 17r-17v.

69. Escolano, Gaspar. *Decada Primera de la Historia de la Insigne y Coronada Ciudad y Reyno de Valencia*. Valencia: Pedro Patricio Mey, 1610: 43-44. On Escolano, see: Martí, Francisco. *El doctor Gaspar Juan Escolano: cronista del reino y predicador de la ciudad*. Valencia: Francisco Vives Mora, 1892.

70. Escolano, Gaspar. *Decada Primera de la Historia...*: 47-54.

71. Escolano, Gaspar. *Decada Primera de la Historia...*: 67-76.



but he claims to be certain about that the first settlement Tubal established was in Catalonia, more precisely in Amposta and that it was the *Cetubals* who inhabited it.⁷²

The 16th and 17th centuries would bring more works on Catalan history and just as in Aragon (Zurita) and Valencia (Escolano), we find one author who rejects Tubal and the whole mythical prehistory of Spain. In the Catalan case it was Miquel Carbonell who wrote a couple of decades before Zurita, so it can be taken for granted that he was not influenced by him. Carbonell says that he read in several texts, among them Pere Tomic who is the only one he actually mentions, that it was Tubal who first came to Spain. He rejects this theory completely:

*Com nunca ajam legit ne podem creure se puga trobar en algun approvat Auctor que home de tal nom poblas Hespunya encara que en lo Genesi se diga Tubal esser fill de Japhet nos diga pero en lo dit Genesi que dit Tubal prengues nom Iberie ne es versemblant.*⁷³

Among other arguments to prove his point, Carbonell uses toponymy, usually employed to prove the opposite. If the arrival of Tubal was true, he states that the peninsula would not be called Iberia, but Tiberia. Also the title of Carbonell's work (*Chroniques de Espanya fins aci no divulgades*) constitutes an exception in early modern Catalan historiography, given that it does not refer to Catalonia, but Spain. The content, nevertheless, is completely focused on Catalonia. Pelayo and Simon i Tarrés believe that Carbonell and Francesc Tarafa (we will discuss him right now) wanted to criticize the Castilian chroniclers and their appropriation of the term 'Spain' by imitating them.⁷⁴

But the historians of the following decades did not continue this critical opinion of Tubal. The precise example of Francesc Tarafa shows all the general and in particular Catalan aspects of the Tubal myth. His work was first published in Latin in 1553 and nine years later Alonso de Santa Cruz translated it into Castilian and published it under the name *Chronica de España*, although he manipulates sensitive aspects of content in this translation.⁷⁵ Tarafa starts his chronicle with Tubal's arrival and states that he was the first person who possessed the Spanish kingdom. He makes reference to a lot of ancient authors, among them Saint Jerome, Josephus and also the false Berossus. The first city Tubal founded was, according to Tarafa's

72. Tomic, Pere. *Histories e conquestes de Cathalunya*. Barcelona: Johan Rosembach, 1495: 5.

73. "As we have never read, nor we think that it could be found in an approved author that a man of this name has populated Spain: although in *Genesis* it says that Tubal is Japheth's son: but it does not say in *Genesis* that this Tubal took possession of Iberia, nor does it seem reliable to us". Carbonell, Miquel. *Chroniques de Espanya fins aci no divulgades*. Barcelona: Carles Amoros, 1547: 2v (The work was originally written between 1495 and 1513).

74. Pelayo, Javier Antonio; Simon i Tarrés, Antoni. "Los orígenes del estado moderno español. Ideas, hombres y estructuras", *Historia de España en la Edad Moderna*, Alfredo Floristán, ed. Barcelona: Ariel, 2004: 223.

75. On Tarafa and especially the differences between the Latin and the Castilian version, see: Miralles, Eulàlia. "National identity and political intentionality in sixteenth-century hispanic historiography: From Tarafa's 'Las Españas' to Santa Cruz' 'La España'". *Rennaissanceforum*, 8 (2012): 87-101.



