

Conflict and Chronicle in Twelfth-Century León-Castile: a literary study of the first Crónica anónima of Sahagún

Submitted by Ryan Evan Schwarzrock
to the University of Exeter
as a thesis for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in History
December 2012

This thesis is available for Library use on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been identified and that no material has previously been submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other University.

(Signature)

Abstract

This thesis argues that the first *Crónica anónima of Sahagún* was written for two primary historiographical purposes: (1) to address the problematic nature of the events with which the conflict between the monastery and the burghers of Sahagún comes to an end in order to construe these as a legitimate victory of the monastery over the burghers; and (2) to capitalise on this victory by presenting within the dramatic story of conflict and chaos the chronicle tells a novel version of the monastery's lordship over the burghers. We approach this argument by way of five chapters. The first three of these chapters provide close readings of the narrative according to a three-part scheme which we have identified. Thus, chapter one covers part one, 'the history of the monastery', part two, 'the outbreak of conflict', and part three, 'the resolution of the conflict'. We show in the course of these how the strict political and narrative order of the monastery's history gives way to a complex narrative disorder which dramatises competition in the narrative among various political and ecclesiastical actors, and various social groups, at both the local and regional levels. This complex story of political, religious, social, and narrative disorder, we argue, is intended to frame the burghers in their challenge against the monastery's authority as treacherous and intriguing, and thus illegitimate, strivers. In the final two chapters we return to the narrative for a closer look at two defining features of the narrative: the role of the first-person narrator, and the role of documents. In our chapter on authorship we consider the way that the author, both as narrator and as participant in the story, intervenes between reader in text in order to point to a communal and subjective version of truth. In the chapter on documents we look more closely at the way that the chronicle uses its dramatised story of conflict to reinterpret the monastery's cornerstone political and ecclesiastical privileges, the *fuero* of Alfonso VI and the *libertas Romana*, in terms of each other, in terms of a series of privileges granted by the archbishop of Toledo and the papacy during the conflict, and, finally, in terms of a charter produced by the burghers that would have undone some of the monastery's powers over that social group.

Table of Contents

Introduction	5
Aims and methodology	5
Political, religious and cultural context	7
Literary context	13
Manuscript tradition	24
Scholarly tradition	26
Date of first <i>Crónica anónima</i>	31
Authorship	33
The philology of the chronicle	34
Second <i>Crónica anónima</i>	40
Reception of the first <i>Crónica</i>	46
Chapter One: the history of the monastery	55
Chapter Two: the outbreak of conflict	77
Medieval conflict theory	84
The breakdown of narrative order	87
Emergence of burghers as narrative agents	100
Conclusion	111
Chapter Three: the ecclesiastical strategy	113
Tortures	114
The burghers' threat	126
Persuasion	133
Ecclesiastical censure	136
Divine intervention	156
Resolution	162
Conclusion	178
Chapter Four: the author in the story	181
The author in the narrative	184
Chapter twenty-six	185
Chapter seventy-three	193
The author in the monastery	200
Author and abbot	209
Conclusion	220
Chapter Five: the use of documents	221
Documents in the monastery's royal past	224
The <i>libertas Romana</i>	227
The <i>fuero</i> of Alfonso VI	234
Raising the question and a new strategy	243
The archbishop's interdict	249
Journey to Rome and papal excommunication	251
Two letters of excommunication	254
The Queen's speeches	255

	3
The meaning of land	258
The burghers' 'cursed' charter	261
Conclusion	266
Conclusion	269
Bibliography	277

Introduction

The first *Crónica anónima* of Sahagún provides an account of the conflict that erupted between the monastery and the burghers of Sahagún from 1109 to 1117. This study presents a close reading of the rhetorical, thematic, and narrative strategies which the *Crónica* uses to construct this account of local conflict. Our reading of these literary strategies allows us to propose a new argument for the purpose of this chronicle: that the *Crónica* was primarily intended to rewrite the social and legal basis for the abbot of Sahagún's lordship over the town's burgher class. It was not, however, the *Crónica's* intention to present this novel rewriting of local authority as such. Thus, our focus will be on the way that the *Crónica* was able to use its account of conflict and the literary conventions of the chronicle genre to present its rewriting as a reassertion of the traditional terms of the monastery's authority. While many studies have used this chronicle as an historical source, the *Crónica* has been largely neglected as a piece of historical writing. However, a deeper understanding of the complexities of its literary and socio-legal designs suggest that the importance of the *Crónica* as an example of twelfth-century Spanish historiography be re-evaluated.

Aims and methodology

This thesis seeks to understand the first *Crónica anónima* according to its historiographical and literary strategies. Our aim is to show how the *Crónica* manipulated the jumbled and fluid nature of the cartulary-chronicle genre to convey a particular message, which we will argue was to rewrite the nature of the abbot of Sahagún's lordship over the burghers. We use the term 'literary' here in both a loose and a specific sense. In brief, we mean first to suggest loosely that this is not a study which uses the *Crónica* simply to glean historical data. As we will shortly see, the majority of previous studies that have made use of the *Crónica* have used it as a source for various historical topics: the history of the monastery or town of Sahagún, the burgher or peasant revolts of the 1110s, or the reign of Queen Urraca. This is a study of the *Crónica* for its own sake according to the strategies of narrative, theme, and rhetoric by which this text creates meaning within a certain generic mode. But, in the second place, we must specify that this is not a literary study *per se*. We do not engage

fully in any particular literary theory or method. Our aim is to show how this chronicle makes use of its historiographical and literary medium to convey its message.

The first three chapters of this study will consider the narrative structure of the chronicle in a comprehensive sense, and especially according to the three part structure that we have identified. The first chapter will pay close attention to the way that the Leonese monarchy's patronage of the monastery establishes an ordered narrative structure at the chronicle's beginning. In the second chapter we will consider how this order is disrupted by the breakdown of political order in the civil war that follows the divorce of King Alfonso I of Aragón and Queen Urraca. We will see here how the narrative itself becomes more confused to reflect the story of political, social, and religious chaos it relates. This narrative chaos can be read as a crisis of authority, with the place previously held by the Leonese monarchy as the strong protagonists of the story, giving way to multiple powers and interests (Queen Urraca, King Alfonso I, Archbishop Bernard of Toledo, and various nobles) competing at both the regional and local levels. The relationship between the regional and local is especially relevant here, as the confusion of power at the regional level allows the chronicler to frame the burghers' rebellion as an inevitable consequence of the breakdown of the larger world outside of Sahagún. In this way the burghers' motives and complaints against the monastery are skipped over.

In chapter three we move to the third part of the chronicle which ends with the resolution of the conflict. As with the transition into the second part which came with the death of Alfonso VI, this section of the narrative is also prompted by a crisis that charges the story with the need for a response. Chapters forty-four through fifty-three describe horrific tortures inflicted upon local peasants by the burghers. These chapters provide the chronicle an opportunity to once more reconfigure the narrative structure based around the various political, ecclesiastical, and local actors of the story. The political storyline of the civil war is minimised. This permits the chronicle to focus on the role of ecclesiastical powers, Archbishop Bernard, Pope Paschal II, and Abbot Domingo of Sahagún, to correct the evil deeds of the burghers and reassert control over them. Crucially, the Aragonese also disappear in these chapters as aggressors against the monastery of Sahagún and in this way the burghers are made the sole antagonists of the narrative.

In chapters four and five we will move into discussions based around two features of the narrative at the heart of the chronicle's literary and legal strategies. These are the appearance of the author as narrator and as participant in the events of his story and the use of documents in the chronicle. By considering the authorship strategy of the chronicle as a rhetorical and thematic strategy, we see how the storytelling of the chronicle is identified with a series of social relationships: the chronicler and the monastic community, the chronicler and Abbot Domingo, and with the author's own critical and emotional reactions to the story. The use of documents takes us to the heart of the chronicle's purpose. It is here that we see how the chronicle repositions the monastery's two most important documents in the experience of the conflict with the burghers to rewrite the abbot's lordship over the burghers.

Political, religious and cultural context

Alfonso VI of León and Cluny

The eleventh century in the Christian kingdoms of the Northern Iberian Peninsula was a period of rapid and sweeping change. At the centre of these cultural, political, and religious trends of change was the figure of Alfonso VI of León and Castile (1065-1109).¹ It is on his reign that we will focus here as it is his long tenure on the throne that most clearly expresses these trends; he was also the great patron of the monastery of Sahagún—even choosing to be buried there—and his reign forms the immediate backdrop to the *Crónica*. These changes were driven by two interlinked developments. First, the power gained by the Christian kings of the North over their Southern, Muslim counterparts in the course of the eleventh century. Second, the dramatic flood of cultural influences opened up by increased contact between Christian Spain and the rest of Western Europe. This was the age of the so-called Reconquest, when Christian kings wielded new military supremacy over their neighbours. And this was the age of the merchants, monks, mercenaries, and pilgrims that poured down from the Pyrenees along the Pilgrim trail to Santiago. These trends are inextricably bound up with the reign of Alfonso VI, the great conqueror of Toledo in 1085. The capture of this city, symbol of the Visigothic, pre-Islamic past, became the

¹ B.F. Reilly, *The Kingdom of León-Castilla under King Alfonso VI 1065-1109* (Princeton, 1992).

sign of the rising fortunes of the peninsula's Christian rulers. The *Crónica* in chapter eight remembers how

the king Don Alfonso was in those times always busy in the deeds of arms, manfully warring against the infidels, and especially against that most well-endowed and famous city of theirs, that is, Toledo, which he overcame and subdued with continual battle, and in the twentieth year of his reign he captured it.²

The reign of Alfonso VI also saw a degree of foreign influence and association unprecedented among his predecessors. Alfonso took several of his wives from across the Pyrenees. In turn these wives may have also worked to further increase French influences at Alfonso's court. It has been suggested that his wife Constance of Burgundy was a "zealous champion" of Cluny in Alfonso's kingdom.³ Abbot Hugh of Cluny was her uncle. Alfonso invited French men into his court and engaged his daughter Urraca to a French count, Raymond of Burgundy. He administered religious reforms, most notably the replacement of the Visigothic liturgy with the Roman version in 1080.⁴ In this vein too, he invited Cluniac monks to his kingdom in order to spread monastic reforms on the Cluniac model. The monastery of Sahagún was chosen as the original staging ground for this experiment. Sahagún was effectively remade as a Cluniac monastery in 1079 when Alfonso installed a Cluniac abbot in the religious house.

Alfonso's association with Sahagún went back to the inauspicious first years of his reign. Alfonso's father, Fernando I, had arranged for his kingdom to be divided at his death. Alfonso VI, his second son, for reasons not clearly understood, was awarded the kingdom of León, marking him as the favourite above his two brothers.⁵ The eldest

² 'Sienpre estava el rey don Alfonso en este tiempo ocupado en fechos de armas, virilmente guerreando contra los ynfieles, e en espeçial contra la muy abastada e famosísima çibdad d'ellos, conviene a saber, Toledo, la qual con batalla continua quebrantó e domó, e en el beinteno año de su reino la tomó'. A. Ubieto Arteta, *Crónicas anónimas de Sahagún* (ch. 8, p. 16). This and subsequent quotations, unless otherwise noted, are from the edition of A. Ubieto Arteta's *Crónicas anónimas de Sahagún* (Zaragoza, 1987), henceforth referred to as CAS.

³ C.J. Bishko, 'Liturgical Intercession at Cluny for the king-emperors of León', *Studia monastic* 7 (1961), p. 61.

⁴ Reilly, *Alfonso VI* and R. Santiago, 'Originales y copias en la documentación del monasterio de Sahagún', *Orígenes de las lenguas romances en el reino de León: siglos IX-XII*, vol. 1 (León, 2004), pp. 533-564.

⁵ Reilly, *Alfonso VI*, p. 15.

of Fernando I's sons, Sancho II (1065-1072), received under the terms of the will Castile, and García (1065-1071), the youngest, received Portugal and Galicia. Following Fernando I's death fratricidal war broke out. By January 1072, Sancho II had defeated Alfonso VI in the Battle of Golpejera, and imprisoned him at Burgos, and, the year previous, had pursued García into Portugal and sent him into exile in Seville.⁶ Sancho's superiority was not to last long however, and by October of that same year he was assassinated by the walls of Zamora.⁷ Alfonso VI had in the meantime been released from the prison at Burgos and allowed to go into exile in Toledo. With the death of his elder brother he now returned from Toledo, crowning himself king of now-reunited León-Castile, comprising all the lands of his father's kingdom.⁸

While Alfonso VI was languishing in prison it was Abbot Hugh of Cluny and his monks that took up his cause and achieved his release.⁹ Two versions of their intervention exist. The oldest of the French sources, *Gilo's Vitae s. Hugonis*, describes Hugh's sympathetic reaction upon hearing of Alfonso VI's incarceration. He immediately offered the prisoner personal prayers and ordered his monks to offer prayers as well. He also sent Bishop Ximeno of Burgos, who was then resident at Cluny, to Spain to petition King Sancho II personally, and to assure Alfonso VI that his release was being sought. The *Crónica Leonesa* tells it slightly differently. According to this Spanish source, Alfonso VI petitioned Abbot Hugh himself after the efforts of the Leonese bishops, abbots and nobles to secure Alfonso's release went nowhere. It is at this point that Abbot Hugh steps in with intercessory prayers and emissaries.

Both sources agree that Sancho II was unmoved by the petitions and by the assurance that Alfonso VI would never again seek royal power. But, according to their miraculous versions of the story, Saint Peter appeared to him in a dream one night to threaten Sancho with immediate death if he did not release his brother. It was only with this dream that Sancho leapt up and granted the prisoner liberation. The implications of Saint Peter's appearance in their accounts is clear: the patron saint of

⁶ Reilly, *Alfonso VI*, pp. 32, 50; B.F. Reilly, *The Kingdom of León-Castilla under Queen Urraca 1109-1126* (Princeton, 1982) pp. 9.

⁷ Reilly, *Alfonso VI*, p. 65.

⁸ *Ibid.* and J. Pérez de Urbel, ed., *Historia Silense* (Madrid, 1959).

⁹ For what follows, see: H.E.J. Cowdrey, *The Cluniacs and the Georgian Reform* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), pp. 226-7; Bishko, 'Liturgical Intercession', p. 66, and C.J. Bishko 'Fernando I and the Origins of the Leonese-Castilian Alliance with Cluny', *Studies in Medieval Spanish Frontier History* (London, 1980) II, 1-136 (pp. 31-2). References cited therein.

Cluny had come in answer to the prayers of Abbot Hugh and his monks to rescue Alfonso.

Cluny's successful intervention would have important consequences for the future of Hispano-Cluniac relations during Alfonso VI's reign. The bond forged between Cluny and Alfonso VI, as a friend and *socius*, was to be the closest of any peninsular ruler before or since. Alfonso VI was also to become the monastery's most generous benefactor, more so than any other European monarch. Yet, despite Alfonso VI's gratitude for Cluny's role in his liberation, it seems he was at first hesitant to commit fully to Cluniac confraternity. Furthermore, while the bountiful annual census of one thousand gold pieces which Fernando I had granted to the abbey around 1063 explains Cluny's interest and efforts in seeing his son's restoration to his rightful kingdom, and while Cluny certainly wished to see filial observance of the pledged census, it would be another five years before Alfonso VI pledged himself to such an agreement.¹⁰

Between 1073 and 1077, Alfonso VI may have attempted to fulfil the inherited dynastic obligation¹¹ to Cluny begun by his father, and to show his own gratitude¹² for the role of Abbot Hugh and his monks in securing his liberation through the cession of monasteries instead of monetary donations to Cluny. During these four years Alfonso VI donated to Cluny a monastery at the rate of roughly one a year.¹³ The donation of

¹⁰ There is plausible evidence to suggest that Fernando I's original pledge bound his successors to observance of the pledge after his own death. Alfonso VI and Abbot Hugh acknowledged as much in the 1090 privilegio re-granting the double census: "quem censum eodem modo per successores suos prefato loco annuatim reddendum instituit et confirmavit". See Bishko, 'Fernando I and the Origins', pp. 29 ff, quote p. 34.

¹¹ Cluny had for some time hoped to extract from the Spanish kings a formalised, constitutional obligation fully promulgated among the bishops and magnates of the kingdom, which was not received until the privilegio of 1090. See Bishko, 'Fernando I and the Origins', pp. 35 & 70.

¹² Hildebert of Lavardin reports that Alfonso agreed to double the amount of his father's census in gratitude for Cluny's part in effecting his release from prison. Does this reason alone account for Alfonso's generosity, miracles and dreams aside? To what degree did he credit Cluny with his release when the Infante Urraca and other Leonese nobles also worked for his release? Was the double census made also politically useful and possible by his spectacular political fortunes? What is the significance of his making up for lost payments in 1088 when the Almoravid invasion had cut off much of his relied upon *taifa* sources? Cowdrey, *The Cluniacs*, p. 227.

¹³ Up to 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. When Santa Maria de Nájera came into Alfonso VI's possession with the partition of Navarre he gave it to Abbot Hugh. These gifts were unprecedented in Spanish dealings with Cluny. Consequently, the monasteries became subject to

Leonese royal monasteries to Cluny was without precedent in Spanish history. Bishko speculates that Alfonso VI was hesitant at first to pledge himself to Cluny and commit to a regular and formal payment as his father had done for the quasi-vassalic connotations that such a pledge implied.¹⁴ Whatever the case, in 1077, for reasons not sufficiently clear, Alfonso VI not only pledged himself to the perpetuation of his father's annual census of one thousand gold *metcales* per annum but he also bound himself to a further 1000 gold pieces bringing the new total to 2000 gold metcales per annum.

