

Studies in Medieval Spanish Frontier History

Charles Julian Bishko

Study II

Fernando I and the Origins of the Leonese-Castilian Alliance With Cluny

(This article appeared originally in *Cuadernos de Historia de España* 47 (1968), 31-135 and 48 (1969), 30-116 and appears in LIBRO with the kind permission of Dna. María Estela González de Fauvre, editor of the journal.)

[1] Was the Leonese-Castilian kingdom in the 11th and 12th centuries a vassal state of Cluny? Did the heraldic lion sculptured on the pediment of the first edifice Abbot Hugh the Great built with Spanish gold symbolize a tamed Leonese Empire in the service of the monks?⁽¹⁾ Few phenomena in the history of Leon and Castile between 1050 and 1150 are better attested yet less studied or understood than the intimate friendship existing between the rulers of the Navarro-Basque dynasty -- Fernando I, Alfonso VI, Urraca, Alfonso VII, Fernando II, Alfonso VIII-- and the Burgundian abbey.⁽²⁾ That the connection ranged far beyond the strictly ecclesiastical sphere--royal donation of monasteries, churches and lands, the installation of Cluniac monks at Toledo and other episcopal sees--is perfectly clear from the contemporary sources which, especially for Alfonso VI and Urraca, emphasize repeatedly Cluny's political or para-political activities below the Pyrenees.

In 1072 we hear of Abbot Hugh's achieving the liberation of the defeated, deposed Alfonso VI from imprisonment at Burgos, after his brother Sancho II's victory at Golpejera.⁽³⁾ In 1073 the same abbot's influence apparently blocks, as adverse to Leonese-Castilian interests, the Spanish crusade planned by Popes Alexander II and Gregory VII.⁽⁴⁾ The Cluniac hand can presumably be detected again in Alfonso's marriage to Constance of Burgundy, Hugh's niece, in 1078,⁽⁵⁾ and in the appearance of Burgundian knights in Spain after the disaster of Zallaca (1086).⁽⁶⁾ One abbatial emissary to the Leonese-Castilian court, the monk Robert, in conjunction with Queen Constance, defends the Hispanic Empire during the years 1077 to 1080 against Gregory VII's claims to papal suzerainty over the Peninsula;⁽⁷⁾ another, Dalmace Geret, in 1105 or 1106 negotiates the pact partitioning Alfonso VI's realms between his sons-in-law Counts Raymond of Galicia and Henry of Portugal.⁽⁸⁾ The aged Alfonso himself, facing in 1109 the ultimate, most acute succession crisis of his long reign, arranges for his chosen successor D. Urraca an immediate personal bond with Cluny through the Infanta's cession of her Gallegan monasterio propio of San Vicente de Pombeiro.⁽⁹⁾ And in 1113, after the Queen-Empress's unhappy marriage to Alfonso I el Batallador of Aragon had dissolved amid widespread civil war, it is Abbot Ponce of Cluny, travelling from Burgundy to the remote tomb of the Apostle at Compostela, who reconciles Urraca with her estranged son Alfonso Raimúndez the future Alfonso VII, and with his most powerful supporters, Count Pedro Froilaz de Traba and Bishop (as he then was) Diego Gelmírez of Santiago.⁽¹⁰⁾

In the light of these repeated Cluniac interventions of unmistakably dynastic and national import, Leonese-Castilian ties with the Burgundian congregation take on the characteristic features of an [2] authentic alliance, a union which ca. 1120 one Cluniac writer, Gilo, styles *conjunctio*.⁽¹¹⁾ Yet modern treatments of Hispano-Cluniac history have done little to examine as a whole the origins, purpose and at least potentially feudal character of this partnership, in part because of the false assumption that it represents no more than a pious Navarro-Basque familial attachment to Cluny dating from the epoch of Sancho el Mayor and dutifully perpetuated by all his descendants on the thrones of Aragon, Navarre and Leon-Castile.⁽¹²⁾ In part, also, this is because objective appraisal of the connection is still hampered by national prejudices that, according to the standpoint of the observer, often depict it as either an inspired instrument for the reform and *aggiornamento* of a backward Iberian civilization⁽¹³⁾ or, conversely, a gross betrayal into foreign hands of Spanish national, ecclesiastical and economic interests.⁽¹⁴⁾

The subject is however much too central to both Iberian and Cluniac history in the 11th and 12th centuries to be left at this primitive level of understanding, particularly if we are ever to achieve an adequate assessment of the first two Leonese-Castilian sovereigns of the Navarro-Basque house, the King-Emperors Fernando I and Alfonso VI; and to dispel--especially for the latter, whose reign in most fundamental respects appears to continue domestic and foreign policies first laid down by his father -- the traditional smokescreen of bias, error and misunderstanding emitted by francophiles, xenophobes and Cidolaters. The paramount need is to clarify the obscure origins of the *conjunctio* under Fernando el Magno, despite the fragmentary and dispersed character of the documentation; here we must lament that Alfonso Sánchez Candeira's death deprived us of his projected edition of the Fernandine reales privilegios as well as of a badly needed comprehensive treatise on this crucial reign. Nevertheless, tentative as conclusions may be at many points, the attempt must be made.

From the Cluniac angle, it is the story of the first Burgundian penetration beyond Catalonia and the domains of Sancho el Mayor into the broad territories of the Leonese Empire, stretching all the way from the Tierra de Campos and the originally Leonese *Reichsland* of the Rioja to Galicia and Portugal, the future heartland of the Burgundian establishment in medieval Iberia. A fateful step, since Cluny's material prosperity, through alliance with the Leonese imperialism of Fernando I and his heirs, thus became linked to the fortunes of the southward frontier advance of the Reconquest and to the unstable system of the parias, the annual stipendiary tribute payments in gold coin which were exacted from the Taifa princes of al-Andalus in the decades before and just after the North African Almoravid irruption into Spain.

On the other hand, for Spanish history, it is the forging of a trans-Pyrenean connection that for a hundred years after the battle of Atapuerca in 1054 functions as an integral element in Navarro-Basque *Grosse Politik*: the attempted unification under imperial Leonese hegemony of a Hispanic confederation which was intended to include the Leonese lands, the old realm of Sancho el Mayor in Navarre, Aragon and Castile, and the affluent principalities of the Taifas. It is the question, finally, whether we should recognize a subjection to Cluny, commencing with Fernando I, of the Leonese-Castilian [3] state paralleling Aragon's acceptance of papal suzerainty under Sancho Ramírez from 1068.

1. The House of Sancho el Mayor and Cluny to ca.1050

To understand the originality of Fernando I's relations with Cluny it is imperative first to define as precisely as possible the nature and true limits of the policy followed towards the abbey by his father Sancho el Mayor and royal brothers Garcia of Navarre and Ramiro I of Aragon. At present this is made difficult by the defects of the standard accounts.⁽¹⁵⁾ These tend to exaggerate grossly the extent of

Cluniac reformist influence upon Navarro-Aragonese-Castilian monasticism, and even while acknowledging that el Mayor did not actually turn over a single peninsular house for conversion into a Burgundian priory, often assume that certain communities -- notably San Juan de la Peña but also others like San Salvador de Leire or San Salvador de Oña -- became permanent centers of Cluniac spirituality in continuing contact with the mother abbey. They commonly fail, with the partial exception of Pérez de Urbel, to relate Sancho's use of the Burgundian monks to his attempted re-structuring of cathedral churches around chapters of monks or regular canons under abbot-bishops, a pattern adopted more directly from Catalonia than from the usually cited Southern French precedents. Again, they uncritically accept a documentation which scholars increasingly attack as false, interpolated or misinterpreted; Pérez de Urbel now rejects the famous real privilegio of 1033, long regarded as proving that el Mayor established Oña as a Cluniac outpost in Castile, and Durán Gudiol fiercely (but surely captiously) discards Peña as the original Aragonese base.⁽¹⁶⁾ And the whole picture of Hispano-Cluniac beginnings under Sancho has often been thoroughly distorted by identifying Cluny as the spearhead of papal intervention in Spain, by confusing its deeply monastic and strongly conservative, royalist and pro-feudal outlook with the doctrines of the Gregorian Reform, or by depicting it as a hotbed of exalted propaganda for an international crusade against Spanish Islam.⁽¹⁷⁾

The truth, if we may attempt to summarize it rapidly, is quite different. What we encounter in Sancho el Mayor's domains between 1020 and 1035 is deliberate royal acceleration of ecclesiastical reforms of a type already long familiar in Catalonia; on the monastic side these included a post-Carolingian Benedictinism, as regards customs and spirituality, of perceptible but neither total nor necessarily direct Cluniac inspiration.⁽¹⁸⁾ Seeking to strengthen his kingdom's religious links with the more fully developed Catalan East, and doubtless guided in this by his friendship with the great Oliba, abbot of Cuixá and Ripoll and bishop of Vich (and with Oliba's able disciple and envoy to Navarre, Abbot Poncio of San Saturnine de Tabèrnoles), the Navarrese monarch turned to Cluny ca. 1025 and persuaded Abbot Odilo to send certain of his monks to Spain.⁽¹⁹⁾ These were clearly few in number, under the leadership of one Paternus, and of the class Radulfus Glaber calls *Hispani*, i.e., Catalans or other Eastern Spaniards who had become familiar, through long residence at [4] Cluny, with Burgundian observances.⁽²⁰⁾ This little band, established at San Juan de la Peña where Paternus becomes abbot, undoubtedly influenced this house but whether, as so often claimed, this influence extended beyond Peña to Oña or to the great houses of the then Navarrese Rioja such as Leire, San Martín de Albelda, San Millán de la Cogolla and San Sebastián (later Santo Domingo) de Silos, is at present quite uncertain. At best only a few large royal abbeys are likely to have been involved; none of these were actually ceded to the alien reformers; and no signs appear of hostility towards royal, aristocratic or episcopal appropriation of monasteries or towards episcopal jurisdiction over monks under the formulas of Chalcedon and the Fourth Toletan Council.

In this context, Sancho el Mayor's direct relations with Abbot Odilo, conducted through exchange of letters, embassies and munificent royal benefactions, tend to center above all about the Spanish sovereign's personal ties with the abbot and about his entry as a lay member into the ranks of the Burgundian congregation -- in Odilo's own technical phraseology, as a *socius* and *familiaris*.⁽²¹⁾ Such confraternal affiliation with the foremost European center of monastic piety and intercessional prayer assured el Mayor of participation in the spiritual merits of the monks and in their daily liturgical supplications for all the abbey's *socii*, in life and death, and of perpetual commemoration of his obit. It is this precious spiritual privilege as much as, or perhaps even more than, his reformist and 'Europeanizing' aims, that explains Sancho's gifts to Cluny. That these royal charities -- described by Jotsaldus in his *Vita s. Odilonis as beneficia et copiosa munera*⁽²²⁾ -- were substantial is patent; but they must be seen as purely occasional benefactions, bestowed from time to time at the monarch's pleasure, and thus unlike the later annual census of his son Fernando or even the *pretiosa munera*

which, according to Adhemar of Chabannes, Sancho exchanged every year with Duke William of Aquitaine.⁽²³⁾ The *munera* to Cluny included at least one gift of silver from the king's share of the spoils of the Gascon-Catalan expedition (in which Sancho took no known part) against the Taifa king al-Mujahid of Denia and Mallorca, perhaps ca. 1025-1030.⁽²⁴⁾ For we hear of silver being sent by el Mayor to Cluny in the custody of Bishop Sancho of Pamplona, and there being divided by Odilo between alms for the poor and funds for constructing a *ciborium* over the high altar of the abbey-church.⁽²⁵⁾

The gift of Muslim spoils does not however establish, as some have thought, the collaboration of Navarrese monarch and Burgundian abbot in a deliberate campaign to advance the Reconquista in the guise of holy war, nor does it prove that enlistment of Cluniac support in propaganda and recruitment of warriors was a central motif of the friendship. Whatever the precise significance of Radulfus Glaber's celebrated passages depicting Catalan monks in arms against the Moors or citing the vow of Count Sancho Guillermo of Gascony and his warriors to bestow upon Cluny the spoils of their hoped-for victory over al-Mujahid,⁽²⁶⁾ these exceptional occasions cannot be taken to prove Sancho himself an active crusader or Cluny his collaborator in war against the infidel. El Mayor indeed throughout his long reign shows surprisingly little interest in the characteristically Catalan [5] and Leonese ideal of the Reconquista; his powerful military efforts rather were directed towards enhancing his power in Southern France, in the Pyrenees beyond Aragon, and to the West in Castile and Leon. In Sánchez Albornoz' apt phrase, he was conducting not "una guerra 'divinal' sino una política 'feudal'".⁽²⁷⁾ As for the abbey's alleged championship of a Spanish crusade, here again extreme caution, if not skepticism, is in order. Eleventh-century Cluny was renowned for its ascetic sanctity and as the peerless center of intercessional prayer, so that the propriety of enriching Saint Peter's monks out of the spoils of the Egyptians offers the most natural explanation for the bestowal of Muslim booty by the pious royal *socius*.

If Sancho's bond with the Cluniacs thus appears primarily personal and pietistic as much as reformist, are we to believe that he envisaged the relationship as continuing after his death and even bound his heirs to maintain it? Many scholars answer this question in the affirmative and indeed employ the hypothesis of an inherited familial friendship between the Navarro-Basque dynasty and the abbey to explain the whole future course of Hispano-Cluniac history; and in this they would seem to have on their side Abbot Odilo himself, who speaks in his extant letter to King Garcia of Navarre of Sancho's *indissolubilis familiaritas et societas*.⁽²⁸⁾ Yet if we turn to the reigns of el Mayor's sons and successors, precisely the opposite conclusion emerges. For Gonzalo in Sobrarbe and Ribagorza nothing can be discovered in this connection; he disappears too rapidly, perhaps in 1037, possibly -- if we follow Ubieta Arteta -- not until 1043, when his two counties are annexed to Aragon.⁽²⁹⁾ For Ramiro I in Aragon and Garcia el de Najera in Navarre, we have the well-known epistles of Odilo, one addressed to Paternus in Aragon, the other directly to the king of Navarre.⁽³⁰⁾ Both texts are frequently cited as proof of how faithfully Sancho's sons maintained the paternal sentiments towards Cluny, but their content fails to support this interpretation; furthermore, although the pair manifestly fall between Sancho's death in January 1035 and that of Odilo in December 1048, and contain allusions to contemporary events, their chronology has never been fixed with any precision. Analysis of these two epistles is therefore desirable.

The letter to Paternus can be accepted as the earlier of the two. This is partly by reason of its historical content, partly because the abbot of Cluny might be expected to look first to Aragon, where San Juan de la Peña was the principal if not sole Burgundian base under el Mayor, even though García of Navarre, as the eldest son and head of the family, might seem to merit prior attention.⁽³¹⁾ The epistle divides naturally into two sections. In the second portion Odilo requests Paternus, obviously not then

residing at Peña, to escort to that monastery certain messengers sent to Spain by himself and the former bishop of Pamplona, Sancho; the latter, we know, had been living at Cluny since 1025-1027.⁽³²⁾ These messengers were to bring back from Peña to Burgundy liturgical vessels and silver money which the bishop had stored in the Aragonese abbey; it is stated that this money is to be used for completion of an altar at Cluny memorializing the two Sanchos, king and bishop, who were its donors. In contrast, in the letter's initial section, roughly two-thirds of the text, manifests a quite different purpose. Here Odilo expresses deep concern [6] -- which he evidently intends Paternus to convey to King Ramiro -- over the grave political and military perils threatening the son of Sancho el Mayor. He declares that he is praying night and day for the restoration of peace among the warring brothers but especially for Ramiro's welfare, having learned from Bishop Sancho of the monarch's benevolence, uprightness and -so flattering a compliment to a bastard! -- likeness in character to his father. So mindful is the abbot of the binding him to Ramiro's *familiaritas* and *fidelitas*, that he has ordered all his monks to pray daily for his safety from enemies, and to recite on his behalf at matins the psalm *Quid multiplicamini Domine* and at the other canonical hours the psalm *Leuavi oculos meos*.⁽³³⁾

These lines, full of nostalgic references to the deceased el Mayor, must have been composed when Cluny's Hispanic focus was still, as under Sancho, upon Aragon; even the one-time bishop of Pamplona still houses his wealth at Peña and eulogizes to the abbot not his own king but the ruler of Jaca. Together with the allusion to menacing danger *ab incursione paganorum et a persecutione falsorum Christianorum*, the prayers for divine protection against enemies, and the choice of psalms in the same vein, this points to a date not long before the battle of Tafalla in 1043, when Garcia and Fernando were to inflict a severe defeat upon their eastern half-brother.⁽³⁴⁾ It is to be observed that while Odilo favors Ramiro's cause in the approaching crisis and places his abbey publicly on record to this effect, he does not possess a direct line of communication with the king, for knowledge of whose qualities he depends upon the Pamplonese prelate. Ramiro can be styled conventionally *carissimus noster* but not, like his father, *socius* or even *benefactor*. No less manifestly the prayers for Ramiro, of extraordinary character and not those normal for a *familiaris*, have been instituted *motu proprio* by the abbot, not in response to petition from Jaca. In short, the whole letter attests that Odilo, eager as he was to cultivate Ramiro's friendship, could appeal only to his father's example, not to any existing bond of paternal compulsion or personal affection; so far from proving, as Pérez de Urbel believes, that at Cluny Ramiro "el perjuró, el adúltero, el hombre que se unía a los moros para combatir a sus hermanos" passed as "el tipo perfecto de monarca", it actually reveals Ramiro himself without a connection with the Cluniacs: what we have on the abbot's part is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.⁽³⁵⁾

With this conclusion Aragonese history stands in complete agreement.⁽³⁶⁾ The revealing departure of Abbot Paternus from San Juan de la Peña, as attested by Odilo's epistle, finds confirmation in the appearance there, as early as 1036, of an almost certainly non-Cluniac abbot, Blasco.⁽³⁷⁾ The Peña diplomas of this epoch, like those of San Victorián, Loarre and Montearagón, fail to display Cluniac traces in content or subscriptions; and the same is true of the reales privilegios contained in Ibarra's collection for the reign as a whole.⁽³⁸⁾ If it were possible to accept as authentic Ramiro's supposed charter of 1044 to San Victorián, where he allegedly introduces Benedictine reformers headed by an abbot "Johannes de Campania"; and if, contrary to the usual ascription of this obscure figure to the [7] Italian Campagna, he could be associated with the County of Champagne in France, it might be possible to suspect French influence of some kind. But this dubious pergamino hardly justifies any such inference.⁽³⁹⁾ The fact is that throughout Hispano-Cluniac history the Burgundian abbey never comes to possess a single dependency in all Aragon, or receives a royal donation of patrimonies, although Ramiro's grandson, Pedro I (1094-1104) must have been generous to the Cluniacs since they came to offer daily prayer for him in their Masses.⁽⁴⁰⁾

Odilo's other Hispanic epistle, that to King García of Najera, discloses a similar situation in Navarre. This text, obviously initiating, not continuing, a correspondence, is addressed to the monarch himself. The abbot first expresses pleasure over the reports reaching him of García's triumphs and growing fame and power; he assures him of Cluny's devoted friendship deriving from the indissoluble bonds of his father's *familiaritas* and *societas*; and three times wishes him success in war over all foes, an end to which both he and his monks are directing their prayers.⁽⁴¹⁾ Lastly and, as he says, *non sine rubore*, Odilo asks García, out of his *sublimis munificentia*, to relieve the abbey from the suffering caused in Burgundy by a severe famine of over two years' duration. Radulfus Glaber's *Historiae* notices a major Burgundian famine lasting through 1045 and 1046, the first such calamity the chronicler records after 1033, which can safely be taken as the one that in its second year drove the abbot of Cluny to press García for Spanish financial aid.⁽⁴²⁾ The date 1046 accords with the reference to García's expanding *potestas*, three years after his victory at Tafalla and one year after his capture of the Muslim Riojan stronghold of Calahorra, an event that might well have stirred hopes of charity across the Pyrenees.⁽⁴³⁾ Odilo makes no allusion to specifically infidel enemies, and his wishes for royal success point to a date when war was still in progress; but we shall not be far wrong if we assign this letter to 1045-1046. On this basis we can deduce that Odilo, having made no progress in his overtures to Ramiro, looked after Tafalla to the brightly gleaming star of the Pamplonese sovereign, Sancho el Mayor's successful heir and true dynastic chief. Perhaps the abbatial *rubor* is merely conventional decorum; but in view of Cluny's earlier prayers for Ramiro I against his Muslim and Christian antagonists -- García was, after all, one of the latter -- Odilo may have felt a certain embarrassment that finds further expression in the heavily fulsome tone of the letter as a whole.

Whether or not the appeal to García was favorably received at the time,⁽⁴⁴⁾ what is pertinent is that, about a decade after his father's death, no bond of previous friendship or benevolence, no confraternal attachment, existed between the Navarrese king and the Cluniacs; the call for help rests solely on the example set by Sancho, one not yet emulated by his son. Once again, as in the Aragonese case, subsequent literary and diplomatic evidence shows a pattern of Navarrese indifference towards the Burgundian congregation, whether above the Ebro around Pamplona or in García's favored region of the Rioja. Despite frequent statements to the contrary, the monarch's extravagantly endowed new monastic foundation in 1052 of Santa María de Nájera has no Cluniac connection until in 1079, after his conquest the Rioja, Alfonso VI of Leon-Castile cedes the abbey to Cluny.⁽⁴⁵⁾ [8] In the dynastic crisis of 1054, leading to civil war between García and his brother Fernando of Castile and the climactic battle of Atapuerca, neither the king of Pamplona nor the two sainted Benedictine abbots who sought to avert the tragedy -- Iñigo of Oña, Domingo of Silos -- turned to Cluny as peacemaker.⁽⁴⁶⁾

This leaves us with Fernando I, by his father's will king of Castile and from 1037 conqueror of Leon, who was to become the most powerful, most affluent, historically the most significant of the sons of Sancho el Mayor. Surely, he at least dutifully continued the paternal ties of amity and charity, as witness his generous concession to the Burgundian monks of the famous annual census of a thousand gold pieces? Here, however, the crucial problems are whether he did so on the basis of his father's precedent, and at what point in his reign this friendship commences. Current opinion answers the first of these questions in the affirmative, and generally holds that the policy dates from the very beginning of Fernando's rule. Pérez de Urbel, for example, posits a kind of simultaneous circular appeal by Odilo to all the sons soon after el Mayor's death, but thinks that in Fernando's case the epistle has been lost.⁽⁴⁷⁾ The two extant letters, as we have seen, must have been written seriatim in ca. 1042 and ca. 1045-1046; and while a possible lost message to Fernando cannot altogether be ruled out, both its loss and its timing remain purely speculative as far as actual succor is concerned, Fernando could not have given Cluny the census in these earlier years, since it is not until after 1055, as we shall demonstrate below,

that he possessed a regular revenue in tributary dinars from vassal Taifa states that would permit him to confer so large an annual stipend upon a foreign monastic community.

Equally inadmissible is the argument that San Zoil de Carrión de los Condes was a Cluniac house when in 1047 Count Gómez Diaz of Carrión and Saldaña ceded it his monasterio propio of San Facundo de Arconada. ⁽⁴⁸⁾ The Arconada charter, which Pérez de Urbel and others cite in support of this thesis, ⁽⁴⁹⁾ is known only through a copy of the late 12th or 13th century, ⁽⁵⁰⁾ and its reference to Cluny is a palpable interpolation, since San Zoil, as its donation acts prove, did not pass into Burgundian hands before the years 1076 and 1077 in the reign of Alfonso VI. ⁽⁵¹⁾ No doubt the altered text we have dates from a time when the monks of Carrión were hard pressed to defend their patrimonies against lay and episcopal encroachment.

But the real test for Fernando's first twenty years, between 1045 and 1054, when he was ruling primarily as a Castilian successor of his father, is the monastic documentation of the Burgalese comarca. The relatively full published diplomatic collections of the Castilian monasteries of this period, including Oña, preserve no trace of the activities or even of the presence of Cluniacs in the kingdom, a silence presaging the very limited success Cluny was ever to achieve there, even with the support of Alfonso VI and his successors. ⁽⁵²⁾

To conclude, then, Sancho el Mayor's confraternal, reformist and benefactorial ties with Cluny were not continued by his sons in any of the three kingdoms carved in 1035 from the great Navarrese state; ⁽⁵³⁾ and this is as true of Fernando I in his first decades as of his Navarrese and Aragonese compeers. This means that the abbey's true, [9] historic entry into 11th-century Spain must have occurred not by way of Sancho's much trumpeted but clearly ephemeral experiment, but rather through passage directly from France into the westernmost Iberian state, the kingdom of Leon, over which el Mayor had at best a very brief and partial control at the very end of his life, but which came to be the center of Hispano-Cluniac expansion, to explain Cluny's advent and the belated conversion of Fernando I in to a powerful and generous ally of the Burgundian abbey, we must therefore look not to Pamplona or even to San Juan de la Peña, but to Leon and to the Franco-Catalan influences that by the middle of the century were penetrating Leonese society and preparing for the Cluniacs the hospitable reception they failed to receive in Aragon, Navarre or Castile.

2. The *Praeparatio Cluniacensis* : Franco-Catalan Religious Infiltration into Leon, 1020-1050.

At present the origins of Cluny in Leon are a complete mystery the very existence of which escapes notice because of the supposition that Fernando I's emulation of his father's friendship provides the obvious explanation for the entire Leonese-Castilian zone. But once we discard the misleading doctrine of filial continuity, and in addition observe that even if royal personalism can be accepted as the decisive factor it still remains indispensable to show why Leon, not Castile, becomes the paramount zone of the abbey's holdings and activities in medieval Iberia, then the basic necessity to investigate the specifically Leonese context of Fernando's eventual *conjunctio* becomes plain. Any attempt moreover to undertake such an inquiry in the face of the formidable reticence of the extant contemporary sources must operate from two major premises: first, that in large part the solution lies in the little studied general movement of religious change within Leon from ca. 1020 on during what might be called the prelude to the Burgundian advent; and, secondly, that the new spiritual currents, while not necessarily Cluniac in provenance or character, allow us to counteract somewhat the lack of direct information by illuminating the channels, methods and supporters of the Franco-Catalan religious penetration of which Cluny eventually becomes apart.

Here we must discard, at least for ecclesiastical history, the currently popular practice of attributing to 'progressive' Castile a monopoly of innovation and creativity in Western Iberia as against an allegedly ultra-conservative Gothicism Leon. ⁽⁵⁴⁾ There are good grounds for believing that, far more than

particularist Castile, imperial Leon responded to those new Europeanizing forces from Catalonia and Southern France which can be seen in Sancho el Mayor's renewal of the Navarrese Church, and which came to play a comparable role in the Leonese lands well before the establishment of ties with the Gregorian Papacy. These forces can be discerned in at least four different quarters: (i) the diffusion of the cult of the martyr-saint Antoninus, commonly known *hispanice* as San Antolín; (ii) the Catalan ecclesiastical [10] centers in the Tierra de Campos at Palencia and San Isidro de Dueñas; (iii) the Europeanizing faction at the Leonese court; and (iv) the Queen-Empress Sancha, consort of Fernando I.

(i) The Cult of San Antolín in 11th-century Spain. The neglected story of the propagation below the Pyrenees of this Southern French devotion merits examination here for both its peculiar regional pattern and its connection with families later prominent in the Leonese reception of Cluny.⁽⁵⁵⁾ Whatever the precise link between the fourth-century martyr of Apamea in Syria and the relics of the Saint Antoninus preserved from the 9th century in the abbey of Fredèlas, to the south of Toulouse -- the site which by the 12th century was known as Pamiers and in 1295-1296 became the seat of a bishopric -- it is certain from Adhemar of Chabannes that by ca. 1010-1015 the cult center had entered a phase of great celebrity, with numerous miracles and throngs of pilgrims.⁽⁵⁶⁾ If we can trust the citation by Moret and Pulgar of a charter of Sancho II Abarca of 968, a church of San Antonino de Aclunate existed in Navarre before the end of the 10th century.⁽⁵⁷⁾ There can however be little doubt that the effective implantation of the cult in Spain commences in the reign of Sancho el Mayor and shows very marked regional diversity.

Few if any traces survive from the Catalan counties, despite the activity of the Urgellian abbot-bishop Poncio, a strong partisan of el Mayor, who can be found at the Leonese court ca. 1023/1025-1025/1028, served as bishop of Oviedo, and directed the restoration in 1034-1035 of the church of Palencia where San Antolín became a patron.⁽⁵⁸⁾ Poncio's old abbey of San Saturnine de Tabèrnoles, although readily accessible to Pamiers and in visible contact with nearby Saint-Sernin de Toulouse, displays no known interest in the cult, nor do the Seo d'Urgel, Ripoll or other ecclesiastical centers in Urgel, so far as I can discover from published sources.⁽⁵⁹⁾ As for eastern Catalonia, although the Count Roger the Young of Foix who ca. 1060 tried to give Cluny the abbey at Frèdelas was the brother of the Countess Ermesinda who married Ramón Berenguer I, and of Bishop Pedro of Gerona, no traces of mid-eleventh-century observance of the devotion to San Antolín have yet been found at Barcelona, Gerona or Vich.⁽⁶⁰⁾

So too for Aragon and Castile dedications of churches or monasteries to the saint, or other symptoms of familiarity, are lacking.⁽⁶¹⁾ As for Navarre, aside from the church of 968 just cited, the evidence is exclusively liturgical and confined to the Rioja. The Feast of San Antolín was completely unknown to the traditional Hispanic *sanctorale*, so that the chronology of its introduction into peninsular liturgical calendars is revealing, although, since this coincides with the advent of numerous other Gallican and Roman saints moving across the Pyrenees, it throws more light on official acceptance than on popular interest.⁽⁶²⁾ Of the nine extant Hispanic calendars, which have been carefully studied by Vives and Fábrega, two from the Rioja provide for celebration of San Antolín's anniversary on 2 September. The first of these (I de Silos; S4; Vives-Fábrega, no. 4) may go back to the late 10th century but on one folio the manuscript bears the date 1039; in any case the text contains numerous interpolations of [11] the 11th century.⁽⁶³⁾ The other calendar (II de Silos; S3; Vives-Fábrega, no. 5) comes from the magnificent codex of the *Liber Ordinum* that served Férotin as the basis of his classic edition; this manuscript was completed in 1052 at San Prudencio de Laturce, a dependency of San Martín de Albelda.⁽⁶⁴⁾ On the other hand, the two Silos codices of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (Vives-Fábrega, nos. 8-9), copied in the Rioja before 1067 and in 1072, respectively, do not list the Antoninian observance.⁽⁶⁵⁾ Thus by the middle of the 11th century, possibly as early as 1039 but certainly by 1052,

the feast was being celebrated in the Rioja. Its limited popularity, however, is underscored by the absence of monasteries or churches under San Antolín's patronage from the hagiotoponymy of the diplomatic collections of San Millán de la Cogolla, San Martín de Albelda, San Salvador de Leire, Santa María de Nájera, Santo Domingo de Silos and other houses of the region.