Latin version, *Tarraco* (Tarragona).⁷⁶ With this reference he contributes to the same tendency Tomic started and which locates the origins of the Tubal settlement in Catalonia. As we have already seen, Tarafa knew and approved the false Barrosus document. In this line he also adopts the theory of Tubal as the carrier of civilization as he states the he gave laws to the Spaniards.⁷⁷

In 1564 the Catalan Parlament or *Cortes* assigned to record the history of Catalonia to Antoni Viladamor. During the reunion of *Cortes* that year they made the request to the King for the establishment of an official chronicler for the Catalan Principality, similar to the one Aragon had since 1548. In 1585 when King Philip II came back to Catalonia, this office was supposed to be granted and Viladamor wanted to present the first part of his *Història general de Catalunya* in case the position would be given to him. But Viladamor died before the *Cortes* came together and the position was never created. The manuscript remained unpublished until the beginning of the 21st century, although it was read by many historians of the 17th century.

Viladamor deals in detail with the question of how and where Tubal got to Spain and where he first settled. He excludes the theory that Tubal arrived in Andalusia by sea and also that he came through the Pyrenees. Given that he came from Phoenicia, Viladamor states that it is logic that the came across the Mediterranean to Catalonia where he founded Tarragona.⁷⁸ Catalans in general and Viladamor in particular recreate the mythologies based on Castilian sources.⁷⁹

The case of Lluís Ponç d'Icard shows, that the Tubal myth not only appeared in chronicles of the kingdoms, but also in local ones, just as in his *Libro de las grandezas y cosas memorables de la metropolitana insigne y famosa ciudad de Tarragona* (1572), which only wants to explain the history of one city. His Catalan manuscript was translated into Castilian for its publication. Ponç makes reference to Castilian and Catalan works published earlier than his own, from Morales, Garibay, Medina (who probably inspired him with his title), Tomic and Carbonell. He also quotes ancient historians such as Saint Jerome and the false Berrosus. At the beginning of his work he agrees with other authors, that Tubal founded four different cities in the Iberian Peninsula, namely Pamplona and Calahorra in the north, Saragossa in Aragon and Tarragona in Catalonia.⁸⁰

Later on in chapter nine Ponç takes up again on the Tubal myth when he treats specifically the origins of Tarragona. After ruling out extensively other foundation

76. Tarafa, Francesc. *De origine, ac rebus gestis Regum Hispaniae liber, multarum rerum cognitione refertus*. Antwerp: Ioannis Steelsi, 1553: 8.

77. Tarafa, Francesc. *De origine, ac rebus gestis Regum Hispaniae liber...*: 9.

78. Viladamor, Antoni. *Història general de Catalunya*, ed. Eulàlia Miralles. Barcelona: Fundació Noguera-Pagès Editors, 2007: I, 248-250. On Viladamor, see: Miralles, Eulàlia. "L'historiador Antoni Viladamor i el seu entorn familiar: notes biogràfiques". *Pedralbes*, 17 (1997): 121-152.

79. Miralles, Eulàlia. "Estudi introductori", *Història General de Catalunya*, Antoni Viladamor, ed. Eulàlia Miralles. Barcelona: Fundació Noguera-Pagès Editors, 2007: I, 188-189.

80. Ponç d'Icard, Lluís. *Libro de las grandezas y cosas memorables de la metropolitana insigne y famosa ciudad de Tarragona*. Lleida: Pedro de Robles y Juan de Villanueva, 1572: 6. On Ponç see the introductory study in the modern publication of the Catalan manuscript: Duran, Eulàlia. *Lluís Ponç d'Icard i el "Llibre de les grandeses de Tarragona"*. Barcelona: Curial Edicions Catalanes, 1984.



myths of the city such as the one of Heracles, which is referred by others authors like Ocampo or Tomic, he concludes that Tubal came down from the Pyrenees (he agrees with the ones claiming Tubals arrival by land) to this area where he founded Tarragona (Tarraco) because of the fertile land and good climatic conditions. The name Tarraco itself would come directly from Tubal according to Ponç, which to him is the ultimate proof, that he is right, given that cities are usually named after their founders, which he tries to prove with a couple of other examples.⁸¹

Just as Viladamor also Pere Gil's work *Libre primer la historia Cathalana* (written in 1600) remained unpublished until. Just as him Gil claims that Tubal arrived to Catalonia and founded Tarragona. Before he moved on to other parts of Spain, Gil points out that Tubal founded several other cities and towns within Catalonia and only after this he created Sagunto in Valencia and more cities in other parts of Spain.⁸² Unlike most authors, Gil gives an explicit interpretation of Tubal's arrival in Catalonia. The fact that he came first to the Principality would mean *alabança, y preeminencia en alguna manera*.⁸³ Pre-eminence in comparison to the other Spanish kingdoms is what he certainly wants to express.