The Abbey of Sahagún

The town of Sahagún is situated some thirty miles east-south-east of León on the river Cea, in the borderlands between the kingdoms of León and Castile, a region of constantly shifting political boundaries from the time of Alfonso III (866-910) onward. This region is called the *Tierra de Campos*. It is a flat *meseta* or lowland of arable and fertile land lying between the rivers Cea and Pisuerga, producing grain, wine, and fruit. The Visigoths had originally settled the area in the early sixth century, drawn by the potential for cattle herding. Because of this the region was sometimes referred to as the *Campi Gothici*. Sancho III the Great of Navarre (1000-1035) took control of the territory after 1029 when he claimed Castile from Vermudo III of León (1028-1037). He married his son Fernando I to the Infanta Sancha, the sister of the now-deposed Castilian king. The *Tierra de Campos* was then granted to Fernando I as dowry with the marriage.¹⁵

The town was originally the village known as *Domnos Sanctos*. Its present name is a shortening and corruption of San Facundus, the monastery's eponymous patron saint along with his brother San Primitivo. Precise information on the beginnings of the religious community that grew up around the site of the martyrdom of these saints is difficult to ascertain. The first *Crónica anónima* of Sahagún, a work of the twelfth-century, recounts that two Roman martyrs, Facundus and Primitivo, lived in the 'time

Cluny and adopted its customs according to Cowdrey, *The Cluniacs*, p. 227. See also Bishko, 'Fernando I and the Origins', p. 30.

¹⁴ Bishko, 'Fernando I and the Origins', p. 31.

¹⁵ Cowdrey, *The Cluniacs*, pp. 15-16; Bishko, 'Fernando I and the Origins', p. 21; Reilly, *Urraca*, pp. 7-8; R. Fletcher, *The Episcopate in the Kingdom of León in the Twelfth Century* (Oxford, 1978) pp. 1-3; T.F. Glick, *Islamic and Christian Spain in the Early Middle Ages* (Brill, 2005) pp. 27-28.

when the noble and powerful man Marcus Aurelius ruled'.¹⁶ This would date their deaths to sometime between 161-180. According to the *Crónica*, the local faithful collected the bodies of the two Romans from the river Cea in which they had been dumped and constructed 'a chapel and a small church'.¹⁷ The monastery was sacked by a Muslim army sometime in the ninth century and subsequently rebuilt by Alfonso III who also founded the monastery in a document dated 22 October 904.¹⁸ The chronicle also mentions Ramiro II (931-950) who granted the monastery a *coto*, or a preserve of woodland, orchards and vineyards for the monastery's exclusive use.¹⁹

Cluny Abbey

The Benedictine monastic house of Cluny, set in the Burgundian department of Saône-et-Loire, became in the twelfth century the most powerful, wealthy and influential of abbeys in Europe. Founded by William Duke of Aquitaine in 910, Cluny was able to harness new religious trends under the banner of its own highly organised and disciplined form of monasticism. Three of the twelfth-century popes at one time were resident at Cluny, including the leading reformer pope, Gregory VII, the other two being Popes Urban II and Paschal II. Cluny could depend on a continual series of capable abbots during its first two hundred and fifty years of existence, all among the most influential churchmen of their day. Among these were Sts. Odo, Odilo, Hugh, and Peter the Venerable. Under the last of these Cluny was to reach its peak of influence and prosperity, between 1122 and 1156. Cluny's innovation in monasticism was its use of local Burgundian feudal methods of organization to create a system of subject houses throughout Europe, all completely dependent on the mother house. Under its highly centralised system Cluny established new monastic houses as well as seeking out existing houses which would be incorporated under Cluny's rule. In the twelfth century Cluny oversaw a network of over three hundred subject monasteries. Cluny's success was also largely dependent on a system of benefactors to support its sizeable congregation. Of these benefactors, which included the German Emperors, the Spanish kings, Fernando I and in turn his son Alfonso VII became the abbey's most generous donors. Their donations, won from their own systems of subject Muslim Taifas who

¹⁶ '*tiempo que el noble e poderoso barón Marcho Antonio regía*' CAS, ch.2, p.9.

¹⁷ '*una capilla y yglesia pequeñuela*' CAS, ch. 2, p. 10.

¹⁸ J.A. Fernández Flórez, *Colección diplomática del monasterio de Sahagún, 857-1230*, v.2 (León, 1994), p. 27.

¹⁹ CAS, ch. 5, p. 11.

paid tribute or *paria* money, financed ambitious building projects such as Abbot Hugh's new abbey church, known as Cluny III and can be credited in large part with the monastery's tremendous success.

Literary context

The *Crónica anónima* can be grouped with a genre of medieval historiography which has been called the charter-chronicle, or cartulary-chronicle.²⁰ As the name suggests, cartulary-chronicles are a mix of charters and historical narrative, but their pastiche nature tends to be more complex than this. For example, the *Crónica anónima* comprises (in addition to charters and historical narrative) a wide range of textual forms and rhetorical strategies: history, hagiography, dramatic outbursts, direct speech, and direct addresses to the reader.

Establishing a clear definition of the cartulary-chronicle as a genre is problematic for several reasons. The cartulary-chronicle is a medley of other genres and textual forms. What these might be and how they are combined might differ greatly between individual examples. Given that it was their fluidity as a genre that (according to the argument of Vanderputten) made them a useful historiographical option, the question of finding a definition is beside the point. Recent studies have pointed to the cultural and social conditions in which the jumbled pastiche style of these histories would have had a pragmatic logic. Steven Vanderputten has put forward this idea. In his essay 'Monastic literate practices in eleventh- and twelfth-century northern France', he writes:

the enormous investments made by groups and individuals to transmit information in written form shows that documents were, in effect, being tested as levers for achieving political, social and economic goals. The main problem was that those who tried to use written documents for this purpose did not know which, if any, type

²⁰ The term charter-chronicle has been used by Jennifer Paxton to describe the subject of much of her work, the *Liber Eliensis*: see Paxton, 'Monks and Bishops: The Purpose of the *Liber Eliensis*', *The Haskins Society Journal*, 11 (2003: for 1998), 17-30.

of written discourse would ultimately prove to be the most effective.²¹

Approaches such as that taken by Vanderputten, who focuses on the social and cultural circumstances which inspired and shaped the genre, offer a way around the problem of settling on literary or historiographical criteria within the text itself. Vanderputten's model also relies upon broader work on social and cultural changes happening at the same time that these hybrid texts were becoming more popular. The twelfth century was an era of broad changes in the uses and meanings of literate culture.²² Additionally, cartulary-chronicles were often produced in response to specific cases of social conflict. In these circumstances, monastic groups could not anticipate which historiographical forms would be most strategic in future, or rapidly changing present, conflicts. Consequently, they hedged their bets by including many different forms and styles in one text to make them more elastic and resilient as attitudes to and uses of charters and chronicles fluctuated. The 'social logic' approach provides persuasive answers to many of the interpretive questions and difficulties posed by cartulary-chronicles.²³ Most importantly, it provides a basis for a more sympathetic understanding of cartulary-chronicles according to their own purposes within specific, indeed very often strictly local, circumstances, rather than to dislocated ideals of history or literature in the abstract. But it also opens the way to further questions about the internal textual organisation and structure of cartulary-chronicles.

A handful of studies have called attention to the textual logic of cartulary-chronicles in specific case studies.²⁴ These studies have identified patterns of logic within the pastiche structure of these histories. The work of Jennifer Paxton on the *Liber Eliensis* provides a particularly useful model for our study of the *Crónica Anónima*.²⁵ For Paxton, cartulary-chronicles occupy a middle ground between charter

²¹ S. Vanderputten, 'Monastic Literate Practices in eleventh- and twelfth-century northern France', *Journal of Medieval History* 32 (2006), 101-26.

²² The changing nature of the meanings and uses of literate culture in the subject of Michael Clanchy's *From Memory to Written Record, England 1066-1307* (Oxford, 1993; 1st ed: London, 1979).

²³ The phrase is taken from G. Spiegel's 'History, Historicism, and the Social Logic of the Text', *The Past as Text: The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (ed.) Spiegel (Baltimore, 1997), 3-28.

²⁴ In addition to the work by Jennifer Paxton, quoted above and below, see: G.A. Loud, 'Monastic chronicles in the twelfth-century Abruzzi', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 27 (ed.) J. Gillingham (Woodbridge, 2005), 101-31.

²⁵ Paxton's work on the *Liber Eliensis* was originally the subject of her PhD: *Charter and chronicle in twelfth-century England: The house-histories of the Fenland Abbeys* (PhD thesis, Harvard University,

and chronicle. She argues that charter and chronicle were not wholly distinct historiographical modes in the period in question, but, rather, that cartulary-chronicles demonstrate that their function and meaning often converged.²⁶ Cartulary-chronicles provided a comprehensive literary medium where monastic communities could bring together the legal records of their privileges and rights with stories of their origins and expressions of their identity and sanctity. In her study of the *Liber Eliensis*, she shows how the deployment of charter and miracle accounts follow a clear pattern and logic according to the text's argument that a recently-deceased bishop of Ely, one Nigel of Salisbury, was evil and had not protected the rights and status of Ely monastery as he should have. She also shows how the story of the spiritual patronage provided by Ely's patron saint, Saint Æthelthryth, is used as a narrative thread which ties the pastiche elements of the text together. Paxton's notion of the internal logic of the organisation of the pastiche elements of cartulary-chronicles for the purposes of constructing argument and order can be usefully applied to the *Crónica Anónima*.

The *Crónica* comprises the textual and narrative forms as diverse as charter, epistle, historiography, hagiography, and *gesta abbatum*. The rhetorical styles of the narrative are also diverse. The chronicle uses in different places in the text such rhetorical strategies as impersonal historical narrative, direct speech, dramatic first-person outbursts by the author, direct addresses to the reader, and an apostrophe to the monastery's patron saints, to name some of these. The chronicle also involves itself with both the local conflict between the burghers and the monastery of Sahagún and the civil war that was fought throughout the Northern kingdoms, from Aragón to Galicia. A wider, regional perspective is also used in places to describe the broader nature of the burgher rebellions that broke out across the towns of the pilgrim trail, from Burgos to Santiago de Compostela. Peasant revolts that happened in this same wider territory are also described.

The fusion of charter and narrative and of diverse narrative forms (historiography, hagiography, etc.) signal the *Crónica's* participation in the cartulary-

1999. I have been unable to consult her thesis but her ideas have been published in recent articles. In addition to the article quoted above, see: 'Lords and Monks: Creating an Ideal of Noble Power in Monastic Chronicles', *The Experience of Power in Medieval Europe 950-1350* (ed.) R. F. Berkhofer (Aldershot, 2005), 227-236; 'Introduction: The Book of Ely', *Medieval Hagiography: an Anthology* (ed.) T. Head (New York, 2000), intro: 459-494.

²⁶ Paxton, 'Monks and Bishops: The Purpose of the *Liber Eliensis*', p. 18.

chronicle genre. Yet, as we have begun to indicate, the complexity of the chronicle's jumbled nature is more profound than just a pastiche of documents and medieval narrative genres. The *Crónica* arranges these and its various rhetorical modes into a larger structural whole in order to tell of the local conflict in a way that suits the specific purpose of the chronicler. The cartulary-chronicle provides the chronicler of the *Crónica* an open and adaptable format to shape according to his need. This reading diverges from Vanderputten's notion of the cartulary-chronicle's uncertain relationship to its audience. We propose here that the *Crónica* has a very definite and pointed relationship to its audience: its argument concerning the ecclesiastical nature of the monastery's authority over the burghers, an argument meant to be read by the monastic audience itself. This reading does not, however, contradict Vanderputten's premise. This still explains for us the social logic which gave rise to the cartulary-chronicle. It also points us to the way that the *Crónica* was also open, at the same time that its author and immediate readers might have participated in a specific programme of reinterpreting the nature of the monastery's local authority, to other readings. As we will show further on, the second *Crónica anónima* provides an example of such a re-reading. We do not have evidence for other uses or readings of this text, yet we do not need to close off from the possibility that Vanderputten's proposed try-everything strategy was at work in the *Crónica* at the same time that a more deliberate argument was being made. It is natural to assume that the chronicler would be ready for the chronicle to be put to whatever service it could in the interest of the monastery of Sahagún.

The parallel storylines of the local conflict in Sahagún between the burghers and monastery and the regional civil war fought between Alfonso I and Urraca are especially important for the way that the chronicle constructs its narrative. Each of the three parts of the narrative that we have identified arranges the relationship between the local and the regional in contrasting ways. The first part of the chronicle tells the story of the earliest foundations of the monastery, from the martyrdom of its patron saints and the foundation of the monastery to the death of the long-reigning Alfonso VI. This part is structured around an account of the devotion and generosity of the kings of León towards the monastery of Sahagún. The story of the privileges and gifts given by the Leonese monarchy to the monastery both establishes a close relationship

between monarchy and monastery and also gives a clear, ordered pattern to the narrative. This original political and religious harmony gives way to the chaos of the civil war.

The next section of the chronicle breaks from the historical account of the monastery's early foundations and royal benefactions but continues with a focus on the monarchy with the events that ensue the death of Alfonso VI. The narrative returns to the local events of Sahagún with the occupation of the town by a unit of Aragonese soldiers returning from a political rebellion in Galicia. The chronicle makes it clear that this attack was instigated by the Aragonese with the burghers joining in. This establishes the opportunist role of the burghers in the local conflict. By continuing to focus in the following chapters on the events of the civil war, only occasionally turning back to Sahagún, the chronicle is able to structure its assertion that the burghers were merely taking advantage of the political situation (without any understandable complaints of their own against the monastery). Through the course of this section of the chronicle the burghers emerge only eventually as aggressors against the monastery in their own right.

The next narrative transition comes with a series of chapters describing the gruesome tortures inflicted upon local peasants captured by the burghers. These tortures form a peak of rhetorical and emotional energy in the text. They also function to shunt Alfonso I and his Aragonese followers and Queen Urraca from their central place in the narrative. The burghers are now the primary aggressors against not only the monastery but the whole social, political, and ecclesiastical order. This allows the chronicle to show the need for an ecclesiastical response to the burghers' crimes. The main players in the narrative are thus repositioned: Alfonso I and Urraca take a back seat and the ecclesiastical order, led by Archbishop Bernard, Pope Paschal II, and Abbot Domingo confront the burghers who are now act alone as the antagonists of the story.

Important questions also arise concerning the chronicle's use of certain rhetorical and literary conventions. The *Crónica* is pervaded by the *topoi* of the medieval chronicle. These *topoi* spring up in the chronicle's descriptions of people, of the past, and of places, in set-piece scenes of dramatic action, and in frequent

interruptions of the story by the narrator for various reasons (we will return to these in chapter four of this thesis). These literary conventions are an important consideration for our understanding of the way that the *Crónica* might have been read and used. At a very basic level, such *topoi* signal the chronicle's participation in the generic practices of a wide variety of medieval texts. As a very familiar feature of the chronicle, these could have allowed the *Crónica* to be read by a wide medieval audience. Though there is no evidence that the *Crónica* did circulate beyond the monastery's walls (it is not mentioned by any other medieval chronicle), this notion at least points to the idea that not all elements of the text were tailored exclusively for the monastic community. Vanderputten's notion of the cartulary-chronicle's open-ended relationship to its audience is useful here. Such an indiscriminate approach to audience can be thought of as part of the generic DNA of the *Crónica* as a cartulary-chronicle, even though the work might have been primarily meant for an internal audience.

We argue that the *Crónica* was written specifically for the monastic community of Sahagún, as a kind of internal briefing following the conflict with the burghers. The *Crónica* was meant to set out a new version of authority that relied more heavily on an ecclesiastical model. This meant a reinterpretation of the *libertas Romana* as a document relevant specifically to the monastery's local power over the burgher class. The *libertas* is made to oppose the charter drawn up by the burghers during the conflict; the monastery eventually confirms this charter for the burghers, but later has it destroyed. It seems that the memory of the burghers' charter and the monastery's confirmation were not as easily effaced as the physical document. Why else would the chronicle have been willing to admit to the monastery's confirmation of a charter limiting the burghers' obligations? A fundamental motivation behind the production of the *Crónica* must have been to address this troubling event.

The specificity of the chronicle's purpose and its audience stands in contrast to Vanderputten's model of the cartulary-chronicle's open-ended strategy as regards purpose and audience. The *Crónica*, then, adopts a historiographical genre not originally suited to its objectives. Our project then stands in contrast to that of a study such as Gabrielle Spiegel's work on thirteenth-century French chronicles in her book

Romancing the Past.²⁷ In her study, Spiegel has tied the rise of vernacular prose histories in the north of France to specific political and social developments among the aristocracy. Spiegel has pointed to works such as the *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* as leading a new fashion for French vernacular prose histories among the Flemish nobility. Vanderputten has similarly been interested in the origins of an historiographical genre. The first *Crónica anónima* does not fit into such studies. Rather, in this case we are dealing with a genre that was spreading around Western Europe, making itself available to local groups for their particular needs. In the example of Sahagún, the cartulary-chronicle was applied to a situation that involved a more definite argument and a more definite audience than was originally intended by the social and legal logic of the genre.

In *Romancing the Past*, Spiegel is interested in how a given history authorises itself as a 'true' history. In the example histories that she considers this authorisation happens in opposition to what these 'true' texts identify as 'false' histories. This dichotomy in the French texts that Spiegel looks at corresponds to the polarities of poetry and prose, with works such as *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* (quoted by Spiegel in this regard) holding up prose as the medium of true history versus the distortions of histories in verse. The *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle* is a fictional account of a military expedition made by Charlemagne in Spain at the command of Saint James. The chronicle was originally written in Latin in the mid-twelfth century, purportedly by Archbishop Turpin of Rheims, but probably in fact by a cleric. Starting in the early-thirteenth century the pseudo-history began to be translated into Old French (among other vernacular languages). It is in an early example of these translations (made by Nicolas of Senlis possibly in 1202) that Spiegel locates the first assertion that poetry is the medium of untruthful history (making prose therefore the vehicle of truthful history).

The first *Crónica anónima* does not comment on its linguistic form, Medieval Latin prose. Yet, it is worth considering the *Crónica's* attitude to truth and the way that it authorises its project. Spiegel does not consider Latin texts in her study, so our text should not be expected to fit immediately into her model. In theory, Latin was, as Chris

²⁷ G. Spiegel, *Romancing the Past: The Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-Century France* (Berkeley, 1993).