In striking contrast with this sparse dissemination of the devotion all the way from Barcelona to Burgos are the abundant notices discoverable in the territories of the Leonese Empire. The earliest known case, the appearance of San Antolín on 17 February 1035 as titular in the restoration charter for the Church of Palencia promulgated by Vermudo III and Queen Jimena of Leon, will be discussed below. ⁽⁶⁶⁾ Three years later, on 30 August 1038 -- just three months after Fernando I's imperial coronation in the city of Leon -- we encounter a pergamino of the Countess Sancha Muñoz which informs us that this lady, having previously sent her vassal Rodrigo Galfidez to Aquitaine to procure relics of the martyr, was now placing these in her monasterio propio of San Antolín, founded on behalf of her husband's soul and located on the bank of the River Esla near Coyanza, to the south of the Leonese capital. In addition, clearly as a fervent devotee of the cult, she bestows upon the house jewelry, Moorish slaves, and three villas (Castro Gonzalo, Fontes de Rupero, and Villaseca) which Alfonso V had once given her husband. ⁽⁶⁷⁾ The same year saw an even more exalted figure, the Leonese Infanta Sancha, daughter of Vermudo II and sister of Alfonso V, appear in some sort of association with the abbey of San Antolín de Fingoy, in the diocese of Lugo. ⁽⁶⁸⁾ A monastery of San Antolín de Toques also existed in this district, although the history of this royal house cannot be documented before a donation act of 1067 of the ill-fated King García of Galicia. ⁽⁶⁹⁾ Still another Gallegan abbey, San Antonino or San Antolín de Baiñas, occurs in the diocese of Santiago, but nothing is known of its origin. ⁽⁷⁰⁾

At some point between 1039 and 1045 the tide of popularity surged all the way to the County of Portugal, for on 13 October in the latter year the "ancilla Dei Eleuva cognomento Matre Du(l)ce" and her son Pelagio Vermudiz in a grant of properties to the abbey at Moure (north of Braga, in the concelho of Vila Verde) that came to be known as Santo Antonino de Barbudo, included the martyr of Pamiers among its patrons, whereas an earlier charter of 1039 mentions only Saints Bartholomew, Matthew, Stephen and Euphemia. ⁽⁷¹⁾ second Minhotan house of Santo Antonino is known to have existed near Guimaraes in the *freguesia* of Mesao Frio, but unfortunately cannot be dated. ⁽⁷²⁾ During these same years the devotion also reached [12] the Vierzo, for in 1044 a certain Diego gives lands in the valley of the Bueza, a northern tributary of the Sil, to a monastery dedicated to the saint, San Antolín de Ribera. ⁽⁷³⁾ In Asturias also in 1044 Count Piniolo Jimenez and his wife Aldonza, along with other monasteries and lands forming the endowment of their large new foundation of San Juande Corias, include an abbey of San Antolín de Villanueva. ⁽⁷⁴⁾ About the same time another Asturian magnate, Count Munio Rodríguez, appears in possession of the house of San Antolín de Bedón near Llanes. ⁽⁷⁵⁾

There is also Leonese liturgical evidence of prime interest. The Calendar of Compostela (C; Vives-Fabrega, no. 6) contained in the celebrated Liber Diurnus or Diurno preserved at the University of Santiago, was copied in 1055. It is commonly said that the codex was written for King Fernando I but the scribe Peter declares he worked at the express order of Queen Sancha, and an inscription on fol. 6 makes it clear that the book was intended for the daily devotions of both sovereigns: "Fredinandi regis sum liber necnon et Sancia regina". Since this calendar provides for the celebration on 2 September of the feast "sca antonini", both D. Sancha and her husband must have been familiar with its observance. ⁽⁷⁶⁾ The so-called Calendario de Leon (L; Vives-Fábrega no. 7), often assigned to 1059 but basically of 10th-century origin with numerous interpolations of 1060, 1067-1058, etc., also commemorates "S. antonini martir" on 2 September. ⁽⁷⁷⁾ Finally, there is the feast's inclusion in the missal of Mateus,

which, David has shown, represents a manuscript tradition in four layers, commencing in the second half of the 10th or early 11th century and acquiring various interpolations of French and Roman saints before it was ultimately copied ca. 1130-1150 by a scribe of the Church of Toledo and transmitted to the Church of Braga. ⁽⁷⁸⁾

Thus, from the decade 1035-1045 on, churches and, above all, monasteries under the patronage of San Antolín, and commemoration of his anniversary, can be found all across the Leonese Empire from the Tierra de Campos and Asturias to Galicia and Portugal. ⁽⁷⁹⁾ These testimonies, for the most part capable of precise chronological assignment, can be supplemented by toponymic evidence from both Spain and Portugal of additional sites named for the martyr, the majority of which almost certainly date from this same epoch. Simply from such standard chorographical guides as those of Miñano, Kadoz, the *Enciclopedia Universal*, the official Spanish *Nomenclátor*, the recent *Diccionario geográfico de España* and, for Portugal, Castro's *Dicionário corográfico*, ⁽⁸⁰⁾ it is possible to assemble some two dozen entries, including villas, aldeas, barrios, despoblados, and the like. These place names, if classified according to modern province, yield the following statistics: Lerida, 1; Vizcaya, 3; Oviedo, 8; Lugo, 6; La Coruña, 1; Pontevedra, 2; Orense, 1; Minho, 3; Estremadura, 1; Ribatejo, 1. ⁽⁸¹⁾ The distribution pattern here emphasizes Asturias (8), Galicia (10), and Northern Portugal (3); omits Leon and the Tierra de Campos altogether; and, except for San Antolín de Vilanova near Cervera, offers nothing for Catalonia, or Navarre, Aragon, Castile -- the old territories of Sancho el Mayor. Obviously not too much should be made of haphazard toponymic survivals, but the Asturian and Gallegan concentration at least coincides with the impression gained from the charters of 1035-1045 of local enthusiasm for [13] the cult.

There are then good grounds for believing that from at least 1035 a wave of enthusiasm for the Antoninian devotion swept through the upper classes of the Leonese Empire, affecting religious life on ecclesiastical and aristocratic levels. But did this movement reach Fernando I's kingdom through the work of Cluniac evangelists, as Serrano holds? ⁽⁸²⁾ There is little reason to think so. The Cluniac literary works and cartularies of this era reflect no concern whatever for the Apamean martyr, with one exception, the charter of Count Roger of Foix giving the abbey the *locum Sancti Antonini*. ⁽⁸³⁾ This act, however, the circumstances and motivation of which are obscure, and which perhaps belongs ca. 1060, must never have come into effect, for nothing in the subsequent history of the cult center attaches it to Cluny nor does its name again appear in the Cluniac cartularies. Especially conclusive for Spain is the lack of any mention of San Antolín in the entire corpus of Hispano-Cluniac pergaminos so far discovered; nor do any of the peninsular monasteries under his patronage ever turn up as Burgundian priories or sub-priories.

The Antoninian diffusion, in short, is thus not itself a Cluniac phenomenon; but its value is great as proof of Leon's spiritual connection with France by at least the first decade of Fernando I, and as a guide to the geographical and social lines along which this penetration operated. Pérez de Urbel and others believe the cult spread westward by way of Navarre, commencing with Sancho el Mayor's restoration of Palencia in late 1034 or January 1035 and his deposit there of major relics brought from France; and this can be reconciled with the story Rodericus Toledanus tells of the king's discovering, while out hunting, a ruined chapel with an altar to San Antolín on the site of the future cathedral. ⁽⁸⁴⁾ Alternatively, it can be argued that Poncio of Tabernoles, el Mayor's agent in the Palencian restoration, first established the new foreign devotion at that see, whence it spread to other parts of Spain. ⁽⁸⁵⁾ To both these hypotheses there are formidable objections. Nowhere else in his privilegios does el Mayor disclose any interest in San Antolín; together with the paucity of Navarrese testimonies as observed above, this makes it difficult to understand why he should take the unusual step of associating a minor Southern French titular with the customary dedication of a cathedral church to the Virgin. Poncio's

responsibility seems more plausible, but counter-indicated by the negative evidence of his Catalan background. To be sure, the concentration of Antoninian entitlatures and place names in Asturias might be ascribed to his influence but there are no signs of this at Oviedo. The Vizcayan and Gallegan sites however, make it more natural to deduce general Southern French line of penetration affecting all northwestern Iberia even if we follow Lacarra in rejecting Menéndez Pidal's notion that, before the reorientation to the Rioja by Sancho el Mayor of the Compostelan route, trans-Pyrenean pilgrims journeyed across Asturias by way of Irún and *per deuia Alauae*.⁽⁸⁶⁾

More attention needs to be paid in this matter to the difference between the patronal dedications of the Church of Palencia in the two reales privilegos restoring that see. That of el Mayor, bearing the date 21 January 1035 and despite certain interpolations manifestly [14] preserving the original list of patrons, names in conventional fashion the Trinity and the Virgin.⁽⁸⁷⁾ Vermudo III's shorter, uninterpolated diploma of 17 February 1035, alters the dedication to include the martyr of Frédelas-Pamiers: "in hunc locum preminatum sancti Saluatoris seu sancte Marie atque sancti Antonini martyris".⁽⁸⁸⁾ Poncio appears in both charters; we cannot tell whether, in the second case, this means reconciliation with Vermudo III or simply conventional notice of his undoubted services in organizing the diocese under the former regime. Certainly more is involved than an arrival of relics in the short interval between the two diplomas, for the Palencian Church celebrated the translation on 18 May,⁽⁸⁹⁾ and the Leonese king-emperor could have secured a major portion of the saint's body for the new cathedral as readily as Sancho, since, as Rodrigo Galíndez' mission proves, the monks of Frédelas were willing to share their treasure with petitioners from Leon.

Here we have to reckon with the political as well as specifically religious factors affecting the reconstruction of the Palencian bishopric, a subject we shall more closely examine below. The point is, that Sancho el Mayor's ecclesiastical policy in the Tierra de Campos was designed to complement his secular purpose of subtracting this entire region from Leon by removing it from the authority of the bishop of León. The ambitious Navarrese monarch had seized the Campos in 1029-1030; ostensibly legitimized his conquest by marrying his son Fernando to the Leonese Infanta Sancha, for whom the region served as dowry; and intended Palencia's restoration to tighten the bonds with Castile and the Navarrese state.⁽⁹⁰⁾ When, following el Mayor's sudden demise in early 1035, Vermudo III unexpectedly recovered the Campos and reincorporated them into Leon, he must have been tempted to abandon altogether his enemy's plans for Palencia, which the Leonese real privilegio significantly describes as *in suburbio Legionensi*. What he did in fact was to accept the new bishopric, with its Catalan prelate Bernard I and Catalan canons, but he faced it about towards Leon, and sought to assure this Leonese orientation by linking the church to the cult then becoming so popular in the Leonese lands in contrast with Castile or Navarre. Such a conclusion implies that, even before the earliest extra-Campestrian-notice of 1038 and after, the devotion was already fashionable at the Leonese court. But this deduction is far more strongly indicated than the usual assumption that the cult would have spread all the way to Portugal by 1044 after Leon's most dreaded enemy introduced it at Palencia in 1035.

To conclude this part of our inquiry: by 1035, and probably at least a decade before, there already existed an effective channel for the transmission of the new religious currents moving from Southern France across the Pyrenees directly into Leon, without the mediation of Castile, Navarre or Aragon, a channel that could in time serve to bring reports of Cluny's sanctity to the Leonese court and prepare the way for the first Cluniacs to reach the western sectors of the kingdom of Fernando I.

(ii) Palencia and Dueñas: Catalan Ecclesiastical Outposts in the Tierra de Campos. A second Leonese line of connection with religious [15] revival in the first half of the eleventh century, this time running from Catalonia, can be found in the strategic borderland lying between the two kingdoms of Leon and Castile, the *Campi Gothorum* or *Campi Gothici*, the modern Tierra de Campos.⁽⁹¹⁾ This

fertile region of grain and pasture lands between the rivers Cea and Pisuerga, comprising today much of the provinces of Palencia and Valladolid, was destined to become the true center of all Cluny's trans-Pyrenean expansion. Here in 1072 Alfonso VI gave the Burgundians their first genuine peninsular dependency, the house of San Isidro de Dueñas, and subsequently Santiago de Astudillo and San Juan de Hérmes de Cerrato (to say nothing of his attempted transfer of the venerable abbey of Sahagún); here lay the great monasterio propio of San Zoil de Carrión de los Condes ceded in 1076-1077 by Countess Teresa and the Beni Gómez; here also, as priories and patrimonies multiplied in the late 11th and 12th centuries, Cluny located the headquarters of her chamberlain sent to govern the vast province of Hispania that stretched from the Rioja to the Luso-Gallegan West.⁽⁹²⁾ This concentration in the Cea-Pisuerga mesopotamia requires to be seen, moreover, as far more than the result of a random selection of Dueñas to be Cluny's initial monastic acquisition, or of the region's undoubted attraction to foreign monks, with its 'European' countryside of flourishing peasant villages, cereal agriculture, viticulture and livestock economy. There are distinct signs that the Alfonsine choice of San Isidro was no accident and that, under Fernando I and probably even earlier, circumstances were preparing the Campos zone for the central place it would retain throughout most of Hispano-Cluniac history.

This whole subject is inseparable from the peculiar political and military position the ancient Campi Gothorum had come, by the 10th century, to occupy as a strategic and economically desirable frontier zone between Leon and Castile.⁽⁹³⁾ It was Alfonso III el Magno (866-910) who first colonized on a major scale this long-empty despoblado north of the Duero, bringing in nobles, peasants, townsmen, clerics, monks and Mozarabs to create a population firmly attached in loyalty and civilization to the Leonese throne.⁽⁹⁴⁾ Later in the century, however, the rise of the Counts of Castile and their repeated attempts, through war, marriage, intrigue, and subornation of the local aristocracy, to wrest the area from Leon and extend their western boundary to the Cea, converted the Campos into a strife-torn land of interstate conflict. During Alfonso V's minority, Count Sancho García succeeded ca. 1010 in annexing the area;⁽⁹⁵⁾ but by 1018, when Castile in turn was under a regency for the young Infante García, Alfonso expelled the Castilians and re-established Leonese control all the way to the Pisuerga.⁽⁹⁶⁾ It is after Alfonso's death in 1028 that we hear of the scheme, celebrated in the Castilian epopeya, to wed his sister Sancha to the Infante, with the Campos as her dowry, the scheme that foundered with the hapless García's murder in the city of Leon on 13 May 1029 at the hands of members of the Navarrese Party in Leon.⁽⁹⁷⁾ Then in 1029-1030 the ambitious Sancho el Mayor of Navarre, presenting himself as the heir of the Castilian comitalline, took over not only all Castile but the Cea-Pisuerga mesopotamia as well.⁽⁹⁸⁾ The marriage of Sancho's son Fernando to the Leonese Infanta [16] Sancha late in 1032, with the latter's dowry once again the now Navarrese-controlled Tierra de Campos, served to legitimize annexation of the borderland.⁽⁹⁹⁾ As soon as el Mayor's death in January 1035 became known, however, Vermudo III of Leon speedily moved to recover the lost territory, but two years later, at Tamarón, Fernando I's victory over the Leonese and extension of his rule over the western kingdom closes the military but clearly not the cultural struggle.⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ It is noteworthy that in the partition of his domains, which Fernando proclaimed in December 1064 or January 1065, the king revealed his by then heavily Leonese predilections in assigning the Campos not to Sancho el Fuerte, his intended successor in Castile, but to Alfonso VI, along with all Leon and the imperial title.⁽¹⁰¹⁾ Thus under Alfonso, Urraca and Alfonso VII the land remains officially Leonese, with far-reaching consequences for Cluny's success in western Iberia. Not until the very end of Alfonso VII's reign, in 1157, will a new royal partition of the Leonese-Castilian state assign the Tierra de Campos to the eastern kingdom and give much of the region its henceforth permanently Castilian alignment and character.⁽¹⁰²⁾

For the background of Cluniac penetration into Leon, the continuing repoblación of the Tierra de Campos in the middle decades of the 11th century is vital. At this time, when Leonese-Castilian and

Leonese-Navarrese conflicts were at their height, both sides sought to strengthen their position by securing the support of the turbulent, politically unstable but in large part pro-Navarrese local aristocracy, and of the monasteries and churches; and by introducing new, presumably loyal, colonists, lay and religious, into the country-side ravaged by incessant raiding and chronic major invasion. Especially does this seem to be true of the half-dozen or so years before el Mayor's death, when the Navarrese monarch's settlement of Catalan and perhaps other immigrants from eastern Spain was designed to cement the Campos more firmly to Pamplonese domination. The largely unstudied lay aspects of this repoblación can be passed over here; but in the realm of ecclesiastical colonization it is necessary to examine two centers, the cathedral Church of Palencia and the Benedictine abbey of San Isidro de Dueñas, that stand out as major agencies in the *praeparatio Cluniacensis*.

We have spoken of the royal Navarrese and Leonese revival of the Palencian see. In the orderly plan carried through at el Mayor's command by Poncio of Tabernoles, at the time a refugee from Oviedo, the boundaries of the new diocese are carefully demarcated; a bishop, Bernard, installed; and provision made for a chapter or *canóniga* of monk-canon. ⁽¹⁰³⁾ It is evident from the names of the first and succeeding bishops, and from subscriptions of members of the *cabildo* diplomas of the next few decades, that Poncio brought in Catalans -- men *ab eo is partibus*, as Fernando I's real privilege of 1059 declares; ⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ very likely they came from Urgel. An episcopal church in the hands of a monk-bishop, with a *cabildo* composed of monks living as regular canons, was a familiar enough element in the ecclesiastical reformation then in progress in Southern France and Catalonia, nor was this type of diocesan organization altogether unknown in the Leonese-Castilian Church. ⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ But to establish such a foundation at Palencia, with bishops and monks brought in from outside the kingdom who were [17] steeped in the new foreign spirituality and the use of the Roman Rite and other alien customs, was in effect revolutionary: it introduced into the native Church, in so central an area as the Tierra de Campos, a powerful outpost of anti-traditionalist sentiments, an enclave of Franco-Catalan reformism that can in perspective be seen as the forerunner of Alfonso VI's much touted ecclesiastical *afrancesamiento*. For Fernando I after Tamarón there was no reason whatever to alter Palencia's Catalan structure. In his reign all three bishops -- Bernardo or Bernat I (1034-1047), Miro or Mir (1047-1062), and Bernardo or Bernat II (1062- ca. 1085)--are Catalans; ⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ and the last of these, who in one parchment suggests his full name may have been Ramón Bernat, seems to have cherished the hope -- years before Alfonso VI's conquest of Toledo and installation there in 1086 of the Cluniac Bernard of Sedirac -- of making Palencia the metropolitan capital of the Leonese-Castilian Church. ⁽¹⁰⁷⁾

A similar Catalan pattern is indicated for the royal monastery of San Isidro de Dueñas, located south of Palencia at the confluence of the Carrión with the Pisuerga. This was an Old Leonese house of much the same origin and tradition as the better known Sahagún, both communities tracing their foundation to Alfonso III's monastic colonization of the Tierra de Campos at the beginning of the 10th century. San Isidro benefited greatly from the generosity of the kings of Leon and the nobles of what became the Beni Gómez clan, but like the area in general seems to have suffered severely from the Castilian-Leonese warfare. The surviving excerpts from its lost Becerro show it being pulled away from its old moorings towards the last Castilian counts and eventually Sancho el Mayor. As far as Sancho is concerned, his attention to Dueñas dates from his annexation of the Campos in 1029-1030, for we find him giving the abbey the church of San Pedro de Avellano, perhaps in 1031, ⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ and again in 1033 the church of San Miguel de Baltanás and other properties. ⁽¹¹⁰⁾ What is particularly suggestive is that both these real privileges name San Isidro's abbot as Durandus, i.e., the Catalan Durán, which points to a Catalanization of the community, very possibly through replacement of its Leonese monks by Catalans some years before the installation of the Catalan canons at Palencia. Furthermore, a diploma of 1053 by which the priest Endura and his wife María at Fernando I's express order gave San Isidro "nostra domo

sancti Andreeque est juxta sancti Pela(g)ii martiris in Ualle de Muliere Mortua", contains various confirmants with foreign names: the priest Ricolfus (a name common enough in Catalonia but rare in the West); a mysterious Guillelmus abba(s), not the head of Dueñas, who in this year was named John; a layman Petro Roger, and possibly others.⁽¹¹¹⁾ Whether or not the introduction of Eastern monks under Sancho el Mayor should be accredited to Poncio of Tabèrnoles, we cannot say, but the probability that the reputation, if not the actual customs, of Cluny was known in this monastery of the Campos is very strong.

We may well be justified in going further and positing a more tangible relation with Cluny, both at the cathedral church of Palencia and at San Isidro de Dueñas, than mere awareness of its piety and repute. Presumably neither canons nor monks included Cluniac Hispani. On the other hand, Poncio, like his master Abbot-Bishop Oliba of [18] Ripoll-Cuxá-Vich, was certainly familiar with the spirituality and customs of Cluny which were penetrating into Catalonia in this epoch;⁽¹¹²⁾ no doubt the same was true of the early bishops and canons of the restored see. For Bishops Bernardo and Miro nothing definite is discoverable, but Bernard II, who was named by Fernando I to the post in 1062 and drawn from the canóniga,⁽¹¹³⁾ can be found confirming Alfonso VI's transfers of Leonese royal monasteries to the Cluniacs, although three of the four involved exemption from his own episcopal authority. San Isidro de Dueñas (1073), Santiago de Astudillo (1077) and San Juan de Hérmedes de Cerrato (1077) were all in the Palencian diocese; San Salvador de Palaz del Rey (1075-1076) in that of León.⁽¹¹⁴⁾ Bernardo also supported Alfonso's abortive effort in 1079 to impose the Cluniac monk Robert as abbot upon Sahagún against the bitter opposition of Abbot Julian and the congregation of this stoutly Old Leonese house.⁽¹¹⁵⁾ He likewise subscribed both the charters converting San Zoil de Carrión into a Burgundian priory.⁽¹¹⁶⁾ All these pro-Cluniac indications come from the reign of Fernando's son, but they harmonize with everything we can learn regarding the sympathies of the Palencian cabildo.

At San Isidro de Dueñas, with its probably close contacts with the Church of Palencia, a similar attitude can be inferred. This appears most visibly in the Endura charter of 1053 mentioned above, where among the subscriptions -- and we shall return to this crucial entry -- there occurs the name of the first Cluniac monk known to have reached Leon and the Campos, Frater Galindus or Fray Galindo.⁽¹¹⁷⁾ His inclusion in the list of witnesses hints at the monastery's respect for this distinguished visitor.

In this setting San Isidro's connections with Fernando I take on special significance. This involves much more than the fact that the king-emperor made at least one donation to the abbey and confirmed various of its 10th and 11th-century privileges.⁽¹¹⁸⁾ There is also the link implied by Alfonso VI's choice of this house in 1073 as his first cession of a Leonese real monasterio to Cluny. The strongly Fernandine background of this benefaction has escaped notice, partly because in Bruel's edition of the donation act, reproduced from the Cluniac Cartulary B (Bibliothèque de la Ville de Cluny, MS 3), the date reads "IIII kalendas junii, millesimo CXI" or 29 May 1073.⁽¹¹⁹⁾ The month here is, however, wrong. Still unpublished Spanish copies of this privilegio, to be found in the remains of the Becerro of Dueñas, which though incomplete preserve superior readings at several points, fix the correct date as "III kals januarías era. M.CXI", or 29 December 1073.⁽¹²⁰⁾ The day, 29 December, is the exact anniversary of Fernando's death eight years before.⁽¹²¹⁾ In addition to this precise timing, there are the charter's provision for intercession on behalf of Fernando, and its citation, in the dispositive, of a verse from the same canticle of the Hispanic Breviary which Fernando is known from the *Historia Silense* to have recited in the basilica of San Isidro de Leon during his last dramatic days at the end of 1065.⁽¹²²⁾ All this can only mean that in Alfonso VI's mind there was a peculiar fitness in choosing this anniversary date and this Catalan house of the Campos for Cluny's first Leonese dependency

19] (iii) Religious Europeanizers in Leon, 1020-1050. A third factor in the Leonese context of Fernando I's turn to Cluny is the appearance in that kingdom from ca. 1020 on of persons in the royal family, at the court, and in the high nobility, who are drawn towards the religious innovations represented by the Campestrian Catalans and the Antoninian cult. In part, these persons can be identified with families politically affiliated with the so-called Navarrese Party which existed under Alfonso V and Vermudo III. Ever since Menéndez Pidal's classic study of the historical basis and prosopography of the *Romanz del Infant García*, first published in 1911, ⁽¹²³⁾ we have known that a small but extremely influential group of partisans and agents of Sancho el Mayor within the Leonese royal family and aristocracy actively opposed every effort to align the kingdom with Castile against Pamplona and was deeply involved in the Navarrese ruler's labyrinthine intrigues to establish his domination over Burgos. This collaboration brought about the assassination of the Castilian Infante García in 1029 on the very eve of his politically decisive marriage to Alfonso V's daughter Sancha; and its further fruits can be seen in el Mayor's occupation of Leon ca. January 1034 and Fernando I's definitive annexation after Tamarón in 1037. Menéndez Pidal and Pérez de Urbel have done much to clarify the membership and political machinations of this pro-Sanchan faction in the Leonese state; ⁽¹²⁴⁾ but what of its religious proclivities? Did Navarrese political sympathy also mean attraction to the new Franco-Catalan elements of el Mayor's ecclesiastical policies?

There is a fair amount of affirmative evidence on this head. From 1020/1021, when Poncio of Tabernoles arrived in the Leonese capital in the train of the Infanta Urraca of Navarre, at the time of her marriage to Alfonso V, ⁽¹²⁵⁾ this known agent of Sancho el Mayor was at work as the Queen's chaplain, as bishop of Oviedo from 1023/1025, and as the key figure in the eastern ecclesiastical orientation of the Tierra de Campos. ⁽¹²⁶⁾ To the presence within the Leonese Church of this champion of Navarro-Catalan reformism it may be possible to add that of two prelates of Astorga. The Diego of the Tumbo Negro of Astorga who, as noted above, in 1044 gave lands to the Vierzan monastery of San Antolín de Ribera, may be the later Astorgan bishop of this name who was ruling the see by 1051; ⁽¹²⁷⁾ and that Astorga was a Europeanizing center finds support in the fact that a predecessor of Bishop Diego, the chronicler Sampiro, was the only Leonese bishop to subscribe his name to Sancho el Mayor's act restoring the Church of Palencia, and apparently to welcome the Navarrese conquest. ⁽¹²⁸⁾ In lay circles, we may note first that Poncio's close association with the royal household put him in a position to exercise Europeanizing influence upon the two leading feminine members of the Navarrese Party, Queen Urraca -- Sancho el Mayor's sister -- and her Mother, the dowager Queen Jimeno of Navarre, by birth a Leonese lady who evidently returned to her native land to spend her last years with her royal daughter. ⁽¹²⁹⁾ Then there are the Leonese aristocratic families in whose ranks can be found devotees of San Antolín in the 1030's and 1040's and, in the next generation, admirers and benefactors of Cluny. The Countess Sancha Muñoz, founder in 1038 of San de Coyanza, can be linked to the Navarrese Party through her **[20]** vassal, Rodrigo Galíndez, whom she sent to Aquitaine for relics; Galíndez turns up in Leon by 1034 and is perhaps the Riojan noble of this name who in 1037 -- in the course of his trans-Pyrenean journey? -- bestows various properties upon the abbey of San Millán de la Cogolla. ⁽¹³⁰⁾ Sancha's father, Count Munio Fernández, and husband, Count Pedro Fernandez, seem to have been loyal adherents of Alfonso V, but Pedro's nephew was the notorious Fernán Laínez, royal governor of the Leonese capital, a foremost leader of the Navarrese Party, and a participant in the murder plot against the Castilian Infante in 1029. ⁽¹³¹⁾ In Galicia, the connection of San Antolín de Fingoy and San Antolín de Toques with the royal family, and in the former case specifically with the Infanta Sancha Vermúdez, reminds us that this lady appears in the diplomas in the company of Queens Urraca and Jimena of the Navarrese camarilla. ⁽¹³²⁾ Both Count Piniolo Jiménez, who in 1044 owned the monastery of San Antolín de Villanueva, and Count Munio Rodríguez, in whose hands was the house of San

Antolín de Bedon, have Navarrese ties. In Piniolo's case, direct testimony fails, but his wife Aldonza was a kinswoman of Count Munio, and the latter great Asturian noble was a notorious member of the pro-Sanchan faction, participating actively in García's murder and later rebelling against Vermudo III. [\(133\)](#)

These cases establish that individuals and families in Leon adhering to the Navarro-Basque political cause were often drawn into acceptance of such novel religious movements as the fashionable veneration of San Antolín and thus predisposed towards other innovations of Franco-Catalan origin. On the other hand, it is possible to list various members of the Navarrese faction who cannot be connected with the Antoninian cult -- the Castilian Velas, Gonzalo Muñoz, Muño Gustioz, Fernán Láinez, and other leaders of the Party -- but this is at least partly due to our scant documentation. So too el Mayor's foremost lieutenants and their numerous progeny in the Tierra de Campos, Counts Fernán Gutiérrez of Monzón and Gómez Díaz of Saldaña and Carrión -- this last the ancestor of the Beni Gomez, the leading pro-Cluniac aristocratic clan under Alfonso VI -- cannot be linked with the martyr-saint of Pamiers or other foreign religious practices. It is imperative also to remember, in view of what we have emphasized regarding direct Asturoleonese-Gallegan contacts with Gascony and Aquitaine, that Navarre is not the only, or even most successful, channel of Europeanizing elements..

Nevertheless, the roots of Cluny in Leon go back in unmistakable part to families connected with the Navarrese Party. For example, the Countess Teresa Peláez who with her sons and daughters gave Cluny the familial monastery of San Zoil de Carrión in 1076 and 1077 was the widow of Gómez Díaz, el Mayor's old partisan. [\(134\)](#) Doña Justa, the second wife and widow of Gómez Díaz's brother Ansur Díaz, fits the same pattern. She was the stepmother of the famous Count Pedro Ansúrez, later so generous a benefactor of Cluny, and sometime before 1085 she traveled all the way to Burgundy to become a nun in Cluny's principal convent of Marcigny-sur-Loire. [\(135\)](#) There is the case also of the noble lady Doña Fronildi Gutiérrez, who similarly became a Cluniac religious, although this time apparently in the aristocratic house of San Salvador de Palaz del Rey which Alfonso VI had given the Burgundians; **[21]** Fronildi was the widow (before 1059) of the Leonese noble Fernando Ordonniz and -- more to the point -- daughter of Count Gutier Alfonso of Liebana, the Asturian magnate who warmly supported Sancho el Mayor's designs, subsequently made his peace with Vermudo III, and appears in privileges of the epoch of Fernando I. [\(136\)](#) We must then allow for the ferment created after 1020 in that narrow but powerful segment of the Leonese upper classes which was affected by the revolutionary religious forces at work in Eastern Spain and Southern France as a consequence of its pro-Navarrese political ties. And at this point, perhaps, Sancho el Mayor's true contribution to Hispano-Cluniac history becomes visible: not the transmission to his heirs of an obligatory dynastic friendship with the Burgundian abbey; but the indirect encouragement in the Leonese Church and Leonese society of currents of spiritual change that, along with those from directly across the Pyrenees, prepare the kingdom, in contrast with Castile, Aragon and el Mayor's own Navarre, for the eventual intimate alliance with the monks of Cluny.

(iv) The Queen-Empress D. Sancha . Should we include among the Leonese religious Europeanizers of the second quarter of the 11th century Fernando's able consort from 1032, the sister of Vermudo III, D. Sancha? It will not have escaped notice that in the diffusion of the Antoninian devotion as well as in the early annals of Cluny in Leon the women of the royal family and high aristocracy are especially prominent; and since Sancha is thought to have taken decisive part in her husband's program of ca. 1054 to Leonicize the entire Leonese-Castilian state, her relations with the Europeanizing Navarrese Party during her girlhood and her later interest in Cluny may well be connected. Again, as so often, the evidence is circumstantial. The young *nobilissima puella* must have been much thrown into the company of her stepmother, Queen Urraca, the dowager Jimena, and other feminine stalwarts of the Party; the Infanta Sancha Vermúdez whom we have seen associated in 1038 with San Antolín de

Fingoy was her aunt; and between 1032 and 1037 she must have spent some time in Navarrese circles at Pamplona and Burgos until her husband's defeat of Vermudo III in the latter year restored her links with her homeland. ⁽¹³⁷⁾ The fact that the *Liber Diurnus*, copied at Sancha's express order to be used in the devotions of Fernando and herself, includes not only the Feast of San Antolín but also other non-Hispanic material such as four *cantici romenses*, discloses the Queen-Empress was no strict traditionalist but willing to accept Gallican and Roman interpolations passing into peninsular liturgical codices. ⁽¹³⁸⁾

Highly suggestive, too, are Sancha's long-standing ties with the Terra de Campos, the *terra predilecta* of Cluniac expansion in Spain. Twice the Campos served as her dowry, first in the ill-fated betrothal of 1029 to the Infante García, again in late 1032 when she married Fernando I. ⁽¹³⁹⁾ This connection seems more than formal and political. Her name appears alongside her husband's in his extensive privilegio of 1059 confirming the rights and patrimonies of the Church of Palencia, with its Catalán Bishop Miro, cabildo of Catalan canons and dedication to San Antolín. ⁽¹⁴⁰⁾ A more conclusive document is the only one discoverable in which the queen-empress acts without the [22] collaboration of Fernando and in her own right as *regina serenissimi Fredinandi uxor*, to make a donation to San Isidro de Dueñas sometime between November 1054 and December 1065. ⁽¹⁴¹⁾ This as yet unpublished text shows Sancha possessed property of her own in the Campos; her charter grants Dueñas her *villa* of Santa Cecilia 'de Valderaaces' nearby, with all its temporal.

Unfortunately we know little of Sancha's actual relations with Cluny, although these must have been close, for after her death on 7 November 1067 -- she survived Fernando by only two years -- Abbot Hugh assigned her extraordinary intercessional honors. ⁽¹⁴²⁾ From the *Consuetudines cenobii Cluniacensis* that the monk Bernard compiled at the abbey between 1078 and 1083, we know that she was included in the intention of one of the only three *prebendae* (or daily alms portions) assigned at Cluny to feeding the poor, the other two of which memorialized Abbot Odilo and the German Emperor Henry II: "pro Fredelano et eius uxore et regibus Hispaniarum", ⁽¹⁴³⁾ Several years later, ca. 1085, another compiler of a major Cluniac customal, Udalric, records that throughout the year, in all daily Masses celebrated at the abbey, the seventh collect was said "pro regina Hispaniarum et pro sororibus et aliis feminis familiaribus"; and there can be no doubt that this deceased Queen-Empress of the Spains was Fernando I's consort, D. Sancha. ⁽¹⁴⁴⁾ To be sure, both these great intercessional privileges can be linked to Alfonso VI's concession in 1077 of the *census duplicatus*, but more is involved than filial generosity, for, as the cases of the Holy Roman Empresses Adelaide and Agnes prove, Cluny did not automatically confer her prized commemorative honors upon the spouses of even imperial benefactors, but only in return for personal services and confraternal membership of the empress concerned. ⁽¹⁴⁵⁾ We know also that the abbey carefully observed the anniversary of Sancha's death both in Burgundy and in the far-flung dependencies throughout Europe, since her obit appears prominently under 7 November in the Necrologium of the Swiss Cluniac priory of Villars-les-Moines, which Wollasch has now shown to be in fact that of the foremost Cluniac nunnery, Marcigny-sur-Loire, and which thus preserves much of the content of the lost necrology of Cluny herself. ⁽¹⁴⁶⁾ Like Fernando, Sancha must have been a *socia* or *familiaris* of the abbey. It would not be surprising if she shared her husband's decision to give the Burgundians the annual census of 1000 gold pieces, although pretty certainly, to judge from the reales pergaminos on this subsidy of Alfonso VI and Alfonso VII, as well as from the silence of Cluniac and peninsular writers on this point, she was not publicly associated with the benefaction.