A few years after Gil, in 1609, Jeroni Pujades published his *Coronica Universal del Principat de Cathalunya*. He mentions ancient authors like Josephus, Castilians like Ocampo and Medina, Catalans like Tarafa and Viladamor and also Beuter from Valencia. The fact that he mentions Viladamor shows that his unpublished manuscript was actually circulating and still around two decades after his death. He also refers to Carbonell and states that he cannot understand why he does not agree on this subject, given that so many important authors do so.⁸⁴ The content on Tubal is clearly orientated on the Viladamor manuscript. Just as Viladamor does, Pujades rejects the entrance of Tubal by sea and through the Pyrenees. He claims that the authors who affirm one of these options would be influenced by the affection to their homelands (unlike him who presumes to be fully correct on this matter). The truth is, according to Pujades, that Tubal came to Catalonia and founded Tarragona, given that this area had the best fertility on the peninsula.⁸⁵

Estevan de Corbera would conclude the same as Viladamor and Pujades. Corbera died in 1635 and his work was only published in 1678. He states that all authors (ignoring Zurita among others) would agree on the fact that it was Tubal who started

81. Ponç d'Icard, Lluís. *Libro de las grandezas y cosas memorables...*: 77v.

82. Gil, Pere. *Libre primer de la historia Cathalana en lo qual se tracta de Historia o descripció natural, ço es de cosas naturals de Cathaluña*, ed. Josep Iglésies. Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 2002: 273. See also the introductory study by Joan Vilà-Valentí: Vilà-Valentí, Joan. "Anàlisi del contingut geogràfic de l'obra de Pere Gil", *Libre primer de la historia Cathalana en lo qual se tracta de Historia o descripció natural, ço es de cosas naturals de Cathaluña*, Pere Gil, ed. Josep Iglésies. Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 2002: XVII-XLVII.

83. "praise and pre-eminence in some way" [for Catalonia]. Gil, Pere. *Libre primer de la historia Cathalana...*: 273.

84. Pujades, Jeroni. *Coronica Universal del Principat de Cathalunya*. Barcelona: Jeroni Margarit, 1609: 2v. On Pujades, see: Amelang, James. "The mental world of Jeroni Pujades", *Spain, Europe and the Atlantic World: Essays in honor of John H. Elliott*, Richard L. Kagan, Geoffrey Parker, eds. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press, 1995: 211-226.

85. Pujades, Jeroni. *Coronica Universal del Principat de Cathalunya...*: 8-8v.



the first population of Spain. He refers to the different opinions on how he got there and where he arrived and comes to the same conclusion as Pujades that these authors want to attribute this honourable antiquity to their homeland. But, Corbera proceeds, given that Tubal travelled through the Mediterranean it cannot be denied that he came first to Catalonia where he could find all he needed in abundance.⁸⁶ He states furthermore that Tubal entered Catalonia in Cap de Creus from where he moved on to found Tarragona and Tortosa. Only after that parts of his people moved on to other parts of Spain to populate them as well.⁸⁷

In 1641 Francesc Martí de Viladamor (unrelated to Antoni Viladamor) published his *Notícia Universal de Catalunya* (sponsored by the *Consell de Cent*), clearly marked by the historical context of the Catalan revolt against the government of Olivares which had started in 1640. As most of the Catalan authors, he explains the arrival of Tubal to Catalonia and the foundation of Tarragona as the first settlement. Unlike most Catalan authors (and in the Crown of Aragon in general) Viladamor also highlights the argument of civilization by saying that he gave laws to the Spaniards. Now, he does not only claim the beginning of Tubal for Catalonia, but he also uses him for the very peculiar situation Catalonia found itself in at the beginning of the 1640s. He argues that because of the Tubal laws, Catalonia would have lived since its very beginning with laws and natural liberty and this liberty, claims Viladamor, has never been lost.⁸⁸ The argument of the natural liberty that Catalonia supposedly always had is directed to the Count-Duke of Olivares, the favourite of King Philip IV. who tried to obtain more money and recruit more soldiers from Catalonia and other non-Castilian territories for the wars the monarchy was involved in. So he uses the argument because in the particular historical situation of Catalonia he has a particular purpose and point to prove.