Given-Wilson has remarked, the language of ‘prestige and education’ and the ‘most authoritative medium for writing history’.²⁸ But, Given-Wilson is really commenting of later English chronicles (his frame of reference for this comment is Thomas Walsingham, a chronicler working in the second half of the fourteenth century). Latin itself is not given any particular value as the medium for the story in the *Crónica*. Nevertheless, there are a number of rhetorical and narrative gestures that occur throughout the text that we can point to as part of a larger authorising strategy. One such tactic we could point to involves the chronicle’s polemic against the burghers. As we will have occasion to see in this study, the burghers are often accused of lies, slanders, and false incitements against the monastery; thus, the chronicle is not in contention with other false histories, but with a treacherous local rival group. Another source of authority in the chronicle is (as we might expect in a cartulary-chronicle) documents. A rhetoric of authority surrounds the giving of both royal and ecclesiastical documents to the monastery before and during the conflict. Phrases are used such as ‘the authority of his royal privilege’²⁹ (for a royal grant by Alfonso III) and ‘apostolic authority’³⁰ (to describe powers afforded Abbot Domingo by the papacy). Only on one occasion does the chronicle refer to truth as an attribute of historiography. This is in chapter two where the chronicle speaks of the ‘the sure knowledge and true account of the ancient fathers’.³¹ This is concerning the chronicle’s (unspecified) sources for martyrdoms of the monastery patron saints Facundo and Primitivo.

A more subtle scheme of authorisation pervades the chronicle. The chronicler points in several places to his own inability to do justice to his story as narrator. Phrases such as ‘my tongue could not express (the sufferings of Abbot Domingo) even if my throat were to sound with the power of a thousand voices’³² convey this theme. The impossibility of expression relates furthermore to the ‘affected modesty’ *topos*, where the narrator regrets his lack of skill, stated by the chronicler in chapter forty-eight: ‘I am neither learned in science nor eloquent in speech’.³³ This last example

²⁸ C. Given-Wilson, *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England* (London, 2004), p. 137.

²⁹ ‘*autoridad de su privilegio real*’, *CAS*, ch. 4, p. 11.

³⁰ ‘*autoridad apostólica*’, *CAS*, ch. 69, p. 106.

³¹ ‘*çierta cognición e de los padres antiguos vera relación*’, *CAS*, ch. 2, p. 9.

³² ‘*mi lengua non podría explicar aunque mi garganta sonase con benas de mil sonas*’, *CAS*, ch. 37, p. 72.

³³ ‘*yo nin sea savio por çiençia nin eloquente por palabra*’, *CAS*, ch. 48, p. 80. On this rhetorical convention see E.R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (trans.) W.R. Trask (Bern, 1948; London, 1953), pp. 83-5.

comes during the series of chapters on the burghers' tortures of local peasants; the chronicler is complaining about his powerlessness as a writer to articulate the terrible reality of these tortures. But, the chronicler also makes clear that it is not just a problem of his own abilities:

If that eloquent poet Marón (Virgil) was brought back from the inferno, or if Obidio Naso (Ovid) should rise from the grave, neither could do justice to these things in all their fullness.³⁴

Thus, it is the terrible nature of the burghers' crimes themselves that are the obstacle, not necessarily the skill of the writer. In a text so concerned with lies, slanders, and perjuries, and in which a 'false' charter plays a central role, it might seem surprising that the chronicler should make such a point of the problem of representation. Of course, this is one way of emphasising the severity of the burghers' crimes. It is also part of the rhetorical makeup of the medieval chronicle. As mere convention we should be cautious about reading too much into these statements. Ruth Morse has made this point:

There is something inescapably intertextual in this kind of reading, when the alert interpreter is constantly on the lookout for what it is he is supposed to be reminded of, and in which texts he has seen it before. This intertextual recognition distracts from any concentration upon the distinct truth or falsehood of an account and encourages attention to the style of the dramatization. Spotting the scheme, trope, or *topos* could be an end in itself, but need not be.³⁵

Yet, the question still remains, why should the chronicler weaken the position of his text in circumstances where the monastery's documents of local authority were under threat? A possible response to this problem is that the author's suspension of certain kinds of authority (personal and textual) allows for an emphasis on other kinds of authority, particularly those that are more secure and lasting. The chronicler denies his own authority as author of the text in the affected modesty *topos*. But, more than

³⁴ '*si aquel poeta e eloqüente Marón resuçitase de los ynfiernos, e Obidio Naso, e enseñando, saliese de la sepultura, daría lugar a esta materia e non satisfaría a su grande abundancia*', CAS, ch. 53, p. 82.

³⁵ R. Morse, *Truth and Convention in the Middle Ages: Rhetoric, Representation, and Reality* (Cambridge, 1991), p. 108.

this, the chronicler holds rhetoric itself up as problematic in denying the ability of even such Roman writers as Virgil and Ovid (held up as the highest of pagan authors) to communicate the nature of the events of the local conflict in Sahagún. Taking this assertion at face value, the message is that there is an insurmountable gap between the text and reality. As Ruth Morse has affirmed, knowing just how to read such *topoi* is problematic. Were readers of the *Crónica* congratulating themselves on their recognition of the text's various tropes? Or, were they stopping to ponder the fundamental implications of these declarations by the narrator for the authorial and textual project itself?

It is impossible to know; probably neither. These *topoi* most likely did not stand out or call attention to themselves as we are having them do here. Instead, they would have fitted into a larger narrative whole. Of course, the question also hinges on the audience itself. We have suggested that the *Crónica* was intended for the monastic community of Sahagún itself. The effect of these complaints by the narrator about the difficulty of his task amongst the sympathetic audience of the monks of Sahagún might have been sympathy, perhaps as well as anger at the viciousness of the burghers. In fact, this connection between the modesty *topos* and the narrator's place in the monastery is made explicit in chapter forty-eight:

Now then, my fellow monks of the cloister that knew along with me of these things and others that I have not included, should they not judge me worthy or deserving of lashes because I have left many things unwritten? I trust though that they will pardon me as they know that the malice of the burghers had grown and multiplied, that they would not pardon nobles or common people.³⁶

This interjection by the narrator comes amidst the chronicle's chapter on the burghers' tortures of the local peasants, as with the quote above about Virgil and Ovid. Thus, the direct purpose of this passage is to heighten the drama of the scene. But the reminder that the chronicler speaks at some level to the monks of Sahagún, as an audience both ready to judge and ready to forgive, is significant.

³⁶ 'Pues agora los mis conpañeros monjes claustrales que saven en uno conmigo estas cosas e otras que non pongo, ¿non [me] debrán juzgar digno e mereçedor de açotes porque deço muchas cosas de escrevir?. Confío pero que ellos me perdonarán, pues que saben la malicia de los bur[u]ses tanto aver cresçido e abondado, que nin a los nobles nin a los medianos perdonavan' CAS, ch. 48, p. 80.

What we can finally suggest is the way that the text points to external truths above and beyond its own textual boundaries. In turn, the chronicle establishes its own trustworthiness in relation to these larger forms of truth. Often this truth is aligned with authority, whether royal or ecclesiastical. By appealing to these institutions of authority and by incorporating the privileges and documents bequeathed to the monastery by these, the chronicle finds one way of acquiring legitimacy for itself. But, how necessary is this in a text meant for an audience already approving of the chronicle's causes? Besides royal and ecclesiastical authority, the chronicle looks to a divine spiritual form of truth. In important instances this is also given a communal relevance. In chapters two and three the story of the martyrdom of San Facundo and San Primitivo turn into the story of the organisation and growth of the first religious community of Sahagún. In chapter twenty-nine the author calls upon San Facundo to punish Alfonso I after he steals the monastery's piece of the true cross. In chapter thirty-eight the monks and abbot huddle together in the cloister in fear of the burghers repeating the words of Psalm 119 ("Lord, when will you punish those that persecute us?"). After the chapters of the burghers' torture of the local peasants, references to divine interventions and divine justice also become more frequent. As in chapter fifty-four, where the chronicle affirms that a burgher amongst a group that had forced its way into the monastery to demand that the monks sign their new charter was killed by his enemies as divine punishment for his offence against the monastery, these often follow attacks on the abbot or monks.

Such scenes, along with the references to divine intervention which is either implored or affirmed and celebrated, speak directly to a higher form of divine truth which takes the side of the monastery against the burghers. The chronicle can also use these to associate itself with this partnership between the monastic community and divine power. What does the truth of any one description or scene of the chronicle matter when the larger significance of the story is the fulfilment of higher Christian truth and the chronicle's alignment with this power as it acts in the monastery's struggle with the burghers? It is the ultimate trump card against the burghers' threat to the monastery, and especially to its documents of authority. Spiritual truth also fits into the chronicle's project of arguing for the monastery's ecclesiastical lordship over the burghers. Divine power provides another answer to the burghers' charter that

would have undermined the *fuero* of Alfonso VI, along with the *libertas Romana*, and letters of authority given to the monastery during the conflict by Archbishop Bernard of Toledo and Pope Paschal II.

We have considered here the way that certain rhetorical features function in ways particular to the purposes of the *Crónica*. The issue of ‘truth’ and authorising strategies in medieval texts has been a central concern of works like Spiegel’s *Romancing the Past* and Morse’s *Truth and Convention in the Middle Ages*. For the texts that Spiegel is concerned with, truth is a matter of the adoption of prose as a historiographical form. For Morse, truth in a medieval text was not a function of the text itself or its objective account of the past or present, but rather of its position relative to an external holder of authority, usually a classical author or text. This takes us closer to the strategy used by the *Crónica*, except that here classical authors are explicitly denied authority. The chronicle can be seen to push off from these pagan authors much as Spiegel’s chronicle’s push off from poetic histories, defining their version of truth against their counterpart’s version of fiction. In the *Crónica*, however, such a clear opposition between truth and fiction is not made, rather the problem is of a lack of full or trustworthy communication that strikes at the heart of the textual project itself. So much rhetoric is a problem in this world. But the chronicle appeals instead to its place amongst a sympathetic monastic audience and their relationship to external powers that act within the local sphere of Sahagún, the monarchy, the archbishop, the papacy, and finally the divine.

The manuscript tradition of the *Crónicas anónimas de Sahagún*

Manuscript 251 of the *Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores* comprises two chronicles known together as the *Crónicas anónimas de Sahagún*.³⁷ The first – the subject of this study – concentrates the majority of its attention on the local conflict between the monastery and the burghers of Sahagún between the years 1109-1117. The second tells of a burgher revolt two centuries later, between the years 1237-1255. The chronicles of this manuscript have appeared in three editions. In 1782, Romualdo Escalona, a monk of Sahagún, published the chronicles as an appendix to his *Historia*

³⁷ M. Santiago Rodríguez, *Los manuscritos del Archivo General y Biblioteca del Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores* (Madrid, 1874), n° 57. The text is one leaf and 175 folios.

del real monasterio de Sahagún.³⁸ Julio Puyol y Alonso published the chronicles serially in the *Boletín de la real academia de la historia* in 1920.³⁹ The latest edition was prepared by Antonio Ubieto Arteta in 1987; it is to this text that we will refer in this study.⁴⁰

There are suggestive similarities between the two Sahagún chronicles. Both deal with burgher revolts and both have first-person narrators who appear as eye-witnesses to their histories. These narrators also both appear as close associates of their abbots, Abbot Domingo (1111-1117) and Abbot Nicholas (1251-1264), respectively. Yet, it is not clear when the two chronicles were bound together. Mention of the works from the seventeenth-century suggests that they already formed a pair by this time. Other mentions of the manuscripts either speak of the two together or are not specific; thus, we can only follow by assuming that they were bound together at a very early date, perhaps with the completion of the second *Crónica* in the thirteenth century. We will consider the relationship between the first and second chronicle in more detail in a later section in this introduction.

Though just one copy survives today, there have been references to older copies. The first known mention of the text is found in the *Bibliotheca Hispana Vetus* of Nicolás Antonio.⁴¹ In fact, Antonio had taken his reference from the *Historia eclesiástica de la imperial ciudad de Toledo* of Jerónimo Román de la Higuera.⁴² It is possible that after this other historians consulted the first *Crónica*, though clear evidence is lacking; Puyol y Alonso conjectures that Juan Benito de Guardiola, archivist at the monastery library of Sahagún in the mid to late sixteenth century, used the

³⁸ R. Escalona, *Historia del real monasterio de Sahagún*, (León, 1782).

³⁹ J. Puyol y Alonso, 'Las crónicas anónimas de Sahagún' *Boletín de la real academia de la historia*, (Madrid, 1920), tomo LXXVI, pp. 7-26, 111-122, 242-257, 339-356, 395-419, and tomo LXXVII, pp. 51-59 and 151-192. These were then collected in one book: *Las crónicas anónimas de Sahagún: nueva edición conforme a un manuscrito del siglo XVI* (Madrid, 1920).

⁴⁰ A. Ubieto Arteta, *Crónicas anónimas de Sahagún* (Zaragoza, 1987).

⁴¹ N. Antonio, *Bibliotheca Hispana Vetus* (Rome, 1696).

⁴² Unpublished: J. Román de la Higuera, 'Historia Eclesiástica de la Imperial Ciudad de Toledo', Biblioteca Nacional de España, mss. 1.639-1.641 y 1.285-1.293. Higuera was a Jesuit cleric from Toledo best known as the perpetrator of the 'false chronicles'. That he was the first to 'discover' the chronicle in Pre-Modern times probably did not help the case for the text's authenticity. Higuera also, without explanation, ascribed the chronicle to a monk Alberto of Sahagún, though no subsequent investigator has repeated this assertion.

chronicle for his *Historia del monasterio real de San Benito de Sahagún*,⁴³ but doubts that this author knew the chronicle very well. The first sustained engagement with the text comes in the latter part of the seventeenth century. At this time the monk and scholar, José Pérez (c. 1640-1696), prepared an unpublished edition of the chronicles and used them for a history of the monastery. It was this edition and history that Escalona used for his own history a century later.⁴⁴ Pérez affirms the existence of three copies in the monastery library at this time, all Romance versions: the first from a monk who lived until 1543, the second of 1567, and the third, by one of Pérez's fellow monks, Juan de Herrera, of 1656. According to him the original Latin copy (or copies?) was already missing. There is reference elsewhere to a fire in the monastery's library in 1590, and it has been supposed that it was in this fire that the original Latin manuscript perished.⁴⁵

Scholarly tradition

There are only a few studies which have approached the *Crónica* according to its particular historiographical and literary strategies. These have been particularly interested in the organization of the *Crónica* around a kind of plot, or temporal scheme. This present study also focuses on the division of the chronicle into discrete parts, but, as will become clear, the focus in the case of this study is specifically on the narrative and discursive elements that determine these division.

Javier Jiménez Belmonte, 'Hagiografía y denuncia política en la primera Crónica anónima de Sahagún',⁴⁶ has argued that the chronicle conforms to a three part narrative structure: 'un tiempo de fundación y armonía', 'un tiempo de destrucción', and 'un tiempo de redención'.⁴⁷ In fact, the *Crónica* itself, in chapter one, introduces its subject according to a two-part narrative scheme. This matches Belmonte's 'time of

⁴³ Recently published as J. B. Guardiola, *Historia del monasterio de San Benito de Sahagún (según el ms. 1519 de la Biblioteca nacional)* (2007). Guardiola describes the chronicle in his view: '*es historia de las cosas del Monasterio desde estos tiempos (los de Alfonso III) en adelante*' (cited from Puyol y Alonso, 'Las crónicas', p. 11).

⁴⁴ Escalona incorporated the work of Pérez into his *Historia del real monasterio de Sahagún*, but omitted the prologue of his predecessor. This was later published by Puyol y Alonso in an appendix in his *El abadengo de Sahagún* (Madrid, 1915), pp. 305-11.

⁴⁵ Puyol y Alonso, 'Las crónicas', LXXVI, p. 10.

⁴⁶ J. Jiménez Belmonte, 'Hagiografía y denuncia política en la primera crónica anónima de Sahagún', *La Corónica*, 29 (2001) 213-232.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 217.

foundations and harmony' (in the chronicle, the history of the monastery) and 'time of destruction' (in the chronicle, the burghers' revolt); and we will also follow this pattern. It is the nature and place of the third part of the chronicle on which there is disagreement.

According to Belmonte's, the *Crónica* functions as a 'discurso político-religioso' in which the story of the monastery's history, the burghers' uprising, and the resolution follow an hagiographical scheme. It is the monastery itself which comes through suffering and destruction to be finally redeemed in its victory over the burghers. Belmonte also puts special emphasis on the figure of Alfonso VI, who represents in large part the central saintly figure of the hagiography/history, and who in this guise presents a direct rebuke to his successor (as the husband of his daughter) and namesake, Alfonso I of Aragón.

Belmonte's assertion of the fundamentally hagiographical nature of the text has been followed by two more recent scholars. Ludovine Gaffard, 'Martirio y taumaturgia: la construcción de una memoria original de los santos Facundo y Primitivo en la primera *Crónica anónima de Sahagún*',⁴⁸ writes, '*El estudio de lo maravilloso hagiográfico en la primera 'Crónica anónima de Sahagún' nos sitúa en uno de los núcleos centrales de la obra, en el que empieza a aclararse a nuestro parecer, su génesis*'.⁴⁹ Gaffard, however, comes to a very specific conclusion, which Belmonte does not share. Gaffard argues that the *Crónica's* handling of its hagiographical material is evidence that the chronicle was written a century later. According to Gaffard, the absence of a passion scene for the monastery's patron saints in chapter two and the miraculous appearance of St Facundo in chapter sixty-nine to rescue a captive peasant are in line with hagiographical trends of the next century, and oblige us to re-date the text.