Sancha's journey from interest in Franco-Catalan-Navarrese spiritual trends to admiration for Cluny we cannot trace: what is significant for her role in the future alliance is her intensely Leonese and imperial attachments, for, as we shall see, when Fernando I cements his friendship with the Burgundians, he

does so not as king of Castile but as a Leonese king-emperor of Hispania.

[23] 3. Fernando I and Cluny: The Inauguration of Friendship, 1049-1053

The precise moment of Cluny's advent escapes our knowledge, but we can be confident that it occurred in the context of two new catalytic factors favoring establishment of contact between the abbey and the Leonese-Castilian monarchy. One of these is the succession at Cluny early in 1049 of the extraordinarily capable young abbot whom history remembers as St. Hugh the Great, not yet at the start of his long tenure of office prepared to launch the vast building program he was to finance largely from Spanish gold, but confronted like Odilo before him with the necessity of supplementing from outside the resources upon which the congregational life of some 200 monks depended. ⁽¹⁴⁷⁾ Hugh it must have been who decided to press beyond Jaca and Pamplona, the scenes of his predecessor Odilo's failures, to approach the last, most remote son of Sancho el Mayor in the hope of restoring once again the lucrative connection with Spain, for the Cluniacs, in Pérez de Urbel's phrase, "el país de los tesoros escondidos". - ⁽¹⁴⁸⁾ The other decisive factor is the profound shift in the center of gravity of all Christian and, before long, Muslim Spain produced by the overthrow of hitherto dominant Navarre and the establishment of Leonese-Castilian paramountcy. This permanent transformation of the peninsular political scene culminates in Fernando's victory over García of Nájera on 15 September 1054; but it was evidently in preparation several years previous, to judge by what the Silense tells us of the growing estrangement between the two brothers that led to war and Garcia's death. ⁽¹⁴⁹⁾ For Fernando I Atapuerca is the supreme turning point of his reign from its primarily Castilian and royal phase to the dynamic decade of Leonese and Hispanic imperialism ending in 1065.

It is in the framework of this new conjuncture between 1049 and 1054 that it is necessary to analyze the one explicit account that has come down to us of the actual inauguration of Fernandine-Cluniac friendship. This is the real privilegio issued by Alfonso VI at Burgos in 1090 for the purpose of re-affirming his 1077 grant to Cluny of the *census duplicatus* of 2000 gold dinars a year. ⁽¹⁵⁰⁾ It is, as we shall see, a document of strongly Cluniac inspiration, very likely composed by the abbatial chamberlain Seguin then in Spain, and this gives exceptional value to its description of Fernando's first approach to the abbey, since it must preserve Cluny's own tradition in the matter as well as the one accepted by Alfonso VI twenty-five years after his father's death. In the pertinent passage Alfonso, who represents himself as "heres paterne dignitatis ita quoque bone successor uoluntatis", declares:

Subiit itaque mihi regi Adefonso in mentem quid egregium inter cetera egerat pater meus rex Fredelandus pia recordatione semper commemorandus. Comperta namque coenobii Cluniacensis tam celebri tam probata tam sancta religione diuino mox timore compunctus et amore, societatem fratrum Deo et sancto Petro ibidem militantium humiliter expetiit, deuotius [24] accepit, fidelissime quoad uixit retinuit, non inaniter credens se participem fore in eorum spiritalibus, si de sua temporali habundantia indigently seruorum Dei fuisset munificus.

The text continues with Fernando's bestowal of the census upon the monks, to which we shall return. What is immediately relevant is the information that relations with the abbey went through two stages; first, a *compertio* -- the monarch discovers or learns about the Burgundian congregation; subsequently, *mox*, he enters its confraternity and participates through benefactions in its spiritual merits. There is no suggestion of any inherited obligation from Sancho el Mayor or previous solicitation by Abbot Odilo. The move towards Cluny appears as something entirely novel, the result of the king-emperor's own personal response on hearing of the abbey's *celebritas*, *probitas* and *sanctitas*. We may guess a letter or

envoy of Hugh lies back of this, as unquestionably does the influence of the Leonese Europeanizers around Fernando. Certainly without the latter, abbatial success would be inexplicable.

It can moreover be established that the *compertio* and thus the opening of contact between Fernando I and the Cluniacs took place by at least the early summer of 1053, quite possibly several years earlier, but at any rate some time between 1049 and 1053. For when, on 9 June 1053, the priest Endura with his wife María conveys to Abbot Juan and San Isidro de Dueñas his monasterio propio of San Andres *in ualle de muliere mortua*, in the Tierra de Campos, not far from Dueñas and Tariego, there appears in the list of confirmants the entry: "Ego Frater Galindus clunia(ac)ensis qui fuit presens". ⁽¹⁵¹⁾ This is the first notice of an authentic Cluniac monk in Leon, proof that the abbey was not in touch with the kingdom; but who was Frater Galindus or Fray Galindo and how explain his presence? The honorific prefix "frater", rarely if ever employed in the peninsular monastic vocabulary of this epoch, manifestly designates a senior member of the prestigious Burgundian community, someone entrusted with an official mission precisely like another envoy of Abbot Hugh, the Frater Henricus who in 1066 came to Urgel to negotiate with Viscount Arnau Mirde Tost the abortive cession of the church and viscounty of Ager. ⁽¹⁵²⁾ The name "Galindus" is almost certainly Eastern Hispanic, probably not Catalan, but Aragonese or Riojan; thus we would seem to have here as abbatial legate an *Hispanus*, one of the old zealous peninsular breed whose ascetic idealism had taken him to Burgundy.

Conceivably, Fray Galindo could have been a survivor of Paternus' little band of Cluniacs at Peña who had returned to Burgundy after the accession of the unsympathetic Ramiro I; ⁽¹⁵³⁾ but if so, it seems very unlikely that under the political conditions prevailing a year before Atapuerca a Navarrese, even a Riojan, would have been persona grata at the Leonese-Castilian court. What is undeniable is some sort of close relationship with the king-emperor and the house of San Isidro.

Endura's charter of 1053 is a private document which, however, displays close association with the reyes Fernando and Sancha. In the dispositive the priest and his wife affirm that the text has been drawn up "per iussione serenissimi atque gloriosissimi fredenandi regis et gloriosissima sancia regina uxor eius". The act itself presumably **[25]** incorporates a judgment reached in a pleito attended by the local royal official whose attestation it bears: "Guter Goncaluez qui tenet Tariego et fuit conciliator confirmat". Other exalted personages also subscribe: two bishops, Ciprian of Leon and Pedro of Lugo; an abbot Guillelmus, probably a Catalan but patently not the abbot of San Isidro; Xemeno Belazquez de Luna, Xemeno Lopez and his wife Onega, Enego Semenez, all recognizable aristocratic figures. In addition, the pergamino bears Fernando I's own validation: "Ego Fredinandus nutu Dei rex in han(c) scripturam quam fieri iussi et relegendo cognoui manu mea confirmaui". This is an impressive array of confirmants, somewhat briefer than in the normal royal chancery act of the reign, but sufficiently striking in a private document to indicate it must have been written in the presence of the sovereign and members of his court, perhaps at Palencia, possibly at Dueñas itself, beyond question within the Tierra de Campos. ⁽¹⁵⁴⁾ We can then deduce that Galindo's visit brought him into close association with Fernando I and equally into some sort of friendly connection with San Isidro de Dueñas.

How should this be defined? We do not believe that by 1053 Fernando and Abbot Hugh had already negotiated the union under which the monarch became a Cluniac *socius* and paid the census of 1000 *metcales* for clothing the monks, or that Galindo had come to collect the annual installment. The census -- as we shall contend below -- is unlikely to have been promised or paid before the Fernandine fisc was receiving a steady flow of tributary dinars, a good fortune which it did not yet enjoy in 1053. Nor can we say how Hugh's approach to Fernando may be related to King García of Navarre's foundation of his new Riojan abbey of Santa María de Nájera, an event which immediately follows his successful acquisition of a paria from al-Muqtadir of Zaragoza and in which Cluny took no part, as the confirmants of the real privilegio of 2 December 1052 show. In all probability 1053, if not the very year

of Fernando's *compertio* -- which in any case must fall before this point and after 1049, when Hugh became abbot -- belongs in the first of the two stages of the friendship: that of the royal enthusiasm initiating what the *Cronica Najerense* calls the *mutuus amor*,⁽¹⁵⁵⁾ and Hildebert of Cluny the *dilectio*,⁽¹⁵⁶⁾ between king-emperor and abbey. Doubtless Galindo took back to Cluny one of the early gifts by which Fernando, in Hildebert's words, "Cluniacense monasterium multo sibi astrinxerat beneficio", and which Hugh would one day gratefully include in his acknowledgement of the ruler's *multa bona*.⁽¹⁵⁷⁾

All that we know of Fernando I's personality and his strong attraction to the regular Church suggests that the phraseology of the diploma of 1090 regarding his admiration for Cluniac sanctity -- perhaps in this passage, at least, the very words of Abbot Hugh -- is no merely conventional statement. As is evident from the Silense, the king-emperor not only made generous grants to monasteries but took delight in seeking the company of monks, frequently visited their houses, and could join in the singing of the office, parts of which he seems to have known by heart.⁽¹⁵⁸⁾ This distinctly monastic piety, deeply rooted as it was in Hispanic tradition, must have been much impressed by the reports of Cluny's austerity and fervor reaching the king through the Europeanizers in Leon and now personally exemplified in such a delegate [26] as fray Galindo. And unquestionably for Fernando, as later for Alfonso VI and Urraca, the abbey's supreme renown as a center of intercessional prayer must have been as powerful a motive as any in drawing him into close relations with its monks. No doubt also the abbey's lack of ties with Jaca or Pamplona played a part.

Certainly neither reformism nor crusading fervor, although both are often mentioned, explain Fernando's attitude, at least in this stage of the relationship. The difficulty with the reformist thesis is that while the king-emperor exhibits from 1055 on a strong concern for renewal and modernization of the Leonese-Castilian Church, this is not for the most part directed towards monasticism or inspired by Cluny, but primarily towards the secular clergy and laity -- administration of cathedral chapters of regular canons, organization of rural churches, authority of the bishops, relations of clergy and laics, the ordering of cult and of the Christian-life.⁽¹⁵⁹⁾

The principal narrative sources -- the *Historia Silense*, the *Crónica Najerense*, the *Tudense*, the *Toledano*, the *Crónica Primera General* -- are all silent regarding any Fernandine monastic reform, Cluniac or non-Cluniac in character. His numerous *reales privilegios* show Fernando generous towards the monasteries but these texts in content, style and subscriptions reveal no extra-Hispanic influences, their frequent allusion to observance of the Benedictine Rule being of course a commonplace of Leonese-Castilian royal diplomas from the time of Alfonso III (866-910). Monastic abuses and their correction do, however, receive attention from the two important councils of the reign: that of Coyanza, which was held, as García Gallo has proved, in 1055, and was an imperial synod, including on the morrow of Atapuerca the Navarrese bishops of Pamplona and Nájera along with those of Leon and Castile;⁽¹⁶⁰⁾ and that of Compostela, a wholly Gallegan assembly, which Martínez Díez has now shown (contrary to the old Risco theory of the two councils of Santiago in 1061 and 1063) to be a single synod meeting in 1056.⁽¹⁶¹⁾ Of Coyanza's fourteen canons, only two specifically relate to the monasteries: canon 2 orders observance of either the Benedictine or Isidorian Rule, forbids monks to hold property except by permission of their bishop or abbot, reaffirms subjection of abbots to their bishop, and warns monasteries not to receive an alien monk without his abbot's approval.⁽¹⁶²⁾ Canon 5 regulates the training of monks for ordination, and the presence of religious at weddings.⁽¹⁶³⁾ Compostela deals succinctly with the qualifications and duties of abbots (canon 2); condemns the *consortium* of women with monks (canon 3); demands that monks abstain from involvement in lawsuits and other secular activities, and that abbots leaving their houses to live in the world be excommunicated until their return (canon 4).⁽¹⁶⁴⁾

Benedictinism, poverty, stabilitas, training in Biblical religion, abstention from secular entanglements -- all Cluniac ideals surely, but to what degree due to Cluniac pressure? García Gallo and Martínez Díez see the acts of these Fernandine councils -- in their primitive redaction, free from later Gregorian-inspired interpolations -- as possessing a thoroughly nationalist, neo-Gothicist character, uncontaminated by foreign reformist currents from across the Pyrenees.⁽¹⁶⁵⁾ This is open to question, particularly in view of what we have seen [27] of Leonese response over the preceding thirty years to Franco-Catalan religious infiltration. What García Gallo says of the "espíritu tradicional y restaurador" of Coyanza fails to take into account the interest both councils show in cathedral chapters of regular canons, one of the prime subjects of reformist zeal in Southern France and Catalonia, and represented in Fernando's own domains by the Church of Palencia.⁽¹⁶⁶⁾ The alternatives of the Benedictine or Isidorian Rules offered at Coyanza may indeed express nationalist sentiment, but may not this strange choice of the latter have been evoked by foreign pressure to abolish all Rules except that of Monte Cassino?⁽¹⁶⁷⁾ As for García Gallo's denial of the Cluniac pressure in Leon in 1055,⁽¹⁶⁸⁾ this is now refuted by what we know of Fray Galindo's arrival in Leon two years before Coyanza. But it would be unwise to ascribe the monastic canons of either Coyanza or Compostela to the monarch's new friendship with the Burgundians; where these are not fully in accord with traditional Hispanic practices, it is the influence of Bishop Miro of Palencia, who attended the synod of Coyanza, not that of the Cluniacs, for which allowance should be made.

As for the Crusade hypothesis, this can be firmly ruled out as in any sense a relevant motive. Fernando I, in the final decade of his reign, and in contrast with the policy of his father and his own first twenty years of rule, conducts an almost continuous series of large-scale campaigns against the muluk al-Tawa'if; but these are not holy wars incited by trans-Pyrenean propaganda. They involve no French warriors; their objective is not so much conquest of territory as imposition of political vassalage upon the Taifas and acquisition of the lucrative parias.⁽¹⁶⁹⁾ We have noted the present tendency to minimize or deny Cluny's sponsorship of war against the infidel; and although the abbey's complete insulation is questionable in the light of her possible connection with the Barbastro crusade of 1064, the fact is Fernando I took no part in this operation. It is true Fernando's serial attacks upon al-Andalus commence when his friendship with Cluny was already in existence; and no doubt the Burgundian monks hailed Christian victories and gratefully received a share of the spoils, just as did the many churches and monasteries of the kingdom upon which, as the Silense tells us, Fernando piously delighted to bestow the booty of his Muslim wars.⁽¹⁷⁰⁾ Nothing however warrants the assumption that his association with Cluny originated in the hope of securing Burgundian collaboration in an international crusade in Spain against Islam.

4. From Friendship to Alliance: the Lost Real Privilegio

In the Alfonsine diploma of 1090 Fernando's *compertio* of Cluny's followed not long thereafter (mox) by his entry into confraternity and by the concession of the annual census. It is this second stage which represents the true alliance or *conjunctio* between monarch and abbey, which is henceforth so fundamental to the whole history of Hispano-Cluniac relations over the next two centuries as to make it imperative to dispel, if possible, the obscurity surrounding its formation. Since the extant notices deal almost exclusively with Fernando's [28] becoming a Cluniac *socius* and initiating his annual stipend of 1000 gold dinars for clothing the monks, the attempt to ascertain the terms, date and implications of the new relationship, with its political as well as the original religious overtones, must concentrate upon these twin phenomena, and first upon the grant of the census.

A formidable difficulty is that for this donation no charter is known to survive in the Spanish archives or in the Cluniac collections of Paris and Burgundy, which raises the question whether one ever existed.

For Alfonso VI's pledge in 1077 and reaffirmation in 1090 of a census of twice his father's amount, the *census duplicates* of 2000 gold pieces, we possess not only the original privilegios, carefully treasured at the abbey down through the centuries, but also several copies included in the great Cartularies B and C now in the Bibliothèque de la Ville de Cluny.⁽¹⁷¹⁾ In addition, there survives for the charter of 1090 a peninsular copy, found among the various legal documents that in the late 12th century were collected in a cuaderno of 8 folia for use as the reference file of the provincial chamberlain of the Cluniac Province of Hispania, Prior Humbert of San Zoil de Carrión (1169- ca. 1190).⁽¹⁷²⁾ In contrast, despite crises over non-payment of the subsidy under Alfonso VI, Urraca and Alfonso VII, no peninsular or Burgundian authority mentions the existence of such a text for Fernando, with the important exception of the Burgalese diploma of 1090, the trustworthiness of which on this point may be open to question. Alfonso VI in 1077 twice describes his father's census as being customary (*solitus erat dare*),⁽¹⁷³⁾ which might suggest purely voluntary repetition of an annual charity differing only in its regularity from the gifts of treasure Fernando distributed to his kingdom's monasteries and churches.

It is however difficult to believe that the Fernandine census was not incorporated in a formal real privilegio, not only because of the two Alfonsine texts but because any regular payment -- and all the Spanish as well as Cluniac mentions describe the gift as a census -- would require formal notarized promulgation. Such is the case, for example, with this same ruler's bestowal in 1049 upon the Cathedral Church of Leon of an annual income of 500 *solidi* from the *census Iudaeorum* of that city, and with the tenth conceded in 1059 to the see of Palencia out of the royal revenues of that diocese.⁽¹⁷⁴⁾ Hugo Monachus of Cluny in his *Vita s. Hugonis* of ca. 1122 uses the word *instituit* of Fernando's grant;⁽¹⁷⁵⁾ the *Historia Silense* has *statuit*,⁽¹⁷⁶⁾ and the same verb is employed by Alfonso VII in his privilegio of 29 July 1142 setting forth the terms of his agreement at Salamanca with Abbot Peter the Venerable on the refunding of the census.⁽¹⁷⁷⁾ These terms clearly imply a juridical testament. Finally, there is the explicit statement of the diploma of 1090 *instituit et firmauit*, which unquestionably means formal issuance and royal subscription (*firmitio*, *confirmatio*) of a pergamino drawn up by the Leonese-Castilian chancery, just as in this same document Alfonso VI's reference to having confirmed (*firmaui*) his own earlier grant of the *census duplicatus* specifically refers to his still extant charter of 1077.⁽¹⁷⁸⁾

For reconstructing the form and general content of such a lost pergamino, we are not entirely without data, particularly if we can assume that one or the other of Alfonso VI's censive charters is based [29] upon a missing Fernandine prototype. The diploma of 1090 can be ruled out for this purpose, even though its detailed information on Fernando's dealings with Cluny might seem to summarize the supposed text; for this act is patently of Cluniac composition and completely alien to the usages of Leonese-Castilian notaries.⁽¹⁷⁹⁾ Alfonso's earlier privilegio, of 10 July 1077, may however actually preserve the appearance of his father's donation act: it runs in the name of the *rex Le(gi)onum*, not the later more common *rex Hispaniarum*, as in 1090; the queen-empress is not mentioned;⁽¹⁸⁰⁾ the dispositive is relatively brief; the episcopal and lay subscriptions few. It is possible both Alfonsine charters, like other Spanish citations of the Fernandine grant, echo or paraphrase an original wording. Alfonso in 1077 asserts his father's gift was made *illo sanctissimo loco Cluniacensi* and intended *causa uestimentorum*. In 1090 his words are: *censum annualem mille uidelicet aureos quod uulgo mancales appellant conuentui Cluniacensi ad uestitium proprie dedit*. The *Silense* says the grant annually involved *mille aureos ex proprio erario* and was given *pro uinculis peccatorum soluendis*.⁽¹⁸¹⁾ Alfonso VII, in his privilegio of 1142, declares that both Fernando and Alfonso VI *Cluniacensi ecclesie de redditibus sui regni censual iter singulis annis pro salute animarum suarum reddi statuerunt*,⁽¹⁸²⁾ while for Rodrigo of Toledo Fernando *obtulit insuper Cluniacensi monasterio de regio fisco mille aureos annuatim perpetuo soluendos*.⁽¹⁸³⁾ All these allusions to the *mille aurei* from the monarch's own revenues, the assignment of the gift to clothing, and the pious intention, appear to reflect elements

of the Fernandine diploma.

There is however one point upon which these and other relevant notices are in sharp disagreement. This is whether Fernando I promised to pay Cluny the gold pieces only during his own lifetime, or also bound his successors to continue the payment in perpetuity. This is really the question whether he envisaged his Cluniac tie as purely personal or as constituting a henceforth permanent alliance between the abbey and the Leonese-Castilian state. We have only to look at the Leonese-Castilian chroniclers of the 12th and 13th centuries to discover a double tradition concerning the intended duration of the Fernandine census. For the Castilian writers who mention it, the census was from its inception imposed upon Fernando's heirs: the Toledano uses the phrase *annuatim perpetuo soluendos*; the Primera Crónica General, *pora siempre*.⁽¹⁸⁵⁾ But the Leonese authorities disagree, deliberately emphasizing the stipend's vitalicial character. For the Historia Silense, "statuit (Fredinandus) quoque per unumquemque annum uiuens . . . mille aureos ex proprio erario dari".⁽¹⁸⁶⁾ In the Tudense this becomes *dum uiueret*, as if the Gallegan bishop, Perhaps reflecting 13th century episcopal hostility towards the then decadent Cluniacs, wished to give even greater force to his belief in the limited duration of the Fernandine census.⁽¹⁸⁷⁾

These contradictory traditions, furthermore, find a parallel in Alfonso VI's censive diplomas of 1077 and 1090. For the latter text, drawn up at Burgos in Eastertide following Abbot Hugh's visit to Spain, there is no doubt whatever; speaking of Fernando I, it affirms: *quem censum eodem modo per successores suos prefato loco annuatim reddendum instituit et firmavit*".⁽¹⁸⁸⁾ We may have here the basis of [30] the Castilian perpetuity doctrine found in the Toledano and the Primera Crónica General. In contrast, Alfonso's earlier act of 10 July 1077, the first on the *census duplicatus*, not only makes no claim that Fernando imposed perpetual maintenance of the subsidy but manifests a certain deviousness in alluding to the hereditary aspect. The dispositive clauses relating to Fernando's gift and Alfonso's intention to double it say nothing of any obligation the latter has inherited, nor do they bind his future heirs. Only in the closing comminatory section, and thus by indirection, does Alfonso refer to the matter by invoking eternal punishment upon any of his successors who refuses to continue the payment: "Et si quis ex meo genere qui post me uenturus sit, quod minime credi potest, hunc votum mei testamenti infringere uoluerit et qualiscumque fuerit qui hoc regimen post me gubernauerit et si hunc censum ita duplicatum persolvere non quesierit, sicut supra dictum est, in primis suis a fronte careat lucernis, igne cremetur ardente cum opibus suis et cum Christi proditore permaneat cruciatus".⁽¹⁸⁹⁾

Does this almost furtive provision for the future simply mean that Alfonso was avoiding confession of previous culpability on his part in not sending Cluny an annual gift of dinars? or do we have here, in confirmation of the contention of the Silense and Tudense that Fernando's promise was for himself alone, the appearance of anew, non-Fernandine principle of perpetuity that will find explicit expression thirteen years later in the diploma of Burgos? To advance towards any solution of this mystery -- which, we repeat, embraces the whole question of whether Fernando's Cluniac *conjunctio* was merely personal or intended to be a permanent feature of Leonese-Castilian foreign policy -- we need to explore at least two promising lines of inquiry: first, the story of what happened with regard to the maintenance of the census in the obscure decade between Fernando I's death at the end of 1065 and Alfonso VI's doubling of 1077; and, secondly, the reliability of the Burgalese real privilegio of 1090 as an historical source for the relations between Fernando I and Cluny.

(i) The Fernandine Census under Alfonso VI, 1066-1077. Since we have no direct data to establish whether in this period prior to the doubling Alfonso, as his father's imperial successor in Leon, actually paid Cluny the annual 1000 dinars, the problem must be approached by moving backward from the known fact of the *census duplicatus*. Here we first discover that between 1073, the year after his

unexpected restoration to power by reason of his brother Sancho II's assassination at Zamora, and 22 May 1077, Alfonso VI transferred to Cluny, for conversion into priories, the first four reales monasteries the abbey acquired in the Leonese-Castilian state. All four were located in Leon proper; San Isidro de Dueñas, in the Tierra de Campos, 29 December 1073; San Salvador de Palaz del Rey, in the Leonese capital, 27 August 1075-1076; Santiago de Astudillo, in the Tierra de Campos, 31 January 1077; and San Juan de Hérmedes de Cerrato, also in the Campos, 22 May 1077.⁽¹⁹⁰⁾ These cessions do not terminate Alfonso's monastic donations to the Burgundians: he was still to give them in 1079 Santa María de Nájera, the abbey founded by his slain uncle King García of Navarre, and in 1081 Santa Coloma de Burgos;⁽¹⁹¹⁾ and perhaps, [31] if popular opposition had not prevented it, the venerable Leonese house of Sahagún, where in 1079 Robert of Cluny was made abbot.⁽¹⁹²⁾ Nevertheless, after the transfer of Hérmedes de Cerrato on 22 May and the institution of the doubled census seven weeks later on 10 July 1077, Alfonso did not in fact give Cluny another royal monastery in the kingdom of Leon during the entire remaining thirty-two years of his long reign.⁽¹⁹³⁾

All this hints at some sort of equivalency in Alfonso VI's mind between the four Leonese cessions -- averaging about one a year from 1073 to 1077 - -and the 4000 dinars he would have had to contribute if he were continuing his father's census at the old rate of payment. But should we consider that these monasteries took the place of a single census which the king declined to pay, or that they represent the equivalent of the 4000 extra dinars required by an anticipated doubled census? It cannot be because of lack of funds that the king-emperor pursued this unpopular policy of alienating Leonese reales monasteries to Cluny, when the abbey herself clearly preferred metcales, for the imperial fisc in these years was presumably engorging huge amounts of tributary gold from the old Fernandine Taifa vassals of Zaragoza, Toledo, Sevilla and Badajoz. The inference is that before 10 July 1077 Alfonso, despite pressure from Cluny and his own willingness to accede to pleas for alms, was reluctant to undertake, for either a single or anticipatory doubled census, a monetary obligation which possessed quasi-vassalic connotations of dependency for himself and his Empire.

This forces us back still earlier in Alfonso VI's career, to the troubled years 1066-1072, the epoch of civil war among Fernando I's three sons, and to the precise circumstances under which in 1072 Abbot Hugh intervened in the Spanish conflict.⁽¹⁹⁴⁾ Upon Alfonso, as the heir to Leon and thus to the imperial title and primacy, would unquestionably have fallen the filial responsibility -- assuming that one existed -- of continuing the census, so that Cluny's role in the struggle should throw some light upon whether he had done so. The decisive phase of the fratricidal strife occurs in early 1072 when, following García of Galicia's elimination, Sancho II's victory at Golpejera in January allows him to depose the defeated Alfonso as king-emperor and to imprison him at Burgos. At this point, as both Cluniac and Spanish sources agree, Abbot Hugh enters the picture. According to the oldest *Vitae s. Hugonis*, news of Alfonso's defeat and incarceration led the abbot to offer personal prayers for him, to order his monks to pray for the monarch's liberation, and to send the former Bishop Ximeno of Burgos, then a monk at Cluny, back to Castile, ostensibly to reassure the royal prisoner (but presumably also to intercede with the victor).⁽¹⁹⁵⁾ When Sancho, whom the Cluniac texts consistently depict as *tyrannus*, proves recalcitrant about releasing his brother, St. Peter himself appears to him in a dream, threatening immediate death, so that the alarmed Castilian leaps from his bed and releases Alfonso, allowing him to go into exile at Muslim Toledo.⁽¹⁹⁶⁾ The *Crónica Leonesa* has a somewhat different account, in which, after vain efforts by the Leonese bishops, abbots and nobles to secure Alfonso's release, and their swearing that he would never again seek royal power, Alfonso addresses an appeal for help to the abbot of Cluny. Then come the [32] abbey's congregational prayers, the bishop's visit to Burgos, the Petrine dream, and the liberation. In this version, more detailed than that preserved at Cluny, it is important to observe that Abbot Hugh acts only after receiving a plea from the imperial prisoner, and that this is couched in terms of the former friendship with Fernando I: "ob recordationem mutui amoris quam cum

patre ipsius rege .F. habuerant".⁽¹⁹⁷⁾ The implication is that Cluny had previously remained aloof from the civil war and now responded because of previous ties not with Alfonso VI but with his father. It can therefore be concluded that between 1066 and 1072, i.e., from Fernando's death to Alfonso's restoration, no personal or benefactorial link, no *mutuus amor* or *dilectio*, existed between the Leonese ruler and Cluny. Fernando's census can not have been paid, or the abbey would have been, from the very start of the civil war, Alfonso's active partisan.

This deduction agrees perfectly with Alfonso's own statement in the privilegio of 1090 that his *societas* with the Burgundians began only with his institution of the *census duplicatus*, i.e., in 1077. In the first ten years after Fernando I's death the census thus appears to have passed through three stages: (1) between 1066 and 1072, no payment whatever of dinars and complete breakdown of the *conjunctio*, recalling the rupture at the passing of Sancho el Mayor; (2) between 1073 and 1077, in the context of Alfonso VI's gratitude for his restoration, four grants of Leonese royal monasteries; and (3) on 10 July 1077, perhaps with a decade of non-payment brought forcibly to the royal mind by the urgings *die hac nocte* of the abbatial chamberlain Robert, at this time prior of Dueñas,⁽¹⁹⁸⁾ the revival of the Fernandine grant along with Alfonso's own counterpart of an additional 1000 dinars. This leaves still undetermined whether the break with the Fernandine subsidy after 1065 was due to Alfonso's refusal to respect a provision in his father's lost privilegio, or whether in 1077, and even down to 1090, he honestly believed Fernando had made a strictly vitalicial promise. For this question, and for understanding the monarch's explicit espousal in 1090 of the doctrine of a census hereditary from its inception, the key lies in the diploma of Burgos.

(ii) The Imperial Pragmatica of Burgos, Easter 1090. Alfonso VI's real privilegio of Easter 1090 has been universally accepted by historians of Hispano-Cluniac affairs but without ever receiving the close scrutiny it needs.⁽¹⁹⁹⁾ It is apparent at first glance that although running in the name of the *Hispaniarum rex*, the document cannot be a product of the Leonese-Castilian chancery. The dating according to the Incarnational era, the sophisticated language and literary polish, and the absence of episcopal, comital and other subscriptions, all betray foreign notarial composition. The text designates itself a *constitutio*, and in two other places uses analogous verbal forms;⁽²⁰⁰⁾ three points it calls itself a *preceptum*.⁽²⁰¹⁾ This terminology from the Roman public law, along with the un-Hispanic concept of a ruler establishing a fundamental constitutional provision by personal edict, gives it the appearance of an imperial *pragmatica* such as might have emanated from the chancery of the Holy Roman Empire but certainly not from its trans-Pyrenean counterpart in Leon and Castile. The application of *preceptum* to Hugh's order that all future abbots of Cluny [33] maintain in perpetuity the intercessional privileges being conceded to the family of Alfonso VI makes it plain that the author of this charter regarded the royal action as equivalent to an abbatial *statutum*.⁽²⁰²⁾ The document in its essentials must have been formulated at the conference in Burgos between Alfonso and Hugh of which it speaks, and put into final form following the abbot's return to France and the king-emperor's convocation of his curia. Unquestionably this was done by a Cluniac monk familiar with imperial German diplomatic usage, very likely Seguin, the abbatial chamberlain in Spain in these years, who in 1088 or 1089 had negotiated Alfonso VI's huge delivery to the Burgundian monks of 10,000 *talenta*, i.e., dinars.⁽²⁰³⁾ Since none of the episcopal or lay confirmations ordered in the course of the text has actually been attached, apparently what we have is a copy of the perfected draft sent back to Cluny, not the form actually promulgated in Spain.