After the first Catalan republic (1641), the dynastic union with France (1641, one week after the proclamation of the republic) and the return to the Spanish monarchy (1652) the Tubal myth stays present in Catalan chronicles, as shows the example of Narcís Feliu de la Penya and his *Anales de Catalunya*. Like most Catalan historians he believes in the arrival of Tubal through the Mediterranean (he claims that it would have been difficult to arrive through the Ocean, given that he would have gone around the whole African continent). Like several Early Modern chroniclers he had exact concepts of how much times lay between key events in early human history. Feliu de la Penya explains, that Tubal founded Tarragona 1788 years after the creation of the world, 143 after the Deluge and 2174 before the birth of Christ.⁸⁹

86. Corbera, Estevan. *Cataluña ilustrada*. Naples: Antonino Graminani, 1678: 137-139.

87. Corbera, Estevan. *Cataluña ilustrada...*: 140-141.

88. Martí de Viladamor, Francesc. *Notícia Universal de Catalunya*. Barcelona: Consejo de Ciento de la Ciudad de Barcelona, 1641: 26-9.

89. Feliu de la Penya, Narcís. *Anales de Catalunya. Tomo Primero*. Barcelona: Joseph Llopis, 1709: 26-27. On de la Penya see in particular the second chapter of the PhD Dissertation by Andrea Ricci: Ricci, Andrea. "Narcís Feliu de la Penya (1646-1712) i el seu temps". *Tesis doctorales en Red*. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. 14 May 2016 <<http://www.tdx.cat/bitstream/handle/10803/125652/ar1de1.pdf?sequence=1>>.



6. The myth in Portugal

In medieval Portugal, Portuguese chronicles used to focus basically on the one single King and his reign, similar to the Catalan case. The most well-known of these chroniclers is Fernão Lopes (1380-1460, years are for reference only), who wrote about several Portuguese Kings such as John I. It is also believed that Lopes is the author the *Crónica de 1419*, which remained unpublished and was rediscovered in the first half of the 20th century.⁹⁰ Nevertheless, this chronicle does not mention Tubal, nor anything that happened before Portugal became an independent kingdom in the 12th century.

Also unpublished (until 2000) remained the first work which could be considered the first Portuguese history, the *História de Portugal* by Fernão de Oliveira, written between 1580 and 1582.⁹¹ He was probably also the first Portuguese historian to adopt the Tubal myth and the mythical Spanish past in general. Oliveira states that it is generally known that Tubal was the first person to populate Spain, which is why the first name Spain had was *Tubália* and the people were called, quoting Josephus, *tubales*.⁹² As far as Tubal's arrival to Spain is concerned, Oliveira affirms exactly what especially Catalan authors try to prove wrong. He explains that Tubal arrived to Spain through the Atlantic Ocean, which is why he came to Portugal and not to Andalusia like several authors claimed. He also uses toponymy within his arguments. Tubal would have founded Setúbal in Portugal and Oliveira quotes Ocampo to prove it,⁹³ ignoring that Castilian authors used this very same name for a foundation in Andalusia which would later change its name. He also rejects the theory that the terms *Celtiberos* and *Celtiberia* would come from Tubal and refuting this, he states that the theory of Tubal's arrival through the Pyrenees would be proven wrong, too.⁹⁴

Manuel Cândido Pimentel explains that Oliveira's ideological purpose was to prove a historic supremacy of antiquity of Portugal over Spain.⁹⁵ We agree with the first part, that Oliveira indeed wanted to show Portugal's greater antiquity, but not over Spain, given that Portugal was a part of Spain, a name that was used to describe the Iberian Peninsula as a geographical unit, as we already explained in the beginning. The struggle for supremacy therefore was not against, but within Spain and against the other Spanish kingdoms, for example Castile or Valencia.

90. On this chronicle see: Basto, Artur de Magalhães. *Cronistas e crónicas antigas. Fernão Lopes e a "Crónica de 1419"*. Coimbra: Universidade de Coimbra, 1960.

91. Franco, José Eduardo. *O mito de Portugal. A primeira história de Portugal e a sua função política*. Lisbon: Fundação Maria Manuela e Vasco de Albuquerque d'Orey, 2000: 18.

92. Oliveira, Fernão de. "História de Portugal", *O mito de Portugal. A primeira história de Portugal e a sua função política*, José Eduardo Franco, ed. Lisbon: Fundação Maria Manuela e Vasco de Albuquerque d'Orey, 2000: 352.