As we have said above, the chronicle involves a first-person narrator and author who is an eyewitness and participant to the history he recounts, so if Gaffard is right the chronicle is a fabrication. In fact, there is a straightforward rejoinder to this

⁴⁸L. Gaffard, 'Martirio y taumaturgia: la construcción de una memoria original de los santos Facundo y Primitivo en la primera *Crónica anónima de Sahagún*', in *Pratiques hagiographiques dans l'Espagne du Moyen Âge et du Siècle d'Or II*, (eds.) A. Arizaleta et al. (Toulouse, 2007), 33-54.

⁴⁹*Ibid.*, p. 54.

assertion. The *Crónica's* handling of its saints is entirely in line with the contemporary *Miracles of Saint James*.⁵⁰ The *Miracles* were passed down as one of the five books of the *Liber sancti Jacobi* which was compiled sometime between 1139 and 1173.⁵¹ The stories of this miracle collection focus solely on the saint's appearances in aid of pilgrims who run into trouble on route to his shrine in Galicia. The *Liber sancti Jacobi* was probably compiled some two decades after the *Crónica*, but the miracles themselves would have been written, and could have been in circulation, prior to this. It is not difficult to imagine the anonymous chronicler of Sahagún hearing of these as the monastery was on the pilgrim trail, but, even if he did not, the presence of the *Miracles* at this time still requires us to dismiss Gaffard's conclusion.

We can also add to our discussion here the work of Charles Garcia. Garcia has made the *Crónica* the subject of four essays: 'L'anonymat individuel au service d'une identité collective: l'exemple des Chroniques Anonymes de Sahagún (XIIe siècle)',⁵² 'La minorité "franque" de Sahagún dans les Chroniques anonymes (XIIe siècle)',⁵³ 'Une histoire (presque) sans mort. Le dépassement de la mort dans les Cronique anonymes (XIIe siècle)',⁵⁴ and 'Révoltes populaires ou lectures du Moyen Âge? Léon-Castille (XIIe S.): Féodalisme et mouvements sociaux dans l'historiographie du XXe siècle'.⁵⁵ There is considerable overlap in the approach and focus of these. For example, a common theme is the hagiographical and even Romantic elements of the text.⁵⁶ The echo of Belmonte in Garcia's work is clear, and another resounds in the focus in 'L'anonymat individuel' of the contrast between the saintly Alfonso VI and the tyrant Alfonso I.⁵⁷ A

⁵⁰ T.F. Coffey, L.K. Davidson et. al. *The Miracles of Saint James: Translations from the Liber sancti Jacobi* (New York, 1996).

⁵¹ On the dating of the *Codex Calixtinus* (the original manuscript of the *Liber*), see: M.C. Díaz y Díaz, *El Códice Calixtino de la catedral de Santiago: estudio codicologico y de contenido* (Santiago de Compostela, 1988), pp. 77-81; W. Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality in the Holy Land and Iberia: c.1095-c.1187* (Woodbridge, 2008), 140-1.

⁵² C. Garcia, 'L'anonymat individuel au service d'une identité collective: l'exemple des Chroniques Anonymes de Sahagún (XIIe siècle)' in *Identités méditerranéennes. Reflets littéraires* (ed.) M. Michaud (Paris, 2007), 97-110.

⁵³ C. Garcia, 'La minorité "franque" de Sahagún dans les Chroniques anonymes (XIIe siècle)' in *Minorités et régulations sociales en Méditerranée médiévale* (eds.) S. Boissellier et. al. (2007), 283-298.

⁵⁴ C. Garcia, 'Une histoire (presque) sans mort. Le dépassement de la mort dans les Cronique anonymes (XIIe siècle)' in *Entre ciel et terre: La mort et son dépassement dans le monde hispanique* (eds.) D. Lecler & P. Rochwert-Zuili (Paris, 2008), 21-32.

⁵⁵ C. Garcia, 'Révoltes populaires ou lectures du Moyen Âge? Léon-Castille (XIIe S.): Féodalisme et mouvements sociaux dans l'historiographie du XXe siècle' in *Images du Moyen Âge* (Rennes, 2006), 45-56.

⁵⁶ For example, Garcia 'Révoltes populaires', *passim*.

⁵⁷ Garcia, 'L'anonymat individuel', p. 109.

concern with the portrait the chronicle draws of the burghers as French immigrants is also pervasive.⁵⁸ A common purpose also binds these essays together: Garcia argues that the chronicle is set falsely in the twelfth century. In ‘La minorité “franque”’, he writes:

La finesse de l’enchaînement des épisodes, la dramaturgie des mises en scène, les portraits physiques et psychologiques de tant et tant de personnages, l’excellente restitution d’une atmosphère troublée et, enfin, la sensibilité esthétique d’une incroyable profondeur, tout cela fait qu’il nous semble impensable que l’on puisse continuer à défendre l’idée que nous nous trouvons face à un document élaboré dans la décennie de 1120.⁵⁹

This argument – that the text is too sophisticated in its methods to be of the twelfth century – is made by Garcia in other essays.⁶⁰ Unfortunately, Garcia does not compare the *Crónica* with contemporary chronicles from both Spain and further abroad. It is possible to point to a number of chronicles that can be compared to the chronicle in terms of their literary purpose and method and were nearly (or in some case exactly) contemporaneous with the *Crónica*: these are to be found in Spain: the *Historia Compostellana* (1111-1140),⁶¹ and beyond: the *Vézelay Chronicle* (1167),⁶² the *Farfa Chronicle* (1107-1119),⁶³ *The murder of Charles the Good* (1127),⁶⁴ and the *Revolt in Laon* (1115).⁶⁵ Many more examples could be included, but there can be no doubt that this was a very dynamic period of history writing in Western Europe, and on the peninsula as well. With this company the *Crónica* seems well at home in the 1110s.

⁵⁸ Garcia ‘L’anonymat individuel’, pp. 102ff. La minorité “franque”, *passim*.

⁵⁹ Garcia, ‘La minorité “franque”’, p. 297.

⁶⁰ Garcia, ‘L’anonymat individuel’, p. 110; ‘Une histoire (presque) sans mort’, pp. 28-9; ‘Révoltes populaires’, pp. 54-5.

⁶¹ On the date of the *Historia*, see B. Reilly, ‘The *Historia Compostellana*: The Genesis and Composition of a Twelfth-Century Spanish Gesta’, *Speculum* 44.1 (1969), pp. 79-80, 85.

⁶² Hugh of Poitiers, *The Vézelay Chronicle and Other Documents from MS. Auxerre 227 and Elsewhere* (eds. and trans.) J. Scott and J. O. Ward (New York, 1992); J. Ward, ‘Memorializing Dispute Resolution in the Twelfth Century: Annal, History and Chronicle at Vézelay’, *The Medieval Chronicle* (ed.) E. Kooper (Amsterdam, 1999), 269-284 (p. 272).

⁶³ S. Boynton, *Shaping a Monastic Identity: Liturgy and History at the Imperial Abbey of Farfa, 1000-1125* (Cornell, 2006), p. 20.

⁶⁴ Galbert of Bruges, *The murder of Charles the Good* (ed. and trans.) J. B. Ross (New York, 2005).

⁶⁵ Guibert of Nogent, *A Monk’s Confession: The Memoirs of Guibert of Nogent* (ed. and trans.) Archambault, P. J. (Penn State, 2006).

Belmonte's time-scheme has also been followed in a recent doctoral thesis: Leticia Agúndez San Miguel, 'Memoria, escritura y control social: la construcción de la memoria histórica en el monasterio de Sahagún (siglos X a XIII)'.⁶⁶ Agúndez's concern is the role of the written word in the construction of a collective memory that bound together the monastic community at Sahagún.⁶⁷ Accordingly, her interest ranges across the corpus of texts and documents produced at the monastery between the tenth and thirteenth centuries. It is, then, among these that she discusses the *Crónica*. Agúndez acknowledges the work of Belmonte,⁶⁸ but she refers primarily to the narratological time-scheme given in Georges Martin's essay, 'Le pouvoir historiographique: l'historien, le roi, le royaume. Le tournant alphonsin'.⁶⁹ Martin proposes that medieval historiography follows a basic tripartite order: the time of the 'herencia', the time of the 'ejemplaridad', and that of the 'causalidad factual'.⁷⁰ In this the three sections of the chronicle correspond to (1) the history of the monastery (2) the collapse of the political order (3) the arrival of Cardinal Boso in Spain to restore political order.

Both Belmonte and Agúndez emphasise the political purposes of the *Crónica* and establish its narrative divisions according to the fortunes of the Leonese monarchy and the events of the civil war: the outbreak of political chaos, the restoration of political order. In the opinion of this study this reading overlooks key elements of the text which suggest a revised reading of its narrative pattern. The purpose of this study is to develop this reading, but we can here point to three places in the chronicle which are not well explained by the model of these previous approaches:

⁶⁶ L. Agúndez San Miguel, 'Memoria, escritura y control social: la construcción de la memoria histórica en el monasterio de Sahagún (siglos X a XIII)', (unpublished thesis, Santander, 2011).

⁶⁷ In this her concerns overlap considerably with the wider interests of L. Gaffard: 'Los monjes de Sahagún a la luz de su escritura. Imagen de una comunidad y construcción memorial (León-Castilla, siglos XII-XIII)', *Actas del XI Congreso de la Asociación Hispánica de Literatura Medieval* (León, 2008), 551-560, and 'Poesis de la chronique dans la collection diplomatique du monastère de Sahagún', *Poétique de la chronique. L'écriture des textes historiographiques au Moyen Âge (péninsule Ibérique et France)* (Toulouse, 2008) 89-105.

⁶⁸ Agúndez San Miguel, 'Memoria, escritura y control social', p. 312.

⁶⁹ G. Martin, 'Le pouvoir historiographique: l'historien, le roi, le royaume. Le tournant alphonsin', *Histoires de l'Espagne: (historiographie, geste, romancero). Annexes des cahiers de linguistique hispanique médiévale* 11 (1997), 123-136.

⁷⁰ Agúndez San Miguel, 'Memoria, escritura y control social', p. 315; Martin, 'Le pouvoir historiographique', pp. 57-68.

(1) The complex interplay of the regional and the local in the chronicle's version of the outbreak of chaos after the death of Alfonso VI. We suggest that the meaning of this picture of chaos that emerges in these chapters is not so much political as narratological and is specifically structured to frame the burghers' ambitions beyond their local place in Sahagún under the abbot's power. (2) The sudden disappearance of the Aragonese from the narrative in the chapters which tell of the burghers' tortures of local Aragonese. Belmonte suggests that these scenes transfer the hagiographical blood and pathos normally found in the passion scene to the peasants to establish King Alfonso I of Aragón as the persecuting tyrant of the story. But this does not explain the disappearance of the Aragonese king's deputies and knights from these chapters. We too emphasise the pathos and energy located in these chapters, but we suggest that their narrative purpose is to restructure the narrative and conflict as specifically a direct confrontation between the burghers and the monastery. Thus, we locate the second transition in the narrative here, where the chronicle shifts from the political to the ecclesiastical, from the conflict to its resolution, and to the role of Abbot Domingo in bringing about this resolution. (3) Finally, both Belmonte and Agúndez focus on the arrival of Cardinal Boso in Burgos to put an end to the civil war between Urraca and Alfonso as the transition into the end of the chronicle. Yet, their emphasis on the political nature of this event fails to explain the total disappearance of the king and the queen from the chronicle's account of the Council of Burgos. We suggest that the crucial end of the local conflict occurs several chapters earlier, around the events of the monastery's confirmation of the burghers' charter (chapter seventy-three) and the expulsion of the burghers from Sahagún (followed by the re-appropriation of its stolen land by the monastery and the burning of the burghers' charter, chapter seventy-five). It is there two difficult events that the chronicle has been preparing since the chapters of the burghers' tortures. Thus, we focus on the show-trial nature of the confrontation between the burghers and Abbot Domingo at Burgos, and the chronicle's focus on the character and charisma of the abbot in defeating the burghers.

Date of first *Crónica anónima*

There is no specific information on the completion date of the first *Crónica*. The last event narrated by chronicle is the Council of Burgos held in the early months of 1117. There are reasonable grounds for maintaining that the chronicle was composed

sometime soon after the council. The *Crónica* presents a very immediate account of both the civil war between Urraca and Alfonso I and the local conflict between the monastery and the monarchy. The chronicle gives very full descriptions of its dramatic scenes. It is often hazy on chronology (something Bernard Reilly has remarked on),⁷¹ but we will show many in many instances how a clear chronology of events is interrupted by more urgent purposes the chronicler has in his material. That is, the chronicler was often more interested in making a point than in writing history for history's sake.

The chronicler is also able to write in detail of the complex intrigues and clashes between the various political actors struggling for power after the death of Alfonso VI in 1109. Also notable is the degree to which the chronicle keeps to its central story of conflict. There are no major historical digressions, no considered reflections on the purpose of history, and only scant allusions to other histories or religious texts; a useful comparison can be made here with the *Historia Compostellana*.⁷² This chronicle, contemporary with the first *Crónica*, records many of the same events of the reign of Queen Urraca, and like the *Crónica* also expresses the interests of its religious house. Yet, the effect of the *Compostelana* is very different to that of the *Crónica*. The *Compostelana* is a work which grew up, like many medieval chronicles, as an institutional project. A succession of the church's chroniclers continued the work over a period of three decades. Each of these aimed at the same core concern, to record and praise the deeds of Diego Gelmírez, bishop (1100-1120) and then archbishop (1120-1140) of the see of Compostela, yet the result of their work is more general reference than biography. The central theme of the tribulations and successes of Diego Gelmírez allows the chroniclers to address a number of ecclesiastical, political, and social concerns across his career. The accretive nature of the work also results in a work of various narrative styles and methods. As a cartulary-chronicle the work also becomes a repository for a great number of documents. The *Crónica*, by contrast,

⁷¹ Reilly, *Urraca*, p. 66, 89, 114.

⁷² The *Historia Compostellana* was the work of a series of canons of the see of Compostela writing between 1107-1149. It is in essence an extended *gesta* designed to record and praise the deeds of Diego Gelmírez (1100-40). *Historia Compostella* (ed.) E. Falque Rey (Turnhout, 1988) [Also in Spanish translation as *Historia Compostelana* (ed.) E. Falque (Madrid, 1994). For dating and authorship see: Reilly, 'The *Historia Compostelana*', pp. 78-85. Reilly favours 1111-1113 for the initiation of the work.

shows itself to be the work of one chronicler focused single-mindedly on one eight-year episode of history.

Authorship

We do not have a name for the author of the *Crónica*. Yet, the anonymous author frequently appears in his story and explicitly says that he was an eye-witness to certain events.⁷³ José Pérez pointed out that the author was a *compañero* of Archbishop Bernard of Toledo (who was formerly abbot of Sahagún and plays a main part in the chronicle).⁷⁴ And Escalona added that he was '*socio o compañero*' of the abbot Domingo I of Sahagún.⁷⁵ These observations are readily supported by the chronicle; the evidence of association between the anonymous author and Archbishop Bernard and especially with Abbot Domingo will be made clear in chapter three of this study. There are two further hints of the role and identity of the *anónimo* in the chronicle. Twice the chronicle introduces a monk called Pedro. He is described in one place as 'my companion, his [Abbot Domingo's] chamberlain'.⁷⁶ Was our author also one of the abbot's chamberlains? Pedro is also described as a 'young man' ('*mançebo*'). An interesting speculation follows: Was our author a young servant of Abbot Domingo? In this case, his handling of the complexities of the internal affairs of the monastery, the ecclesiastical and political affairs of the kingdom, and the legal, social, and religious issues implicated in the conflict with the burghers is impressive. Perhaps, he was then a member of the monastery's old guard. Perhaps, he played an advisory role to Domingo, who is also referred to as a 'young man monk' upon his election as abbot.⁷⁷ The evidence offered in the chronicle of his previous association with Archbishop Bernard might suggest this. Bernard was abbot of Sahagún from 1079-1086, until he was promoted to the archbishopric of Toledo. If the author of the chronicle was a young man at this time then he would be in his late 30s or 40s at the outbreak of conflict with the burghers. This is not impossible then. We might have proposed that the author had come to Sahagún with Bernard who arrived from Cluny Abbey in 1079;

⁷³ For example, the chronicler asserts at the death of King Alfonso VI in Toledo in 1109 '*yo allí era presente*' ('I was present there', CAS, ch. 16, p. 25). The presence of the author in the *Crónica* is the subject of chapter three of this study.

⁷⁴ Puyol y Alonso, *El abadengo*, p. 305.

⁷⁵ Escalona, *Historia*, p. 297.

⁷⁶ '*mi compañero, su camarero*' (CAS, ch. 62, p. 93). The same terms of description, '*mi compañero*' and '*su camarero*', also appear earlier in CAS, ch. 36, p. 69.

⁷⁷ '*un monje mançevo*' (CAS, ch. 26, p. 46).

but, the chronicle makes it clear that the author was a native of Spain. In one place he references the accusation that French knights in Alfonso I's army were using black magic, which the author describes as 'abhorred by those of our land'.⁷⁸

Turning to the document records of the monastery in these years no candidates for author of the *Crónica* emerge. The following names appear between 1109 and 1117, the years of the conflict with the burghers: a prior, Martín, who sold a part of one of the monastery's vineyard's to one Alfonso, a singer;⁷⁹ a priest, Martino, who twice introduces himself as the notary of a charter with a formulaic postscript;⁸⁰ a priest, Ciprianus;⁸¹ and a deacon, Galindus.⁸² But there is no evidence to associate any of these men with the authorship of the *Crónica*.

The philology of the chronicle

In the previous section, we gave an account of the debate surrounding the authenticity of the first *Crónica anónima*. We also explained in the course of that discussion our pro-authenticity position. In brief, we argued that, without clear evidence of a forgery, the chronicle's historical and literary appropriateness, as well as its social, communal, and personal immediacy, are relatively stable grounds for taking the chronicle at its word that it was written by an eyewitness soon after the events it describes. Yet, while this line of reasoning is sufficient to assert the validity of the text apart from any concrete idea about how we want to use it, it remains to us to address the specific philological demands of this study, and the assumptions and difficulties inherent in these.