The fact that in this unique *pragmatica* of the 12th-century Hispanic king-emperors the voice is Alfonso's but the hand Burgundian means that we possess here not only what Alfonso VI was willing in 1090 to acknowledge concerning his father's Cluniac policy but also Cluny's own doctrine, as held at the highest level of authority, regarding the census and, indeed, the whole relationship with Fernando I.

In addition to the four long sentences specifically devoted to Fernando, the diploma contains four other subdivisions: (i) a succinct historical sketch of Alfonso's doubling of 1077 which closely follows the lines of his real privilegio of 10 July; (ii) an account of Alfonso's consultation with Queen Constance and a convocation of bishops and magnates where Archbishop Bernard of Toledo (the ex-Cluniac formally installed two years before in his Tagan metropolis) led those present in expressing approval of the perpetuity of the *census duplicatus*; (iii) *pro remedio* and penal clauses, with instructions for the diploma's confirmation by *principes* and *fideles*; (iv) announcement of Hugh's reciprocal *preceptum* commanding all future abbots to observe perpetual *commemoratio uel obsequium* of Fernando and Sancha, Alfonso's brothers, Alfonso himself, and his wife and children.

In the compact, informative opening passage stands the Burgundian version of the foundation and terms of the Leonese-Cluniac *conjunctio*, perhaps in Hugh's own words, possibly even a paraphrase of Fernando's lost privilegio or of the personal letter or *petitio* requesting *societas* that must have accompanied the donation of the census, to judge by the two Alfonsine texts we have for 1077. ⁽²⁰⁴⁾ In any event, this brief biographical account constitutes Cluny's panegyric of the dead king-emperor that recalls the tribute Hugh had paid the imperial benefactor over thirty years before when, on the news of his death, he had ordered commemoration of Fernando's obit in gratitude for his *multum beneficium*, even though Cluny customarily omitted the *Officium pro defunctis* throughout the Nativity octave. ⁽²⁰⁵⁾

As for the hereditary principle incorporated into the Burgalese diploma's passage on Fernando, it would surely be erroneous to regard this as historically false, as the fruit of Cluniac success in persuading Alfonso VI by 1090 to attribute to his father a stipulation of perpetuity Fernando never intended. No doubt the Cluniacs from the start believed the census was perpetual. Even under Sancho el Mayor, [34] Odilo's emphases on the *indissolubilia uincula* in his letters to Paterno and García reflect the belief that the monarchs of Jaca and Pamplona ought to recognize an inherited dynastic obligation; and, after all, any royal gift of an annual census -- and all our notices, including the Leonese, define Fernando's *mancales* as a census -- would normally be expected to continue after the donor's death unless explicitly otherwise stated. The diploma of 1090, however, summarizes so accurately the contents of Alfonso VI's censive letter and charter of 1077 and presents so close a parallel for both Fernando and Alfonso of three stages of approach to Cluny -- request for confraternity, promise of the census, confirmation of a real privilegio pledging the subsidy ⁽²⁰⁶⁾ -- that it is evident Hugh, as might be expected, came to the conference at Burgos armed with all the necessary documents to establish his abbey's claim to a census made hereditary from its inception. It seems likely that these pieces would have included not only Fernando's donation act but also, to judge by the two texts we have for Alfonso VI in 1077, the personal letter of *petitio* to Hugh in which the king-emperor would have expressed his personal affection for the abbot and his congregation, formally asked for admission to *societas*, and promised the annual stipend. ⁽²⁰⁷⁾ Both letter and privilegio may well have used the phraseology found in Alfonso's counterparts: "in diebus vite mee annuente Deo . . . dabo", words which along with Alfonso's de facto suspension of payment between 1066 and 1077 may well lie behind the Leonese vitalicial tradition we have encountered. ⁽²⁰⁸⁾ Whether Fernando used the same indirect method of provision as his son's comminatory clause, there is no way of deciding. What seems reasonably firm is that the diploma of 1090, in declaring of Fernando's intention that "quem censum eodem modo per successores suos prefato loco annuatim reddendum instituit et confirmavit", rested on authentic written testimony and can be accepted as reliable.

The real problem then is not the authenticity of Cluny's claim of a perpetual Fernandine census so much as the reason why for a decade Alfonso VI refused to acknowledge this, did so in 1077 with reference to his heirs alone, and accepted only in 1090 the doctrine that the census was perpetual *ab initio*. Here we touch upon various questions that require extended treatment elsewhere in connection with Alfonso VI's Cluniac policies, but brief consideration must be given them in order to clarify the

heavy emphasis upon Fernando I and the perpetuity of his census in the *pragmatica* of Burgos.

The first point is that at the start of his reign Alfonso VI, whatever were the sentiments of his mother Sancha and other Leonese Europeanizers, was no Cluniaphil and that his subsequent concessions to the Burgundians consistently reveal political as well as the merely personal motives seized upon by those who now mistakenly picture this able ruler as a credulous weakling exploited by foreign monks. As Hugh's failure to act *motu proprio* in the civil war of 1071-1072 demonstrates, Alfonso had previously disregarded the abbey and the census. It is easy to see why. At the time of his succession in 1066 he faced a very different financial situation from his father's. Whereas Fernando in his final years may have been collecting *parias* of as much as 40,000 dinars a year from the kings of Zaragoza, Toledo, Sevilla and Badajoz -- a total of which the Cluniac census of 1000 gold pieces [35] would constitute only 2.5% -- Alfonso inherited under the Fernandine partition plan solely the *paria* of Toledo, probably amounting to 10,000 dinars, so that for him the Cluniac census would have demanded 10% of his tributary income. (209) The monastic cessions from 1073 can be attributed perhaps to gratitude for Hugh's intervention in Alfonso's unanticipated restoration in October 1072. The doubling of the census in 1077, however, is inseparable from the need to secure Cluny's aid in shielding Leonese-Castilian sovereignty -- and the *parias* -- against the claims of Gregory VII, already feudal overlord of Aragon; (210) and in 1090 the reaffirmation of the census must be understood in the context of the Almoravid danger and the looming succession crisis, for both of which problems Cluniac collaboration could be invaluable.

But for the immediate background of the diploma of 1090 we can go beyond these general considerations. From the epistle which Alfonso VI addressed to the Cluniac abbot, probably in 1089, the year before Hugh's journey to Spain, we learn that payment of the *census duplicatus* had ceased some years before, (211) apparently because of the half in *parias* payments brought about by Yusuf ibn-Tashfin's invasion of 1086 and the Almoravid triumph at Zallaca. In view of the fact that the monarch's gift at this time amounted to 10,000 *talenta* or dinars -- which Hugh was to use to build the great abbey-church of Cluny III and which is often mistakenly regarded as one more deplorable sign of Alfonso's extravagant piety -- it looks as if this sum actually constituted liquidation of the arrears that had accumulated between 1085 (or 1086) and 1088, plus the 2000 *mancales* due for 1089. It is also probable that the payment was made possible at this moment by the king-emperor's unexpected receipt of the enormous tribute of 30,000 dinars from the desperate anti-Almoravid Taifa ruler 'Abd-Allah of Granada. (212)

At this time there must have come to Hugh the alarming realization that despite the privilegio of 1077 regular payment of the census could not always be depended upon, even under Alfonso VI; and, more disturbingly, as a parallel to the breakdown of 1066 at Fernando I's death, that Alfonso's successor might prove refractory on his accession. No wonder the Burgundian abbot crossed the Pyrenees to secure the *pragmatica* of 1090! It must have been plain to him that the type of real *pergamino* Alfonso had issued in 1077 and which, as we have seen, must have followed the lines of his father's lost document, -- i.e., a semi-private act, attested by a relatively small number of witnesses, and thus never officially promulgated in a full curia of bishops and magnates -- did not establish a safe, permanent and universally acknowledged constitutional obligation of the Leonese-Castilian crown. Hence the elaborate care taken by the abbot, with the indispensability of the census for his building program in mind, to secure on his visit to Burgos the most solemn and juridically binding reaffirmation of the census, cast in the form of an imperial *pragmatica*, carrying the approval of the queen-empress Constance, the public assent of the Archbishop Bernard of Toledo and other bishops, and the consent of the nobility -- "*primoribus regni mei fidelibus meis uolentibus, consentientibus, laudantibus, astipulantibus*".

All this bears directly upon establishing the existence, the terms [36] and the subsequent fortunes of Fernando I's lost real privilege to the Cluniacs. Our conclusion can now be briefly stated: there did exist a Fernandine act (and probably also a letter, now similarly lost) in which el Magno conceded in perpetuity his gift of 1000 gold *mancales* for clothing the monks. This means that he envisaged the *conjunctio*, the second stage of his friendship with the Burgundian monks, as no merely personal, vitalicial affair but as a henceforth permanent policy of the Navarro-Basque dynasty and the Hispanic Empire. But before we inquire into the political motives and implications underlying this plan, it is imperative to try to fix the point in the reign at which Fernando I's originally purely religious tie came to take on this character of a virtual political alliance.

5. Cluny and Muslim Gold: the Fernandine Census and the Parias

The literary and diplomatic testimonies to the existence of the Fernandine-Cluniac alliance fail to disclose at what point in his long reign the king-emperor moved beyond merely pious esteem and benevolence into confraternal membership in the Burgundian congregation and initiation of the rich gift of the annual census. The Alfonsine pragmatica of 1090 places this second phase of the relationship soon -- *mox* -- after the letter's commencement; it also praises Fernando for faithful maintenance of *societas* with the abbey *quoad uixit* as if this extended over a span of some years. For fixing even approximately the date of establishment of the *conjunctio*, which is at the same time that of the lost real privilege, our chief hope lies in closer scrutiny of the census as the aspect of the *mutuus amor* which receives most explicit attention in our sources. For if the *mille aurei* are indeed Muslim dinars drawn from the tribute-payments of vassal Taifa kings, it may be possible to correlate the inauguration of the Cluniac alliance with Fernando I's campaigns of the Reconquista. We turn therefore to the nature and timing of the celebrated stipend.

Concerning the precise amount of the Spanish gold annually provided Cluny by Fernando's benefaction, and whether this was calculated in counted coins or gross weight of bullion, the sources preserve two traditions, one Hispanic, the other Burgundian.⁽²¹³⁾ Below the Pyrenees the texts are unanimous in estimating the gold by tale, precisely as Fernando I himself must have stipulated in his lost real privilege.⁽²¹⁴⁾ Alfonso VI's act of 1077 does not mention what sum of his father's is being doubled;⁽²¹⁵⁾ but his reaffirmation in 1090 of the *census duplicatus* ascribes to Fernando, perhaps in the latter's own words, a gift of *mille uidelicet aureos quos uulgo mancales appellant*.⁽²¹⁶⁾ Alfonso VII's charter of 29 July 1142, which announces the refunding of the census negotiated with Abbot Peter the Venerable at Salamanca, attributes incorrectly to his great-grandfather Fernando, as well as rightly to Alfonso VI, a charity of "duo scilicet milia mecallorum quam ipsi rex scilicet Fredenandus proauus meus et Adefonsus auus meus Cluniacensi ecclesie de redditibus sui regni censualiter singulis annis pro salute animarum suarum reddi statuerunt."⁽²¹⁷⁾ Both the term *mekalli* and the [37] reduction, later in the same document, of the future royal monetary obligation to a fixed sum reckoned in Almoravid gold maravedis - *ducentorum morabotinorum redditum in balneis que in Burgis sunt* -- confirm the assumption that the census was payable in counted coins -- and Muslim ones at that.⁽²¹⁸⁾ The Historia Silense employs for Fernando's gift the phrase *mille aureos* just as does the Burgalese pragmatica;⁽²¹⁹⁾ the same words appear in the Tudense and Toledano;⁽²²⁰⁾ in the Primera Crónica General they have anachronistically become *mill maravedis*.⁽²²¹⁾

In the Cluniac texts, by contrast, the census is invariably calculated in gross weight of gold, not in specie. The two earliest biographers of Abbot Hugh, Gilo and Hildebert of Lavardin, the bishop of Sens, whose *Vitae* Schieffer assigns to the years 1120 and 1121 respectively,⁽²²²⁾ set Alfonso VI's *census duplicatus* at 200 ounces of gold, which means they believe his father's must have been of 100

ounces;⁽²²³⁾ and this is the figure frequently cited in modern works. But Hildebert, since he is drawing upon Gilo's account, furnishes no independent witness to this figure; and the *Vita s. Hugonis* of Hugo Monachus, an equally authoritative narrative written in or shortly after 1122,⁽²²⁴⁾ declares that the doubled benevolence ran to 240 ounces, which would fix Fernando's at 120.⁽²²⁵⁾ Furthermore, it is this larger amount, equivalent to 10 pounds of bullion, which receives official confirmation from the Cluniac source most likely to be accurately informed on the subject, the abbot himself. For Peter the Venerable, in a passage of his *Liber de miraculis* relating to Spain which must have been composed during or not long after he visited the Peninsula in 1142 for the express purpose of inducing Alfonso VII to resume the then suspended stipend, declares of Alfonso VI that "tam a se quam a patre suo Fredelanno constitutum census, ducentas scilicet et quadraginta auri uncias, singulis annis Cluniacensi ecclesiae persoluebat."⁽²²⁶⁾ Although this statement, like Alfonso VII's virtually contemporary diploma of July 1142, appears mistakenly to carry the full amount of the *census duplicatus* back to Fernando I, it points to an original sequence of 120 and 240 ounces of gold. Thus there existed at Cluny, from at least, the troubled close of Ponce de Helgueil's abbacy, and at a time when the Spanish census, due to Almoravid termination of the parias and Queen Urraca's indigence,⁽²²⁷⁾ had almost certainly not been paid in cash for over a decade, two divergent traditions of its amount. It is this very uncertainty that doubtless explains why on this specific point the compiler of the relatively late *Epitome Vitae ab Ezelone atque Gilone* departs from his model, the Gilonic *Vita*, and substitutes the words *diuersas auri uncias* for the earlier biographer's *ducentas auri uncias*.

It is the higher figure, moreover, as reported by Hugo Monachus and Peter the Venerable, that receives strong corroboration from Hispano-Muslim numismatics. There can be no doubt whatever that the *aurei*, *mancales* or *mekalli* of the just cited Leonese-Castilian reales privilegios and chronicles were in fact Muslim gold dinars. Neither Fernando I, Alfonso VI nor their Leonese predecessors of the old line are known ever to have struck gold pieces, in spite of their imperial pretensions; the earliest such issue for either Leon or Castile was Alfonso VIII's morabetinus or maravedí of 1172.⁽²²⁹⁾ On the other hand, [38] both Fernando and his son received enormous annual parias in gold specie from their Taifa dependencies, which assured them a ready if not always reliable supply of the dinar or *mithgal* (literally, "weight") -- the terms were used interchangeably for the standard gold monetary unit of Al-Andalus.⁽²³⁰⁾ Equating 1000 *aurei-mancales* with 100 or 120 Carolingian ounces of 31.116 gr. yields a coin of 3.12 or 3.74 gr. respectively. The first of these however is unacceptable; Miles has established from numerous extant specimens that Cordobese caliphal dinars tend to weigh between 3.75 and 4.30 gr., or an average of 4.0 gr.⁽²³¹⁾ Very few of the Taifas issued whole dinars; of those that did, the Tujibid kings of Zaragoza between 1031/2 and 1036/7 struck coins of 3.87 and 3.02 gr., while Kings al-Mu'tadid and al-Mu'tamid of Seville between 1045/6 and 1073/4 minted dinars running between 3.22 and 4.51 gr., with most averaging 3.90 - 4.20 gr.⁽²³²⁾ Allowing for the presence of 'Abbasid pieces reaching Spain through trade and other channels, pieces that would fall somewhat below the ideal standard of 4.25 gr. fixed for the dinar by the Damascene caliph 'Abd al-Malik in 696 (A. H. 77), a haphazard collection of a thousand dinars in mid-11th-century Spain would almost certainly run closer to 120 ounces or more than to the lesser weight. Thus the numismatic evidence confirms for the Fernandine census the higher rate found in Hugo Monachus and Peter the Venerable. If the figure of 100 ounces is not simply the result of rounding off the true amount or of lack of exact information on Gilo's part, then the double tradition perhaps reflects the uncertainty that must have prevailed at Cluny due to the fact that the weight of the Spanish subsidy varied annually according to the fortuitous diversity of the coins included.

It is the tributary basis of the censive gold that also explains why at the Leonese-Castilian fisc, in contrast with Cluny, the annual charity was always measured by a fixed number of gold pieces despite

the fact that on both sides of the Pyrenees the medieval practice of weighing rather than counting large numbers of coins was normal -- the Hispano-Muslim *bi'l-wazanah*, the Christian *solidos pondere publice pensatos*.⁽²³³⁾ For this same enumerative handling of gold specie characterizes the assessment and collection of the parias of the Taifas, which are invariably described in terms of so many thousands of dinars-*mithqals*, as can be seen, for example, in the pages of King 'Abd-Allah of Granada's "Memoirs", the record of the Cid's lucrative financial receipts in the Levante, or the tribute pacts arranged between Kings Sancho of Navarre and al-Muqtadir of Zaragoza.⁽²³⁴⁾

Concerning the real value, economically speaking, of the census a few words need to be said, especially since Fernando I and, even more, Alfonso VI have been harshly judged by peninsular critics for their allegedly reckless despatch to Burgundy of so much good Spanish gold.⁽²³⁵⁾ At the present [1968] rate officially fixed by the International Monetary Fund at U.S. \$35 per ounce, 120 ounces of gold would run to \$4200, or somewhat higher on the free market; but this is of course no guide to the vastly greater purchasing power of the precious metal in medieval Europe. In Burgundy where, as Duby has emphasized, the closing decade of the 11th century saw commence a permanent reversal of the long-standing post-Carolingian gold shortage, the Fernandine *mancales*, which exceeded in amount Cluny's entire [39] domanial revenues from her increasing patrimonies, patently constitute an enormous sum, one that converts the abbey into a principal intermediary of the infusion of Muslim gold into the "circuit monétaire anémique de la France continentale".⁽²³⁶⁾ Here Fernando's grant must not only have richly achieved its express purpose, the clothing of Cluny's some 300 monks (*causa uestimentorum*) -- a major item of expense in the abbey's budget since all clothing was annually renewed⁽²³⁷⁾ -- but also left a substantial surplus in addition to releasing monastic funds for other needs. Generous as were the German empresses and emperors, their patronage never conferred upon the Cluniacs anything as ample as the truly imperial Hispanic stipend. It ranks as by far the largest gift Cluny had ever yet received from a king or other lay donor, one which was indeed never to be surpassed except by the *census duplicatus* of the same monarch's son, and only to be approached by the annual 100 marks of silver pledged in 1131 by King Henry I of England.⁽²³⁸⁾ There can then be no difficulty in understanding the abbey's henceforth incandescent gratitude to the Navarro-Basque dynasty, her determined efforts after Fernando I's death to ensure the subsidy's continuation, or the financial straits into which she fell whenever either the fortunes of the Reconquista or internal Leonese-Castilian causes interrupted the flow of peninsular specie.

In Spain however a different standard of economic values must be allowed for. Emiral Al-Andalus had seen a golden flood of dinars (or their equivalents) surging year after year into the Umayyad fisc (*khizanat al-mal*): a quarter-million under al-Hakam I (796-822), over a million under 'Abd al-Rahman II (822-352). In the time of the Caliph 'Abd al-Rahman III (912-961) revenues rose to a staggering 5,480,000 dinars, to say nothing of the 765,000 reaching his privy purse (*khassiyat bayt al-mal*).⁽²³⁹⁾ Although by the mid-11th century such huge sums belonged to an irretrievable past, there is abundant testimony from the history of the parias and other quarters to the still plentiful supplies of gold pieces held in the kingdoms of the Taifas. The massive injections of such metal in the form of tribute and booty into the simpler monetary system of the Christian North from the mid-nth-century on must have had sharp inflationary effects. These remain unstudied; but it is agreed that Fernando I and Alfonso VI were probably deterred from exercising the imperial prerogative of minting gold because of their large holdings of dinars.⁽²⁴⁰⁾

From various royal and private pergaminos it is possible to obtain comparative data for assessing the place of the census in the general economy. In 1043, for example, the ransom of certain Aragonese nobles from the Moors is set at 1000 gold *metcales* each.⁽²⁴¹⁾ In 1071 Alfonso VI, after ceding six *villas* and the monastery of Cisterna to his sister the Infanta Urraca, receives in exchange a shawl

(*adorra*) valued at 2000 *metcales de auro*.⁽²⁴²⁾ Count Gonzalo Salvadores, Preparing in 1082 to go off to fight against the infidel, assigns in his will a legacy of 1500 gold *metcales* to be given the abbey of San Salvador de Oña.⁽²⁴³⁾ Again, in 1118 we hear of 500 gold *metcales* as the price of redeeming the Aragonese noble Inigo Sanz de Laves from Moorish captivity,⁽²⁴⁴⁾ while Alfonso I of Aragon's carta de poblacion to Artsona in 1134 contains a legal penalty of *millem metcales de auro*.⁽²⁴⁵⁾ These and other examples that might be adduced show that [40] Fernando's thousand *aurei* represented a very generous charity -- indeed, if at this time, as certainly later under Alfonso VI, a major tributary paria ran to 10,000 dinars, the gift amounted to 10% of one of these paramount prizes of political and military exertion in the Reconquista. Royal, indeed imperial in amount, it was neither reprehensibly extravagant nor a threat to Leonese-Castilian fiscal liquidity, so long as -- and this reservation is fundamental - the erarium continued to receive the flow of annual dinars from the Taifas. It is only from 1086 on, as the Almoravids by degrees kill off the fabulous Andalusian geese, that Alfonso VI, Urraca and Alfonso VII will find it difficult, and before long impossible, to supply the promised golden eggs, and thus bring the Burgundian abbey to that state of extreme financial crisis for which Peter the Venerable and his wealthy friend and financial counsellor, the English bishop Henry of Winchester, labored in vain to discover a satisfactory solution.⁽²⁴⁶⁾

As for the actual transfer of the *mancales* from Spain to Burgundy, much is obscure. From the frequent appearance of Cluniac abbatial chamberlains in the Leonese Empire under Alfonso VI and Urraca, it can be deduced that this monastic financial officer travelled each year to the imperial court to receive the precious *aurei* or the charters of monastic cessions that substituted for them, and to carry these back to Burgundy, just as the agents of the Hispano-Christian princes were annually sent to the capitals of the Taifa tributaries to collect the parias.⁽²⁴⁷⁾ Perhaps a special ceremony was enacted with Fernando I and later his son Alfonso personally presenting the *mancales* to the chamberlain in much the fashion depicted in a miniature of the Catalan *Liber feudorum maior*, where we see Count Ramón Berenguer I of Barcelona, accompanied by his wife Almodis, counting out coins in the amount of 2000 ounces of gold to the Condes Guillem Ramón and Adelaide of Cerdaña, in return for cession of their feudal rights over Carcassonne (1067).⁽²⁴⁸⁾ Whether a fixed day was observed for the annual delivery, such as, conceivably, the Feast of SS Peter and Paul on 29 June, cannot be decided; neither Alfonso VI's nor Urraca's monastic cessions in lieu of the census reveal any chronological coincidences. At any rate, given the exigencies of trans-Pyrenean travel, a summer date must have been usual.⁽²⁴⁹⁾

It is vital to observe, however, that, despite frequent modern affirmations to the contrary, the medieval sources, whether Hispanic or Cluniac, never actually regard the census as booty taken out of Moorish spoils and sent to St. Peter's abbey in the fashion of the Gascon-Catalan expedition against al-Mujahid, as reported by Radulfus Glaber.⁽²⁵⁰⁾ On the contrary, they depict it as a gift made out of the king-emperor's own personal fortune or from his revenues or treasury. Alfonso VI's diploma of 1090 says his father's gold pieces were given *de sua temporalis habundantia* ; and again, *proprie dedit*.⁽²⁵¹⁾ The same vocable *proprie* occurs in Lucas of Tuy.⁽²⁵²⁾ In 1142 at Salamanca Alfonso VII, when initiating his own reduced stipend of 200 *morabotini* to Cluny out of the revenues of the royal baths at Burgos, declares that Fernando and Alfonso paid the census *de redditibus suis*.⁽²⁵³⁾ The Silense is of the opinion that the *mille aurei* were drawn *ex proprio erario*,⁽²⁵⁴⁾ and the same view is found in the Toledano: *de regio fisco*.⁽²⁵⁵⁾ We have then no simple direct dedication of Muslim booty to [41] the census, but a disbursement of funds deposited in the royal treasury. This is the reason, surely, why the Silense does not classify the Cluniac census among Fernando's allotments of captured treasure to the churches and monasteries of his kingdom, but places it in the non-Reconquista context of the king-emperor's benefactions to San Isidro de Leon and the sees of Oviedo and Santiago.⁽²⁵⁶⁾ It is here, after remarking

upon the numerous gifts made to pilgrims and to those Christians everywhere who live as *monachi*, *clerici uel mulieres dicatae*, and after recounting the story of how Fernando broke a glass wine crater at Sahagún and replaced it with his personal drinking vessel of gold, that the chronicler brings the list of royal generosity to a climax with the bestowal of the census upon the monks of Cluny.

What thus becomes plain is that Fernando's benefaction, intended as a henceforth permanent obligation of the Crown, could not have been based upon chance acquisitions of Saracen booty but involved a regular fiscal process of income and disbursement for the Leonese-Castilian fisc. This is in no sense to abandon the gold of Al-Andalus as the incontrovertible source of the *mancales*, for whatever other types of income the king-emperor enjoyed within his own domains, including the still poorly understood religious capitation tax (the Hispano-Christian counterpart of the Islamic *jizyah*) and parias imposed upon his Muslim and Jewish subjects, the overwhelming majority of these would have been collected at best in the form of silver, not the precious, sparsely distributed gold. It is then to the parias of the Taifas that we look for the funding of the Cluniac stipend; but this conclusion in turn poses a question which bears directly upon the unknown date and circumstances of the grant: were the *mille aurei* paid indiscriminately out of the total gold assets of the imperial fisc, or were they taken from the dinars constituting one particular paria?

In Christian Spain as elsewhere medieval usage dictated attachment of an annually recurring censive obligation to a specific source of royal *redditus* of similarly repetitive character. Numerous examples occur in the ecclesiastical donations of Fernando I and his successors. For El Magno himself might be cited his stipend to the Church of León of 500 *solidi* from the *census Judaeorum* of the imperial capital, [\(257\)](#) or the royal diezmo of San Esteban de Gormaz he promised in 1063 to the Castilian monastery of San Pedro de Arlanza. [\(258\)](#) Alfonso VII was to grant the Leonese see in 1135 a tenth of his rights in "moneta qui fit in ciuitate Legionis et de portatico et de zauazogado et de omni regali calumpnia", [\(259\)](#) This same sovereign's refunding of the census in 1142 involved a pledge to Cluny of 200 gold morabitanos out of the royal income from the baths of Burgos; [\(260\)](#) and this was supplemented ca. 1147-49 by an additional gift to the great priory of Santa María de Nájera of a tenth of the portazgo of Logroño, which was assigned -- just as with Fernando I's Burgundian census -- to the purchase of clothing for Cluny's Riojan monks. [\(261\)](#) In 1204 the will of Alfonso VIII of Castile, in addition to assigning the abbey of Cîteaux in Burgundy a legacy of 5000 morabetini, re-affirmed his previous grant of an annual 300 *morabetini* from the royal *redditus* of Toledo. [\(262\)](#) And in León in 1211 Alfonso IX similarly conceded the Cistercian mother house the sum of 300 maravedis a year from his [42] salinas at Villafáfila, these to take priority over those coming to the king himself. [\(263\)](#)

On these grounds it can plausibly be conjectured that, at least at the time of its inception, the census would not have been discharged from the general stock of gold pieces in the treasury but levied against a specific paria. None of the sources affirms this, and the evidence at best can only be circumstantial; but the possibility merits close examination. We can be confident that the solution must lie in the ten years after the battle of Atapuerca in September 1054. Efforts to place Fernando's concession to Cluny early in his reign on the basis of alleged filial obligation or a lost Odilonic epistle have no claim to acceptance, as we have seen. [\(264\)](#) Even scholars who, like Valous, seek to interpret the census as a share of Saracen spoils [\(265\)](#) are forced towards the terminal third of the reign when, after Garcia's elimination, Fernando I initiates his major campaigns to impose his hegemony over Christian and Muslim states alike. It is true that as early as 1043 the Leonese-Castilian monarch secured a considerable amount of dinars and other treasure from King al-Ma'mun of Toledo as a reward for saving that ruler from threatened defeat at the hands of Sulayman ibn-Hnd of Zaragoza. [\(266\)](#) But there is no sign that this resulted in Toletan acceptance of Leonese-Castilian suzerainty or regular discharge of tribute, obligations not imposed upon al-Ma'mun before his decisive defeat by Fernando I in 1062.

This does not mean that before Atapuerca, and as early as Hugh's election as abbot in 1049 and Galindus' visit of 1053, the king-emperor was not bestowing rich gifts upon the Burgundians; nor does it rule out others after 1054 in addition to the census. But it limits to the years 1055-1065 the period in which the annual subsidy could be granted. Within this decade there were three supreme moments of Leonese-Castilian political or military success over the Taifa principalities that could have been appropriate occasions for Fernando I's entry into the abbey's confraternity and bestowal of the *mille aurei*: his establishment of a protective alliance with al-Muqtadir of Zaragoza in 1058-1059; his victorious war of 1062 against al-Ma'mun of Toledo; and in 1063 his subjection of al-Mu'tadid of Sevilla to imperial vassalage. All three episodes entail the acquisition of lucrative tributary payments; and it is therefore to the alternative claims of each of these parias that we now direct our attention. ⁽²⁶⁷⁾

(i) 1058-1059: The Vetus Paria of Zaragoza and the Catalan-Navarrese Tithing Precedents. In a real privilegio of 1091 endowing the church of San Pedro de Castellar and issued at a time when he was besieging the city of Zaragoza, King Sancho Ramírez of Aragon distinguishes between the *noua paria* he expects to gain through victory over the Hudid kingdom and the *uetus paria* Zaragoza had long previously paid its Christian suzerains. ⁽²⁶⁸⁾ It is clearly this latter tribute that Fernando I, and for a time Sancho II and Alfonso VI, enjoyed, one that, as we know from the pacts between Sancho of Peñalén and al-Muqtadir, amounted by 1069 and 1073 to 12,000 dinars "de oro muy escogido", rendered in monthly installments, ⁽²⁶⁹⁾ although under Fernando it is perhaps more likely to have run to 10,000 dinars [43] paid annually. Certain cogent reasons point to this Zaragozaan *uetus paria* as the original basis for the Cluniac census.

The first of these is the Ebro kingdom's chronological priority among the three or four major Taifa tributaries of the reign. ⁽²⁷⁰⁾ Fernando's intervention in 1043 in the war between Kings al-Ma'mun of Toledo and al-Muqtadir of Zaragoza had brought him immediate compensation from Toledo but not creation of any tie of vassalic dependency. Similarly, the campaigns against al-Muzaffar of Badajoz which commence in 1057-1058, although undoubtedly seeking to impose political suzerainty and tributary obligations, never seem to have resulted, despite victories in the field, in reducing that powerful Taifa state to anything like continuing subjection, as the climactic war of 1064 with Fernando's advance to the Mondego and conquest of Coimbra demonstrates. ⁽²⁷¹⁾ But when in 1058 Fernando's attacks upon the domains of Hudid Zaragoza involve him in a prolonged with al-Muqtadir's Christian protector and current receiver of his tributary dinars, King Sancho Garces of Pamplona, a very different situation eventuates. ⁽²⁷²⁾ In the course of this war, following several Leonese-Castilian victories, the Muslim ruler abandons his dependency upon Navarre, switches his allegiance to the triumphant king-emperor, and by the same token directs toward Leon the Zaragozaan *uetus paria* of (probably) 10,000 dinars a year. Through this *volte face*, which can be placed in late 1058 or early 1059, Fernando gained control over the golden prize for which Eastern Hispano-Christian princes from Barcelona to Jaca and Pamplona had long been contending, among themselves almost as much as against al-Muqtadir. ⁽²⁷³⁾ For the first time in over two decades of rule he possessed the means by which he might, in pious gratitude to God for his success, dedicate, out of the new Moorish revenue he could expect henceforth to collect, an annual thousand dinars to the monks of Cluny.