93. Oliveira, Fernão de. "História de Portugal...: 352-353.

94. Oliveira, Fernão de. "História de Portugal...: 357.

95. Cândido Pimentel, Manuel. "O mito de Portugal nas suas raízes culturais", *Portugal: percursos de interculturalidade*, Artur Teodoro de Matos, Mário Ferreira Lages, eds. Lisbon: Alto Comissariado para a Imigração e Diálogo Intercultural, 2008: 3, 29.



Oliveira is also the only Portuguese author Matteo Ballester Rodríguez mentions in his article on the Tubal myth. According to him, the use of Tubal in a strictly Portuguese affirmation can only be considered as a curiosity and very particular case and not as the beginning of a solid tradition. He also argues that the myth had already been linked to Spain for centuries, which would have made a disconnection of the myth from Spain very complicated.⁹⁶ This interpretation is mistaken on several points. First, Ballester also does not take into account that Portugal was considered a part of Spain. Second, Oliveira does not try to disconnect the myth from Spain, given that he writes explicitly about Tubal's arrival to Spain and his answer to the question to which part of Spain he arrived is Portugal. Thirdly, although Oliveira himself could not start a new tradition, given that his work remained unpublished and also unknown, he cannot be considered a curious isolated case as we will see below.

It seems that the Portuguese chroniclers enter the Tubal debate only at the point in which their kingdom is dynastically united with the other Spanish kingdoms. The important Portuguese myth had always laid with Ulisses, the mythical founder of Lisbon. Now, given the importance of antiquity and the fact that Odysseus was clearly posterior to Tubal may have provoked Portuguese writers to adopt him into their chronicles as a more ancient founder of Portugal.

In 1597 Bernardo de Brito, who in 1614 would become the official chronicler of the Portuguese kingdom, published the first part of the *Monarchia Lusitana*. This monumental work on Portuguese history would finally have eight volumes, written by five authors and published between 1597 and 1729. According to Brito, Tubal was travelling through the Mediterranean until he reached the Strait of Gibraltar, which brought him to the Ocean.⁹⁷ Brito refers to a very particular source, Laymundo de Ortega, an author who is not mentioned in any of the works we treated so far. Brito explains in his prologue the discovery of this manuscript: *Que foy hum livro antiquissimo, escrito de letra Gothica, em pergaminho grosso, e mal pullido, composto por hum Portugues chamado Laymundo Ortega*.⁹⁸ Naturally this brought up the suspicion that Brito himself might have invented the text.

According to Laymundo, Brito states that Tubal passed through the Strait of Gibraltar and arrived to Spain from the ocean where he started a new monarchy. Brito also quotes other ancient authors such as Josephus or the false Berossus. He also refers to Tubal's first founding with the name *Cethubala* which would turn into Setúbal by the time.⁹⁹ After this he comments on Ocampo's work and critiques

96. Ballester, Mateo. "La estirpe de Tubal...": 231.

97. Brito, Bernardo de. *Monarchia Lusitana*. Alcobça: Mosteiro de Alcobça, 1597: I, 6v. New research on Brito would be desirable, given that the existing biography by Álvaro Terreiro (1992) is strongly in the tradition of the romantic national historiography from the 19th and big parts of the 20th century. See: Terreiro, Álvaro. *Frei Bernardo de Brito: historiador profético da Resistência: uma leitura para nosso tempo: vida e obra, breve antologia*. Lisbon: Câmara Municipal de Almeida-Sociedade Histórica da Independência de Portugal, 1992.

98. "It was a very ancient book, written in gothic letters, in big vellum and badly polished, composed by a Portuguese with the name of Laymundo Ortega". Brito, Bernardo de. *Monarchia Lusitana...*: I, 4v.

99. Brito, Bernardo de. *Monarchia Lusitana...*: I, 6v.



that despite the fact that he speaks in extended lines about *Cethubala* he does not recognize that Tubal founded it in Portugal claiming that it was rather in Andalusia. Brito accuses Ocampo of taking the credits for this glory of the most ancient foundation to Castile. He also accuses the Valencian Martí de Viciana of the same thing. He reproaches him for claiming the origins of Tubal in Spain for the region of Valencia.¹⁰⁰ Just like the Catalan authors he accuses the ones from other kingdoms while doing the exact same thing himself. Interestingly, he quotes the first volume of Viciana's work, which is lost today unlike the three following parts, which is why we could not include him with the Valencian authors, because logically it is the first volume which treats the arrival of Tubal. He also takes on Garibay, rejecting his hypothesis of Tubal arriving first to the Basque region. All this explains Brito, is nothing but imagination and inventions that lack evidence while actually *nosso Reyno foy o mais antigo na povoação, e Setubal o lugar, em que primeiro ordenarão vivenda e vecinhança comuna*.¹⁰¹