Two philological problems present themselves immediately: the sole extant manuscript of the *Crónica* is a material artefact removed some five centuries from the

⁷⁸ 'aborresçibles a los de nuestra tierra' (CAS, ch. 33, p. 61).

⁷⁹ He introduces himself in the charter as, 'Ego Martinus, monachus, Dei gratias priorem Sancti Facundi, una cum omni congregatione, in hanc kartam quod fieri iussimus et legere audiuimus manus nostras roboramus.' J.A. Fernández Flórez, *Colección diplomática*, p. 28: no. 1183.

⁸⁰ 'Hanc autem kartam uenditionis ego Martinus, huius claustris monachus, iussu domini et abbatis mei domni Dominici, conscripsi et signum inciens roborau' (monogramma: MARTINVS presbiter conf.) (doc. 1190; dated 1113, diciembre, 31, miércoles, hora sexta); 'Hanc, autem, kartam conuentionis inter reginam Yspanię dominam Vrrakam et abbatem Sancti Facundi dominum Dominicum, ego Martinus, Sancti Facundi monachus, iussu abbatis scripsi et signum feci (monogramma: MARTINUS presbiter)' *Ibid.*, doc. 1195; dated 1116, octubre, 15.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 28: doc. 1184.

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 28: doc. 1191.

time the chronicle that it contains was first written, and it gives us our work only in a vernacular translation. A rough source critique of our manuscript points to the three layers of construction: the original twelfth-century chronicle, the chronicle in translation, and the final copy of the extant manuscript. In a strict material sense what survives is a collapse of all three into one artefact. For the purposes of this study, which will interest itself in the original twelfth-century chronicle, the question at hand is our method for returning to this original, working from the extant manuscript.

We can take a practical approach to these hurdles. Indeed, a long-followed precedence is already in place for admitting the *Crónica* as a genuine historical source. Most historians working on the various topics for which the *Crónica* has been found useful (the history of the monastery of Sahagún, the reign of Queen Urraca, or the burgher revolts of the 1110s) have been satisfied to accept it as a valid source text. This tradition goes all the way back to the work of Pérez and Escalona, and many examples have appeared in the previous three decades (see relevant section above). For the purposes of these scholars, common practice and the benefit of the doubt, it would seem, has settled the debate in favour of authenticity. José Pérez expressed this logic in terms of a wider philological phenomenon in his original preface for his work on the *Crónica*, addressing the problems associated with the lack of an original manuscript for the chronicle:

*Si esta sospecha fuera bien fundada, pudiéramos dudar con razón de infinitas obras de los SS. PP. Griegos y Latinos, que salen cada día á luz, sacadas de copias antiguas, pero mucho mas modernas que sus originales. Sin embargo, los críticos mas severos las admitten por legitimas, con tal que no contengan algo que desdiga del estylo y doctrina de los PP. en cuyos nombres salen.*⁸³

Our study is not one which will use the *Crónica* to fill in, or glean data for, a separate historical study; we will largely confine ourselves to the literary and historiographical boundaries of the chronicle itself. Yet, as we have suggested previously, this study will have an historical dimension: we will take up the implications for how our literary reading of the chronicle applies to the historical circumstances in

⁸³ J. Pérez, 'Prólogo de las Notas de la historia del Autor Anonymo', *El abadengo de Sahagún*, Puyol y Alonso, (Madrid, 1915) p. 308.

which it was written. It is hoped, then, that our present study will in its own way serve to strengthen the commonly-accepted place of the *Crónica* in the historiographical record.

No doubt the *Crónica* will continue to be used as an important source text for related historical scholarship. Nevertheless, the philological issue has only very briefly been touched upon since the analyses offered by Pérez and Puyol y Alonso (the short remarks by Ubieto Arteta in his latest edition of the *Crónica*, for example). Even those who have lately rejected the chronicle as a forgery (Gaffard, García) have not built their conclusions upon a scrutiny of the manuscript itself. Thus, it will be useful here to take up this issue here anew, not to rehearse what others have already said on the matter, but to look closer at the implications of the philological difficulties of the *Crónica* for our literary reading. It will also be useful to bring into this discussion ideas from more theoretical philological models as they will apply.

Only one known copy of our chronicle survives. We know, however, that there were others. Pérez attests to three copies at the end of the seventeenth century – the oldest two of these from the sixteenth century in two independent vernacular translations. It has been proposed that Guardiola had access to a fourth copy. At least one other copy must have been made when the chronicle was translated into the vernacular in the thirteenth century. Perhaps another vernacular translation was made in the fourteenth century when it has been suggested that the Old Spanish of the extant text dates from. And then there was the original text by the anonymous author in Latin probably soon after 1117. It was Bernard Cerquiglini's maxim of his work on medieval manuscript culture that 'medieval writing does not produce variants; it is variance'.⁸⁴ Looking back through the manuscript history of the *Crónica* the condition of variance is apparent; at the same time, we recognise that this variance has also been lost to us to a significant degree in the disappearance of all manuscripts save one.

This perspective helps to qualify our position relative to the lost autograph manuscript. Our challenge need not be just to establish a direct connection between the autograph and the extant manuscript as two fixed and stable points of original composition and re-transmission. In many ways these concepts do hold up, and we will

⁸⁴ B. Cerquiglini, *Eloge de la variante: Histoire critique de la philologie* (Paris, 1989), p. 78.

rely on them in our reading of the chronicle, yet, it is also possible to treat the relationship between the chronicle and its manuscript history in a more holistic sense. We can reconceive of the static binary of original and copy, seeing these instead as fluid points of textuality within a complex communal unity. This will allow us a way of filling in the gap between the original and the copy by focusing on the ways that they are drawn together by the larger monastic communal context in which they were generated.

An appeal to the ‘community logic’⁸⁵ of the monastery as a continuum of collective motivations, practices, and uses prompts us to consider how we might not only return to an hypothetical original, but read the chronicle and its manuscript history together as a single dynamic process of textual composition, reproduction, translation, and preservation. We note that the history of the manuscript extends from the anonymous author all the way to Pérez and Escalona in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, both themselves monks of Sahagún. It is clear that the survival of the chronicle, as well as the form in which it survives, must be understood as a function of the continued existence of the monastery and the uses and meanings it found in the chronicle over time, from a narrative that took up pressing issues of local authority to, much later, a record of the ancient history of the monastery and its community.

The communal logic of the *Crónica* gives a specific sense to Cerquiglini’s ‘variance’, suggesting the ways that the chronicle participates in the process in which texts at hand are fluidly adapted or reinterpreted according to the purposes of the monastic community through the centuries. This is a complex participation which we can discern in various strategies of the chronicle. Much of this will be covered in greater depth in the course of this thesis, and so it will be enough here to simply introduce in resume form some of the ways that the chronicle takes part in the larger process of textual variance in the communal life of the chronicle and its manuscript.

In chapter four we look at the role and voice of the author/narrator in the chronicle. The function of the authorial voice is given a greater social complexity if we

⁸⁵ A conscious play on Spiegel’s ‘social logic’ of the text, suggesting the very specific social context in which the chronicle and its afterlife can be interpreted.

consider the way that this personal voice might have worked in what is many ways a very communal chronicle: that is, a chronicle which begins with the history of the community, includes the communities foundational documents, tells a story of common tribulations and dangers.

Among the basic presuppositions of language as a code for communication is the notion, which may at first seem trivial, that every utterance, every discourse, has a speaker and an addressee and is produced in a specific extradiscursive context. This context includes the time and place of the speech event, the identity of the participants and their relations to one another, plus a variety of cultural or real-world knowledge which the participants presumably share. The utterances of a text are in this sense not decontextualised pieces of language; even the act of writing, which may sever them physically from their origin, does not ipso facto obliterate connections to a speaker, a context, and the locutionary act that produced them.⁸⁶

Was this chronicle meant to be read aloud, performed, among the monks? What then would be the result of one other than the author reading the chronicle's moments of first-person narration? What are the implications of later reproductions of the chronicle? What are the implications of the translation of the first-person voice into the vernacular a century later? Evaluation of these issues must rely on both an analysis of the author function in the chronicle as well as on aspects of the chronicle's place within the community. As we shall see, the first-person voice shifts between registers that vary in the unique personal thoughts and experiences or generic conventions they express. The relations among the monks might have filled the chronicle with meanings that are lost to us today. The identity of the author is a good example. If the chronicle was performed in the time of the original author then the monks in audience would have associated the I-voice with a specific person and role within the monastery. This association was naturally lost with time.

⁸⁶ S. Fleischman, 'Philology, Linguistics, and the Discourse of the Medieval', *Speculum* 65.1 (1990), 19-37 (p. 29).

In chapter five of this thesis we will consider how the chronicle incorporates and adapts several documents and letters in the course of its narrative. These provide a good example of the way that the chronicle itself participates in the pattern of adaption and reappropriation. We see this especially in the chronicle's use of Alfonso VI's *fuero* of 1085 and the monastery's *libertas Romana*.

The extant manuscript gives us a relatively fair version, with few problems for the reader or editor. Only one lacuna obscures the text, this in what is chapter fifty-five in the Ubieto Arteta version. The use of abbreviations is limited to common words: *nro. (nuestro) s. (señor) q (que)*. Little variation appears in the editorial practices among the manuscript and the three printed editions of the chronicle. The manuscript tends to run words together, and to punctuate after every few words. Thus, a passage from the manuscript which appears (as best as we can render it in print) as:

'Eansipor muchos . çercos . deaños. Asumemoria. E deuoçion. ay enladiha capilla. Anro. Señor era frequentado. mucholoableE Rreligioso. seruiçio' (MS. 251).

Is given in the three printed editions as:

'Y así por muchos cercos de años á su memoria, y devocion ay en la dicha Capilla á nuestro Señor era frequëntado mucho loable, y religioso servicio' (Escalona: ch. 1 p. 297).

'e ansi por muchos çercos de años a su memoria e deuoçion ay en la dicha capilla a nuestro señor era frequentado mucho loable e rreligioso seruiçio' (Puyol y Alonso: ch. 1, p. 112).

'e así por muchos çercos de años a su memoria e devoçión a y, en la dicha capilla, a nuestro señor era frequentado mucho loable e religioso seruiçio' (Ubieto Arteta: ch. 2, p. 10).

The bases for most of the variation, as we see above, is punctuation and the regularisation of spelling. Thus, we will not rely on these as good grounds for any of our close readings of the text. Nevertheless, the manuscript itself presents few problems *per se*.

In this section we have attempted to offer a multifaceted approach to the problems faced by the distance in the manuscript versions between the original and the unique extant copy. The notion of the communal nature of the manuscript

tradition has especially proved useful as a way of bringing these two fixed ends into a more fluid and even overlapping relationship. In the next section we will continue these philological concerns by turning to the second manuscript as evidence for the way that the chronicle was both preserved and transformed in its communal context.

The second *Crónica anónima*

The second chronicle stands to tell us much about the way that the first chronicle continued to operate in the monastery's historiographical record a century after its production. As we have seen, the second chronicle documents further confrontations between the monastery and the burghers of the town between 1237-1255. The similar themes and narrative patterns of the two chronicles suggest how the first chronicle established a model that the second was able to follow. At the same time, however, there are important differences between the two. Much had changed in Sahagún between the monastery and the burghers; the second chronicle itself fills in for us a sense of these changes. Thus it is that the second chronicle responds to the historiographical precedent provided by the first chronicle as well as to the demands of an evolved local rivalry with the burghers. The second chronicle not only builds upon, but also (in ways that we will see) repurposes, reinterprets, and even rewrites the first. The relationship between the two *Crónicas anónimas*, then, must be understood as more complex than simply continuation and emulation.

The second chronicle makes explicit its awareness of the first chronicle, referring back to it as the 'above-mentioned chronicle' (*'la crónica susodicha'*).⁸⁷ This is the only direct reference to the first chronicle, yet a broader system of reference is established by the second chronicle's return to certain themes and events covered by its precursor. Examination of these references shows how more than being a simple continuation, the second chronicle also refigures the historical account of the first chronicle. Thus, the direct reference to the first chronicle is in fact part of a larger reference to Abbot Domingo I. We read in the second chapter of the chronicle (chapter eighty in Ubieto Arteta):

There have been three abbots of this monastery of Sahagún with the name Domingo. The first Abbot Domingo was a native of the village

⁸⁷ CAS, ch. 80. p. 133.

called Lillo, near Cofiñal, which is connected to this convent; this abbot was very good and suffered many evils from the burghers of the town of Sahagún in order to protect the liberty of the monastery, as it is recounted in the above-mentioned chronicle.⁸⁸

It is worth comparing this description of Abbot Domingo to the more abstract biography given in the first chronicle. This comes after Domingo's election by the monastery in chapter twenty-six:

After all this, the convent chose with [the archbishop's] counsel a young and dutiful monk, shaven in humility, ennobled by chastity, graced by learning, prudent and noble in ecclesiastical things, and wise and discrete in secular business, who came from a noble family, and was called Domingo.⁸⁹

The second chronicle reduces this encomium to the two-word characterisation 'very good' (*'mucho bueno'*), but also adds the detail of Domingo's birthplace in Lillo (north of León), which is nowhere mentioned in the first chronicle. The summarisation given by the second chronicle that Domingo 'suffered many evils from the burghers of the town of Sahagún in order to protect the liberty of the monastery', is a convincing account of the theme of the first chronicle, and sounds very much like an expression that we might find there. Yet, even that line is not an exact quotation we find anywhere in the first chronicle.

At the beginning of the next chapter (chapter 81 in CAS), the second chronicle again makes an implicit reference back to the first chronicle. Here the second chronicle reviews events in the reign of Alfonso VI:

In the year 1066, the king Don Alfonso, son of the king Don Fernando, in this monastery consecrated to the honour and reverence of the holy martyrs Facundo, that is, and Primitivo, inflamed by divine grace, made this monastic order illustrious; first

⁸⁸ *'Tres fueron los abades en el monasterio de Sant Fagum llamados por este nonbre Domingo: el primero abad Domingo fue somoçano de la villa llamada Lilio, açerca de Confiñal, que es de la mesa del conbento; este fue mucho bueno e muchos males sostubo de los burgeses de la villa de Sant Fagum por guardar la libertad de el monasterio, según que se contiene en la crónica susodicha'* CAS, ch. 80. P. 133.

⁸⁹ *'E después de todo, el convento, avido e pensado su consejo, escogió un monje mançevo e presto a toda obediencia, afeitado por humildad, enobleçido por castidad, esguarneçido por letras, prudente e noble en las cosas eclesiásticas, e en los negoçios seglares savio e discreto, el qual benía de noble generaçión, manso por natura e benigno, llamado Domingo'* CAS, ch. 26, p. 46.

by the direction of the abbot Don Fernando, and afterwards he arranged for the Roman rite to be celebrated in Spain by the authority of the vicar Ricardo of the Roman Church. And as he considered that here the monastic order was backward, again moved by the divine grace, he undertook to reform the said order with wise and pious men in the image of the rule of Cluny, of the order of San Benito.⁹⁰

Again, we can compare this with a description of these same events given in the opening chapters of the first chronicle:

This same man, among the many other pious and religious things that he did, in the eleventh year of his ascension to the high and magnificent royal throne of his kingdom, he strove to make all of Spain celebrate the divine service according to the custom of the Roman church, sending supplication to that man of most honourable life, the pope Gregory VII. And then, in the fifteenth year of his reign, inflamed with the same spirit of zeal and devotion for the holy religion, he sent a request to the man Don Hugh, the abbot of the monastery of Cluny, asking if it might please him to send him some monks who might teach the religion, customs, and ceremonies of Cluny to this monastery of Sahagún (of the which we have said much). In order to effect this and to realise the desired effect of his devout petition, the said abbot of Cluny sent him then Don Roberto, and then Don Marcelino, monks.⁹¹

⁹⁰ *'En la era de mill y çiento e seis, el rei don Alfonso, fijo del rey don Fernando, en este monasterio consagrado a honor e reberencia de los santos martires Facundo, conbiene a saber, e Primitivo, alunbrado por graçia divinal, fiço resplandeçer la horden monacal, primeramente por mandado de don Fernando, abad, e después procuró que se çelebrase el ofiçio romano en España por autoridad de Ricardo, vicario de la iglesia romana. E por quanto vio que aquí se avía la horden monachal pereçosamente, otra bez, movido por graçia divinal, procuró reformar la dicha horden por algunos barones savios e religiosos, a semejança de la regla de Cluni, de la orden de Sant Benito'* CAS, ch. 79, p. 133.