This leads to a second persuasive reason for linking the *uetus paria* to the census: the long previous record of the fractioning of this tribute by Catalan and Navarrese rulers on behalf of leading ecclesiastical centers, which can be traced back to the practice, originating in Catalonia, of tithing the parias of the Taifas, like any other source of state income, to support episcopal sees and monasteries. ⁽²⁷⁴⁾ As early as 1047, when the youthful Count Armengol III of Urgel and his mother Constanza bestowed upon the Church of Urgel a tenth of all parias they were receiving or would in future acquire, ⁽²⁷⁵⁾ that of Zaragoza was almost certainly the principal one they had in mind, just as when some years

later in 1072 this same count made the Hudid tribute the basis of his pledge of an annual twelfth to the Seo. ⁽²⁷⁶⁾ In 1048 Count Ramón Berenguer I el Viejo and his first wife Isabel give one-half of a tenth, i.e., a twentieth, of their annual tribute from Zaragoza to the Church of Sant Pere de Vich. ⁽²⁷⁷⁾ Four years after this the same practice can be found in Navarre, in an expanded form that embraces both a royal paria and that paid by Mudéjares within the kingdom. For in 1052 King García el de Nájera, in the course of founding in the Rioja as his intended dynastic pantheon the abbey of Santa María de Nájera, and endowing the new house with numerous churches, monasteries, lands and other temporalities, declares also: "parie uero uel tributi mee terre uel illius que Deus [44] michi siue meis successoribus deinceps usque in eternum de terra Sarrazenorum dederit, do et confirmo dexam partem Sancte Marie". ⁽²⁷⁸⁾ At this time García possessed *de terra Sarrazenorum* -- in addition to the parias being paid him by his Mudejar subjects of Calahorra (which he had captured in 1045-1046) and elsewhere in his domains -- only a single Taifa tribute, that of Zaragoza; of this he had acquired a share, probably a half, just a few months before the act of 12 December, at the end of the war against al-Muqtadir won by him and his allies, Ramón Berenguer and King al-Muzaffar of Lerida. ⁽²⁷⁹⁾ It is furthermore possible that in or about 1052 the Navarrese ruler ordered a similar tithing of this same Zaragozaan tribute in the interest of the Church of Pamplona, for Sancho Ramírez, in his already cited privilegio to San Pedro de Castellar (1091), was to give this latter newly established center the same share of the *uetus paria* of Zaragoza as that formerly collected by the Pamplonese see. ⁽²⁸⁰⁾ No donation act for this concession is known; but since Sancho is clearly acting here in his Navarrese rather than Aragonese capacity, and placing San Pedro -- just to the north of besieged Zaragoza -- under the bishop of Pamplona, there must have been a now missing Navarrese real privilegio tithing the Zaragozaan paria to Pamplona. This could conceivably have been issued by Sancho of Peñalén, but is far more likely to be connected with his father García of Nájera and the original capture in 1052, for the first time in Navarrese history, of a large portion of the tributary dinars of al-Muqtadir. If from this latter year on, García was indeed dividing with Ramón Berenguer a Zaragozaan paria of ca. 10,000 dinars, and giving Nájera and Pamplona a tenth of his share of 5,000, he would thus have been assigning each church 500 dinars a year, or a total of 1000 gold pieces, precisely the amount his brother Fernando I, when he had succeeded as dynastic head and after he in turn had established a protectorate over the Ebro principality, was to bestow upon Cluny.

Other instances of royal tithing of the Zaragozaan paria, as well as those of the Mudéjares, occur in Aragon, and confirm how widespread a form of ecclesiastical charity this became subsequent to the suggested date of Fernando's benefaction. In the spring of 1063, on the eve of his ill-fated second campaign against the Zaragozaan border fortress of Graus, Ramiro I of Aragon promised the see of Jaca a third part of a tenth, i.e., a thirtieth, of all tribute he was then receiving or would in future years receive from the kingdoms of Zaragoza and Tudela. ⁽²⁸¹⁾ In later years his son Sancho Ramírez was to grant such fractions of parial revenues not only to churches within his domains but also to leading French monasteries with peninsular interests. Between 1086 and 1094 he gave to the abbey of Sauve-Majeure a tenth of the parias of the Moorish *villas* of Ejea and Pradilla; ⁽²⁸²⁾ in 1093 to Saint-Pons-de-Thomieres tenths of the parias of the *castros* of Villelas, Arguedas and Valtierra. ⁽²⁸³⁾ Sancho's tithing in 1091 of the Zaragozaan *uetus paria* we have just mentioned; about the same time he apparently also conceded the monastery of San Salvador de Leire an annual forty *solidi* from that identical tribute. ⁽²⁸⁴⁾

From the mid-eleventh century on, then, there existed in Catalonia, Navarre and Aragon a well-established pattern of the tithing of Muslim parias, external and internal, on behalf of churches and monasteries; [45] and this can be linked above all to the *uetus paria* of Zaragoza. No documented parallel to this practice is known for the Leonese-Castilian state, despite its eventual if at times unstable control over the parias of Zaragoza, Toledo, Seville, Badajoz and Granada; but when in late 1058 or

1059 Fernando I came into possession of the Zaragoza tribute he must have been aware of its traditional tithing for ecclesiastical purposes. That his lost real privilegio on the Cluniac census specifically assigned the abbey a tenth of al-Muqtadir's annual gold we can unhesitatingly rule out; that, on the other hand, his benefaction may have originated in his receipt of this paria's annual yield and its previous ecclesiastical fractioning is not only plausible, but indeed probable. If so, the *mille aurei* constituted no radical innovation, even in amount, in Hispanic royal eleemosynary custom, except for the fact that they were granted to a monastery which was across the Pyrenees, but clearly advancing in peninsular repute.

To these arguments from chronology and eastern Hispanic precedent may, perhaps be added a third from the early history of the monastery of Santa María de Nájera. This famous Riojan house has at times been quite wrongly regarded as Cluniac from its beginning in 1052;⁽²⁸⁵⁾ in fact, its founder García of Nájera was neither friend nor benefactor of Cluny and Santa Marie's Burgundian affiliation does not antedate Alfonso VI's cession of 1079.⁽²⁸⁶⁾ Nevertheless, just as the latter's choice of San Isidro de Dueñas for donation to Cluny in 1073 was no random matter but linked to his father's memory,⁽²⁸⁷⁾ so it is possible that this first Riojan transfer to Abbot Hugh and his monks had a background in the events of the preceding reign. García in his foundation act promised the house for himself and his successors⁽²⁸⁸⁾ a perpetual tithe, which possibly included 500 dinars from the Zaragoza tribute; presumably under Sancho of Peñalén this continued, despite Ramiro's attempt at Graus in 1055 just after Atapuerca to gain control of al-Muqtadir's paria⁽²⁸⁹⁾ until, probably in 1059, the prize passed to Fernando in the course of his Navarrese war. Fernando's associations with Santa María are only dimly discernible: with his *obtimates* he attended the foundation ceremony in 1052 and subscribed García's privilegio of 12 December;⁽²⁹⁰⁾ in 1056 he participated along with Ramiro I of Aragon and Sancho de Peñalén in the consecration of Nájera's abbey church on 29 June, the feast of SS Peter and Paul.⁽²⁹¹⁾ We can see that from the time of García's burial in this intended pantheon of the senior branch of Sancho el Mayor's dynasty, the house remained intimately associated with the tragic memories of Atapuerca. From 1054 on, the widowed Navarrese queen Estefanía and her children King Sancho Garcés and the Infante Ramiro appear in privilegios associated Santa María that reflect abiding devotion to the slain monarch; these the earliest, that of Estefanía herself, falls on 5 September, just four days after the fateful battle.⁽²⁹²⁾ This lends especial significance to the fact that it was on 3 September in 1079, close to his uncle's obit and three years after his conquest of the Rioja from Sancho Garcés, that Alfonso VI gave the abbey to Cluny in a charter whose conformation further emphasizes how strongly familial was this benefaction: in addition to three of García's children, Ramiro, Ermesinda and Jimena, Fernando I's daughters, the Infantas Urraca and [46] Elvira, were also present.⁽²⁹³⁾ Santa María's cession was doubtless due in part to Alfonso VI's aim to convert this shrine of pro-Pamplonese sentiment into a loyal Burgundian outpost that would promote his program of Leonization in the now imperial *Reichsland* of the Rioja. But should we not see here also a desire to free his conscience of an obligation, felt by his father and now directly resting upon himself as lord of the Rioja and of the Zaragoza paria, to erase his tithing obligation under García's act of 1052 by turning the monastery over to the same prestigious congregation upon which, two years before in 1077, he had bestowed the 2000 dinars of the *census duplicatus*? If so, one more link between Cluny and the *mithqals* of Hudid Zaragoza stands revealed.⁽²⁹⁴⁾

(ii) 1062: the Paria of Toledo and Imperial Neo-Gothicism. The emphatically imperial setting of the Cluniac alliance under Fernando I and Alfonso VI, the post-Atapuercan Neo-Gothicist revival centering around the queen-empress Sancha and the Leonese clergy and nobility, and Fernando's own manifest adoption of the imperial ideology as a means of consolidating the Navarro-Basque dynasty in the Leonese-Castilian union and over the Peninsula as a whole,⁽²⁹⁵⁾ all suggest the possibility that

conjunctio and census date from 1062, the year of the king-emperor's reduction to tributary vassalage for the first time of Toledo, the ancient capital of Visigothic Hispania. ⁽²⁹⁶⁾ The exalted sense of manifest destiny that appears after 1085 in Alfonso VI's proud titles -- *Toletani imperii rex et magnificus triumphator, totius imperii Hispaniae et Toletani regni Deo annuente victoriosissimus rex* , and the like ⁽²⁹⁷⁾ -- echo the deep-rooted Leonese veneration for the historic city, which Fernando must have shared and which could well have inspired him to mark his acquisition of al-Ma'mun's vassalage and tribute through an extraordinary gift of alms to the monks of Cluny. The fact that in his partition plan of December 1063/January 1064 El Magno is reported to have associated Toledo with Leon, assigning this one Taifa state in clientage to his second son Alfonso, along with the Leonese throne and the imperial title, ⁽²⁹⁸⁾ might indicate that he expected his perpetual census to Cluny to be paid henceforth out of the paria of the Tagus.

To corroborate such timing and motivation for the inauguration of the census, data have to be sought once again in the better documented reign of Alfonso VI, where two promising lines of inquiry can be pursued: the record of the actual discharge of Toledo's paria in the difficult years before 1085; and the troubles affecting payment of the *census duplicatus* between that date and the promulgation of the Burgalese pragmática of 1090.

We can probably believe that during the initial, purely Leonese, phase of Alfonso's long term of office, i.e., the five years between his father's death at the end of 1065 and his own deposition after Golpejera in early 1072, King al-Ma'mun continued to deliver the *mithqals* he had been paying Fernando I since 1062. ⁽²⁹⁹⁾ Whether in 1072, when the dethroned Alfonso was living in exile on the banks of the Tagus under al-Ma'mun's protection, the Taifa sovereign sent the annual gold to the victorious *rex-imperator* Sancho II, we do not know. In any case, after Alfonso's unexpected restoration in October of that [47] year, it is probable that the Toletan paria again came to the Leonese capital until 1075, when al-Ma'mun died of poisoning at the hand of his enemies. ⁽³⁰⁰⁾ In the chaotic decade between this political murder and Toledo's definitive surrender into Leonese-Castilian hands on 6 May 1085, all we can be sure of is that at irregular intervals Alfonso received substantial amounts of specie or treasure from the Tagan fisc. It is possible that no regular tribute whatever was paid between 1075 and 1079, for al-Ma'mun's successor al-Qadir at first aligned himself with the powerful bando responsible for his grandfather's death and bitterly opposed to recognition of any vassalic or tributary dependency upon the Hispanic king-emperor. ⁽³⁰¹⁾ But by 1079 King al-Mu'tamid of Sevilla's seizure of Cordoba, the siege of Cuenca by al-Muqtadir of Zaragoza's Christian ally King Sancho Ramírez of Aragon, and Alfonso VI's menacing approach to the frontiers of the Toletan kingdom, had driven al-Qadir to accept once more Leonese-Castilian suzerainty and protection, unquestionably at a heavy price in treasure. ⁽³⁰²⁾ Indeed, Toledo's return to imperial vassalage may have occurred even earlier, in 1076 or the beginning of 1077; if so, we might find in the resumption of Toletan gold at this point the eleemosynary impulse -- as distinct from Alfonso's anti-papal imperialism -- underlying the sudden revival and doubling of the Fernandine census to Cluny on 10 July 1077. Certainly the striking departure in this year from the policy of compensating Cluny in the form of Leonese monastic cessions, which commence with San Isidro de Dueñas on 29 December 1073 and terminate abruptly with San Juan de Hermédes de Cerrato on 22 May 1077, to be followed only seven weeks later by the announcement on 10 July of the *census duplicatus*, ⁽³⁰³⁾ points to Alfonso's receipt of some large quantity of Muslim gold as well as to his confidence in its future repetition. This is not the only possible explanation of how the doubled census may have been funded, since it was probably in 1075 that the king-emperor also collected from the Zirid ruler of Granada, 'Abd-Allah, a huge tributary payment of 30,000 *mithqals* , an event to which we shall presently return. ⁽³⁰⁴⁾ But the picture soon changes in any case: the years 1080-1081, which witnessed al-Qadir's flight from his capital, the city's occupation by King al-Mutawakkil of Badajoz in

league with the local anti-Alfonsine intransigents, and Alfonso VI's subsequent restoration of al-Qadir, all entailed disruption of regular tributary payments, however dearly al-Ma'mun's grandson paid for his reinstatement.⁽³⁰⁵⁾ Finally, between 1082 and 1085, with Leonese-Castilian armies invading the reino and desperate civil struggles within Toledo itself, there must have been a complete breakdown of tributary gold delivery. Above all, in 1085, after six years of encroachment and intervention, Alfonso VI's occupation of the capital and the entire territory of the Tagan principality meant the permanent extinction of its paria as a source of revenue.

Precisely what effect upon the Cluniac census these years of bloody struggle over Toledo may have exerted, we have no sure way of determining. but for the quinquennium immediately succeeding Alfonso VI's victory there survives important explicit testimony of a prolonged suspension of the delivery of the duo *millia mancales* to the Burgundian abbey. This is the epistle which Alfonso addressed to Abbot Hugh in connection with his despatch to Burgundy of the sum of [48] 10,000 *talenta*, i.e., dinars, and which is usually dated ca. 1088 or in 1088-1090.⁽³⁰⁶⁾ This text has been identified as an official announcement of a huge royal thank-offering out of the spoils of captured Toledo assigned to the building of the new abbey-church at Cluny,⁽³⁰⁷⁾ but this is most unlikely and the letter requires closer scrutiny of its timing and historically significant content than it has yet received.⁽³⁰⁸⁾ Its most visible, unquestionably paramount, purpose is to exculpate its writer for delinquency in meeting a financial obligation to the abbot. This can only refer to the annual census. Alfonso also promises to contribute towards construction of Hugh's great new church (now styled Cluny III), but such aid is only to materialize in the future, after pacification of the *Yspanie urbes*.⁽³⁰⁹⁾ In the meantime he is sending 10,000 dinars by Seguin, patently the abbatial chamberlain Hugh had sent to Spain. Thus the *decem milia talentorum* must be seen not as an inexplicable new benefaction for the building program at Cluny, but as the arrears of the imperial subsidy, which had been accumulating at the rate of 2000 dinars a year over a period of five years. It is this prolonged non-payment of the *census duplicatus* which explains Alfonso's profoundly apologetic tone, his allusion to the abbot's (now lost) letter of stern reprimand (*salutaria monita*),⁽³¹⁰⁾ his plea for Hugh's and his monks' prayers, and his assurance that the gold is being sent to Burgundy in the care of Seguin, Hugh's chamberlain.

As for the epistle's date, this clearly falls prior to Hugh's journey to Burgos and the Easter diploma of 1090, since Alfonso says he has never yet seen the Cluniac abbot; and the reference to the archbishop, i.e., Bernard of Toledo, throws it after December 1086.⁽³¹¹⁾ Within these *termini* the year 1089 has by far the strongest claim, since it was very probably in the course of this year that the Leonese-Castilian monarch, after some years of financial straits, came into possession of the large supply of dinars from which the *decem milia talentorum* must have been taken. From the "Memoirs" of 'Abd-Allah of Granada we know that probably in 1089 the Taifa ruler paid the Leonese-Castilian king-emperor, as once before in 1075, the immense sum of 30,000 *mithqals*, this time in order to secure a protective alliance against the Almoravid sultan Yusuf ibn-Tashfin, then preparing for his third armed entrada into Al-Andalus.⁽³¹²⁾ There can be little question that it was this unexpected bonanza that enabled Alfonso VI to clear his account by sending to Cluny from his replenished fisc -- with a sense of relief fully apparent in his message to Hugh -- a full third of the Zirid gold to satisfy his quinquennial obligation. It is even possible that at some point the chamberlain, fearful of conducting so valuable a treasure across the Pyrenees, left the gold (at the priory of Santa Coloma de Burgos or of Nájera?) and went on to Cluny to urge a Spanish visit on his abbot. Although the latter's visit to Burgos is usually set just before the April 1090 issuance of Alfonso's *pragmatica* on the census, this document does not indicate just when the meeting had taken place. A winter crossing of the mountains for a spring rendezvous would be, if not impossible, unusual; but perhaps the abbot came by the easier route via Catalonia in the company of the papal legate Cardinal Rainerius, who was apparently in the vicinity of Narbonne about

the time of the issuance of Urban II's two bulls [49] of 28 December 1089 instructing him to judge two ecclesiastical suits in this area and by March 1090 can be found presiding over the Council of León.- (313) Alfonso VI seems to have attended this council shortly before travelling to Burgos for the promulgation of his Easter (21 April) *pragmatica* on Hugh's visit and the census. We know that Hugh returned from Spain laden with *gazae innumerales*, (314) and these may well have been, unless they were the promised contribution to the building fund, the 10,000 dinars of 'Abd-Allah .

For the hypothesis of a Toletan origin of the Fernandine census, the crucial bearing of all this is, that if we go back in this context five years previous to 1089, including that year in our computation, we arrive at 1085 as the commencement of the caesura in Alfonso VI's censive payments. This rules out the otherwise easy deduction that it was simply the disaster of Zalaka (1086) and the imminence of an Almoravid offensive that forced the Leonese-Castilian ruler to husband all his resources and deprived the abbey of her customary Spanish gold. Rather it suggests that it was the Christian conquest of Toledo, which the king-emperor (although obviously not the Burgundian abbot) might regard as entailing the permanent disappearance of the Toletan *paria* and thus of the tribute from the imperial Gothic city that had previously provided the dinars of the *census duplicatus* , that lies back of the interruption in payment and evokes Hugh's deep concern. This in turn might seem to imply a long-standing connection between census and Toletan *paria* dating from the stipend's first institution in the reign of Fernando I, presumably in 1062.

Yet the objections to such a Toletan formula, under which Fernando I would have commenced his census in 1062 and paid it at most four times before his death, are formidable. So distinctive a basis of payment as the *paria* of imperial Toledo would hardly have been kept secret, yet no notice, Hispanic or Cluniac, hints at it. Prof. Grassotti reveals doubt regarding the reliability of the passage in the *Chronicon Compostellanum* recording the terms of Fernando's partition scheme, (315) which might place in question the assignment of Toledo to Alfonso VI; but the letter's finding asylum in 1072 with al-Ma'mun favors the chronicler's accuracy on this point. More conclusive are the two Granadan bounties of 30,000 dinars each in 1075 and 1089, the one followed within two years by the doubling of the census, the other by the paying off at one stroke of the total due for five years. These do not supply a specifically Granadan key to the census; what they prove is that Alfonso was not depending upon Toletan gold but willing to draw upon any available source of tributary income to meet his confraternal obligations to Cluny. The fact is that the king-emperor's situation as regards the receipt of the *parias* must have been difficult well before 1085; in addition to the collapse of Toletan tributary vassalage from at least 1083, there was the breakdown from before 1081 of the Zaragoza *paria* and the drying up, after much Regularity in payment, of that of Sevilla by 1086 at the latest, perhaps before. (316) Behind the collapse then of the Alfonsine census must lie the termination not only of the Toletan but of all the *parias*, the tapering-off of that golden phlebotomy which ever since Fernando's Navarrese war of 1058-1059 had transfused the lifeblood of the *Tafias* into the erarium of the Leonese-Castilian state. Perhaps when, [50] in 1090 after his conference with Abbot Hugh, Alfonso VI with the consent of his queen, prelates and magnates solemnly re-affirmed at Burgos the perpetual obligation of the *census duplicatus* , he could still hope for other windfalls like that of 'Abd-Allah the year before; and not too much can be predicated upon the fact that we hear no more about the census in the remaining nineteen obscure years of the reign. (317) Nevertheless, in the clash between the two Empires, Hispanic and Afro-Almoravid, Cluny's Muslim gold seems to have been an early casualty.

(iii) 1063: The Paria of Seville and the Argument from the Council of Jaca. The case for associating the Fernandine census with the Taifa kingdom of Sevilla and the summer campaign of 1063 against its ruler al-Mu'tadid ibn-'Abbad (318) does not require proving a direct link. It would suffice to establish that at this point the king-emperor, in possession of at least the three great *parias* of Zaragoza,

Toledo and Seville, and perhaps also that of Badajoz, and thus expecting that some 30,000 or more dinars a year would flood into the imperial fisc, was moved to share his good fortune with his venerated Burgundian friends of some ten years' standing. It is worth observing that the Silense presents the notice of the Cluniac stipend in a passage coming after his account of the two most notable events of 1063, the victory over al-Mu'tadid and the translation of St Isidore of Seville's body to León, and immediately preceding the story of the Zaragoza and Valencian campaigns of 1065. ⁽³¹⁹⁾ It might also be contended that among the reasons for Alfonso VI's failure to continue his father's annual benefaction in the first years of his reign was its comparative novelty, the lack of time for the commitment to become rooted. To be sure, so late a date as 1063 might seem to contradict Alfonso's own statements in his privileges of 1077 and 1090 that the payment was customary under his father, that the latter throughout the remainder of his life scrupulously maintained the confraternal bond (*fidelissime quoad uixit retinuit*), and that the entry into *societas* followed soon after (*mox*) the *coropertio* of Cluny, an event which, as we have seen, belongs ca. 1053. But against this it can be urged that such assertions, rhetorical in tone and panegyric in purpose, should not be pressed too far in the interests of historical exactness.

Such reasoning is however readily impugnable. The order of narrative in the Silense seems a natural transition from El Magno's prime role in the Isidorian translation and from a brief summary of his partition plan for the Empire, to a eulogy of his past gifts to religion at Oviedo, Santiago, Sahagún and Cluny, without necessarily any intention of imposing so narrow a chronological limit as 1063-1065. The two Alfonsine diplomas, in the second of which we discern the hand of Cluny, bear the stamp of truth; neither they nor the series of extant notices attesting the affectionate ties between abbey and king-emperor can rightly be denied their witness to a long established eleemosynary friendship.

It is equally fruitless to seek some connection between the census and the climactic religious event of the king-emperor's final imperial decade, the translation to the Leonese capital of the remains **[51]** of St Isidore of Sevilla, which was an unanticipated by-product of the defeat of al-Mu'tadid. ⁽³²⁰⁾ Through the surviving acts of translation, as well as from the Silense who incorporates these into his text, we know something of the mood of high religious exaltation created by this latest military victory over the infidel, and its sequel -- the Muslim surrender of the body, its transport with pomp and solemnity from the banks of the Guadalquivir to those of the Bernesga, its deposit in the rebuilt, re-dedicated basilica henceforth known as San Isidro de León. ⁽³²¹⁾ In such a context an extraordinary act of pious generosity towards the monks of Cluny would be natural enough; and such a solution would be especially attractive if any influence of the Catalan monks of San Isidro de Dueñas could be detected in the whole affair, particularly in view of the connections of this reformist house of the Tierra de Campos with the king-emperor, D. Sancha, Bishop Bernard II of Palencia, and Frater Galindus of Cluny. But fatal to any such hypothesis, in addition to the absolute lack of evidence of Campestrian inspiration or intervention, is the ineluctable fact that the St Isidore who was patron of Dueñas was not the Baetic metropolitan of Visigothic fame, but the 3rd-century Greek martyr of Chios, whose cult was of severely limited popularity in the Leonese-Castilian Church. ⁽³²²⁾ Dueñas owed her distinctly Byzantine dedication to the abbey's Mozarabic refugee founders of the early 10th century; and it is certain from Yepes that as late as the 17th century the monks were still fully conscious of the true identity of their patron, commemorating his feast on 14 May according to the Byzantine menologium, not on 4 April, the anniversary of the Hispalensian prelate. ⁽³²³⁾ There can be then no suspicion of Franco-Catalan influence: Fernando's Isidorian enthusiasm, culminating in his choice of San Isidro de León for his last days, was a purely Leonese and imperialist phenomenon, exclusively explicable in the context of the Gothicist traditionalism of the Leonese Church.

Yet the claims of the year 1063, and a connection with the paria of Sevilla, would be quite strong if we could accept a hypothesis offered in 1935 by Carl Erdmann in the Excursus on Gregory VII as feudal

overlord of Aragon which is appended to his well-known *Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedankens*.⁽³²⁴⁾ Here a *terminus post quem* is proposed on the grounds that the Fernandine census was pledged subsequent to a council of the Aragonese Church held at Jaca in the spring of that year. Erdmann's argument centers about the undated bull *Apostolica sedes* addressed to Bishop García of Jaca and probably issued in 1084-1085, in which Gregory VII praises King Ramiro I of Aragon for being the first ruler in Spain to have made himself and his kingdom tributary to St Peter: *beato clauigero Petro se et regnum suum prius in Ispaniam tributarium fecit*; and also for having established the Roman Rite in his domains in place of the *Toletanae illusionis superstitio*.⁽³²⁵⁾ The tributary reference would indicate that the pope had knowledge of a Ramiran subsidy offered to the Apostle prior to Fernando I's census to St Peter at Cluny; and this must mean the Aragonese monarch's promise, made to the cathedral Church of St Peter at Jaca a few weeks before his death at Graus on 3 May 1063, of an annual tenth of all royal revenues collected from his Christian and Moorish *tributarii*.⁽³²⁶⁾ Therefore, Fernando I's institution of the Cluniac [52] stipend can be placed after this donation in the spring of 1063 and thus within the two and one-half years before the king-emperor's death in December 1065.

Erdmann's theory, it is necessary to recall, arises out of his partial disagreement with the exegesis of *Apostolica sedes* found in Paul Kehr's classic monograph of 1928 on the date and manner of Aragon's original subordination to papal feudal suzerainty.⁽³²⁷⁾ Here Kehr makes clear that the two accomplishments the bull ascribes to Ramiro -- the initiation of Petrine vassalage and the introduction into Aragon of the Roman Rite -- were in truth the work of Ramiro's son, Sancho Ramírez, in 1068 and 1071, respectively. He explains that this surprising confusion on the part of pope and Curia was due to Bishop García of Jaca, who, in seeking to block his brother King Sancho's plans to substitute Roda for Jaca as the ecclesiastical capital of the Pyrenean kingdom, misled the pope into believing that Ramiro's tenth of 1063 was really made not to San Pedro de Jaca but to San Pedro de Roma; hence Gregory could rightly regard the king as *beato clauigero Petro tributarius*.⁽³²⁸⁾

Erdmann in contrast prefers to assume that Gregory was not deceived; the pope, fully conscious that Ramiro paid tribute only to San Pedro de Jaca, seized upon the opportunity to praise the Aragonese monarch as the Apostle's first royal tributary in Spain in order to criticize by implication the close friendship and financial link between the Leonese-Castilian kings Fernando I and Alfonso VI and San Pedro de Cluny. This Gregory did because of what Erdmann, following Schmid, sees as his "ausgesprochen clunyfeindliche Politik" below the Pyrenees -- his strong disapproval of how the abbey in 1077-1080 impeded acceptance of the Roman Rite in Leon and Castile and was shielding Alfonso VI (since 1077) against the pope's claims to feudal suzerainty over the entire Peninsula. To praise Ramiro's priority of Petrine tributary benefaction even if only to Jaca, was to express implied disapproval of Fernando's later donation of the Cluniac census.⁽³²⁹⁾

Erdmann's thesis, however, fails to carry conviction, as he himself partly acknowledges.⁽³³⁰⁾ For one thing, we cannot tell whether Gregory VII really knew the exact date of the inauguration of the Fernandine census to Cluny. It is difficult to believe that the pope would equate a donation of a tenth to Jaca with the authentic feudal subordination to Rome of the various rulers who, like Sancho Ramirez himself from 1068, received the *tuitio sancti Petri*; on this premise he should have assigned the honor of prius in Ispaniam to Count Ramón Berenguer I, who as early as 1048 bestowed a twentieth of the paria of Zaragoza upon the canons of Sant Pere de Vich.⁽³³¹⁾ As for the papal quarrel with Cluny, this by 1084-1085 was well in the past, making oblique criticism of the Leonese-Castilian alliance with the abbey as gratuitous as it is unlikely. The natural explanation, as Kehr states,⁽³³²⁾ which may be inferred from the bull's references to Ramiro as living some twenty years after his death, to the Roman Rite, and to the Petrine tributary vassalage, is a simple confusion of father and son. Erdmann avoids this solution because of his belief (shared by Kehr) that at the time *Apostolica sedes* was issued in 1084-1085

Sancho, although indubitably a papal vassal, could not be described [53] as a tributary, since it was not until 1088 or 1089 after his defeat of the Moors at Monzón that he promised to pay the Holy See henceforth an annual pension of 500 gold mancuses *Iaccensis monete* and each of his nobles likewise pledged one mancuso a year.⁽³³³⁾ But Pope Alexander II's three bulls of 18 October 1071 regarding the subordination *in tutelam et singulare patrocinium sanctae Romanae ecclesiae* of Aragonese reales monasterios (San Juan de la Peña, San Pedro de Loarre, San Victorián), each with the annual obligation of an ounce or half ounce of gold,⁽³³⁴⁾ show that even before the start of Gregory VII's pontificate Sancho Ramírez was in effect instituting an indirect *Romzins*, a census of the nominal amount normally found in 11th-century cases of rulers feudally linked to the papacy. With Aragonese gold reaching the Apostolic Camera "Ramiro", i.e., Sancho Ramírez, was in truth a Petrine tributary well before Monzón and in 1084-1085 could properly be said by the pope to enjoy priority, not over Fernando I's *conjunctio* with Cluny (which was not in the pope's mind at all) but as the first peninsular ruler so to place himself under the suzerainty of the Roman Church. For all these reasons we must abandon Erdmann's strained effort to find a Gregorian attack upon Cluny and her Fernandine subsidy in *Apostolica sedes*; this bull is of no utility whatever for fixing the *terminus post quem* of the Cluniac census in 1063 or 1063-1065.

The claims of the year 1063, however, cannot yet be dismissed. This is the year not alone of the victory over al-Mutadid of Seville but also of events in Aragon and Catalonia lying behind that major international intervention in the Reconquista often styled the Crusade of Barbastro. Historians generally treat this enterprise as originating in a partnership of Aragon and the papacy against Spanish Islam; but it patently represents also a direct threat to the imperial Hispanic program of Fernando I's final decade, the federation under Leonese-Castilian hegemony of at least the former domains of Sancho el Mayor and of the Taifa tributaries. Should we then identify as the basic factor driving the king-emperor into closer, quasi-political *conjunctio* with Abbot Hugh his sudden pressing need for a powerful counterweight to a new, potentially dangerous, Aragonese-papal coalition? or was the confraternalcensive bond already forged and operative by the years 1063-1064 when Leonese-Castilian imperialism confronted its most serious challenge prior to the advent of the Almoravids? In either case, it is imperative to assess the bearing of the war against Barbastro upon the chronology and character of Fernandine-Cluniac relations.

Notes for Study Two

1. On Cluny's lion, see Kenneth J. Conant, *Cluny, 1077-1088*, in *Mélanges offerts à René Crozet*, ed. P. Gallais (Poitiers, 1966), I, p. 343
2. For Hispano-Cluniac relations in this epoch, see Justo Pérez de Urbel, *Los monjes españoles en la Edad Media* (Madrid, 1933-1934), II, 395-435; Philibert Schmitz, *Histoire de l'Ordre de saint Benoît*. 2nd ed. (Maredsous, 1948), I, 238-246; idem, "Benedictin (Ordre)," in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques* [DHGE], VII, (Paris, 1934), cols. 1081-1083; Guy de Valous, "Cluny (Abbaye et Ordre de)," *ibid.*, XIII (1956), cols. 144-149; Avelino de Jesus da Costa, "A Ordem de Cluny em Portugal," *Cénaculo*, IV (1948), 5-40; also, separately, Braga, 1948); Marcelin Defourneaux, *Les français en Espagne aux XIe et XIIe siècles* (Paris, 1949), pp. 17-49; Maur Cocheril, *Études sur le monachisme en Espagne et au Portugal* (Lisbon, 1966), pp. 85-124. The scattered notices of Antonio de Yepes, *Corónica general de la Orden de San Benito* (Irache, 1609-1621), IV, 325-326, 329-330 (sections unfortunately omitted in the abridged edition of J. Perez de Urbel in *Biblioteca de autores españoles*, Madrid, 1960, tomes 123-125), and IV-VII, *passim*, remain basic.
3. Cf. Ramón Menéndez Pidal, *La España del Cid*, 4th ed. (Madrid, 1947), I, 165-176, who is however

unduly skeptical regarding Cluny's role (p. 175, n. 4); C. J. Bishko, "Liturgical Intercession at Cluny for the King-Emperors of Leon," *Studia monastica*, III (1961), 61-62, 65-66.