As with most Iberian kingdoms, in Portugal there is also found an exception, an author who does not accept the Tubal myth and the mythical past of Spain as a whole. In the Portuguese case it is Duarte Nunes do Leão who in his *Origem da Língua Portuguesa* (1606) picks up the question of the first language spoken in Spain. He states that many authors have attempted to answer this question and that the Castilians and also some Portuguese would all acknowledge that it was Tubal who came to Spain after the confusion of tongues and that he founded Setubal. Whether ancient Setubal is found in Castile or in Portugal, Nunes de Leão claims all these authors were mistaken because Setubal, according to him, is a modern name.¹⁰² Afterwards his criticism becomes more severe, especially against Florián de Ocampo. He calls him a good writer, but very weak in factual issues. Ocampo, says Nunes de Leão, should have written less fables and according to him, the real Berossus would not be able to believe the false account on this place (Spain) where there were no letters nor writers or any memories on which an author could rely on. Nunes' conclusion is therefore that research on the first language in Spain is a waste of time.¹⁰³

But just as in the other kingdoms, Nunes' denial of Tubal had no impact on subsequent authors. Yet there is another singular case of an author who does not deny the Tubal myth, but does neglect the Portuguese primacy as the first population. The author in question is Diogo de Paiva d'Andrade and his work *Exame d'Antiquidades* from 1616. His father Francisco de Andrade had been the official chronicler of the Portuguese kingdom until his death in 1614. His successor was not

100. Brito, Bernardo de. *Monarchia Lusitana...*: I, 7.

101. "our kingdom was the most ancient one in population and Setúbal was the place where they first started a settlement and neighbourhood". Brito, Bernardo de. *Monarchia Lusitana...*: I, 7.

102. Leão, Duarte Nunes do. *Origem da Língua Portuguesa*. Lisbon: Pedro Crasbeeck, 1606: 4-5. See the introductory study by Maria Leonor Carvalhão Buescu in the newest edition: Buescu, Maria Leonor Carvalhão. "Introdução, notas e leitura", *Origem da Língua Portuguesa*, Duarte Nunes do Leão. Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda, 1983: 43-186.

103. Leão, Duarte Nunes do. *Origem da Língua Portuguesa...*: 6-9.



his son Diogo, but the above explained Bernardo de Brito. In some sort of mixture between bitterness and vengeance, the main purpose of Andrade's book seems to be criticize Brito and prove him wrong. He refers to him not by his name, but with *o autor da Monarchia*.¹⁰⁴ After a resumé of Brito's work, Andrade states that Brito's sources are not valid, and above all the already mentioned Laymundo Ortega, *he escritor que ninguem conhece*.¹⁰⁵

As his work is basically directed against Brito, it seems to be logic that Andrade rejects one of the key points of Brito's work, the arrival of Tubal in Portugal. He states that Setúbal without any doubt would deserve such a noble founder, but as he feels obliged to tell the truth, he has to say that Brito has no foundations except his own authority. To reject him he quotes Josephus (ironically one of the authors Brito uses to prove Tubal's arrival by sea) who claims *Gades* (Cadiz) to be the first foundation in Spain. In this way his conclusion is that Tubal's first settlement was not in Portugal, but in Castile, more exactly in Andalusia, that is if Tubal actually came to Spain which according to Andrade is not proven, which is why he refuses to examine the following mythical kings after Tubal.¹⁰⁶

Brito himself did not write any answer or defence of his work, possibly because he died in 1617, only a year after Andrade published his work. Nonetheless it would not remain unanswered, because in 1620 Bernardino de Silva, a nephew of Brito, published the first of two volumes in defense of Brito. After dedicating a whole chapter to prove the credibility of Laymundo and the false Berossus he gets directly onto the Tubal matter. First, he quotes a series of ancient and modern authors from Castile and Valencia to prove the existence of Tubal and that he actually arrived in Spain, something Andrade had left open because of the lack of evidence. Second, Silva wants to prove that Tubal not only arrived in Spain, but that he first arrived in Portugal where he founded Setubal. Again he quotes several ancient authors and addresses himself directly to Andrade telling him that even if Laymundo and Berossus were not trustworthy (which they are according to Silva) there would still be many more authors who would confirm the facts, which is why he cannot understand his attitude towards Brito.¹⁰⁷