⁹¹ *'El qual, después que suvió en al alteça e magnífico estado real de su reyno, entre otras cosas muchas que muy loable e religiosamente fiço, en el onçeno anno de su reyno procuró, suplicando al barón de muy onrrada vida Gregorio sétimo en la silla apostolica, que en toda España fuese çelebrado el divinal ofiçio según que la iglesia Romana acostumbra; e aún con decavo enflamado por çelo e devoçión de la santa religión, en el quinçeno anno de su reyno enbió a Cluni, mucho rogando al varón don Hugo, abbad del monasterio del dicho Cluni, que por su contenplaçión le plugiese enbriarle algunos monjes, los quales*

There are overlaps in these versions of Alfonso VI's monastic and liturgical reform, especially seen in repeated phrases 'inflamed by divine grace' (*'alunbrado por graça divinal'*) and 'moved by the divine grace' (*'movido por graça divinal'*) in the second, and their counterpart in the first, 'inflamed with the same spirit of zeal and devotion for the holy religion' (*'enflamado por çelo e devoção de la santa religión'*). But telling differences appear as well, and in these we see the different preoccupations of the two, even here where they most clearly show their common interest and purpose. It is clear that the author of the second chronicle was working from an independent source, if also from the first chronicle. A different set of people are included: the second chronicle does not mention Pope Gregory VII, Abbot Hugh of Cluny, or the monks Robert or Marcelino; it does, however, mention Cardinal Richard of Marseilles, and an Abbot Fernando. Cardinal Richard presided over the Council of Burgos in 1080, where the Mozarabic rite was abolished in Alfonso VI's kingdom: thus, we can understand his inclusion.⁹²

Abbot Fernando is a more obscure reference. He would appear to be the short-serving abbot mentioned in two documents in January of 1072.⁹³ Nothing is known of his dealings with the king, or any part of his in the king's religious reforms. It would seem the second chronicle is a decade too early. Abbot Julian (1072-1079) has been passed over, as has Abbot Robert, who was installed by Alfonso VI in May of 1079.⁹⁴ This is the same Robert mentioned along with Marcelino by the first chronicle in the passage quoted above. The monk Robert was, in fact, despite what the first chronicle says, accepted by King Alfonso VI and stayed for a time at Alfonso's court, perhaps advising the king on the issue of religious reforms. However, the king's decision to install Robert as abbot of Sahagún proved highly controversial with Pope Gregory VII, and Robert was sent back to France. There may, however, be a more pervasive logic to the second chronicle's seemingly obscure or mistaken reference to Abbot Fernando.

mostrasen e enseñasen la religión, costumbres e çeremonias del dicho monasterio de Cluni en este monasterio, del qual abemos fecho larga fabla. Para lo qual cunplir e a la debota su petición dar efeto deseado, el dicho abbad de Cluni le enbió luego a don Roberto e después a don Marcelino, monjes' CAS, ch. 6, pp. 13-14.

⁹² F. Fita, 'El concilio nacional de Burgos (18 feb. 1117)', *Boletín de la R. Academia de la Historia* XLIX, 49 (1906), 341-346; Fletcher, *The Episcopate*, p. 206; Reilly, *Alfonso VI*, p. 103.

⁹³ Fernández Flórez, *Colección diplomatic*, nos. 13 & 26 (January 1072).

⁹⁴ E. Zaragoza Pascual, 'Abadologio del monasterio de San Benito de Sahagún (siglos X-XIX)', *Archivos Leoneses* 77 (1985), 97-132 (pp. 105-06).

The second chronicle shows us how the dynamics of the antagonism between the monastery and the burghers of the town had changed a century after the revolt documented in the first chronicle. The struggle for local power in Sahagún now focuses chiefly upon the authority to appoint the town's officials. As in the first chronicle, the monastery's strategy involves appeals for intervention from outside authorities, with the object of procuring new or updated documents of privilege. In contrast with the first chronicle, however, ecclesiastical authority plays a very distant secondary role to that of royal power: efforts at document-procurement focus solely on the *fuero*; and there is no parallel in the second chronicle to the active and authoritative part played by Archbishop Bernard in the first. But the role of royal power within the local parameters of Sahagún is also qualified by its new obligations further south, and the competing parties have often to travel outside the town to meet the king (in Seville, Toledo, or Guadalajara). The burghers themselves have also taken on a new identity and organisation: they have now formed a *consejo* and are led by a named cast of principle actors.

These changes in the local dynamics of power help us to understand differences between the first and second chronicle. To be sure, the two *Crónicas anónimas* are very closely linked: a common purpose, monastic identity, narrative pattern, and generic form run through the pair. Yet, it is precisely these commonalities that make their differences indicative. The second chronicle (as we have seen) consciously associates itself with the first chronicle, yet it picks up on a particular thread that runs through the first. The first chronicle is longer and more complex in its narrative structure and its use of the various generic elements available to the cartulary-chronicle than the second. The second chronicle is more strictly a *gesta abbatis*, ordering its narrative according to a progression of various abbots of the monastery and their struggles with the burghers. The tenures of the following abbots thus order the narrative: Abbot Domingo (1111-1117), Abbot Domingo Pérez (1135-1150), Abbot Domingo Juan (1150-1164), Abbot Juan (1182-1194), Abbot Guillermo de Calzada (1227-1232), Guillermo de Taillante (1232-1244), García de Cea (1244-1251), and Abbot Nicholas (1251-1264).

The first chronicle is more interested in the great figures of power: specifically the king, the pope, the archbishop. This begins to come out in the last passage quoted

above, which highlights the role of King Alfonso VI, Pope Gregory VII, and Abbot Hugh of Cluny. In fact, as we will see in chapter one of this study, the first seventeen chapters of the first *Crónica* are structured according to the reigns of a series of kings of León; the reign of each new king is announced and then the chronicle gets to the gifts and privileges each of these kings provided the monastery. It is only in chapter twenty-six that the first chronicle begins to emphasize the role of one of the monastery's abbots, Domingo I, in defending the monastery. The second chronicle, by way of contrast, orders its narrative according to the tenures of the abbots listed above. The second chronicle makes less of the great external powers of king, pope, and archbishop. It is possible to suggest that this has to do with the mitigated role these powers play in the local affairs of the town. If this is the case, then this is a good example of the way that the second chronicle adapts the historiographical model it inherits from the first chronicle.

The second chronicle both extends and distances itself from the first. Referring back to it establishes a connection, but it also distances the events of the chronicle as historical, as 'that chronicle', not the first part of 'this chronicle'. It is a complex double-gesture of association and differentiation, emulation and adaptation. The second chronicle also connects the two chronicles by invoking a larger sense of the communal historiographical project in which the two participate. The second chronicle expresses its sense of a larger tradition of history writing at the monastery (or, more precisely, the lack of one); in this the first and second chronicles as *gestae* of the monastery's abbots are implicitly linked together:

For there are many things that were done by our ancestors and are not written in any chronicle; and this is due partly to indolence, partly to ignorance; so that, nearly all of these are lost to oblivion. And it is because of this that we confess that we in no way know the names and deeds of all of the abbots of Sahagún; yet, we do know of many of these, and will recount them for those that want to hear.⁹⁵

⁹⁵ '*Pues como muchas cosas que son fechas por nuestros antecesores e non son escriptas en las crónicas, e esto se causó parte por pereça e parte por ynorançia, por tanto, quasi todas son dadas a olvido; pero por quanto los nombres de todos los abades de Sant Fagum e en sus fechos confesamos conplidamente non saber, pero conbiénenos algunas cosas, de muchas, recontar a los que las quisieren oir*' CAS, ch. 82, p. 135.

The question of the translation of the first chronicle into the vernacular is also a pressing question. We cannot be certain that the first chronicle was translated into the vernacular at the time of the composition of the second. This is a tempting assertion, as the second was written in the vernacular and because we know nothing about the life of the chronicle outside of its mention in the second chronicle. One possible piece of evidence comes from the second chronicle. The chronicle reinforces the notion that with the second chronicle we have moved into the era of vernacular documents. The chronicle gives the logic for the use of the vernacular in documents. In the first chronicle the sole reference to the vernacular had been in the context of a speech made by Beltrán at the Council of Burgos in 1117. The count begins his address to the synod with the preface, 'If in this your most holy assembly it might be permitted for me to speak in my vulgar mother tongue ...'.⁹⁶ Tellingly, the sole reference to the vernacular in the second is specifically to do with the written word. Here the chronicle says that the king had ordered a certain document to be translated into the vernacular: 'And he ordered for that document to be translated into language maternal and vulgar in two copies'.⁹⁷ These details in the story show the accepted role of the vernacular at the royal court as the language of documents. It is possible then to link the translation of the first *Crónica* with this new vernacular cultural context. Christopher Given-Wilson has also remarked that it would be unusual for a chronicler continuing a previous chronicle to write in anything but the original language of that chronicle; this example shows the opposite. Here the language of the original chronicle has been translated to suit the historiographical needs of a subsequent century.⁹⁸

Reception of the first *Crónica*

In this section we consider the question of the audience of the first *Crónica*. This is a notoriously difficult question in medieval studies. It is also one which hinges upon a still more complex tradition of theoretical inquiry in literary studies more generally.⁹⁹

⁹⁶ "Si en aqueste vuestro mui santo conbento e ayuntamiento sea lícito a mi fablar con fabla materna e bulgar ..." CAS, ch. 78, p. 127.

⁹⁷ 'E mandó aquesa conposición que fuese traslada en lengua materna e bulgar en dos cartas' CAS, ch. 85, p. 151.

⁹⁸ Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, p. 137.

⁹⁹ In its more theoretical manifestation, the study of how texts are received by their audiences has been called 'reception theory'. For the early formulators of reception theory in regard to medieval studies, see: H.R. Jauss, 'Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory', inaugural lecture at University of Constance (First published in German, 1967; first English translation in *New Literary History* (1970), 7-37

In what follows we will explore the difficulty of identifying a particular audience for the *Crónica*, given the problems with linking the text to any occasion or group outside of the monastery, and the lack of evidence provided by the text itself. Our recourse will be, in part, to a model put forward by Steven Vanderputten, who has suggested that documents were often produced in long-term conflicts between local groups without any clear sense of occasion or audience, but rather as a way to mark a pause in hostilities, and in anticipation of the next outbreak. He writes:

more often than not, [such] disputes had no precise beginning or end but belonged to 'structural conflicts' (often lasting for several generations), while the parties involved usually 'performed' temporary truces and settlements in public. For those performances, neither court cases in the modern sense of the word or written documents could provide a satisfying alternative. The function of any ensuing charters was mostly to assist the parties; and witnesses' memory of events until the tensions between them had reached a new boiling point and the nature of their relation had to be reconsidered in the context of recent developments.¹⁰⁰

His description fits well with the first *Crónica*, and provides a sense of the purpose of the production of charters (for which we can also understand cartulary-chronicles). The suggestion is that we are not looking for an audience, as in a defined group identified by the author and in an important sense determining the purpose of the text.

We suggested in the previous section how an emphasis on the communal nature of the chronicle might give us a way to read coherence and continuity into what might otherwise be taken to be simply a state of 'corruption' as regards the first *Crónica anónima* as it survives today. More than this, we went on to show how the first chronicle itself adapts the documents incorporated into its narrative that it found in the monastery's collection to suit its purposes. Later it would be subject to this same trend of reinterpretation and adaption when it was translated into the vernacular and

[reprinted in *New Directions in Literary History* (ed.) R. Cohen (Baltimore, 1974); and H.U. Gumbrecht, "Strangeness as a Requirement for Topicality: Medieval Literature and Reception Theory," *L'Esprit Createur* 21 (1981), 5-12.

¹⁰⁰ Vanderputten, 'Monastic literate practices', p. 102.

appended to the second chronicle. Our purpose in this was to suggest how such communal practices and necessities run through the first chronicle; the implication being that at some level the first chronicle anticipates its own place in this tradition, and thus its later adaption and reformulations. This squares up with both Cerquigliani's notion of 'variance' as well as that of an 'ambiguous audience' as offered by Vanderputten and Paxton.

This long perspective on the afterlife of the chronicle begs another more direct question: that of the immediate audience of the chronicle. It may have been only natural for the chronicler that his work would eventually enter into the textual tradition of the monastery which might preserve but also change it, but this, of course, only goes a very short way towards explaining the direct motivations and aims that led the chronicler to his task. The question of audience overlaps to a great degree with that of these more immediate impulses.

This issue has earned few remarks in the secondary literature on the chronicle. One idea worth our attention here, however, was advanced by Ubieto Arteta in the introduction to his printed edition of the chronicle. He suggests there that the chronicle was written to be presented at the Council of Burgos in 1117. It is an intriguing possibility. The council is the final event narrated by the chronicle, and functions there as the resolution of the six-year conflict between the monastery and the burghers of Sahagún. The council was ecclesiastical in character, presided over by one Cardinal Bosón of St Anastasia, acting as papal legate, and attended by Archbishop Bernard of Toledo among other prelates. As we have said, a central part of our thesis is that the chronicle intends to argue for the ecclesiastical nature of the monastery's authority over the burghers. This involves emphasis of the *libertas Romana* and the historical link between the monastery and the papacy recorded in this privilege. The thought that the chronicle was meant to be presented to the ecclesiastical council could provide a rationale for this strategy as an attempt to persuade this audience.

However, there is an immediate problem with this notion, one that Ubieto Arteta does not address. That is, the chronicle itself narrates this council. These final chapters (76-78) of the chronicle at least were certainly not presented at the council. One way around this problem might be to argue that the chronicle was presented in

Burgos and that only after this were the final chapters of the chronicle in which the council is recounted added. Indeed, there is a chronological gap in the chronicle's narrative between the expulsion of the burghers from Sahagún by Queen Urraca in the autumn of 1116 and the council which occurs in January-February of 1117. In the chronicle this gap is skipped over between chapters seventy-five and seventy-six. We could, then, take it that the chronicle up to chapter seventy-five was presented at the Council of Burgos, and then after the council an account of the council itself was appended as chapters seventy-six through seventy-eight. Yet, this notion is not entirely persuasive. The chronology of the chronicle is throughout patchy and jumbled, so this gap is not in itself suggestive of the composition pattern of the text. More than this, this narrative gap in the chronicle corresponds to a gap in the events of the conflict itself: after the expulsion of the burghers from Sahagún by Queen Urraca in the autumn of 1116 the conflict was temporarily resolved until it was taken up again at the council.

There is another way of looking at the question that further dissuades us from the idea that the Council of Burgos was the intended audience of the first *Crónica*. The chronicle's own account of the council gives us no suggestion that the chronicle (that would be the first seventy-five chapters of it) was presented or played a part in the council. Indeed, there is no role for documents at all in the chronicle's version of events. Things here are strictly oral. The case between the abbot of Sahagún and the burghers is decided, first, by the burghers' admission of guilt to Bertrán (their arbiter), and, second, by Abbot Domingo's willingness to entrust the decision of the case entirely to Bertrán, his adversary at the trial. These developments are worked out in a series of sometimes lengthy speeches by the various actors, further emphasising the oral nature of the scene. This seems relevant in a chronicle which is deeply invested in documents, especially the *libertas Romana* and the *fuero* of 1085, but also the burghers' charter and a string of letters from Archbishop Bernard of Toledo and Pope Paschal II.

As we will see, the chronicle is unclear about the precise purpose of the case between the abbot and burghers at the council. The chronicle tells us that the burghers make a complaint against Abbot Domingo to Cardinal Bosón (who arrives to oversee the council in Burgos) for their expulsion from the town. Bosón agrees to hear

their case; thus, Abbot Domingo arrives in Burgos initially to defend himself against the burghers. With the burghers' admission of guilt, this original dynamics of the case are reversed and the burghers find themselves defending themselves against the charge of perjury for bringing false charges against Domingo. After this, the chronicle gives hints that the scope of the trial broadens into an indictment against the burghers for their crimes of the previous six and a half years of rebellion against the monastery. The position of the council at the end of the chronicle reinforces the sense that this is not just one more event of the unfolding conflict, but its fitting conclusion. If we are going to accept that the chronicle was meant to be presented at Burgos, we must follow the chronicle's lead on this point. Yet, there is good reason, perhaps better reason, to suspect that this interpretation, and the possibility of using the council to conclude the narrative, came about only after. Indeed, according to the chronicle's own account, it was only when the burghers brought complaints against Abbot Domingo that it was determined that the case would be heard at the council. If this event did come about in this unexpected way, there is no room to believe that following the expulsion of the burghers the anonymous author set to work on the chronicle in anticipation of the council.

So then, what audience was the chronicler writing for? As it turns out, this is not a question that we will be able to satisfy with any definite answer. Dismissing the Council of Burgos as the intended destination, we have no specific assembly or occasion to link the chronicle to. Looking to the text itself, we do not find an explicit identification of any particular targeted group. We are compelled, then, to turn to a less exact kind of answer. This might be precisely the point. We have referred previously to Steven Vanderputten's proposal that cartulary-chronicles developed as a response to circumstances in which the function of documents was uncertain, as a way of building up an arsenal of diverse documentary and literary forms in the hope that between them the right combination would be found for use in future conflicts. This notion of the hedging strategy of the cartulary-chronicle not only points us to a more indefinite concept of the *Crónica's* intended audience, but also indicates the essential relationship between the form the text assumes and its loose anticipation of its audience.

Vanderputten's suggestion also helps to make sense of certain rhetorical features of the *Crónica*. Moving from a search for a specific audience group, we are in a better position to understand the text's audience as, in one important sense, a function of a particular narrative strategy. In several places in the chronicle direct reference is made to the audience.

The first and most conspicuous of these occurs at the beginning of chapter two, where the audience is addressed directly: 'To all the readers of the present book and chronicle, and attentive listeners ...'.¹⁰¹ Two more examples are found in chapter seventy-one. Here the author appeals to the audience to explain his decision to cut short his account of the imprisonment of Abbot Domingo and himself by Alfonso I as they pass through Aragón on their return journey from Rome. Thus, the author writes: 'How many dangers and what harms we suffered on our return, I wish to leave out of this work in order to spare the reader tedium'.¹⁰² And shortly after returns to this theme: 'If I knew it would bring any good to my reader I would tell here in sad words of all the frustration and distress that tormented us and wore upon us, and of all the hunger and terror we suffered'.¹⁰³

These passages demand our attention in this section on the audience of the chronicle. Yet, they are not readily helpful as regards the identification of any specific audience. The overriding sense in which these invocations of the audience are just rhetoric must be stressed. The chronicle's addresses to the 'reader' and 'listener' remain imprecise of any particular group. It is more appropriate to read these invocations of the audience as rhetorical gestures that link the chronicle to wider generic conventions of medieval historiography and literature, than as marks of an individual relationship between author and audience. However, taking into account their rhetorical nature, there are further clues to be gleaned from the chronicle's addresses to the audience which can in fact suggest something about the type of audience which the chronicle expects.

¹⁰¹ 'A todos los leedores del presente libro e crónica atentos oidores' CAS, ch. 2, p. 9.

¹⁰² 'Quántos peligros, quántos daños sofrimos en la tornada, quiero dexar de enxerir en esta obra, porque al leedor non benga enojo' CAS, ch. 71, p. 107.