4. Pierre David, *Études historiques sur la Galice et le Portugal du VI^e au XII^e siècle* (Lisbon-Paris, 1947) pp. 351-354, 373-376; but this episode requires further study of the responsibility of the papal legate Gerald of Ostia, former *prior maior* of Cluny, and of the abbot for the collapse of this enterprise at a time when Alfonso VI was renewing the Leonese-Castilian alliance with Cluny.

5. David, *op.cit.*, pp. 388-390; Defourneaux, *op. cit.*, 22-23.

6. Prosper Boissonnade, *Du nouveau sur la Chanson de Roland* (Paris, 1923), pp. 32-35; Damiao Peres, *Como nasceu Portugal* (Barcelos, 1938), pp. 41-44; Defourneaux, pp. 195-197; Jean Richard, "Etablissements bourguignons en terre de croisade," *Annales de Bourgogne*, XXII (1950), 48-54.

7. P. David, "Grégoire VII, Cluny et Alphonse VI," *Études historiques* pp. 341-439, where he refutes the many traditional errors concerning this episode still found, e.g., in Menéndez Pidal, *España del Cid*, I, 227-251; L. García de Valdeavellano, *Historia de España*, 2nd ed. (Madrid, 1955), I, 2, pp. 346-347.

8. P. David, "Le pacte successoral entre Raymond de Galice et Henri de Portugal," *Bulletin hispanique*, L (1948), 275-290; Luiz Gonzaga de Azevedo, *História de Portugal* (Lisbon. 1935-1942), III, 171-176; Ruy de Azevedo, "Data crítica do convénio entre os Condes Raimundo da Galiza e Henrique de Portugal," *Revista portuguesa de historia*. III (1947), 539-552.

9. David, *Études*, p. 454, n. 4; C. J. Bishko, "The Cluniac Priories of Galicia and Portugal: Their Acquisition and Administration, 1075-ca. 1230," *Studia monastica*, VII (1965), 322-324.

10. C. J. Bishko, "The Spanish Journey of Abbot Ponce of Cluny," *Ricerche di storia religiosa*, I (1957), 311-319; *idem*, *Cluniac Priories*, pp. 322-324.

11. Gilonis Vita s. Hugonis, ed. A. L'Huillier, *Vie de Saint Hugues abbé de Cluny. 1024-1109* (Solesmes, 1888), p. 584. The same term reappears in the *Epitome vitae ab Ezelone atque Gil one*, Migne PL, CLIX, col 912.

12. E.g., Ernst Sackur, *Die Cluniacenser in ihrer kirchlichen und allgemeinesgeschichtlichen Wirksamkeit bis zur Mitte des elften Jahrhunderts* (Halle an der Saale, 1892; reprinted, Darmstadt, 1965), II, 101-113; Defourneaux, *Français en Espagne*, pp. 19-21. Jacques Hourlier, *Saint Odilon, abbé de Cluny* (Louvain, 1964), is of very limited value on Spanish topics.

13. E.g., in exaggerated form, Guy de Valous, "Les monastères et la pénétration française en Espagne du XI^e au XIII^e siècle," *Revue Mabillon*, XXX (1940), 77-97; for more balanced interpretation, primarily in terms of monastic reformism, cf. David, *Études*, pp. 362-363; Claudio Sanchez Albornoz, *España, un enigma histórico*, 2nd ed. (Buenos Aires, 1962), I, 253, 280-282.

14. This attitude, absent from Yepes, finds bitter expression all the way from Juan Francisco Masdeu's late 18th-century reaction to current *afrancesamiento* in his *Historia crítica de España*, XIII (Madrid, 1794), 351-355, where he speaks of the Cluniac reform in Spain as "el principio de la depravacion francesa . . . con el título aparente de reformadores de nuestros Monasteries, pero con el fin verdadero de dominar en ellos"; down to Américo Castro, *La realidad histórica de España*, 2nd ed. (Mexico, 1962), p. 373: "... las consecuencias mas importantes de la venida de Cluny fueron tristamente politicas ... Los designios franceses, en lo que a su esquema, eran en 1100 análogos a los de 1800; el Napoleón de entonces era el abad de abades, Hugo de Cluny".

15. To the older accounts by Sackur, *Cluniacenser*, II, 101-113, J. Pérez de Urbel, *Sancho el Mayor de Navarra* (Madrid, 1950), pp. 297-321, and Paul Kehr, "El Papado y los reinos de Navarra y Aragón hasta mediados del siglo XII," *Estudios de Edad Media de la Corona de Aragón* [EEMCA], II (1946),

81-87, should now be added H. E. J. Cowdrey, *The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform* (Oxford, 1970), pp. 214-219; José María Lacarra, *Historia política del Reino de Navarra desde sus orígenes hasta su incorporación a Castilla* (Pamplona, 1972-73), I, 176-177, 218-222, 243-245; Antonio Linage Conde, *Los orígenes del monacato benedictino en la Península Iberica* (Leon, 1973), II, 863-927; Peter Segl, *Königtum und Klosterreform in Spanien* (Kallmünz, 1974), pp. 32-46.

16. Pérez de Urbel, *Sancho el Mayor*, pp. 314-316; Antonio Durán Gudiol, *La Iglesia de Aragón durante los reinados de Sancho Ramírez y Pedro I* (1062?-1104) (Roma, 1962), pp. 10-12, 26-29, 126-133. Duran attacks traditional errors making San Juan a Burgundian dependency from el Mayor's time on -- something it never became -- but his contentions that this abbey did not yet exist in 1025, that the Cluniacs first arrived there only in 1071 under Sancho Ramírez, and that all (rather than some) of the pergaminos relating to the reformist group in 1025 are suspect, fail to dispose of the Odilonic epistle or of the references in authentic charters of Peña in the 1040's to an abbot called Paterno Minor. Cf. Antonio Ubieto Arteta, *Cartulario de San Juan de la Peña* (Valencia, 1962-1963), II, nos. 76 (p. 41), 82 (p. 55), 92 (p. 69).

17. On Cluny and its often unsympathetic attitude towards certain Gregorian objectives, see Augustin Fliche, *La réforme grégorienne* (Louvain, 1924-1937), I, 39-60; Gerd Tellenbach, *Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest* (Oxford, 1940), chapter 4 and Appendix V; Kassius Hallinger, "Progressi e problemi della ricerca sulla riforma pre-gregoriana," in *Il monachesimo nell'alto medioevo e la formazione della civiltà occidentale* (Spoleto, 1957; Settimane di studio del Centre italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, IV), pp. 257-291, 472-481; Norman F. Cantor, "The Crisis of Western Monasticism, 1050-1130," *American Historical Review*, LXVI (1960-1961), 47-67. Cluniac spirituality in the period is discussed by Jean Leclercq, "Pour une histoire de la vie à Cluny," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, LVII (1962), 385-408, 783-812. On Cluny's alleged sponsorship of the Reconquista as a crusade, the older extreme views of P. Boissonnade, *Du nouveau sur la Chanson de Roland* (Paris, 1923), pp. 11-12, and others of his school, such as Paul Alphandéry, *La Chrétienté et l'idée de Croisade* (Paris, 1954-1959), I, 28, and Defourneaux, *Français en Espagne*, p. 131, have been rejected or revised by A. Fliche, *L'europe occidentale de 888 à 1125* (Paris, 1930), pp. 551-553; Carl Erdmann, *Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedankens* (Stuttgart, 1935; reprinted 1955), pp. 60-64; Eng. trans., *The Origins of the Idea of Crusade* (Princeton, 1977), pp. 68-72, with editorial comment by Marshall Baldwin, p. 68, n. 28; p. 72, no. 37; David, *Études*, pp. 367-370; E. Delaruelle, "L'idée de croisade dans la littérature clunisienne du XI^e siècle et l'abbaye de Moissac," in *Moissac et occident au XI^e siècle* (Toulouse, 1964), pp. 95-116 (also *Annales du Midi*, LXXV (1963), 419-440). See further the recent vigorous defense of papal-Cluniac reformist collaboration in general, and with specific attention to Spain at pp. 215-247, in H. E. J. Cowdrey, *The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform*; and the same writer's "Cluny and the First Crusade," *Rev. Bénédictine*, LXXXIII (1973), 285-311.

18. On the first wave of Carolingian Benedictinism to reach Navarre and the Rioja, cf. C. J. Bishko, "Salvus of Albelda and Frontier Monasticism in Tenth-Century Navarre," *Speculum*, XXIII (1948), 559-590; for the second, primarily Catalan, movement of the later 10th and early 11th centuries, cf. Ramón d'Abadal i de Vinyals, "L'esperit de Cluny i les relacions de Catalunya amb Roma i la Italia en el segle X," *Studi medievali*, 3rd series, II (1961), 3-41; A. Mundó, "Moissac, Cluny et les mouvements monastiques de l'Est des Pyrénées du Xe au XII^e siècle," in *Moissac et l'Occident*, pp. 229-251; Archibald R. Lewis, *The Development of Southern French and Catalan Society, 718-1050* (Austin, Texas, 1965), pp. 242-260, 315-336.

19. On Sancho's indebtedness to Oliva, neither Anselm M. Albareda, *L'abat Oliva fundador de Montserrat, 971?-1046* (Montserrat, 1931), nor R. d'Abadal, *L'abat Oliva, bisbe de Vici, i la seva època* (Barcelona, 1948), is of help; but see Pérez de Urbel, *Sancho el Mayor*, pp. 81-82. For Poncio, cf. note 58, *infra*; and on Sancho and Odilo, Pérez de Urbel, pp. 297 ff.

20. Radulfus Glaber, *Historiae*, III, 12, ed. M. Prou, *Raoul Glaber, Les cinq livres de ses histoires* (Paris, 1886), pp. 61-62; PL, CXLII, cols. 650-651. On the Spanish monks at Cluny, and their advent at Pena, Pérez de Urbel, op. cit., pp. 303-309.
21. Odilo, Epistula III: "ex indissolubil i familiaritate et societate qua olim patri uestro probamur copulati . . .", ed. Luc d'Achery, *Spicilegium*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1723), III, 381; PL, CXLII, col. 942.
22. Jotsaldus, *De uita et uirtutibus s. Odilonis abbatis*, I, 7; "Quid etiam Stephanus rex Hungrorum siue Sancius rex Hesperidum populorum, qui quamuis eum praesentialiter non uiderint, tamen ad famam sanctitatis eius intercurrentibus legatis et reciprocis litteris astrinxerunt illum sibi beneficiis et copiosis muneribus, commendantes se humiliter orationibus illius et suffragiis" (PL, CXLII, col. 902).
23. Adhemar of Chabannes, *Historiae*, III, 41 (PL, CXLI, col. 56).
24. J. Pérez de Urbel, in *Historia de España*, ed. Ramón Menéndez Pidal, VI (Madrid, 1956), pp. 326-328; idem, *Sancho el Mayor*, pp. 87, 304. The date of this expedition requires more precise fixation. Pérez de Urbel's hypothesis that Sancho organized this enterprise under Cluniac influence is highly uncertain; at best, he may have encouraged it.
25. Odilo, Epistula II (*Spicilegium*, III, 81; PL, CXLII, col. 942); Radulfus Glaber, *Historiae*, IV, 7 (ed. Prou, p. 110; PL, CXLII, cols. 682-683). Glaber does not mention Sancho but for him as for Odilo it is the *ciborium* which benefits from the spoils.
26. Cf. note 24, supra
27. *España, un enigma histórico*, I, 280-281; Valdeavellano, *Hist. de España*, I, 2, p. 256.
28. Cf. note 21, supra.
29. Antonio Ubieto Arteta, "Gonzalo, rey de Sobrarbe y Ribagorza (Problemas de cronología)," *Pirineos*, VI (1952), 299-322; Pérez de Urbel, *Sancho el Mayor*, pp. 232-233.
30. Ed. d'Achery, *Spicilegium*, III, 381; reprinted PL, CXLII, cols 941-942, as nos. II-III.
31. For Ramiro's self-acknowledged subordination to his older half-brother at Pamplona, see Antonio Ubieto Arteta, "Ramiro I de Aragón y su concepto de la realeza," *Cuadernos de historia de España* [CHE], XX (1953), 45-62 (especialmente pp. 45-46, 60-61).
32. Jotsaldus, *Uita s. Odilonis*, I, 7: "Fuit etiam in remotis partibus occidentalium alter Sancius, Pampulanorum episcopus, qui ita sibi in amicitia adhaesit et copiosis muneribus deseruiuit, ut ad eum (sc. Odilonem) etiam de tam longinquis regionibus ueniret et monachum se ab eo fieri decerneret" (PL, CXLII, col. 902). On the date, Pérez de Urbel, *Sancho el Mayor*, p. 273.
33. The arrangements for bringing Bishop Sancho's treasure from Peña probably reflect anxiety at Cluny over its safety in the event of Ramiro's downfall.
34. Pérez de Urbel, p. 250; Valdeavellano, p. 278. In view of Ramiro I's personal abstention from use of the royal title (cf. Ubieto Arteta, *Ramiro I de Aragón*, loc. cit.), it is interesting that the Cluniac abbot, while calling the Aragonese ruler *dominus*, uses *rex*, *regnum* only of Sancho el Mayor and the latter's domains. Odilo's reference to an *incursio paganorum* suggests ignorance of Ramiro's employment of Moorish allies at Tafalla.
35. Cf. Pérez de Urbel, *Sancho el Mayor*, pp. 320-321, who believes that lavish gifts from Jaca preceded Cluniac supplications for the king; but Odilo's letter proves that Ramiro's benevolence was known to the abbot not directly but only through Bishop Sancho's panegyric.
36. For the opposite opinion, Pérez de Urbel: "La Orden de Cluny . . . le (à Ramiro) favorecerá con su inmenso poder que tuvo no escasa importancia en el sostenimiento y desarrollo de aquel reino aragonés

mal consolidado todavía" (Sancho el Mayor, p. 321).

37. *Cartulario de San Juan de la Peña*, II, nos. 70, p. 22 (1036); 72, p. 27 (1038); 74, p. 34, n. 24 (1039), etc.

38. See *Cartulario de Peña*; also Paul Kehr, *Papsturkunden in Spanien II. Navarra und Aragon, Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*. philog.-hist. Klasse, N. F., XXII, 1928, Heft 50, pp. 115-123, 169-176; Eduardo Ibarra, *Documentos correspondientes al reinado de Ramiro I* (Zaragoza, 1904).

39. Kehr, op. cit., pp. 169-172; Durán Gudiol, *Iglesia de Aragón*, pp. 140-142; Yepes, *Corónica de San Benito*, III, 165-165v.

40. See Abbot Hugh's instructions regarding anniversary intercession for Bishop Pedro of Pamplona issued between 1094 and 1109 to the monks of Cluny, assuring the prelate even before his death "ut in omni uita sua oratio illa, quam pro salute domni Petri regis cotidie in missa dicendam stabiliuimus, pro ipso similiter dicatur, ut quae pro rege singulariter pronuntiaretur nunc pluraliter pro ambobus proferatur" Johannes Ramackers, "Analekten zur Geschichte des Reformpapsttums und der Cluniazenser," *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, XXIII, Roma, 1931-1933, 49). Cf. also H. E. J. Cowdrey, "Unions and Confraternity with Cluny," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, XVI (1965), 157, n. 2.

41. Odilo, Epistula III: "... de cunctis inimicis uictoriam cum triumpho ... de cunctis inimicis uestris uictoria ... pacem et uictoriam ... ut Dominus uobis concedat tota nostra fraternitas et optat et orat" (*Spicilegium*, III, 381; PL, CXLII, col. 942).

42. Radulfus Glaber, *Historiae*, V, 1, 16-18; cf. IV, 4, 9-13 (ed. Prou, pp. 127-128; 99-103).

43. García's real privilegio of 30 April 1045 restoring and endowing the see of Calahorra, where the city appears as already in his hands, would place its capture no later than the spring of that year. Cf. José de Moret, *Annales del reyno de Navarra* (Pamplona, 1648-1704), I, 671-673; Kehr, *Papsturkunden*, pp. 50-51.

44. Pérez de Urbel, *Sancho el Mayor*, p. 321, guesses that García did not reply to the appeal; in any case, his attitude must have been negative. For a contrary view, A. Ubieto Arteta, s. v. "García (de Nájera)" in *Diccionario de historia de España* [DHE] (Madrid, 1952), I, 1210.

45. *Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Cluny, formé par Auguste Bernard*, ed. Alexandra Bruel (Paris, 1876-1903), IV, nos. 3343 (pp. 431-440), 3540 (pp. 665-668). On the erroneous ascription to García of Nájera's cession to Cluny, cf. *inter alios* Defourneaux, *Français en Espagne*, p. 23; Hermann Diener, "Das Verhältnis Clunys zu den Bischöfen vor allem in der Zeit seines Abtes Hugo (1049-1109)," in *Neue Forschungen über Cluny und die Cluniacenser*, ed. Gerd Tellenbach (Freiburg, 1959), pp. 310-311.

46. Menéndez Pidal, *España del Cid*, I, 121-123; Valdeavellano, *Hist. de España*, I, 2, pp. 281-282.

47. *Sancho el Mayor*, p. 321. The fact that the appeal to García was couched in terms of famine relief while Fernando's census -- unlike the additional 1000 dinars his son Alfonso VI gave Cluny for food -- was expressly allotted to the purchase of clothing, strengthens the case against possible contemporaneity.

48. Yepes, *Corónica*, VI, 459v, Apéndice 14, and cf. pp. 74-74v. The conventional date 1047, which comes from the textual reading "die VI feria idus marcii era LXXXV post millesima", conflicts with the fact that the March Ides in that year fell on Sunday, not a feria (Florez, *España Sagrada* [ES], X, 318). Presumably the date has been garbled, possibly from an original X aspada; in March 1056, the

year preceding Gomez Diaz' death, the Ides were on Sunday.

49. Pérez de Urbel, *Monjes españoles*, II, 425-426; M. Alamo, "Carrión (San Zoil de Carrión de los Condes)," DHGE, XI, (1949), cols. 1137-1138.

50. Arch. Hist. Nac., Madrid, Clero, San Zoil de Carrión, Leg. 1146, no. 1-P.

51. *Chartes de Cluny*, IV, nos. 3492 (pp. 604-607), and 3507 (pp. 622-625).

52. Cluny's Castilian holdings did not extend beyond the second- or third-class priory of Santa Coloma de Burgos, various extra-Riojan subpriories and patrimonies of Santa María de Nájera, and briefly, after 1142, San Pedro de Cardeña.

53. This is essentially Masdeu's position, *Hist. crítica de España*. XIII (1794), pp. 351-353; XV (1795), pp. 266-267, but of course without accepting his extreme rejection of the Hispano-Cluniac evidence from the time of Sancho el Mayor and of Franco-Navarrese influence upon eventual Leonese-Castilian reception of the Burgundians.

54. Ramón Menéndez Pidal, *España del Cid*, I, 93-96; idem, in his *Historia de España*, VI (1956), xxv-xxxvii.

55. On the tangled early history of the Syrian origins and Southern French evolution of the Antoninian cult, see the current views and bibliography in R. Aigrain, "1. Antonin (Saint)" and "2. Antonin (Saint)," DHGE, III (1924), cols. 848-851; and cf. *Acta Sanctorum*, Septembris, I, 1868, 340-356; A. P. Frutaz, "Antoninus v. Apameia," *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, I (Freiburg, 1957), 665; Camille Daux, "Le barque légendaire de Saint Antonin, apôtre et martyr de Pamiers," *Revue des questions historiques*, LXVII (1900), 402-456. For the Peninsula, the most useful sketch is Luciano Serrano, *El obispado de Burgos y Castilla primitiva desde el siglo al XIII* (Madrid, 1935), I, 232-233. The entire Tome IV of Fernandez de Pulgar, *Historia secular y eclesiástica de Palencia* (Madrid, 1679-1680), is devoted to San Antolin, his alleged Spanish nativity and the celebration of his cult at Pamiers and in Spain, but offers little new material for the 11th century; its useful list of peninsular monasteries dedicated to the martyr is drawn from Gregorio de Argáiz, *La soledad laureada por San Bernito y sus hijos en las iglesias de España* (Madrid, 1675), but also cites Yepes and Moret. I have not been able to consult Abbé Vaissière, *Saint Antonin, prêtre, apôtre du Rouergue, martyr de Pamiers* (Montauban, 1872).

56. *Historiae*, III, 56: "Ea tempestate sanctus Leonardus confessor in Lemovicino et sanctus Antoninus in Cadurcino miraculis coruscabant et undique populi eo confluebant" (PL, CXLI, col. 69).

57. Pulgar, IV, 153, with a reference to Moret which I have not yet been able to locate.

58. Pérez de Urbel, *Sancho el Mayor*, pp. 82-84, 290-294; Alfonso Sánchez Candeira, "El obispado de Oviedo entre 976 y 1035," in *Estudios dedicados a Menéndez Pidal*, III (Madrid, 1952), 622-626.

59. See in general Paul Kehr, *Papsturkunden in Spanien. Vorbereiten zur Hispania Pontificia. I. Katalanien. I Archivberichte, Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, philolog.-hist. Klasse, N. F., XVIII, 2, passim; and on Saint-Sernin, *Carrulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Sernin de Toulouse*, ed. C. Douais (Toulouse, 1887)

60. Bruel places the donation act for Frédélas, which is addressed to Abbot Hugh, in '1049-1064' (*Chartes de Cluny*, IV, no. 2991, pp. 189-190); but the allusion to the Cluniac governor as *famosissimus per orbem* tends to support the ascription to 'ca. 1060' found in the edition of Claude Devic and Jean J. Vaissette, *Histoire générale de Languedoc* (Toulouse, 1872-1892), V, cols. 510-511. Cf. also *Gallia Christiana*, 2nd ed. (1874), XIII, col. 150 ff.; *Instrumenta*, col. 87.

For eastern Catalonia, see Jaime Villanueva, *Viage literario a las iglesias de España* (Valencia-Madrid,

1803-1852); Kehr, op. cit.; and such diplomatic collections as the *Cartulario de "Sant Cugat" del Vallés*, ed. José Rius Serra (Barcelona, 1945-1947). On 25 November 1079 Cluny was to acquire from Viscount Ramón Folch of Cardona the monastery of San Pedro de Casseres in the diocese of Vich not far from Tabernoles (*Chartes de Cluny*, IV, no. 3541, pp. 668-669); but no link is visible between this grant and the San Saturnine of the time of Poncio and Oliba.

61. In neither kingdom have I yet run across 11th-century churches or monasteries under Antoninian patronage. The French-born San Román, bishop of Barbastro 1104-1116?, had been a canon regular of Saint-Antonin de Fredelas (Duran Gudiol, *Iglesia de Aragón*, p. 98), but this is too late to be relevant. In Castile the personal name appears but again relatively late; cf. *Libro Becerro del monasterio de Valbanera*, ed. Manuel Lucas Alvarez (Zaragoza, 1950; also, EEMCA, IV), 1073: "domno Antonino in Matute et in Uillanoba" (no. 65, p. 508); 1079: "et dominatur Tobia Antonin Nunneç" (no. 105, p. 537); also Índice, s. v. Antolin, Antulin, Antonin Nuniç, etc. This is probably the same "Antolino Nuniz" who confirms Alfonso VI's privilegio to Oña on 1 May 1092 (Juan del Alamo, *Colección diplomática de San Salvador de Oña*. Madrid, 1950, I, no. 99, p. 129). There is also the renowned lieutenant of the Cid, Don Martín or Martino Antolínez, on whom see R. Menéndez Pidal, *El Cantar de mio Cid* (Madrid, 1908-11), II, 749.

62. Both the annotated edition of the Hispanic calendars by Dom Marius Férotin in his *Le Liber Ordinum en usage dans l'Église wisigothique et mozarabe d'Espagne du cinquième au onzième siècle*, *Monumenta ecclesiae liturgica*, V (Paris, 1904), cols. 449-497, and the study of M. Alamo, "Les calendriers mozarabes d'après Dom Férotin: additions et corrections," *Rev. d'hist. eccles.*, XXXIX (1943), 101-131, have been superseded by José Vives and Angel Fábrega, "Calendarios hispanicos anteriores al siglo XII," *Hispania sacra*, II (1949), 119-146, 339-380, III (1950), 145-161.

63. Vives-Fábrega, p. 354: "*Sci antoni*", where the editorial asterisks denote a manifest interpolation or later addition.

64. Ibid., p. 360: "Sci Antonini mr".

65. Ibid., p. 378. More light will be shed on the Riojan diffusion of the veneration of San Antolín when long overdue attention is paid to the circulation of liturgical manuscripts of the Roman Rite below the Pyrenees in the 11th and 12th centuries.

66. Cf. note 85, *infra*.

67. Tumbo de León, Catedral de León, fols. 176v-178; M. Risco, ES, XXXV, p. 55; R. Menéndez Pidal, "El 'Romanz del Infant García' y Sancho de Navarra antiemperador," in his *Historia y epopeya* (Madrid, 1934), no. 46 (p. 84); Pérez de Urbel, *Sancho el Mayor*, pp. 218-219, and doc. no. 193 (p. 447).

68. Cf. Sancha's confirmation of the carta de cambio between the abbot of San Antolín de Fingoy and the abbess of Santa Eulalia de Fingoy (Risco, ES, XL, 160; Luis Sánchez Belda, *Documentos reales de la Edad Media referentes a Galicia*, Madrid, 1953, no. 146, p. 76). In the course of their reign the reyes Fernando I and Sancha, presumably after having previously given the *villa* of Ermulf to San Antolín de Fingoy, ceded both this house and that of Santa Eulalia to their daughter D. Elvira (Sánchez Belda, *ibid.*, no. 156, p. 80). Elvira in turn gave one-half of the two reales monasteries in 1086 to the Church of Lugo (*ibid.*, no. 165, p. 83), which obtained the other half from Alfonso VI in 1088 (*ibid.*, no. 168, p. 85). These and other privilegios relating to San Antolín de Fingoy are preserved in both the Tumbos Viejo and Nuevo of Lugo.

69. Sánchez Belda, no. 160 (p. 81), cf. also nos. 163 (p. 82), 173 (p. 87). Yepes, *Corónica*, III, 199-200, cites this house as a later dependency of San Martín de Santiago, but knows no earlier document than one of 1076 by which a Visclavara gives it and its abbot Tanoy the aldea of Plantelos and coto of

Miro. Pulgar, following Argáiz, lists Toques among the monasteries of Antoninian entitlature but has no other information (*Iglesia de Palencia*, IV, 11, 153).

70. Pulgar, *ibid.*, p. 153.

71. *Liber Fidei sanctae Bracarensis ecclesiae*, ed. Avelino Jesus da Costa (Braga, 1965 --), I, nos. 234, 235 (pp. 277-278); *idem*, *O bispo D. Pedro e a organizacao da diocese de Braga* (Coimbra, 1959), I, 312-313; II, 177-179. David places ca. 1060 the foundation of this house by the presbyter Nuno Froilaz (*Études*, p. 234); but charters running between 1039 and 1058 prove it existed earlier (*Liber Fidei*, nos. 234-238, pp. 277-281; cf. also nos. 239-248, pp. 282, 330). The subscription to the charter of 1045 (no. 235, p. 278) of "comitissa domna Ilduara", who was the sister of Alfonso V's first wife Elvira and long co-governor with her husband and grandson of the County of Portugal, offers a possible link of the new patronage with the ladies of the Leonese court. Da Costa, p. 268, no. 1, dates in "1100 (?)" the transfer of Santo Antonino de Barbudo by Nuno Scares to the See of Braga in a donation act confirmed by Count Henry of Portugal (no. 231, pp. 268-273); but on 8 June 1101 (no. 232, pp. 273-274) Count Henry and his wife Teresa appear also to have ceded the monastery to the Bracaran see.

72. Da Costa, *O bispo D. Pedro*, I, 312-313.

73. Jéronimo de Chirivoga, *Privilegios de Astorga*, Arch. Hist. Mac., Clero, MS 970, fols. 644V-645, from the lost Tumbo Negro of the Cathedral, no. 224. Notices in Yepes, IV, 272V; Pulgar, *Iglesia de Palencia*, IV, 153.

74. Risco, ES, XXXVIII, escritura xii (pp. 291-294), rubrics the act "1042"; but the text reads "era MLXXXII" (1044), which is the date given by Pulgar (IV, 153) as well as that in *Catálogo de los pergaminos de la Catedral de Oviedo*, ed. Santos García Larragueta (Oviedo, 19577, no. 47 (pp. 26-27). The house is mistakenly styled "S. Antonio de Villanueva" in Yepes, III, 8.

75. Pulgar, IV, pp. 11, 153, following Argáiz; Yepes, III, 7V, where the abbey is called "San Antolín cabe Zelorio" (i.e., Celorio); Vigil, I, 235-236. Note that a daughter of Count Muño, Countess Elvira, had a son named Antolín Mansconiz (also Mexuniz, Mangiones): *Cartulario de Monasteryo de Vega* (Madrid, 1927), nos. 13-14 (pp. 17-21).

76. Vives-Fábrega, *Calendarios hispánicos*, pp. 344-366; M. Férotin, "Deux manuscrits wisigothiques de la bibliothèque de Ferdinand Ier, roi de Castille et de Leon," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, LXII (1901), 375-383.

77. Vives-Fábrega, p. 372; Férotin, pp. 384-387.

78. David, *Études*, pp. 511-538.

79. Add also from Argáiz, as cited by Pulgar, IV, 153, the dedication to San Antolin of the iglesia colegial of Medina del Campo, below Valladolid, presumably a foundation of the early twelfth century.

80. Sebastián de Miñano, *Diccionario geográfico-estadístico de España y Portugal* (Madrid, 1826-1828), VII, 442-443; Pascual Madoz, *Diccionario geográfico estadístico histórico de España y sus posesiones de Ultramar* (Madrid, 1845-1850), XIII no entries s. v.; *Enciclopedia universal ilustrada europeo-americana* (Barcelona, 1907-1930), LIII, 580-581; *Diccionario corográfico con forme al Nomenclátor de ciudades, villas, lugares, aldeas y otras entidades de población del Censo general de 1940* (Madrid, 1940), IV, 127; *Diccionario geográfico de España*, ed. German Bleiberg (Madrid, 1961), XV, 108; Américo Costa, *Dicionário corográfico de Portugal continental e insular* (Porto, 1929-1949), X, 780; António César do Amaral Frazao, *Novo dicionário corográfico de Portugal* (Porto, 1952), pp. 604-605.

81. *Lérida*: San Antolí de Vilanova; *Vizcaya*: San Antolín, Abadiano; San Antolín, Derio; San Antolin, Zamudio; *Oviedo*: San Antolín de Bedón; San Antolín, Ibias; San Antolin de Llera; San Antolín de Naves; San Antolín de Obona; San Antolín de Salas; San Antolín de Sotiello; San Antolín de Villanueva; *Lugo*: San Antolín, Sarria; San Antolín near Santa Eufemia; San Antolín, near Samos; San Antolín de Toques; San Antoiño, near San Juan de Aboime; San Antuiño, near Saviñao; *La Coruña* : San Antolín de Baiñas; *Pontevedra*, San Antolín de Barro, Perdecamay; San Antoiño, near Tuy; *Orense*: San Antolín de Baltar; *Minho*: Santo Antonino de Barbudo; Santo Antoninho, lugar and quinta, de Moure; Santoinho, Darque; *Estremadura* : Santo Antoninho, largo, Lisbon: *Ribatejo*: Santo Antonino, Coruche.

82. Serrano, *Obispado de Burgos* , I, 232.

83. Cf. n. 60, supra.

84. Pérez de Urbel, *Sancho el Mayor* , pp. 215-221; Rodríguez Fernández, *Monasterio de Ardón* , p. 155, n. 353; Rod. Tol., VI, 6. On the dating of el Mayor's privilegio, Pérez de Urbel, p. 217 and n. 70. Serrano suggests the need for closer study of the Palencian pergaminos relating to the consecration of the cathedral church (*Obispado de Burgos* , I, 232-233); no doubt Dr. Derek Lomax will examine this problem in his promised opus on the medieval diocese of Palencia (cf. his "Don Ramón, Bishop of Palencia (1148-84)," in *Homenaje a Jaime Vicens Vives, I* , Barcelona, 1965, 283, n. 7). Kehr, *Papado y los reinos de Navarra y Aragón* , p. 83, also recognizes the problem.

85. Cf. no. 58, supra.

86. R. Menéndez Pidal, *Orígenes del español*, 2nd ed., I (Madrid, 1929), 489; L. Vázquez de Parga", José María Lacarra and J. Uría, *Peregrinaciones a Santiago* (Madrid, 1948-1949), II, 11-15, 497-547. Note that Llanes, near which the house of San Antolín de Bedón and several Antoninian placenames are found, was on the route of pilgrims moving between León and the Casa Santa at Oviedo (Lacarra, *ibid.*, pp. 534-536).

87. Pulgar, II, 66-70; Castilian translation in Alonso Fernandez de Madrid, *Silva Palentina*, ed. Matfas Vielva Ramos (Palencia, 1932-1942), I, 100-104, with facsimile of pergamino (not the original) giving Latin text; Pérez de Urbel, with discussion of date, *Sancho el Mayor*, no. 79 (pp. 396-397).