Neither Nunes' complete denial of Tubal nor the controversy generated by Andrade had no major impact on the general line of Portuguese historians and how they tried to use the myth for the interests of Portuguese primacy. One of these cases is António de Sousa de Macedo who in 1631 published his *Flores de Espanha, excelencias de Portugal*. He claims Portugal to be the most ancient kingdom of the world, arguing that Spain is the most ancient of the current kingdoms and Portugal is the most ancient Spanish kingdom because it was Tubal who populated it. This is proven, according to Sousa de Macedo, by the existence of the city Setubal, which so many authors confirm to be the first foundation and which is located in Portugal,

104. "the author of the Monarchy". Andrade, Diogo de Paiva de. *Exame d'Antiguidades*. Lisbon: Jorge Rodriguez, 1616: 8.

105. "a writer nobody knows". Andrade, Diogo de Paiva de. *Exame d'Antiguidades...*: 9.

106. Andrade, Diogo de Paiva de. *Exame d'Antiguidades...*: 9v-11v.

107. Silva, Bernardino de. *Defensão da Monarchia Lusitana*. Coimbra: Nicolao Carvalho, 1620: I, 32.



sin embargo de lo que Duarte Nunes diz, he adds in parentheses.¹⁰⁸ He also rejects the theory that Tubal arrived through the Pyrenees with the argument that it would be unlikely that through entering Spain from the north he would have gone the whole way to Portugal. This means that he does not use the place of entry to prove the first settlement, but he takes for granted that it was in Portugal and with that he neglects possible other points of entry.¹⁰⁹

Similar things can be said about Manuel de Faria e Sousa, who's *Europa Portuguesa* was published in 1678, almost 30 years after the author had died. He elaborated several volumes on the different parts of the Portuguese Empire, three volumes of *Europa Portuguesa*, three of *Asia Portuguesa* and one on *Africa Portuguesa* (the *América Portuguesa* remained unpublished). On Portuguese history he had already published the *Epítome de las historias portuguesas* in 1628, a shorter, probably proto version of what later would be the *Europa Portuguesa*. In the tradition of Oliveira and Brito (Faria e Sousa himself explains in his prologue that the first part of his work is based mostly on Brito¹¹⁰) he explains Tubal's arrival through the Atlantic Ocean after crossing the Mediterranean and passing the Strait of Gibraltar. Upon arrival he founded Setubal between the sea and the river Tagus.¹¹¹ The history of Tubal's arrival is already found to be almost identical in his *Epítome* from 1628.

As in the Crown of Aragon, especially in Catalonia, the introduction of laws, sciences or letters do not seem to be of a primary importance to the Portuguese historians. Like the Catalans they are mainly focused on proving that the origins of Spain's antiquity lie within their kingdom.

7. Conclusions

The purpose of this paper was to compare the presence of the Tubal myth in early modern Iberian historiography and how it is used in different ways and for different purposes in the Chronicles of the different Spanish kingdoms. The analysis of several historians and their work has led to multiple conclusions.

First, despite the great acceptance of Bible based myths in historiographical works there are authors who remain still sceptical or even very critical. We find a complete rejection of all myths, as it is the case of the Aragonese Jerónimo de Zurita or the Portuguese Duarte Nunes do Leão. And there are the cases of authors who reject the presence of myths in history in general, but who take the arrival of Tubal to be fact, for example Juan de Mariana from Castile or Manuel de Faria e Sousa

108. "despite what Duarte Nunes says". Macedo, António de Sousa de. *Flores de España, excelencias de Portugal*. Lisbon: Jorge Rodríguez, 1631: 24v.

109. Macedo, António de Sousa de. *Flores de España...*: 24v.

110. Sousa, Manuel de Faria e. *Europa Portuguesa*. Lisbon: Antonio Craesbeeck de Mello, 1678: I, 5. On Faria e Sousa, see the recent PhD Dissertation by Cruz Bonilha: Bonilha, Alexandre da Cruz. *Manuel de Faria e Sousa, historiador*. Saint Paul: Universidade de São Paulo (PhD Dissertation), 2011.