¹⁰³ 'En cuánto enojo e tristeça nos fatigó en al dicho espacio e nos atormentó, e quánta fanbre e pavor sofrimos, con estilo lloroso esprimiría si cognoçiese a mi benir algún pro[v]ejo e al leedor alguna consolación' CAS, ch. 71, pp. 108-9.

The invocation of the audience often serves to bring the reader into the story in an emotional way. In chapter seventy-five, as the town of Sahagún awaits an attack from a band of certain Aragonese knights and burghers, the author appeals directly to his audience: ‘So consider for yourselves, those who read this, how tedious and weary that night was for us’.¹⁰⁴ Similarly, in chapter seventeen, describing the outpouring of public grief for the death of King Alfonso VI in the streets of Toledo, the author declares ‘it was impossible to see and hear all this without crying and wailing, for one could not see and consider such lament and grief with dry eyes’.¹⁰⁵ In each of these examples the audience is encouraged to participate in the emotion, whether suspense and fear or grief, of the events of the story. These invocations function to turn the reading or hearing of the text into a subjective experience, where the space between the audience and the subjects of the story – whether grieving public, or monks of Sahagún, or the author of the text – is collapsed.

What we will suggest based on such examples is that the chronicle is programmed for, and maybe even expects, a sympathetic audience. A further example shows that the audience is not only on the hook for an emotional participation, but also for one which is moral and critical. The audience is called upon to take sides. In a particularly elusive scene (which we will consider more closely later in this thesis), the author speaks directly to the reader to insist that the reader become involved in the scene. This is the controversial episode in which the burghers’ charter is confirmed by the monastic community and Queen Urraca. Here the author interrupts the narrative directly following the event to implore ‘Now then, consider for yourself clever reader how the burghers had committed the crime of perjury’.¹⁰⁶ This passage goes on to explain why the confirmation of the charter should not be considered valid.

The invocations to the audience that we have been considering relate also to the polemical nature of the text, where a sharp division is drawn between an in- and an out-group. Words like ‘wise’ in the quote above, and ‘attentive’ in the quote from the beginning of chapter two, can also be taken as significant in this respect. The

¹⁰⁴ *‘Pues considerad vos, los que leedes, cuánto la dicha noche a nos fuese tardosa e pereçosa’* CAS, ch. 75, p. 118.

¹⁰⁵ *‘la qual beer e oir, non era otra cosa si non llorar e genir, ca los ojos secos, tan gran planto e dolor beer e considerar non se podían’* CAS, ch. 17, p. 26.

¹⁰⁶ *‘Pues agora tú, savio leedor, considera que los burgeses cometieron crimen de perjurio’* CAS, ch. 73, p. 114.

chronicle uses these code words to speak directly to a certain audience, one already on the side of the monastic community and its supporters. We need not rule out that the chronicle could have worked to persuade an antagonistic audience. Or, even that persuasion, at some level at least, is not part of the purpose of these rhetorical gestures which draw a line between sympathetic and hostile audiences.

Yet, there is in the first *Crónica* a further dimension to the invocation of the audience which suggests more strongly that the text was meant for a sympathetic audience. In one place in the chronicle the author interrupts the narrative to consider the reaction of his fellow monks to what he has written:

Now then, my fellow monks of the cloister that knew along with me of these things and others that I have not included, should they not judge me worthy or deserving of lashes because I have left many things unwritten? I trust though that they will pardon me as they know that the malice of the burghers had grown and multiplied, so that they would not even pardon nobles or above-common people.¹⁰⁷

Here the author takes it for granted that the monastic community of Sahagún will read or hear the chronicle. The monastic community is assumed to have a common stake in the work and in its ability to convey their mutual experience. In fact, the author does not speak directly to his fellow monks here, instead the author continues to address, at least implicitly, the same rhetorical audience of the other invocations. This is not a direct address to the monks of Sahagún as the only audience. Rather, the monks are worked into the trope as a kind of secondary audience. Two audiences are inferred. Yet, it is possible that we read more into this complex passage, and the identification of the monks as an audience, than we might at first allow from its seeming to speak to an audience other than the monastic community.

This interjection in the narrative by the author is made in the midst of several chapters which describe gruesome tortures inflicted by the burghers on local peasants. It is an episode in the chronicle of great intensity, and the chronicler emphasises its inherent drama with frequent exclamations such as this one (we will return to these

¹⁰⁷ CAS, ch. 48, p. 81.

chapters later in this thesis). It is significant that the author wonders if he is not deserving of lashings: if he is not himself due punishment for inadequately describing the tortures inflicted by the burghers. As we will see when we come back to these chapters in more detail, one of the author's purposes is to transfer the violent and moral energy of the tortures from the peasants into a threat against the larger social order. (Hence the assertion in the quote above, never shown in the narrative, that the nobles were also being tortured).

In the quote we are considering, his energy is also transposed onto the author himself as well. He too, in his conception, will be in the way of violent punishment if he is unable to do justice in his account to the cruelty of the burghers. And the monks are his potential accusers – much more than just a passive audience. A close reading of this passage lets us into the way that the monks are not just a secondary audience, but a group that is imagined having a real stake in the chronicle's ability to convey a common experience.

Admittedly, the ideas that we have begun to develop here have followed from a very narrow piece of textual evidence. However, the thrust of our larger arguments in this thesis will help to fill out our notion of the chronicle as an internal document, meant to convey a particular version of authority for the benefit of the monastic community of Sahagún.

Chapter One: the history of the monastery

The first fifteen chapters of the *Crónica* are devoted to the story of the monastery of Sahagún's early history, from the martyrdom of the monastery's patron saints in the Roman era to the death of Alfonso VI in 1109. The most evident purpose of this history is to establish the monastery's authority over its local territory and over the burgher class that comes to inhabit the town of Sahagún in 1085. This is the familiar 'defence of land and privilege' function of the cartulary-chronicle. The *Crónica* makes this defence through the story of its successive land grants and privileges, the documents recording these (as the name cartulary-chronicle suggests), and the monastery's close relationship to the political and ecclesiastical powers making these grants and privileges. We will take into account in this chapter the participation of the *Crónica* in the generic historiographical mode of the cartulary-chronicle. Yet, our larger purpose is to consider the ways in which the story of the monastery's early history as told in these chapters links up to the subsequent chapters of the *Crónica*, where the 'history of privileges' mode gives way to a dramatic account of the outbreak and eventual resolution of the conflict between the burghers and the monastery of Sahagún.

The chronicle's account of the monastery's early history performs an historiographical function in the way that the chronicle tells its larger story of the conflict with the burghers beyond just a catalogue of grants and privileges for reference in future conflicts. The historical account given in these chapters functions as part of the structural logic of the chronicle. The larger effect of the history given in these chapters for the work as a whole is to establish the past as a time of harmony and prosperity. This will allow the chronicle to frame the monastery's response to the burghers' rebellion as an attempt to reassert the social and legal conditions of the monastery's local power in this idealised past. This structural logic is also seen more immediately in the confrontation between the narrative patterns and styles of these early chapters (1-15) and the chapters (16 and following) on the outbreak of political and local conflict and violence which follow. The ideal political, ecclesiastical, and moral order of the monastery's early history is reinforced with a clear narrative pattern which is driven by the devotion and generosity of the kings of León towards the monastery. The breakdown of the historical order of the monastery's past with the death of Alfonso VI and the burghers' rebellion becomes a narrative issue as the

dominant place of the king's of León in the narrative gives way to individuals and groups competing for agency.

The chronicle gives its own version of the place of the monastery's history in the larger scope of the chronicle in chapter one, which functions as a very brief introduction to the work. The chronicle begins:

Here begins the chronicle of the first foundation of this monastery of Sahagún, and, in turn, of its restoration and magnificent rebuilding, and of the kings and lords of the greatest giving; and, afterwards, of the unspeakable evil deeds and great excesses and ostentation of the burghers and inhabitants of the same place, committed against the abbots, monks, and lordship of the same monastery, and especially against the abbot Don Domingo the first.¹⁰⁸

In contrast with the more elaborate, formalised prologues of many medieval chronicles, this introductory summary gives only a bare and highly contracted version of the contents of the chronicle. In place of rhetorical convention this introduction narrows down the basic storyline of the chronicle. To be sure, there are moments of rhetorical effect, such as the invocation of the 'kings and lords of the greatest giving' (*'los reyes e señores grandísima doctación'*). There is also a grammatical clumsiness here which omits the preposition between 'kings and lords' and 'greatest giving' (I have added it in my translation), and which also omits a thematic link between the history of the monastery's foundation and rebuilding and the generous kings and lords. We will see shortly that a similar clumsy effect continues into the beginning of the next chapter. This can be taken as an awkward translation of the original Latin text. Yet the bare style of this introduction stands out none the less.

The *Historia Compostellana* provides a useful comparison in this respect. The *Compostellana* begins with a preface which describes how the archbishop of Santiago, Diego Gelmírez, ordered a book to be written in order that one might read 'how many honours, properties, ornaments, and dignities the archbishop acquired for the church

¹⁰⁸ *'Aquí comienza la crónica de la primera fundación d'este monasterio de San Fagún e susçesivamente de su restauración e magnífica rehedificación, e de los reyes e señores grandísima doctación; e después de los feos fechos e mui grandes e graves excessos e ynhumildades non deçibles por los burgueses e moradores del dicho lugar cometidos contra los abbades, monjes e señorío del dicho monasterio, e señaladamente contra el abbad don Domingo primero'* CAS, ch. 1, p. 9.

and how many persecutions and dangers he suffered defending it from powerful tyrants'.¹⁰⁹ The preface goes on to curse those that would steal or destroy the book and bless those that would guard it well. This is followed by a lengthy prologue which tells of

ancient fathers who concerned to educate and teach posterity left behind writings on the deeds of kings and military leaders and the virtues and struggles of illustrious men so that they would not fall into the well of oblivion in the long procession of time and the ages.¹¹⁰

The prologue goes on to speak of the how those who should read of the 'virtue and industry'¹¹¹ with enough frequency would be inspired to imitate them and avoid evil deeds. The *Compostellana* then says that the archbishop Diego Gelmírez desired to follow the example set by the 'ancient fathers' by ordering the history of his church to be written from its beginning, in order to provide examples to its readers and to leave a record of the work he had undertaken to 'honour and exalt' the church, and to defend it from 'powerful tyrants'.¹¹²

In place of a more formal introduction such as that of the *Compostellana* the *Crónica* presents a highly condensed version of the story of the text. The narrative model that this introduction lays out tells us something about the *Crónica's* purpose in the way that distinct narrative sections are linked to form the larger story of the chronicle. The text shows here the direct confrontation between two parts of this story, the monastery's history and the subsequent burgher revolt. In effect, we see the way that the burghers' revolt is to be understood through the earlier story of the monastery's history. What is left out of this introduction to the story of the chronicle is also significant. There is no mention here of any reaction or solution to the burghers' revolt. The logic of this omission is particularly revealing of what is at stake in the structural construction of the story of the chronicle, and, even more than this, what is

¹⁰⁹ 'Quantos honores et quantas hereditates et ornamenta et dignitates ipse archiepiscopus sue ecclesie adquisiu[er]it et quantas persecutiones et pericula a tyrannicis potestatibus pro sue ecclesie defensione pertulerit' CAS, preface, p. 3.

¹¹⁰ 'Patres antiqui de instructione et eruditione posterorum solliciti regum atque ducum gesta necnon uirorum illustrium probitates et industrias pagine commendare consueuerunt, ne diuturna uetustate aut longis temporum interuallis abolita in foueam obliuionis labefierent' CAS, prologue, p. 4.

¹¹¹ 'probitate et industria' CAS, prologue, p. 4.

¹¹² 'honore atque exaltatione' / 'tyrannicis potestatibus' CAS, prologue, p. 5.

at stake in making this structure explicit in the text. The effect of leaving the eventual resolution of the conflict out of this introduction is to establish the return-to-the-past stance of the chronicle. Instead of a chronicle about a dispute and its resolution, this introduction imagines a chronicle about the history of the monastery with a story of the burghers' revolt tacked on to the end. This denies, in effect, a future to the story of relations between the monastery and the burghers apart from the original condition of the monastery's lordship over the burghers which will be established in the opening fifteen chapters of the chronicle. In fact, we will see in the course of this study that the events of the *Crónica's* conclusion are arranged to suggest a return to the past and the original conditions of the relationship between the monastery and the burghers.

This introduction also gives us a hint of what kind of history the chronicle will provide for the monastery. The emphasis is on three aspects of this history: the institutional foundation of the monastery, the monastery's buildings, and the monastery's relationship with the monarchy and nobility. These themes fit very clearly into the genre of 'defensive local historiography' as Monika Otter has described it.¹¹³ As she confirms in the case of English historiography, the great majority of monastic history in the twelfth-century was inspired by local conflicts and consequently concerns itself with the local history and affairs of the monastery. The same point has been applied more generally to the wider arena of Western Christendom.¹¹⁴ The story of the monastery's lands, its natural topography, and its buildings are commonly central concerns of these histories.¹¹⁵ These could function as records of the past where written sources were lacking. Inscriptions found on tombstones or other relics of the past might also provide useful in-situ evidence about the past, as Elisabeth van Houts has pointed out.¹¹⁶ The chronicle also calls attention in this introduction to the role of the monarchy and nobility in the history of the monastery. In fact, it is the monarchy that will occupy the central place in the story of the monastery's past; though the chronicle's charter collection contains the records of many donations from local nobles in the early centuries of the monastery's history, these will not be

¹¹³ M. Otter, *Inventiones: Fiction and Referentiality in Twelfth-Century English Historical Writing* (North Carolina, 1996), pp. 22-3.

¹¹⁴ See E. van Houts, *Local and Regional Chronicles* (Turnhout, 1995); and, M. Sot, 'Local and Institutional History (300-1000)', *Historiography in the Middle Ages* (ed.) D.M. Deliyannis (Leiden, 2003), 89-114.

¹¹⁵ Otter, *Inventiones*, pp. 2-3.

¹¹⁶ van Houts, *Local and Regional Chronicles*, p. 32.

mentioned by the chronicle apart from this introduction and a reiteration of this introduction at the end of chapter five.¹¹⁷ The monastery's relationship with the monarchy also presents convenient historiographical possibilities for the chronicle through the tradition of its charter collection. As we will see, the chronicler references these charters as pieces of the historical record which highlight the monastery's long and profitable relationship with the monarchy of León. The chronicle's account of the monastery's history will be built upon the concerns and sources of both the local identity of the monastery and its relationship with the Leonese monarchy.

Chapter two of the chronicle tells of the martyrdom of the monastery's patron saints, Facundo and Primitivo in the Roman Era. This initial event in the history of the monastery introduces a tradition of sacred and local history not anticipated by the chronicle's introduction. In the transition to chapter two the chronicle remains in the introductory mode, thus this chapter reads:

To all the readers of the present book and chronicle, and attentive listeners, by the sure knowledge and true account of the ancient fathers, let it be known that in the time that the noble and powerful man Marcus Aurelius ruled and governed the state of the republic of imperial Rome, the noble knights and blessed martyrs of Jesus Christ, that is, Facundo and Primitivo, born and raised in Spain, who in that place, with singular devotion in the obedience of the Sovereign Lord, bringing great celestial clarity and virtuous examples to the blind world, passed their dying moments and made a glorious end of their religious lives, most acceptable and pleasing to the Lord, for in the end they spilled the precious blood of their sacred bodies, and as their souls deserved they ascended in divine grace to the high throne of the heavenly glory.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁷ For the monastery's early charters see: J. M. Mínguez Fernández, *Colección diplomática del monasterio de Sahagún* (siglos IX y X) v. 1 (León, 1976).

¹¹⁸ *'A todos los leedores del presente libro e crónica atentos oidores, por çierta cognición e de los padres antiguos vera relación, sea manifesto que en el tienpo que el noble e poderoso barón Marcho Antonio regía e governava el estado de la republica del ynperio romano, los nobles cavalleros e bienabenturados mártires de Jesuchristo, Facundo conviene a saber e Primitivo, nascidos e criados en España, e en ella, ante el acatamiento del soberano señor con muy fiel e singular devoçión conbersando e al mundo çiego gran claridad çelestial e exenplos virtuosos dexando, ellos fenesçieron su postrimera e mui religiosa e acavada vida con fin mui glorioso e mucho açpto e agradable al señor, pues que, finalmente,*

This scene itself is characterised by a highly rhetorical style, seen in both its invocation of the ‘true account of the ancient fathers’ and in its description of the martyrdom of Facundo and Primitivo. The invocation of ancient fathers echoes the similar reference in the *Historia Compostellana* that we have quoted above. Ludovine Gaffard’s argument that the *Crónica* should be dated to the thirteenth century, focuses on this version of the martyrdom, which omits the story of their life and passion and gives instead only a rhetorical allusion to their deaths and apotheoses. We have argued against this thesis in the introduction to this study on the basis of the *Miracles of St James*, which also omits the life and passion of its saint in favour of accounts of his miraculous interventions on behalf of pilgrims travelling to his tomb. San Facundo will also intervene in person on behalf of one in need in chapter sixty-nine of the *Crónica*, as we will see.

However, though we do not agree with the conclusion drawn by Gaffard’s argument, her observation on the nature of the depiction of the monastery’s saints and their role in the chronicle is significant. Facundo and Primitivo appear as noble Roman soldiers (*‘nobles caballeros’*). They are not humble victims who show the injustice and excess of power, but part of that power structure itself. We follow here Belmonte’s insight about the close connection between power and hagiography: ‘[c]on el triunfo del Cristianismo, los textos hagiográficos pasaron de ser actas de transgresiones al poder, a historias ejemplares de una élite divina’.¹¹⁹ Belmonte is following the work of historians, such as Peter Brown, David Rollason, Thomas Head, Roger Collins, Jacques Fontaine, and Brian Dutton who together have traced this association from the very early to the later parts of the Middle Ages.¹²⁰ This looks forward to the way that the sacred and the powerful tend to blend together in the chronicle in common purpose as the defenders of the monastery. This same point is made strikingly in this scene in the way that Marcus Aurelius is held up for praise

derramada la su preciosa sangre de sus sagrados cuerpos, sus ánimas merecieron, mediante la gracia divinal, subir al muy alto trono de la gloria celestial’ CAS, ch. 2, pp. 9-10.