88. Pulgar, II, 35-36; *Silva Palentina* , I, 99-100, Castilian translation with facsimile of Latin pergamino (not the original); Pérez de Urbel, no. 158 (p. 440).

89. Aigrain, 2. *Antonin (Saint)* , DHGE, III, col. 851.

90. Cf. Section (ii), following.

91. *Geografía de España y Portugal*, ed. Manuel de Terán (Barcelona, 1952 ff.), IV, part 1, 291-298; Helmuth Hopfner, *Die ländlichen Siedlungen der alkastilischen Meseta*, *Kulturgeographische Beiträge*, ed. L. Mecking, and R. Lütgens, Heft 2 [Hamburg, 1939]

92. Pérez de Urbel, *Monjes españoles* , II, 426-427; Bishko, *Cluniac Priories*, pp. 338-339.

93. On the original repoblación, see Claudio Sánchez Albornoz, *Despoblación y repoblación del Valle del Duero* (Buenos Aires, 1966), pp. 253-291; and on the chronic warfare of the 10th and 11th centuries, J. Pérez de Urbel, *Historia del Condado de Castilla* (Madrid, 1945), I, 436-438; 446-452; II, 639/842-845, 917-949; 966-970, 1014-1017; *idem*, *Sancho el Mayor*, pp. 103-107, 162-168, 176-179.

94. Sánchez Albornoz, loc. cit.: the later ecclesiastical, rural and urban colonization of the 11th and 12th centuries still awaits study.

95. Pérez de Urbel, *Condado de Castilla* , II, 842 ff.; *idem*, *Sancho el Mayor*, pp. 162-163.

96. *Condado de Castilla*, II, 920 ff.
97. Menéndez Pidal, "*Romanz del Infant García*", pp. 44-46; *Condado* 930 ff.
98. Menéndez Pidal, op cit., pp. 67-70; Pérez de Urbel, *Sancho el Mayor*, pp. 162-166; 179-184
99. Menéndez Pidal, pp. 68-69; Pérez de Urbel, *Sancho el Mayor*, p. 177.
100. Pérez de Urbel, op. cit., pp. 236-244; Valdeavellano, I, 2, pp. 266, 273.
101. *Historia Silense*: "Adefonsum itaque, quem pre omnibus liberis carum habebat, Campis Gotorum prefecit, atque omne Legionensium regnum sue ditioni inancipavit" (ed. Francisco Santos Coco, Madrid, 1921, p. 87; ed. J. Pérez de Urbel and A. González Ruiz-Zorrilla, Madrid, 1959, p. 204), Cf. Menéndez Pidal, *España del Cid*, I, 139-145.
102. Julio González, *El reino de Castilla en la época de Alfonso VIII* (Madrid, 1960), I, 663-667.
103. Cf. note 84, supra.
104. Pulgar, *Iglesia de Palencia*, II, 67-70; *Silva Palentina*, ed. Vielva Ramos, I, 104-109.
105. Johannes Josef Bauer, "Die *vita canonica* der katalanischen Kathedralkapitel vom 9. bis zum 11. Jahrhundert," in *Homenaje a Johannes Vinke* (Madrid, 1962-1963), I, 81-112; Johannes Vinke, "Die *vita communis* des Klerus und das spanische Konigtum im Mittelalter," *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens*, VI (1937), 30-59; Alfonso García Gallo, "El Concilio de Coyanza," *Anuario de historia del derecho español*, XX (1950), 372-416. [For a vigorous critique of García Gallo's views on the Council of Coyanza, as well as a dissent from the 'Europeanizing' role my text (I still believe, correctly) ascribes to the Palencian Church, cf. now the analysis of Fernando I's ecclesiastical policies in Hilda Grassotti, "La Iglesia y el Estado en León y Castilla de Tamarón a Zamora (1037-1072)," *CHE*, LXI-LXII (1977), 96-144, especially pp. 115-138.]
106. Serrano, *Obispado de Burgos*, I, 231-232, opines the Palencian clergy were Navarrese; Pérez de Urbel, *Sancho el Mayor*, pp. 291-292, prefers Catalans.
107. See the charter of Abbot Hugh of Cluny of 1085, selling to the condes Pedro Ansúrez and Eilo certain lands in Spain given to the convent of Marcigny by Countess Justa, Pedro's stepmother: "et in palentine bernardus eps qui antea remundo uocabatur" (Tumbo de León, fol. 90v; ES, XXXVI, Apéndice 33, pp. lvii-lxiv; J.A. Serrano Redonnet, "*Ovetensis Monete*", *CHE*, I-II, 1944, p. 187). For Bernardo's metropolitanical claims, cf. his subscriptions "Be . . . Palentine sedis archiepis" (27 May 1083?. Arch. Hist. Nac., Clero, MS 258, Archive de Sta. María de Nájera. Privilegios y cartas reales, I, fol. 68r); "Bernardus Arciaepiscopus Palentina sedis" (17 June 1084): Manuel Mañueco Villalobos and José Zurita Nieto, *Documentos de la Iglesia Colegial de Santa María la Mayor (hoy Metropolitana) de Valladolid* . 1920), I, no. 1, p. 3); and, above all, his endowment on 30 May 1084 of the Palencian cabildo as *Bernardus archiepiscopus* (Pulgar, II, 111; cf. Lomax, op. cit., p. 286).
108. Yepes, *Corónica*, IV, 198-207; also ed. Pérez de Urbel, II, 146-160. The early history of San Isidro de Dueñas will be dealt with in my projected edition of the surviving charters; cf. meanwhile my "The Abbey of Dueñas and the Cult of St. Isidore of Chios in the County of Castile (10th-11th centuries)," in *Homenaje a Fray Justo Pérez de Urbel*, OSB (Silos, 1977), II, 345-364.
109. Arch. Hist. Nac., *Indice de los documentos de San Isidro de Dueñas*, fol. 11; cf. Pérez de Urbel, *Sancho el Mayor*, no. 98 (p. 426).
110. Academia de la Historia, Madrid, Colección Velázquez, t. IV, leg. 4, no. 1385; *Indice*, fol. 5. Cf. Pérez de Urbel, *ibid.*, no. 99 (p. 426).
111. Col. Velázquez, no. 1420; *Indice* . fol. 12.

112. Abadal, *Esperit de Cluny*, pp. 3-41; Mundó, *Moissac, Cluny et les mouvements monastiques*, pp. 230-241; Pérez de Urbel, *Monjes españoles*, II, 416-417.
113. Pulgar, *Iglesia de Palencia*, II, 85, citing Yepes, I, 23, alludes to a donation of Fernando I of 1040 to San Pedro de Cardena that contains the subscription "Bernardus praesbyter Myri confirmat", and identifies this cleric as the future prelate. The reference seems to be to the real privilege of 17 February 1039 but in the text edited by L. Serrano, *Becerro gotico de Cardena, Fuentes para la Historia de Castilla*, t. III (Silos-Valladolid, 1910), no. 335 (pp. 342-344) the names of Bernard and Miro do not appear; furthermore, Miro did not become bishop, as Pulgar fails to note, until 1047, so that Yepes must have seen a charter of later date.
114. *Chartes de Cluny*, IV, nos. 3452 (pp. 560-562), 3508 (pp. 625-626); Col. Velázquez, nos. 1386 (Astudillo), 1389 (Palaz del Rey). The latter charter here bears the date 1076 but according to the *Indice de Dueñas* (A. H. N., *Códices*, no. 41, fol. 123V), it belongs in 1075.
115. Cf. his subscription of the real privilege of 9/10 May 1079 to Sahagún: Romualdo Escalona, *Historia del real monasterio de Sahagún* (Madrid, 1782), Apéndice III, escritura 113, pp. 476-477; Fidel Fita, "El concilio nacional de Burgos en 1080," *Boletín de la R. Academia de la Historia* [BRAH], XLIX (1906), 341-346. On the date 1079, cf. David, *Études*, pp. 407-408.
116. *Chartes de Cluny*, IV, nos. 3492 (pp. 604-607), 3507 (pp. 622-625).
117. Col. Velázquez, no. 1420; *Indice*. fol. 12.
118. Act of 1 October 1053? for church of Santa Coloma de Turiago, Villa Posiduo and churches of San Pelayo de Tobilla, San Pedro de la Yedra, San Andrés in "uallis Mulieris Mortue" (Yepes, IV, esc. 25, with date 1043); confirmations of diplomas of King García, 911 (Yepes, IV, esc. 23); King Ramiro II, 936; Count Fernán Ansúrez, 971; Oveco Munoz, 974?; and Endura, 1053 (Col. Velázquez, nos. 1381, 1414, 1436, 1420).
119. *Chartes de Cluny*, IV, no. 3452 (pp. 560-562).
120. C.J. Bishko, "The Liturgical Context of Fernando I's Last Days, according to the So-called 'Historia Silense'," *Hispania sacra*, XVII (1965; = *Miscelánea Férotin*), 47-59, at pp. 54-55.
121. *Ibid.*, pp. 53-54.
122. *Ibid.*, pp. 47-52.
123. Reproduced in his *Historia y epopeya* (Madrid, 1934), pp. 29-98.
124. Menéndez Pidal, *op. cit.*; Pérez de Urbel, *Condado de Castilla*, II, 920-1001; *idem*, *Sancho el Mayor*, chaps. 9-12.
125. Sánchez Candeira, *Obispado de Oviedo*, pp. 622-623; Pérez de Urbel, *Sancho el Mayor*, p. 292.
126. Sánchez Candeira, pp. 622-626.
127. García Gallo, *Concilio de Coyanza*, pp. 350-351.
128. Pérez de Urbel, *Sampiro, su Crónica y la monarquía leonesa en el siglo X* (Madrid, 1952), pp. 86-95.
129. Menéndez Pidal, "Romanz del Infant García", pp. 73-78; Pérez de Urbel, *Sancho el Mayor*, pp. 19-20, 130-131, 200.
130. Pérez de Urbel, *ibid.*, pp. 218-219; Rodríguez Fernández, *Monasterio de Ardón*, p. 155, n. 353; L. Serrano, *Cartulario de San Millán de la Cogolla* (Madrid, 1930), no. 110 (pp. 122-123).

131. Pérez de Urbel, *ibid.*, pp. 141-142, 171-172; *idem.*, *Condado de Castilla*, II, 920; Menéndez Pidal, *op. cit.*, pp. 78-88.
132. Menéndez Pidal, "Infant Garcia," pp. 74-76; Pérez de Urbel, *Sancho el Mayor*, pp. 16, 130-131, 174-175, 200; and pergaminos cited by both authorities.
133. On Munio Rodríguez as pro-Navarrese, cf. Menéndez Pidal, *op. cit.*, pp. 57-60; Pérez de Urbel, *Sancho el Mayor*, pp. 144-145; A. Sánchez Candeira, "En torno a cinco documentos inéditos de Vermudo III", *CHE*, XI, 153-165. On Aldonza, L. Serrano, *Cartulario de San Vicente de Oviedo* (Madrid, 1929), no. 44 (pp. 49-51); *idem.*, *Cartulario de Monasterio de Vega*, p. 19, n. 1. It was another daughter of this same count, Elvira, who named a son after San Antolín (note 75, *supra*)
134. *Chartes de Cluny*, IV, nos. 3492, 3507.
135. Cf. the pergaminos of 1085 and 1091 published in Serrano Redonnet, "*Ovetensis monete*". *CHE*, I-II, 1944, 185-189. Justa did not become a nun immediately after her husband's death, which occurred before 1063 (cf. V. Vignau, *Indice de los documentos del monasterio de Sahagún de la Orden de San Benito*, Madrid, 1874, no. 1014), since in 1065 she still resided in the Tierra de Campos (*ibid.*, no. 1037). Perhaps it was soon after the death of her son Diego Ansuriz ca. 1080 (Menéndez Pidal, *El Cantar de mio Cid*, II, 547, n. 3) that she left Spain for Marcigny where she must have died before 1085. Her name does not occur in the reconstructed cartulary edited by Jean Richard, *Le cartulaire de Marcigny-sur-Loire (1045-1144)* (Dijon, 1957); or in the house's necrologium as preserved in that of Villars-les-Moines, ed. Gustave Schnürer, *Das Necrologium des Cluniacenser-Priorates Münchenwiler* (Villars-les-Moines) (Freiburg, 1909; *Collectanea Friburgensia*, N. F., 10).
136. Vignau, *Indice de Sahagún*, no. 1138 (9 February 1078) states that Fronildi left her home to become a nun of Cluny but is silent concerning any such departure *de terra Spanensis* as was true of Justa: "exiuit de locum suum et de auitacione suam et conuertit se ad sanctum Petrum cluniacensum". Note also that this pergamino, unlike that of Abbot Hugh for Justa's properties in 1085, is drawn up in Spain and subscribed by Spanish confirmants. Vignau, no. 48, a real privilegio of Fernando I, shows Fronildi already widowed by 1059. Since San Salvador de Palaz del Rey, an ancient royal and aristocratic convent of the Leonese capital (Yepes, IV, p. 82V) was at this time the only house for women Cluny possessed below the Pyrenees (by gift of Alfonso VI, 1075-1077), it must have been thither that Fronildi travelled from her home in the Campos. On her father Gutier Alfonso as among the Asturians of the Navarrese Party, cf. Vignau, nos. 948, 969, 997, 1138; Pérez de Urbel, *Sancho el Mayor*, p. 213.
137. *Historia Silense*, ed. Santos Coco, p. 64, line 12; ed. Pérez de Urbel, p. 179; Menéndez Pidal, *El imperio hispánico y los cinco reinos* (Madrid, 1950), pp. 92-94.
138. Férotin, *Deux manuscrits wisigothiques*, pp. 375-383; Vives-Fábrega, *Calendarios hispánicos*, p. 366.
139. Cf. notes 97 and 99, *supra*.
140. Pulgar, II, 66-70; *Silva palentina*, I, 104-109.
141. Col. Velázquez, t. IV, leg. 4, no. 1405 (fol. 790). The reference here to Fernando's suzerainty over the Rioja ("precellentissimo rege et imperatore regnante in Legione et in Castella et in Najera") throws this privilegio after the battle of Atapuerca in September 1054; unfortunately the subscriptions now attached do not belong with this document.
142. Bishko, *Liturgical Intercession*, p. 61.
143. Bernardus, *Consuetudines cenobii Cluniacensis*, I, 13: *Vetus disciplina monastica*, ed. Marquard

Herrgott (Paris, 1726), p. 158; Bishko, p. 57

144. Udalric, *Antiquiores consuetudines Cluniacensis monasterii*, I, 7 (PL, CXLIX, col. 652 B).

145. Bishko, p. 61.

146. *Necrologium des Cluniacenser-Priorates Münchenwiler* (Villars-les-Mones) p. 83, for 7 November: "VII Id". Sanctia Regina [Hyspanorum]"; Joachim Wollasch, "Qu'a signifié Cluny pour l'abbaye de Moissac?" in *Moissac et l'Occident au XIe siècle*, pp. 13-24. On the year, Menéndez Pidal, *España del Cid*, I, 165.

147. On the commencement of Hugh's building activities after 1075, cf. Conant, *Cluny, 1077-1088*, pp. 342-344; on the economic problem in this and later periods, Georges Duby, "Le budget de l'abbaye de Cluny entre 1080 et 1155," *Annales*, VII (1952), 155-171. On Hugh's early years, see also the most recent biography by Noreen Hunt, *Cluny under St. Hugh, 1049-1109* (London and South Bend, 1967).

148. *Sancho el Mayor*, p. 304.

149. Ed. Santos Coco, pp. 67-71; ed. Pérez de Urbel, pp. 183-188.

150. *Chartes de Cluny*, IV, no. 3638 (pp. 809-810).

151. Col. Velázquez, IV, leg. 4, no. 1420.

152. *Chartes de Cluny*, IV, no. 3409 (pp. 514-517).

153. A Galindus was prior of San Juan de la Peña around this time, according to a real privilegio of Ramiro I of 16 April 1050 (*Cart. de Peña*, ed. Ubieta Arteta, no. 103, pp. 91-93); but that this Aragonese monk would have called himself *frater* or *Cluniacensis*, or been welcome in Leon, is highly improbable.

154. Endura's donation is cited in the real privilegio of Fernando and Sancho to Dueñas published by Yepes, IV, esc. 25, pp. 445v-446, which is one of several indications that this latter document is now wrongly dated in 1043.

155. G. Cirot, "Une chronique léonaise inédite," *Bull. hisp.*, XI (1909), 273.

156. Hildebert, *Vita s. Hugonis*, II, 9 (PL, CLIX, col. 866; *Bibl. Clun.*, col. 419).

157. Bernard of Cluny, *Consuetudines*, II, 32 (ed. Herrgott, pp. 355-356. [My identification of Galindus as Abbot Hugh's emissary to the Leonese-Castilian court is flatly rejected by Prof. Grassotti on pp. 138-9 of her study cited above (n. 105). She prefers to regard this Cluniac monk as an itinerant architect, stone mason or sculptor who was fortuitously invited to subscribe Endura's charter of 1053; but I find no basis for favoring so improbable a hypothesis.]

158. Ed. Santos Coco, pp. 87-91; ed. Pérez de Urbel, pp. 205-209.

159. All previous accounts of Fernando I's ecclesiastical policies have been superseded by A. García Gallo, "El concilio de Coyanza," *An. hist. derecho esp.*, XX (1950), 275-633. [But note the reservations regarding this monograph expressed by Prof. Grassotti, as cited above in n. 105.]

160. *Ibid.*, pp. 347-357.

161. Gonzalo Martínez Díez, "El concilio compostelano del reinado de Fernando I," *Anuario de estudios medievales*, I (Barcelona, 1964), 121-138.

162. García Gallo, pp. 290-291.

163. *Ibid.*, pp. 296.

164. Martínez Díez, pp. 128-130.

165. García Gallo, pp. 366-368; Martínez Díez, *passim*

166. Cf. note 105, *supra*.

167. García Gallo, pp. 399-400. On the anomaly of Hispanic monasteries observing the Isidorian Rule to the exclusion of all others, and the possible relation of this canon to the neo-Gothic revival of the Fernandine epoch, see M. C. Díaz y Díaz, "Aspectos de la tradición de la *Regula Isidori*," *Studia monastica*, V (1963), 53-54.

168. "No esta comprobada la presencia, y menos la intervención efectiva, de monjes cluniacenses en Castilla en el reinado de Fernando I" (p. 366, n. 150). The same correction must now be made of Serrano, *Obispado de Burgos*, I, 258-259. On the other hand, M. Cocheril, *Études sur le monachisme en Espagne et au Portugal* (Lisbon, 1966), p. 82, is certainly in error in regarding Coyanza's strong emphasis upon subordination of monasteries to bishops as a sign of anti-Cluniac reaction on the part of the assembled fathers; cession of houses was not yet an issue under Fernando I, and recent studies have shown how generally cordial in this period were Cluny's relations with the episcopate. Cf. Hermann Diener, *Das Verhältnis Clunys zu den Bischöfen*, in *Neue Forschungen über Cluny*, pp. 218-352.

169. Valdeavellano, I, 2, pp. 282-291.

170. Ed. Santos Coco, p. 273; ed. Pérez de Urbel, p. 190.

171. *Chartes de Cluny*, IV, no. 3509 (pp. 627-629, especially p. 627, n. 2); no. 3638 (pp. 809-810, especially p. 809, n. 1).

172. Arch. Hist. Nac., Clero, San Zoil de Carrión, leg. 1164, no. 2-p bis; cf. C. J. Bishko, "El abad Radulfo de Cluny y el prior Humberto de Carrión, 'camerario' de España: tres cartas inéditas de hacia 1174," *Anuario de estudios medievales*, I (1964), 197-216.

173. *Chartes de Cluny*, IV, 627, 628.

174. ES, XXXVI, Apéndice 29; Pulgar, *Iglesia de Palencia*, II, 68; *Silva Palentin*, I, 107.

175. "... censumque quod pater suus rex Fredelanus quotannis Cluniacensi monasterio soluendutn instituit" (M. Marrier, *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, Paris, 1614, col. 444).

176. Ed. Santos Coco, p. 89; ed. Pérez de Urbel, p. 206.

177. *Chartes de Cluny*, V, no. 4072, p. 423.

178. *Ibid.*, IV, nos. 3509, 3638 (p. 809).

179. Cf., *infra*, subsection 2.

180. None of our sources associates D. Sancha with Fernando in the gift of the census; the omission of his consort in the protocol of Alfonso VI's two charters of 1077 and 1090 confirms the conclusion that Fernando's privilegio must have run in his name alone.

181. Ed. Santos Coco, *loc. cit.*; ed. Pérez de Urbel, *loc. cit.*

182. *Chartes de Cluny*, V, 423.

183. VI, 14 (ed. Andreas Schott, *Hispaniae illustratae*, Frankfurt, 1603-1608, II, 100).

184. *Ibid.*

185. Ed. Menéndez Pidal (Madrid, 1906), p. 492.

186. Ed. Santos Coco, p. 89; Pérez de Urbel, p. 206.

187. Ed. Schott, *op. cit.*, IV, 96.

188. *Chartes de Cluny*, IV, 809.

189. *Ibid.*, p. 628.

190. *Ibid.*, nos. 3452 (pp. 560-562), 3508 (pp. 625-626); Col. Velázquez, IV, leg. 4, nos. 1389, 1386.

191. *Chartes de Cluny*, IV, nos. 3540 (pp. 665-668), 3582 (pp. 719-722).

192. Cf. the act of 10/14 May 1079 (ed. Escalona, *Hist. de Sahagún*, Apéndice III, esc. 113, pp. 476-477; Fita, BRAH, XLIX, 1906, 34T- 346). See also David, *Études*, p. 408.

193. Alfonso's approval, and indeed inspiration, of the gift by his daughter the Infanta Urraca to Cluny of San Vicente de Pombeiro, near Lugo, on 22 February 1109 (*Chartes de Cluny*, IV, no. 3533, pp. 654-655, with wrong date '1079?') constitutes no contradiction of this statement, for this house lay outside Leon, belonged to his daughter, and was ceded under the urgent necessity of securing Cluniac support for Urraca's imminent succession. On the correct date, see David, *Études*, p. 454, n. 4; Bishko, *Cluniac Priories*, pp. 316-319.

194. Menéndez Pidal, *España del Cid*, I, 165-192. Valdeavellano, *Hist. de España*, I, 2, pp. 312-322.

195. Gilo, *Vita s. Hugonis*, ed. L'Huillier, p. 584; Hildebert, *Vita s. Hugonis* (PL, CLIX, cols. 866-867); Hugo Monachus, *Vita s. Hugonis* (*Bibl. Clun.*, ed. Marrier, cols. 443-444). On Ximeno, cf. Serrano, *Obispado de Burgos*, I, 268 ff., especially p. 277.

196. Menéndez Pidal, *op. cit.*, I, 175, n. 4, discards the tradition of Cluniac aid as embodying legendary and anachronistic elements; but it is also found in the *Crónica Najerense* (cf. next note), appears authentic in all basic aspects, and alone makes explicable Alfonso VI's generosity towards the Cluniacs from 1073.

197. Ed. Cirot, *Bull. hisp.*, XI (1909), 273.

198. *Chartes de Cluny*, IV, 628. For Robert as prior of Dueñas, see Col. Velázquez, no. 1426, with date 30 May 1104, which should be corrected to 1076. The probably late-12th-century Cluniac work printed by Marrier (*Bibl. Clun.*, cols. 452-453) as *Alia miraculorum quorundam s. Hugonis abbatis relatio*, assumes that Alfonso paid the Fernandine census prior to the doubling: "hancque renumerationem suis intercessoribus statuii, ut tributum suum duplicaret, et pro centum unciis auri ducentas annuatim daret". But this is refuted by the language of the real privilegio of 10 July 1077, and the monarch's entry into *societas* only at the latter date, not in 1066-1076.

199. *Chartes de Cluny*, IV, no. 3628 (pp. 809-810); and cf. note 172, *supra*. Text also in Yepes, *Corónica*, IV, 452v-453.

200. "constituo", "hanc . . . constitutionem", "censum Cluniacensibus constitutum" (*Chartes de Cluny*, IV, 810).

201. "regie auctoritatis preceptum", "preceptum hujus", "hoc meum preceptum" (*ibid.*, p. 810). Note also on the reverse of the parchment the words "Preceptum siue decretum Aldefonsi regis de censu Hispaniae" (*loc. cit.*, and note 5). The same term is also used at Cluny on the reverse of the original privilegio of 1077: "Preceptum Aldefonsi regis Hispaniarum de censu quern pater suus dedit sanctis apostolis Petro et Paulo ad locum Cluniensem, et quem ipse rex Aldefonsus tempore suo duplicauit" (*ibid.*, pp. 628-629).

202. "Impetraui etiam a Cluniacensi abbate . . . ut omnibus superuenturis abbatibus suis successoribus constituat preceptum de commemoratione, etc." (*ibid.*, p. 810).

203. *Ibid.*, no. 3562, pp. 697-698, where Bruel's date "1080, environ", is erroneous: see David, "Le pacte successoral entre Raymond de Galice et Henri de Portugal," *Bull. hisp.*, L (1948), 282.

204. *Chartes de Cluny*, IV, nos. 3509 (pp. 627-629) and 3441 (pp. 551-553), here wrongly dated "1070 environ".

205. Bernard of Cluny, *Consuetudines*, II, 32 (ed. Herrgott, pp. 355-356).

206. Cf. (1) Alfonso's real pergamino of 10 July 1077: "censum . . . ego in diebus uite mee . . . duplicatum dabo . . . istam kartulam donationis fatio et confirmo" (*Chartes de Cluny*, IV, no. 3509); (2) his letter to Hugh of probably the same date: "censum . . . duplicabo et seriem testamenti composui coram testibus" (ibid., no. 3441); (3) his statement in the 1090 pragmatica: "pactum fraterne, societatis cum meis Cluniacensibus inii, statui, firmaui" (no. 3638).

207. Admission to *societas* is implied rather than explicitly requested in the Alfonsine epistle to Hugh but clearly represents the royal approach to the *pactum fraterne societatis* which the monarch in 1090 associates with his doubling of the census.

208. See above, Notes 184 and following.

209. See Menéndez Pidal, *España del Cid*, I, 139-140; Valdeavellano, I, 2, p. 288; and Section 5, following.

210. Cf. See note 7, above.

211. Suspension for several years of the Alfonsine census can be deduced from the apologetic letter (*Chartes de Cluny*, no. 3441) with its references to the monarch as *peccator*, his claim to exculpation by reason of intense absorption in *pacificandis Yspanie urbibus*, and the delivery of 10,000 *talenta* to the Cluniac chamberlain Seguin.

212. Cf. É. Lévi-Provençal, "Les "Mémoires" de 'Abd-Allah, dernier roi ziride de Grenade," *Al-Andalus*, IV (1936-1939), 107-108; *España del Cid*, I, 258-259.

213. Cluny's Hispanic census, although mentioned by all modern authorities, has been closely scrutinized in only one study, which regrettably remains inaccessible to me: Rafael Alcocer, "Relaciones económicas entre los reyes de España y Cluny," *Rev. histórica de Valladolid*, I (1918), 161-168, 201-209. For more recent brief (and at points inexact) notices, cf. Defourneaux, *Les français en Espagne*, pp. 20-22; Georges Duby, "Le budget de l'abbaye de Cluny entre 1080 et 1155," *Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations*, VII (1952), 155-171, especially pp. 161-163; J. M. Lacarra, "Aspectos económicos de la sumisión de los reinos de taifas (1010-1102)," in *Homenaje a Jaime Vicens Vives*, I (Barcelona, 1965), 255-277, especially p. 277.

214. It should be noted that the *Crónica Najerense*, although using both the *Historia Silense* and either Gilo's *Vitas s. Hugonis* or (as Cirot believes) the *Epitome*, omits all reference to the Cluniac census in treating the reigns of Fernando I and Alfonso VI; for its section on Fernando, see the text printed by G. Cirot, "La Chronique Léonaise et les Chroniques de Pélage et de Silos," *Bull. hisp.*, XVIII (1916), 152-153).

215. "Censum quem pater meus illo sanctissimo loco Cluniacensi solitus erat dare, ego in diebus uite mee annuente Deo duplicatum dabo" (*Chartes de Cluny*, IV, no. 3509, p. 627).

216. Op. cit., no. 3638, p. 809.

217. Op. cit., V, no. 4072, p. 423.

218. Ibid., p. 424. Note that the penal clause likewise provides for fines payable to both king and abbey in maravedís.

219. Ed. Santos Coco, p. 89; ed. Pérez de Urbel, p. 206.

220. Luc. Tud.: "Statuit [Ferdinandus rex] quoque per unumque annum dum uiueret pro uinculis

peccatorum soluendis Cluniacensis coenobii monachis mille aureos ex proprio aerario dari" (ed. Schottius, *Hisp. illustr.*, IV, 96, lines 47-49); Rod. Tol., VI, 14: "Obtulit insuper Cluniacensi monasterio de regio fisco mille aureos annuatim perpetuo soluendos" (op. cit., II, p. 100).

221. "Et sobresso [el rey don Fernando el Magno] dio al monesterio de Crunniego mill marauedis pora cadanno pora siempre" (ed. Menéndez Pidal, II, 492, cap. 812).

222. Theodor Schieffer, "Notice sur les Vies de Saint Hugues abbé de Cluny," *Le Moyen Age*, XLVI (1936), 81-103, especially pp. 87, 89. Schieffer advances understanding of the chronology of the several Hugonic biographies beyond the point reached by A. L'Huillier, *Vie de saint Hugues abbé de Cluny 1024-1109* (Solesmes, 1888), pp. 565-573, and by M. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, II (Munich, 1923), pp. 147-155. Much however remains to be done to clarify the precise chronology, sources and complex interrelationships of the *Vitae*. [Consult now on this whole subject the critical edition of the *Vitae* of Gilo and Hugo Monachus by H. E. J. Cowdrey in the first part (pp. 11-139) of his "Two Studies in Cluniac History, 1049-1126," *Studi gregoriani*, XI (1978), 1-298, and particularly his important Introduction, pp. 17-39.]

223. Gilo, *Vita s. Hugonis*: "rex [Hildefonsus] liberatus duplicate censu paterno intercessoribus suis ducentas auri uncias annuatim destinaret" (ed. L'Huillier, op. cit., p. 584); Hildebert, *Vita s. Hugonis*, cap. 2: "duplicate censu paterno ducentas auri uncias Cluniacensi coenobio quotannis disposuit assignari" (*Bibl. Clun.*, col. 419; PL, CLIX, col. 867). The later anonymous *Alia miraculorum quorundam s. Hugonis abbatis relatio* also supports an original figure of 100 ounces in its incorrect affirmation that Alfonso VI doubled not his father's census, but his own: "[Hildefonsus] hancque remunerationem suis intercessoribus statuit ut tributum suum duplicaret et pro centum uncias auri ducentas annuatim daret" (*Bibl. Clun.*, col. 453).

224. Schieffer, op. cit., pp. 90-93.

225. "Censumque quod pater suus rex Fredelandus quotannis Cluniacensi monasterio soluendum instituit, iste duplicauit et ducentas et quadraginta auri uncias annuatim reddidit" (*Bibl. Clun.*, col. 444). Duby, *Budget*, p. 161, incorrectly attributes to Hugo Monachus the figure of 280 ounces, a mistake also committed by Lacarra, *Aspectos económicos*, p. 277.

226. *Bibl. Clun.*, col. 1296: "ducentas .s. et xl. uini (auri, *marg.*)"; PL, CLXXXIX, col. 907: "ducentas quadraginta scilicet uini (al. iuri, *sed melius*, auri) uncias". Against the easy assumption that Peter's higher rate merely reproduces the higher figure of the two he encountered in the earlier *Vitae s. Hugonis* at a time twenty years after their composition, when he was facing a major financial crisis and eager to insist upon the largest possible sum, can be set the phraseology of the *Lib. de mirac.*, which also includes its unique reference to the fact that Alfonso VI constructed (or more likely, rebuilt) two of the monasteries he gave Cluny and permitted others to do the same. This passage does not appear in any way dependent upon Hugo Monachus and presumably represents official Cluniac knowledge. There is also the fact that in dealing with Alfonso VII the weight of the metal involved would be irrelevant.

227. Urraca's return to her father's original but long-abandoned policy of granting reales monasteries to Cluny between 1114 and 1124 is attested especially by her repeated cessions to San Isidro de Dueñas (Academia de la Historia, Colección Velázquez, t. IV, leg. 4, nos. 1393-1397). On the queen-empress's lack of funds when she was fighting her husband Alfonso I of Aragon and borrowing 100 ounces of gold and 200 marks of silver from the Church of Santiago (*Historia Compostellana*, I, 71; ES, XX, p. 126), see Claudio Sánchez Albornoz, "Notas para el estudio del "petitum"," in *Homenaje a Don Ramón Carande*, (Madrid, 1963), 386-388 (reprinted in his *Estudios sobre las instituciones medievales españolas*, Mexico, 1965, pp. 486-488).