111. Sousa, Manuel de Faria e. *Europa Portuguesa...*: I, 34.



from Portugal. The acceptance of Tubal while rejecting the rest of the mythical first royal Iberian dynasty shows the extraordinary importance the Tubal figure had in the discourse to prove antiquity. Nevertheless, none of the two types of neglecting would influence the later upcoming authors, given that there did not appear any imitators. This means, that most authors keep giving more importance to what previous authors have written than to a possible own rational reflection and analysis of evidence. This would only change during the 18th century when the Tubal myth is starting to decline.

Secondly, there is a significant difference between Castilian chronicles and those from other Iberian territories. For the Castilian authors it is important to point out that Tubal arrived in Spain, which would prove the antiquity of Spain as a whole. This matches with the general purpose the Castilians had in mind when writing Spanish history, which actually consisted in presenting the Castilian history as Spanish history and, for example, the Castilian kings as kings of Spain. The concrete point of arrival therefore is not of primary importance for the Castilians, although there is no unanimity. Some authors localise it in Andalusia and others in the north of Spain, in Galicia or Asturias. But these differences do not affect the main point of the myth which is to prove Spain's antiquity and the antiquity of the Spanish civilization. Based on the false document attributed to Berossus, most Castilian authors claim that Tubal not only began the settlement of Spain, but civilized life thanks to his introduction of laws, sciences and letters. This shows that also the mythical origins of history were used to emphasize the Castilian primacy within the Spanish (or Hispanic or Catholic) monarchy.

Thirdly, very similar in a general perspective and quite different in a particular one, are the cases of the Basque/Navarre territories, Catalonia and Portugal. Most of the authors from these territories do not have a global Spanish perspective in mind, but are focussed on their own kingdom or principality in the case of Catalonia. The Basque and Navarre authors consider that Tubal first settled in their territory and their argument is strongly focused on the language. Although most of them accept the point of entry to be Catalonia, they claim that he did not stay there but that he moved immediately to the north where he would finally settle. They try to prove that the Basque language is one of the 72 languages existing after the 'confusion of tongues' and that it is the one Tubal and his people were speaking when they arrived to Spain, the way that Basque would be the first and original Spanish language. They also emphasize the aspect of Tubal introducing laws, sciences and letters to prove that the Basque constituted the first real civilization in Spain.

Catalan authors also claim the first Tubal settlement for their own territory. Their main argument is that logically Tubal only could reach Spain through the Mediterranean, a route which only could have lead him to Catalonia. Portuguese authors are aware of this, which is why they make him go from the Mediterranean through the Strait of Gibraltar to the Atlantic Ocean, where, according to them, he first settled in Portugal. Unlike Basque writers, Catalan and Portuguese chroniclers do not claim their language to be the first one in Spain. Their purpose is to claim the primacy of their territory within the Spanish monarchy through historiography



among other types of sources. As I already pointed out, antiquity was a very important criteria for the nobility of a territory, which is why Catalan as well as Portuguese authors use the Tubal myth in this way. Unlike the Basque case, there is little use of the introduction of laws in these cases, probably because it is more of a Spanish aspect (he gave laws to the Spaniards) than a particular Catalan or Portuguese one.

No similar tendencies can be found in chronicles from Aragon and Valencia. Some of these authors agree with the Castilian writers, others with the Catalan ones. But none of these claim any kind of primacy neither for their own territory nor for another one. A possible explanation could rest in the fact that these kingdoms had never been the primary kingdom in the middle age Crown of Aragon which was led by the Catalans,¹¹² despite the fact that their noble title Count of Barcelona stood behind the King title of Aragon and after the conquest of Valencia also behind the one from this region.

For the Catalans it was harder to accept their relegation behind Castile and the same can be said for the Portuguese case. Portugal already had its own empire on four continents when they joined the Spanish monarchy in 1580 and it was very hard to accept the absence of the king and that the common monarchy was mainly ruled from Madrid and by Castilians.

The fourth point is that for the Early Modern Period it is necessary to refer to the chronicles of all these territories to have a complete view of the writing on Spanish history of that time. The great diversity in the use of the Tubal myth shows that Castilian chronicles cannot be taken as representatives for Spanish historiography. This has been shown especially by the Basque, Catalan and Portuguese (which certainly belong to the early modern concept of Spain) works which differ widely from the Castilian ones.

112. Elliott, John H. *The revolt of the Catalans. A study in the decline of Spain (1598-1640)*. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press, 1984: 4.