228. Cap. 5 (PL, CLIX, col. 912).

229. On Leonese-Castilian monetary problems in the time of Fernando I and his successors, see Claudio Sánchez Albornoz, "La primitiva organización monetaria de León y Castilla," *Anuario de historia del derecho español*, V (1928), 301-345 (also his *Estudios sobre las instituciones medievales españolas*, pp. 441-482); J. A. Serrano Redonnet, "Ovetensis monete", *Cuad. hist. Esp.*, I-II (1944), 156-189, who attempts (unsuccessfully) to prove Alfonso VI minted gold at Oviedo; F. Mateu y Llopis, "Sobre la hipótesis del oro asturleonés anterior al maravedí," *An. hist. derecho esp.*, XVIII (1947), 630-641; and for a recent authoritative account, Octavio Gil Farrés, *Historia de la moneda española* (Madrid, 1959), pp. 190-199. On Alfonso VIII's gold maravedí of 1172, struck in imitation of the Almoravid dinar, cf. Gil Farrés, pp. 198-199.

230. On this equivalence, and the tendency of Hispano-Christian texts to avoid the confusion inherent in transliteration of *dinar* as *denarius* (the term reserved in Carolingian metrology to the penny, the twelfth part of the *solidus*) by employing such vocables as *aureus*, *mancusus*, *mancus* or (as with Fernando) *mancalis*, or else Latinized forms of *mithqal* such as *metcal*, *metecal*, *mitical*, etc., cf. J. Allan, "Mithkal," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* (Leiden and London, 1913-1936), III, 328; R. Menéndez Pidal, *Orígenes del español*, 3rd ed. (Madrid, 1950), pp. 215-216; F. Mateu y Llopis, *Glosario hispánico de numismática* (Barcelona, 1946), pp. 130-134. It is noteworthy that Alfonso VI associates his father with the vernacular term *mancales* -- not *meticales*, as stated by Menéndez Pidal, *España del Cid*, I, 240-241; or *meteales* as indicated in Mateu y Llopis, *Glosario*, p. 130 -- since this provides a clue in addition to those to be adduced below to linking the census with Eastern Hispanic precedent. In Catalan documents *mancusus* and its variants predominate, and this term was given to the gold pieces struck at Barcelona in Fernando's lifetime (Gil Farrés, op. cit., pp. 135-137), while Latinized or Castilianized forms of *mithqal* characterize texts of Leonese-Castilian provenance. From this standpoint Alfonso VII's *mekalli* [me(n)kalli? me(t)kalli?] in his Salamancan diploma of 1142 suggests substitution of a Leonese-Castilian word based on *mithqal* for the less familiar Fernandine Catalanism *mancales*.

231. See the "Index of Issues and Table of Weights, gold" in George C. Miles, *The Coinage of the Umayyads of Spain* (New York, 1950), II, 551-554; cf. also Gil Farrés, pp. 103-112.

232. George C. Miles, *Coins of the Spanish Muluk al-Tawa'if* (New York, 1954). Antonio Prieto y Vives, *Los reyes de Taifas: estudio histórico-numismático de los musulmanes españoles en el siglo V de la Hégira* (XI de J. C.) (Madrid, 1926), catalogues admirably the various issues but without information on weights; Gil Farrés, pp. 112-115, is equally unhelpful in this respect.

233. Cf. Miles, *Coinage of the Umayyads*, I, 90; Sánchez Albornoz, *Primitiva organización monetaria*, pp. 310-313 (*Estudios*, pp. 449-452).

234. On the parias as paid in counted coins, see (for Granada) Lévi-Provencal's translation of Abd-Allah in Al-Andalus, IV (1936-1939), 30, 35, 37-41, 107, etc.; (for the Levante) R. Dozy, *Recherches sur l'histoire et la littérature de l'Espagne pendant le moyen âge*, 3rd ed. (Leiden, 1881; reprinted Amsterdam, 1965), II, 137-138; R. Menéndez Pidal, *España del Cid*, I, 315, 318-319, 359-360, 390, etc.; (for Zaragoza) José de Moret, *Annales del reyno de Navarra*, I (Pamplona, 1684), 785-786; José M. Lacarra, "Dos tratados de paz y alianza entre Sancho el de Peñalén y Moctádir de Zaragoza (1069 y 1073)," in *Homenaje a Johannes Vincke*, I (Madrid, 1962), 121-134.

235. On European monetary conditions affecting the role of gold under Fernando I and Alfonso VI, see Marc Bloch, "Le problème de l'or au moyen âge," *Annales d'histoire sociale et économique*, V (1933), 1-34 (reprinted in Marc Bloch, *Mélanges historiques* (Paris, 1963), II, pp. 838-867); Maurice Lombard, "L'or musulman du VIIe au XIe siècle," *Annales*, II (1947), 143-160; Archibald R. Lewis, *Naval Power and Trade in the Mediterranean, A. D. 500-1100* (Princeton, New Jersey, 1951), especially chapters 6-

7; Luis G. de Valdeavellano, "La moneda y la economía del cambio en la Península ibérica desde el siglo VI hasta mediados del siglo XI," in *Moneta e scambi nell'alto medioevo* (Spoleto, 1961), pp. 203-230 (Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, VIII).

236. Duby, *Budget*, p. 163. Duby, p. 161, regards Cluny's Alfonsine gold as weighing at least 400 *livres clunisiennes* ; but note that he cites Hugo Monachus incorrectly for a rate of 280 (as against 240) ounces. He also mistakes Fernando's *mancales* for *mancus* .

237. Duby, pp. 157, 159; but the statement on the latter page that Udalric, *Antiquiores consuetudines monasterii* , III, 18 (PL, CXLIX, col . 762) gives the annual cost of the monks ' woolen clothing at "environ 120 livres en monnaie de Cluny" rests upon Duby's confusion of *panni* with *panis* and cannot be accepted. Udalric's extended discussion of clothing (II,11 , cols. 751 -753) does not mention the cost; but for the mid-12th century some data on this can be found at the close of the so-called *Disposito rei familiaris Cluniacensis facta a domno Petro abbate* (*Chartes de Cluny*, V, 475-482, especially p. 482). On the luxurious quality of the garments worn at Cluny, for which Spanish treasure was partly responsible, and for Abbot Peter' s response to St. Bernard of Clairvaux' s attacks upon such indulgence, see David Knowles, "The Reforming Decrees of Peter the Venerable," in Giles Constable and James Kritzeck, ed., *Petrus Venerabilis*, 1156-1956 (Rome, 1956; Studia Anselmiana, 40), pp. 1-20.

238. *Chartes de Cluny*, V, nos. 4015-4016, pp. 369-371 ; cf. Charles Johnson and H. A. Cronne, *Regesta regum Anglo-Normannorum* , 1066-1154, II (Oxford, 1956), 248 (no. 1691) .

239. Lévi-Provencal , *Espagne musulmane* , III, 30-35, 44-46; Isidro de las Cagigas, *Minorías étnico-religiosas de la Edad Media española*, II [(Madrid, 1948), 372-373.]

240. Gil Farrés, *Moneda española* , p. 191.

241. "Unusquisque mille metkales de auro" (Ibarra, *Documentos de Ramiro I*, no. 24, p. 45).

242. "Accipio de uos una adorra auro texta que fuit empta in duos mille methtecales de auro" (Vicente Vignau, ed., *Cartulario del monasterio de Eslonza*, Madrid, 1885, no. 5, p. 9; Eduardo de Hinojosa, *Documentos para la historia de las instituciones de Leon y de Castilla, siglos X-XIII*, Madrid, 1919, no. 17, p. 287.

243. The text of Juan del Alamo, *Colección diplomática de San Salvador de Oña*, I (Madrid, 1950), no. 77 (p. 114) reads "cum mille d.c morabetinis" ; Menéndez Pidal perhaps more accurately expands the contraction as "cum mille DC m(e)t(cal)is" (*España del Cid*, II, 73). Serrano Redonnet erroneously raises the figure to "mil seiscientos maravedíes" ("*Ovetensis monete* ", p. 165).

244. "Et senior Fortun Dat fuit fidiator de quingentis metkals de auro exerchin" (J. M. Lacarra, ed., *Documentos para el estudio de la reconquista y repoblación del Valle del Ebro, Estudios de Edad Media de la Corona de Aragón*, III, Zaragoza, 1947-1948, no.111, p. 515).

245. "Quod pectet millem metecals de auro" (Tomás Muñoz y Romero, *Colección de fueros municipales y cartas pueblas*, Madrid, 1847, p. 513).

246. Lena Voss, *Heinrich von Blois, Bischof von Winchester (1129-71)* (Berlin, 1932), pp. 108-121 (Historische Studien, ed. E. Eberling, 210).

247. David, *Pacte succesoral* , pp. 281-284; Bishko, *Cluniac Priories of Galicia and Portugal*, pp. 338-339. Cf. Alfonso VI 's dispatch of the Cid to Seville, 1079-1080, of Count García Ordoñez of Nájera to Granada, 1080, and of his Jewish official ibn-Salib to Sevilla, 1082 (Menéndez Pidal, *España del Cid* , I, 255, 259-260, 299-300). Note that Sancho el Mayor's gifts to Cluny were sent by him to Burgundy, on at least one occasion in the charge of the Pamplonese bishop Sancho; on the other hand,

in Ramiro's time *missi* came from Abbot Odilo seeking San Juan de la Peña in order to bring back to the abbey Bishop Sancho's liturgical vessels and treasure (cf. notes 25 and 32, *supra*).

248. Fernando Soldevila, *Historia de España*, I (Barcelona, 1952), 183 (a full page reproduction).

249. If a fixed date of payment of the parias according to the Muslim and Christian calendars could be determined, this might throw light upon just when the Cluniac census was paid, assuming this occurred shortly after the year's tributary dinars reached León. J. Balari, *Orígenes históricos de Cataluña*, (Barcelona, 1899), p. 305, cites documents fixing annual payment dates of parias in January, May and October.

250. Cf. note 24, *supra*.

251. *Chartes de Cluny*, IV, no. 3638, p. 809.

252. Luc. Tud., *Hisp. illustr.*, IV, 96, lines 47-49.

253. *Chartes de Cluny*, V, 423.

254. Ed. Santos Coco, p. 89; ed. Pérez de Urbel, p. 206.

255. VI, 14 (*Hisp. illustr.* II, 100).

256. Cf. Santos Coco, pp. 73 and 87-89; Pérez de Urbel, pp. 190 (cap. 87) and 205-206 (capp. 103-104).

257. Cf. M. Vallecillo Avila, "Los judíos de Castilla en la alta Edad Media," *Cuad. Hist. Esp.*, XIV (1950), 38.

258. Real privilegio of 21 December 1063, in Luciano Serrano, ed., *Cartulario de San Pedro de Arlanza* (Madrid, 1925), no. 66 (pp. 136-137).

259. Real privilegio of 11 June 1135 in Julieta Guallart and María del Pilar R. Laguzzi, "Algunos documentos reales leoneses," *Cuad. hist. Esp.*, I-II (1944), no. 1 (pp. 364-366).

260. *Chartes de Cluny*, V, no. 4072 (pp. 423-426). Note also the rubric placed on the reverse of the pergamino at Cluny: "Privilegium Aldefonsis regis de redivibus Hispanie".

261. Arch. Hist. Nac., Clero, *Cartulario de Nájera*. cód. 258, fol. 166 r-v; cf. also the similar merced of Alfonso's son Sancho on 27 February 1149 (Julio González, *El reino de Castilla en la época de Alfonso VIII*, II, Madrid, 1960, no. 3, pp. 12-13). Alfonso VII's charter now bears the date Era 1180 (A. D. 1142) but the episcopal subscriptions alone would place it some half dozen years later.

262. González, *op. cit.*, III, 346 (no. 769).

263. Julio Gonzalez, *Alfonso IX*, II (Madrid, 1944), no. 273 (pp. 369-370). Note that the English census to Cluny of 100 marks, as granted in 1131 by King Henry I and confirmed by Pope Innocent II, was pledged against the royal revenues from London and Lincoln; and that the act of donation (*Chartes de Cluny*, V, no. 4015, pp. 369-370) displays three striking parallels with the Hispanic cases: (i) the money, although drawn from the two specified revenues, is also described as paid from the royal erario (*de meo proprio thesauro*), although after the king's death it is to be disbursed through the Exchequer; (ii) it is to be annually turned over to a Cluniac emissary; and (iii) it is promised in perpetuity ("C. marcatas redditus singulis annis, scilicet LX marcatas in firma et red [ditibus] ciuitatis mee Lundonie, et XL marcatas in redditibus ciuitatis mee Lincolie; ita tamen quod has C. marcatas [quoquo anno] reddi faciam ecclesie Cluniacensi de meo proprio thesauro in omnibus diebus meis; post discessum autem meum [statuout] has C. marcas quoquo anno deferant ministri mei de prenomatis ciuitatibus meis [ad scacarium meum ibique reddantur nuncio Beati Petri. Si uero hec non fecerint ministri, eadem fiat Sancto Petro [de pecunia predicta] iusticia, que fiet de mea firma propria. Hanc itaque donationem

meam concede et regia [auctoritate ecclesie Beati] Petri Cluniacensis in perpetuum obtinendam corroboro"). Cf. also Johnson and Cronne, *Requesta regum Anglo-Normannorum* , II, 248 (no. 1691).

264. Cf. Section 1, supra.

265. Cf. his "Les monastères et la pénétration française en Espagne", *Rev. Mabillon* , XXX (1940), 89-90.

266. Cf. the references in *Hist. Silense* to the Toletan ruler who "immensam pecuniam auri et argenti pretiosarumque vestium conglomerat" as a prelude to alliance with Fernando, and the letter's later return home "multa honustus preda" (ed. Santos Coco, pp. 79-80; ed. Pérez de Urbel, p. 197, cap. 93).

267. Two recent important studies have greatly clarified many historical aspects of the parias of the Taifas: J. M. Lacarra, "Aspectos económicos de la sumisión de los reinos de taifas (1010-1102)," in *Homenaje a Jaime Vicens Vives*, I (Barcelona, 1965), 255-277; Hilda Grassotti, "Para la historia del botin y de las parias en Leon y Castilla," *Cuad. Hist. Esp.*, XXXIX-XL (1964), 43-132. Neither of these works, however, undertakes detailed examination of the operation of the system under Fernando I and Alfonso VI. Of the older treatments, José Balarí y Jovany, *Orígenes históricos de Cataluña* (Barcelona, 1899), remains valuable.

268. Lacarra, *Documentos del Valle del Ebro* , EEMCA, II (1946), no. 2 (pp. 472-473).

269. Cf. Lacarra, *Dos tratados*, pp. 131-134; Moret, *Annales*. I, 785-786.

270. On the chronology of Fernando I's wars against the Taifas, I shall follow the compact but meaty article by A. Sánchez Candeira, "Fernando I, conde de Castilla y rey de León", *Diccionario de Historia de España*, I (Madrid, 1952), pp. 1115, col. 2 - 1118, col. 1, which presumably summarizes the conclusions of his still unpublished *Estudio del reinado de Fernando I*, cited as en prensa p. 1116, col. 2. For the older views, see A. Ballesteros y Beretta, *Historia de España y de su influencia en la historia universal* , 2nd ed., II (Barcelona, 1944J, 296-299; Menéndez Pidal, *España del Cid*, I, 132-134; Valdeavellano, *Hist. Esp.* , I, 2, pp. 282-286, 290-291.

271. Sánchez Candeira, pp. 1117, col. 1, 1118, col. 1; Valdeavellano, pp. 283, 289.

272. Sánchez Candeira, p. 1117, cols. 1-2.

273. Cf. infra.

274. See especially Lacarra, *Aspectos económicos* , pp. 261-264, 268-273.

275. Balarí, *Hist. de Cataluña* , p. 304, citing from Arch. Urgell, Cartulario de Seu de Urgell, I, no. 42, fol. 47v.

276. Balarí, pp. 304-305, from loc. cit., no. 43, fol. 28, col. 1.

277. Balarí, pp. 303-304, from Próspero de Bofarull y Mascaró, *Los condes de Barcelona vindicados* (Barcelona, 1836), II, 14; Antonio Rovira i Virgili, *Historia nacional de Catalunya* , III (Barcelona, 1924), 512.

278. *Chartes de Cluny*, IV, p. 438.

279. R. Dozy, *Recherches sur l'histoire politique et littéraire de l'Espagne pendant le moyen age* (Leiden, 1849), p. 455, note 2; Menéndez Pidal, *España del Cid* , II, 683.

280. Lacarra, "Documentos del Valle del Ebro ," EEMCA, II, no. 2, pp. 472-473: "Interim damus ei de ueteri paria Cesarauguste ciuitatis quantum dari solet Pampilonensi ecclesie".

281. "Donamus etiam et concedimus Deo et beato piscatori omnem decimam nostri iuris, auri, argenti, frumenti seu uini siue de ceteris rebus quas nobis tributarii sponte ac coacte exsoluunt tam Christiani

quam Sarraceni ex omnibus uillulis atque castris tam in montanis quam in planis infra prefixes terminos . . . Insuper etiam ex ipsis tributis que recipimus in presenti uel recipere debemus aut in futuro Deo miserante recipiemus de Seragusta nec non et Tutela de omnibus terciam partem decimacionis supradicte ecclesie et episcopo concedimus et donamus": *El Libro de la Cadena del Concejo de Jaca* , ed. Dámaso Sangorrin, in *Coleccion de documentos para el estudio del historia de Aragón* , XII, 46 (no. 4, pp. 43-50); J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, XIX (1767), col. 932; Juan Tejada y Ramiro, *Colección de cánones y de todos los concilios de la iglesia española* , III (Madrid, 1851), 119-120.

282. Lacarra, op. cit., III, no. 94, p. 502.

283. Lacarra, op. cit., II, no. 3, pp. 473-477.

284. Arch. Hist. Nac., Clero, cód. 93, *Vecerro mayor del mon.º de Leyre*, fol. 510: "quadraginta solidos de parias Caesaraugustae".

285. *Inter alios*, by David, *Études* , p. 360; Defourneaux, *Français en Espagne* , p. 23; Diener, *Das Verhältniss Clunys zu den Bischöfen* , pp. 310-311.

286. See Section 1, supra. For García's foundation act, *Chartes de Cluny*, IV, no. 3343 (pp. 431-440), mistakenly dated 2 December by Bruel; the text, with the important confirmatory attachments of Queen Estefanía (1054) and Sancho of Peñalén (1056), can also be found in Fidel Fita, "Santa María la Real de Nájera, Estudio crítico," BRAH, XXVI (1895), 157-171. For Alfonso VI's act of cession to Cluny, *Chartes de Cluny*, IV, no. 3540 (pp. 665-668); Fita, *Primer siglo de Santa María de Nájera* , BRAH, XXVI (1895), 261-264.

287. Supra, Section 2, ii, *prope finem* .

288. "Michi siue meis successoribus deinceps usque in eternum", *Chartes de Cluny*, IV, 438.

289. Menéndez Pidal, *España del Cid*, II, 683.

290. *Chartes de Cluny*, IV, 440: "Deinde obtimates uiei regni seu fratris mei Ferdinand! regis confirmantes laudauerunt".

291. Cf. Sancho of Peñalén's confirmation of 1056 to his father's foundation act of 1052, with the subscriptions of Fernando I and the Infante Ramiro (Fita, loc. cit., pp. 170-171).

292. (i) Donation of D. Estefanía of a monastery of Santa Coloma, 5 September 1054: "Ego igitur Stefania regina post domini mei regis Garsie, mortem" (Fita, *ibid.*, p. 170); (ii) the confirmation of 1056 cited in the preceding note; (iii) a carta puebla of Estefanía of a serna of San Vicente near San Julian de Sojuela: "Ego humilis Stephania dei gratia regina olim bone memorie regis Garcie filii regis Sancii uxor . . . pro anime, mariti mei regis Garsie" (Arch. Hist. Nac., cód. 258, fol. 62-63; since Bishop García of Alava who subscribes this charter died by 1055, when his successor Vigilano appears, the date 1060 is wrong by some five years) (iv) a donation of Estefanía, as *Dei ancilla* , of Cañas and the Alberguería of Nájera (Yepes, *Corónica*, VI, 464V-465V, escr. 22).

293. *Chartes de Cluny*, IV, 667.

294. Allowance must also be made for the angry charge leveled by Bishop Rodrigo of Calahorra-Nájera in 1155, in a complaint to Pope Adrian IV, that the transfer was due to the machinations of Queen Constance: "ad suasionem coniugis sue, quam ex Burgundiis acceperat" (Fita, pp. 273-274; Kehr, *Papsturkunden in Navarra und Aragon*, I, 58-59; 392-393, no. 77); but Constance, who cannot have appeared in Spain much before May 1079 (David, *Études* , p. 389), could hardly have determined the choice of monastery, whatever her influence in the making of a new royal cession to Cluny.

295. For Leonese imperialism under Fernando I and Alfonso VI, see R. Menéndez Pidal, "*Adefonsus*

Imperator Toletanus Magnus Triumphator," in his *Historia y epopeya* (Madrid, 1934), pp. 239-262; idem, *España del Cid*, I, 134-147; II, 669-671, 725-731; idem, *El imperio hispánico y los Cinco Reinos* (Madrid, 1950), pp. 86-133.

296. On the date of Fernando's Toletan war, cf. Sánchez Candeira, DHE, I, 1117, cols. 1-2; Menéndez Pidal, *España del Cid*, I, 135, followed by Valdeavellano, *Hist. Esp.*, I, 2, 285, puts it in ca. 1062. É. Lévi-Provençal, "Alphonse VI et la prise de Tolède (1085)," *Hespéris*, XII (1931), 33-49 (reprinted in his *Islam d'Occident*, Paris, 1948, pp. 109-135), throws all Fernando's Moorish wars after 1050, but does not discuss this campaign.

297. Menéndez Pidal, *España del Cid*, II, 728-729.

298. *Chronicon Compostellanum*: "Adefonso uero Legionem cum Asturiis, et regno toletano quod tune similiter Sarraceni obtinebant sed tributum illi annuatim inde reddebant tribuit" (ES, XXIII, 326; XX, 609). Cf. Menéndez Pidal, *España del Cid*, I, 139-145; II, 687-688.

299. For following Alfonso VI's political and fiscal relations with Toledo to 1085, Menéndez Pidal, *Adefonsus Imperator*, is indispensable; but see also Lévi-Provençal, op. cit.

300. Menéndez Pidal, *ibid.*, p. 241.

301. Pp. 241-242.

302. Pp. 242-243.

303. *Supra*, Section 4, i.

304. Lévi-Provençal, *Al-Andalus*, IV (1936-1939), 36-40; on the date, see Menéndez Pidal, *España del Cid*, I, 257-259

305. Menéndez Pidal, *Adefonsus Imperator*, pp. 243-249.

306. Cf. David, *Pacte successoral*, p. 282: "vers 1090"; Lacarra, *Aspectos económicos*, p. 277: "hacia 1088-1090"; Kenneth J. Conant, *Carolingian and Romanesque Architecture, 800 to 1200* (Harmondsworth-Baltimore, 1959; The Pelican History of Art, 13), p. 116: "before 1090". Bruel's dating of "1080, environ" (*Chartes de Cluny*, IV, 697) is impossible.

307. Conant, loc. cit.

308. *Chartes de Cluny*, IV, no. 3562 (pp. 697-698).

309. *Ibid.*: "Sciatis me ad presens in pacificandis Yspanie, urbibus ualde adtentum esse, quj postquam, quod Deo annuente in proximo futurum est, mihi adline fuerint, ecclesie, quam edificatis auxilium faciam et uoluntati uestre, summopere adquiescam".

310. *Ibid.*, p. 697: "Perlectis, uenerande pater, uestre dilectionis et sanctimonie. apicibus in quibus paternitatis uestre, salutaria monita habundantissime recognoui . . . patrem et patronem habere promerui, qui me filium suum licet peccatorem . . . per dulciflua sua scripta uisitauit, uisitando castigat, et castigando in totius honestatis uia reformat".

311. On Bernard as Toletan archbishop from December 1086, cf. Juan Francisco Rivera Recio, *El arzobispo de Toledo don Bernardo de Cluny (1086-1124)* (Roma, 1962), pp. 18-28; it was not until the bull of Urban II of 15 October 1088 that, after receiving the pallium at Anagni, he was named primate of Spain (Rivera, pp. 29-42).

312. Lévi-Provençal, *Al-Andalus*, IV, 107-108. Menéndez Pidal, *España del Cid*, I, 393, taking this sum to represent 'Abd-Allah's arrears over a span of three years since Zallaca (1087-1088, 1088- 089, 1089-1090) sets the time of payment at late 1090, which is currently accepted. But it is equally likely

that the triennium comprises the Islamic years 1086-1087, 1087-1088, 1088-1089, which would fix 1089 as the true date. The fact that prior to Abbot Hugh's visit to Burgos of before Easter 1090 Alfonso VI suddenly found it possible to reverse his previous financial course and send Cluny the 10,000 *talenta* corroborates this alternative chronology. 'Abd-Allah's liquidation of his arrears in tribute can thus be seen as preluding a parallel liquidation of the king-emperor's censive arrears to Cluny. Cf. also Grassotti, *Para la historia del botín*, pp. 59-60.

313. Jaffé-Loewenfeld, *Regesta pontificum romanorum*, I, nos. 5417-5418; Serrano, *Obispado de Burgos*, I, 340-343.

314. Gilo, *Vita s. Hugonis*: "Post itinerum difficultates pyreneos quoque montes exsuperans ab Hispaniis gazas innumerabiles ad celeste gazophilacium, Cluniacum dico, reportauit" (ed. L'Huillier, p. 584); Hildebert, *Vita s. Hugonis*, cap. 9: "Ita uir Dei cum praedicta remeans pecunia . . (PL, CLIX, col. 867).

315. Grassotti, *Para la historia del botín*, pp. 52-55. [It should be kept in mind along here that our chief authority on Leonese-Castilian parias history, Prof. Grassotti, notes that the system under Fernando I and Alfonso VI still awaits close examination of the Muslim texts inaccessible to non-Arabists. She also warns that our present evidence for the earlier reign comes not from the *Historia Silense*, which speaks only of large occasional indemnities paid Fernando after military victories, but from the Tudense, writing two centuries later, and the *Chronicon Compostellanum* of post-1126. The Argentine scholar therefore suspects that these two latter texts may conceivably have read back into Fernando I's reign a regime of payments that became regular and annual only under Alfonso VI. This is a point well taken, but I am still inclined to believe that al-Ma'mun's hospitality to the exiled Alfonso VI in 1072, and the statement of the apparently well informed author of the *Chronicon Compostellanum* regarding the territorial and tributary distribution of 1065, tend to support the existence of a regular monetary connection between Toledo and Leon dating from several years previous to 1065.]

316. See Menéndez Pidal, *España del Cid*, I, 283, 299-300, 318-320, 330, etc.

317. It does not necessarily follow that the stipend was never again paid during these difficult years of an Hispania radically altered (cf. the acute if unduly atrabilious analysis of Menéndez Pidal, *Adefonsus Imperator*, p. 261) from that envisaged in the imperial unification program of Fernando I and Alfonso himself before Zallaca, Cluny's sentiments towards the king-emperor remain fervent down to his death and after, as the Hugonic *Vitae* and Peter the Venerable's *Liber de miraculis* attest; and the attention received by the royal *thesaurus Toleti* in the succession pact concerning Alfonso's domains, negotiated in 1105/1106 by his sons-in-law Counts Raymond of Galicia and Henry of Portugal through the intermediacy of Abbot Hugh's chamberlain Dalmace Geret, proves that the king-emperor's resources were by no means exhausted at his death. Cf. David, *Pacte successoral*, pp. 276 ff.

318. Valdeavellano, *Hist. Esp.*, I, 2, pp. 286-287.

319. Ed. Santos Coco, pp. 87-89; ed. Pérez de Urbel, pp. 205-206.

320. Cf. Antonio Viñayo González, "Cuestiones histórico-críticas en torno a la traslación del cuerpo de San Isidoro," in *Isidoriana* (León, 1961), pp. 285-298; M. Gómez Moreno, *Introducción a la Historia Silense* (Madrid, 1921), pp. xv-xvii; *Historia Silense*, ed. Santos Coco, pp. xxxiv-xxxv, 93-99; ed. Pérez de Urbel, pp. 45-49.

321. Santos Coco, pp. 85-87; Pérez de Urbel, pp. 202-204.

322. On St Isidore of Chios (or Alexandria), see *Acta SS. Maii*, III (Antwerp, 1680), 445-452; *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina* (Brussels, 1898), I, 664; A. Pietro Frutaz, "Isidore di Chio,"

Enciclopedia Catolica, VII (Città del Vaticano, 1951), cols. 252-253; O. Volk, "Isidores, hl.", *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, V (1960), 788, col. 2. The feast is included in the liturgical calendars of the Hispanic Rite under 14 May (cf. M. Férotin, *Liber Ordinum*, pp. 464-465; idem, *Liber Mozarabicus Sacramentorum*, Paris, 1912, p. xlviii; Vives and Fábrega, *Calendarios hispánicos*, *Hispania Sacra*, II (1949), 119-146, 339-380, *sub* II Idus Mali); but the patronage very rarely occurs in the diplomatic collections among titularies of monasteries and churches or in subscription lists. [I have now concluded that the Byzantine entitlature of Dueñas does not stem from Mozarabic sources but from the late ninth or early tenth-century connection of Campestrian Benedictinism, by way of Asturias, with Carolingian Aquitaine. See my "The Abbey of Dueñas and the Cult of St Isidore of Chios in the County of Castile (10th-11th Centuries)," in *Homenaje a fray Justo Pérez de Urbel, OSB* (Silos, 1977), II, 345-364.] As for the veneration of St Isidore of Seville, cf. the illuminating studies of the Bollandist authority, R. P. Baudouin de Gaiffier, "Le culte de Saint Isidore de Seville. Esquisse d'un travail," in *Isidoriana*, pp. 271- 283; and Manuel Díaz y Díaz, *Isodoro en la Edad Media hispana*, *ibid.*, pp. 345-387, especially pp. 373-377.

323. Yepes, *Corónica de San Benito*, ed. Pérez de Urbel, II, 148, col. 1.

324. Stuttgart, 1935 (reprinted, 1955), pp. 347-362. This appendix is omitted from the Eng. trans, cited n. 17 above.

325. Jaffé-Loewenfeld, *Regesta*, no. 5098. Paul Kehr, "Wie und wann wurde das Reich Aragon ein Lehen der rttmischen Kirche?," *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, philhist. Kl., XVIII (1928; Castilian version, under title of "Como y cuándo se hizo Aragón feudatario de la Santa Sede," EEMCA, I, 1945, 285-326, to be cited here) publishes the text from the original in the Archive Catedral de Jaca (photocopy in EEMCA, loc. cit.).

326. Mansi, *Concilia*, XIX, col. 932; *Colección de cánones*, III, 118-121. Durán Gudiol, *Iglesia de Aragón*, pp. 138-140, 161-167, edits this text anew, while condemning it as spurious.

327. Note 235, *supra*.

328. Kehr, pp. 305-313.

329. Erdmann, *Entstehung*, pp. 351-356; Paul Schmid, "Die Entstehung des Marseiller Kirchenstaats," *Archiv für Urkundenforschung*, X (1928), 176-207, especially pp. 186-194; David, *Études*, pp. 407-422.

330. Pp. 355-356.

331. Cf. note 277, *supra*.

332. Kehr, pp. 301-305.

333. Erdmann, pp. 357-359; text of Sancho's act in Kehr, p. 319. This new Aragonese census -- to be paid in mancuses of money of Jaca and thus presumably not in Muslim dinars -- falls in the period when Cluny's census was in arrears; and it may thus have been one factor inducing Abbot Hugh to press Alfonso VI for payment and leading to the delivery of the *decem milia talentorum* in 1089 and the re-affirmation of the annual obligation at Burgos in 1090.

334. Jaffé-Loewenfeld, no. 4691; PL, CXLVI, col. 1362; Kehr, *Papsturkunden, Navarra und Aragon*, II, 260-265 (nos. 3-4); idem, "El papado y los reinos de Navarra y Aragón," EEMCA, II (1946), 98-99; Durán Gudiol, *Iglesia de Aragón*, pp. 28-29, 140-144 (hypercritically imputing extensive adulteration of the Peña bull and rejecting that of Loarre as "una manifiesta falsificación"); Lacarra, *Aspectos economicos*, pp. 272-273. On the royal responsibility in these cases, cf., for example, the pope's words in the bull to Prior Simeon of Loarre: "... karissimus filius noster Sancius rex Hispanie . . . predictum

monasterium sancto Petri de castello Luar ab eo constructum et edificatum, mediante legato nostro Hugone Candido et cardinali presbitero nee non venerando abbate monasterii sancti Iohannis baptiste de Penna, in proprium ius et tutelam sancte Romane ecclesie suscipi et apostolicis privilegiis muniri desiderat et corroborari pariterque ex subiectione eiusdem monasterii constitutum censum, uidelicet unciam auri, per singulos annos apostolice sedi persoluendum esse destinavit". (Kehr, *Papsturkunden*, II, 261-262).