¹¹⁹ Jiménez Belmonte, ‘Hagiografía y denuncia política’, p. 215.

¹²⁰ P. Brown, *The Cult of Saints* (Chicago, 1981); D. Rollason, ‘Hagiography and Politics in Early Northumbria’, *Holy Men and Women: Old England Prose Saint’s Lives and Their Context* (ed.) P.E. Szarmach (Albany, 1996), 95-114; T. Head, *Hagiography and the Cult of Saints: the Diocese of Orleans, 800-1200* (Cambridge, 1990); R. Collins, *España en la Alta Edad Media* (Barcelona, 1986); J. Fontaine, ‘King Sisebut’s *Vita Desiderii* and the Political Function of Visigothic Hagiography’, *Visigothic Spain: New Approaches* (ed.) E James (Oxford, 1980), 93-129; B. Dutton, *La ‘Vida de San Millán de la Cogolla’ de Gonzalo de Berceo* (London, 1967).

under the grand political description: he 'ruled and governed the state of the republic of imperial Rome'.¹²¹ There is no ambivalence about the man who should be the evil tyrant with the blood of the monastery's saints on his hands.

Belmonte uses scenes such as this to support his notion of the 'discurso político-religioso' that prevails in the text.¹²² We suggest here a more complex relationship between the two. There is a strong sense in which the political and the religious are combined in the singular purpose of enriching and empowering the monastery in these chapters. But, as we will begin to see this sense will be qualified by the dominant place of the political as the drivers of the narrator. Belmonte's point is that by holding Alfonso VI up as an ideal king the chronicle gives more weight to its criticism of Alfonso I of Aragón. The two certainly cannot be separated entirely, yet Belmonte's scheme rests on a primary distinction between good and bad political power, and we will point in later sections of the text to the complex interplay between the political and the religious that suggest that we make some distinction between them.

The martyrdom of Facundo and Primitivo leads into the story of the construction of the first church at Sahagún. Here the chronicle puts Sahagún's earliest local history into the larger framework of peninsular history. Directly following the martyrdom of Facundo and Primitivo, at the end of chapter two, the chronicle describes how a local community was formed around the holy site of their deaths:

Meanwhile, the faithful and obedient community of that time, with great reverence and devotion, took the same holy bodies and devoutly buried them near the public road on the banks of the river Cea, where they had suffered their glorious passion and received their death.

And in time, with the ever-increasing devotion of the pious community, on the place of the same bodies a chapel and small church was founded; and, in this way, for many years for the sake of

¹²¹ *'regía e governava el estado de la republica del ynperio romano'*, CAS, ch. 2, p. 9.

¹²² Jiménez Belmonte, 'Hagiografía y denuncia política', p. 215.

their memory and devotion, in the same chapel, there was held frequent and devout religious services.¹²³

But this community is temporarily scattered by the conquest of the peninsula by a Muslim army in the year 711. Chapter three explains:

But, as the great sins of the Gothic people deserved it and the just sentence of the most-high Lord allowed it, Spain was put to the cruel knife of the infidels, and the same place and chapel, in which the remains of the same holy martyrs lay, was razed almost to the ground. And for many years it remained a ruin of dust and ash, forgotten without any repair, until such a time that it pleased the divine clemency to check the ferocity of the said infidels, and the glory and kingdom of the said Gothic people, as from the dust of the earth, it was pleased to lift up and glorify.

And then, as before, the devotion of the Christian religious community with great care and diligence put their hands to rebuilding the same place, building there a small church where the bodies of the same martyrs were interred.¹²⁴

The idea that the Muslim conquest of the Iberian peninsula was divine punishment for the sins of the Visigothic kingdom is part of a larger historical tradition of the Asturian-Leonese monarchy which saw themselves as the direct descendants of the Visigoths.¹²⁵ Thus, in the passage above the fall of the Visigothic kingdom is only a temporary setback in the longer scope of Christian history. The repetition of the so-

¹²³ *'Enpero las fieles e devotas personas de aquel tiempo, con gran reberençia e devoción, cogieron e tomaron los dichos sus sagrados cuerpos, los quales devotamente enterraron açerca del camino público, sobre la rivera del río llamado Çeya, en el qual lugar ellos resçivieron su muerte e gloriosa pasión.*

E andando el tiempo e todavía creçiendo la devoçión de piadosas personas, sobre los sus dichos cuerpos fue fundada una capilla e yglesia pequeñuela, e ansí por muchos çercos de años a su memoria e devoçión a y, en la dicha capilla, a nuestro señor era frequentado mucho loable e religioso serviçio' CAS, ch. 3, p. 10.

¹²⁴ *'Mas mereçiéndolo los grandes pecados de la gente gótica e permitiéndolo la justa sentençia del muy alto señor, España fue ferida e metida al cuchillo muy cruel de los ynfieles, por lo qual el dicho lugar e capilla, en la qual los mienbros de los dichos santos mártires folgavan, fasta el suelo fue derrivada. E ansí por muchos espaçios de años quedó desfecha en polvo e çenica, e olvidada sin ninguna reparaçión, fasta tanto que plugo a la clemençia divinal contrastar e refrenar la feroçidad de los dichos ynfieles; e la gloria e reino de la dicha gente gótica, casi del polvo de la tierra, le plugo de resusçitar e ensalçar.*

E entonces, como de cavo, la devoçión de la religión cristiana con gran cuidado e diligençia puso las manos a prestamente refaçer el sobredicho lugar, allí hedifica[n]do una pequeñuela ygleçuela donde los cuerpos de los dichos mártires fueron enterrados' CAS, ch. 3, p. 10.

¹²⁵ For the myth of Visigothic origins see: J.N. Hillgarth, *The Visigoths in History and Legend* (Toronto, 2009).

called Asturian myth of Visigothic origins associates the *Crónica* with other chronicles such as the *Historia Silense* and the *Chronicle of Alfonso III*.¹²⁶ In these chronicles the myth is used in the context of royal history. By contrast, the *Crónica* only glances at the story, relating it not to the legitimacy of a monarchy but rather to the local history of Sahagún.

In fact, the chronicler could be conflating an attack on the monastery in 883 by an army under the Muslim commander Abuhalit with the events of conquest of the peninsula in 771. This attack is related in the *Crónica Albeldense*.¹²⁷ There was a subsequent attack on Sahagún a century later by Al-mansur in 988.¹²⁸ The reference in the introduction to a 'restoration' and 'rebuilding' could be to this later attack, some eighty years after the founding of the monastery, though the chronicle does not refer to it.

We also notice the central place of the physical building of the church of Sahagún in this early history. The history of the religious community of Sahagún is told through the construction, destruction, and reconstruction of this physical structure. It also provides the link between this early history and the next phase of history of the monastery and its royal benefactors. In chapter four the chronicle tells of the foundation of the monastery at Sahagún by Alfonso III.

The chronicle introduces the reign of Alfonso according to a rhetorical mode which emphasises the devotion of the king to the church of Sahagún.¹²⁹ This establishes a narrative pattern that will continue through the chronicle's accounts of the reigns of Ramiro II and Alfonso VI. This narrative pattern is structured around the theme of the institutional, religious, and personal links between the Leonese monarchy and the monastery of Sahagún. This theme is expressed in the narrative according to a precise pattern. The chronicle begins with a description of the person and the royal state of the king and then of his devotion to Sahagún. Chapter four begins: 'It is right to make known that when the most excellent king Don Alfonso,

¹²⁶ Pérez de Urbel, *Historia Silense*; A. Ubieto Arteta, ed., *Crónica de Alfonso III* (Valencia, 1971).

¹²⁷ The *Crónica Albeldense* is found in J. Gil Fernández, ed., *Crónicas asturianas* (Oviedo, 1985), p. 254 [an English version is available in *Medieval Iberia: Readings from Christian, Muslim, and Jewish Sources*, ed. O. R. Constable (Pennsylvania, 1997), p. 60].

¹²⁸ R. Collins, *Early Medieval Spain: Unity in Diversity, 400-1000* (1983), p. xviii.

¹²⁹ For a brief account of the reign of Ramiro II see: J. F. O'Callaghan, *A History of Medieval Spain* (Cornell, 1975), pp. 112ff.

called the Great, was in possession of the high and royal state, he desired with all his heart to enlarge and magnify the same place and chapel mentioned above'.¹³⁰ Next, the chronicle tells of the gifts, privileges, or other benefits given to the monastery by the king. In the case of Alfonso III, this begins with the foundation of the monastery.

The chronicle tells how King Alfonso III received a religious man fleeing from Córdoba,¹³¹ also called Alfonso, and how the king because he 'desired with all his heart to enlarge and magnify'¹³² the church of the martyrs of Sahagún and 'in order to administer a good beginning for [the church of Sahagún]'¹³³ installed Abbot Alfonso at Sahagún, and established a monastery there. The foundation of the monastery is followed by land grants. The chronicle says that the king 'granted and gave [the church of Sahagún] by the authority of his royal privilege all the lands, worked and unworked, with vineyards and all other things pertaining'.¹³⁴

In fact, it is not precisely clear to which charter the chronicle refers here. There is no charter recording the foundation of the monastery. The earliest charter for Alfonso III is dated 22 October 904 and records a grant to the monastery of the village of Zacarías.¹³⁵ The formulaic phrasing of the grant given by the chronicle in this chapter matches two subsequent grants in the charter collection. In a charter dated 30 November 904, Alfonso granted a monastery called 'Sancti Felicis' to Sahagún and the charter stipulates: '*cum omnibus adiacentis vel prestationibus suis, domibus, atriis, terris, ortis, molinis, pratis, padulibus cum suis antiquis productilibus aquis aquarum, cum aqueductibus earum*'.¹³⁶ This same wording appears in the next charter, dated exactly one year later, 30 November 905, in a grant of the monastery's *coto*: '*cum omnibus adiacentiis vel prestationibus suis, domibus, atriis, terris, ortis, molinis, pratis,*

¹³⁰ 'Es agora a saver que después que el mui exçelente rey don Alfonso, llamado Magno, aviendo ya e poseyendo el alteça e estado real' con todo coraçón quiso engrandesçer e magnificar el dicho lugar e capilla susodicha' CAS, ch. 4, p. 11.

¹³¹ The chronicle calls him an abbot: 'un abad fuyendo de Córdova' (CAS, ch. 4, p. 11). Alfonso III was associated with the colonisation of the *Tierra de Campos*, which was also the frontier zone between the regions of León and Castile, see: C. Sánchez Albornoz, *Despoblación y repoblación del Valle del Duero* (Buenos Aires, 1966), pp. 253-291.

¹³² 'con todo coraçón quiso engrandesçer e magnificar' CAS, ch. 4, p. 11.

¹³³ 'le administró buen prinçipio para ello' CAS, ch. 4, p. 11.

¹³⁴ 'le otorgó e dio por autoridad de su previlegio real todas las tierras, así labradas como por labrar, con viñas y las otras cosas çircunstantes' CAS, ch. 4, p. 11.

¹³⁵ Mínguez Fernández, *Colección diplomática I*, p. 27: no. 6.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 29: no. 7

padulibus, cum suis antiquis productilibus aquis'.¹³⁷ The similar phrasing between the *Crónica*'s reference and that of charter collection suggests (as much as we might allow such a formulaic phrase to stand as exclusive evidence) that the *Crónica* is specifically referencing one of these documents. In fact, the last of these documents is thought to be either a forgery or a heavily edited version of an original.¹³⁸ To add to the confusion, as we will see, the *Crónica* will attribute the *coto* to Ramiro II.

Finally, in its account of Alfonso III's generosity towards the monastery, the chronicle emphasises the king's role in continuing the history of building the monastery begun by the first religious community of Sahagún. The chronicle tells how Alfonso III 'had the church built as it appears today, and also built houses for the monks to live in' and how he also 'ordered a hospital to be built to receive pilgrims'.¹³⁹ The assertion that Alfonso III had the church and monastery at Sahagún completed 'as it appears today' (*'como fasta agora paresçe'*) shows the way that the history of the buildings at Sahagún provides a physical connection between past and present. The historiographical function of this tradition is especially significant as it is able to provide tangible evidence of the shadowy history of the religious community of the martyrdom of Facundo and Primitivo for which no other wordly evidence, documentary or otherwise, exists.

We have seen how the chronicle's account of the reign of Alfonso III blends both royal history and local history according to the role of the kings of León as the founders and great benefactors of the monastery. The chronicle's account of the monastery's history will continue to be built upon this thematic formula. This storyline puts us squarely in the genre of local monastic history as defined by Monika Otter or Elisabeth van Houts. When local conflict breaks out after the death of Alfonso VI in 1109 such features of this local history, including the monastery's land and buildings, will be objects of the burghers' attacks. These attacks will be not only physical in nature, smashing up the monastery buildings, destroying its crops and woodlands, but also authoritative, challenging the monastery's rights of possession to their lands or their possessions. In anticipation of these attacks, the chronicle's account of the

¹³⁷ Mínguez Fernández, *Colección diplomática* I, p. 30: no. 8

¹³⁸ This is discussed at: Mínguez Fernández, *Colección diplomática* I, pp. 32-7.

¹³⁹ *'hiço edificar la iglesia como fasta agora paresçe, e aún edificó casas a los monjes para morar ... ordenó ospiçio para reçivimiento de los peregrinos'* CAS, ch. 4, p. 11.

history of its lands, buildings, and possessions and the authority upon which it received and continues to hold them satisfies the 'defence of land and privilege' function of local monastic history. But the way that this history is constructed also has a narrative logic which becomes in the larger scope of the chronicle part of the story of history, conflict and resolution.

The history of the devotion and generosity of the Leonese monarchy is told by the chronicle according to a precise narrative pattern in which subsequent kings are the sole agents of the narrative and act upon the monastery. In the account of the reign of Alfonso III this is shown in the sequence of verbs of desiring, granting, and building that drive the narrative. King Alfonso III 'desired to enlarge and magnify' (*'quiso engrandesçer e magnificar'*), 'decreed that he would take the abbacial seat there' (*'procuró que allí asentase'*), 'granted by the authority of his royal privilege' (*'otorgó e dio por autoridad de su privilegio real'*), 'had the church built' (*'hiço edificar la iglesia'*), 'had houses built' (*'edificó casas'*), 'he had a hospital built' (*'ordenó ospicio'*). This sequence of strong verbs describing the king's role in the monastery's history gives the narrative a clear focus and shape.

The thematic and narrative pattern that characterised the reign of Alfonso III continues into the reign of Ramiro II. The chronicle introduces Ramiro:

Now with the passage of time, the king Don Ramiro, grandson of the same king mentioned above, Alfonso, when he assumed the magnificent royal state, having such great devotion to the same glorious martyrs of Sahagún mentioned above, in their honour and reverence he made grants to the now-built monastery and gave it and ennobled it with great gifts and the rents of many villages and places.¹⁴⁰

As the chronicle says, Ramiro II was the grandson of Alfonso III. Some complicated and discordant political history is passed over in the chronicle's jump from Alfonso III to Ramiro II. Alfonso III divided his kingdom between his three sons, García,

¹⁴⁰ *'Sucçediendo ya los tienpos, el rey don Ramiro, nieto del sobredicho rey don Alfonso, como tubo e entró en el magnífico estado real, a los sobredichos mártires gloriosos aviendo gran devoçión e a su honor e reverençia, el dicho monasterio ya edificado doctó e enobleçió con grandes dones e rentas de muchas villas e lugares'* CAS, ch. 5, pp. 11-2.

Ordoño, and Fruela, who ruled in León, Galicia, and Asturias, respectively. The three sons turned upon each other after the death of their father, and eventually it was Ordoño II (910-925) who came to rule the whole of his father's former kingdom.¹⁴¹ This selective history allows the chronicle to present a more unified and stable picture of the Leonese monarchy and their support of the monastery of Sahagún. The reign of Ramiro II was subject to its own political struggles. Ordoño II was succeeded by his son Alfonso IV (925-930), however in 930 Ordoño abdicated his throne and retired to the monastery of Sahagún. His brother Ramiro II received his crown, but was soon challenged to defend it when Alfonso changed his mind and returned to defy his brother. Ramiro defeated his brother and blinded him.¹⁴²

As with the chronicle's introduction of Alfonso III, Ramiro II is introduced according to his royal status. This is expressed in terms of his title, his lineal relationship to Alfonso III, and the prestige of the royal state which he has inherited: 'the magnificent royal state' (*'el magnífico estado real'*). Again the narrative formula turns directly to the king's relationship to Sahagún. The chronicle, in this case, speaks specifically of the king's devotion to the martyrs of Sahagún (*'a los sobredichos mártires gloriosos aviendo gran devoçión e a su honor e reverençia'*). In turn this devotion leads to gifts and privileges from the king, narrated according to the same pattern of strong verbs of granting that characterised Alfonso III's relationship to the monastery: 'he gave it and ennobled [the monastery] with great gifts and the rents of many villages and places' (*'doctó e ennobleçió con grandes dones e rentas de muchas villas e lugares'*).

In the case of Ramiro II, the chronicle focuses on one grant in particular, the grant of a *coto*, or preserve of woodland over which the monastery would enjoy exclusive control.¹⁴³ The chronicle describes:

And furthermore he assigned to the same monastery the *coto*, in which no person could possess or take for themselves even a palm's

¹⁴¹ For a brief account of the reign of Ramiro II see: O'Callaghan, *A History of Medieval Spain*, pp. 122ff.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 122.

¹⁴³ On the monastery's *coto* see: M.F. Carrera de la Red 'Notas de toponomastica Leonesa: Estudio del Coto de Sahagún', *Archivos Leoneses* 79-80 (1986), 347-363. She defines the *coto* as '*una superficie notable de terreno alrededor del monasterio, donde el abad ejerce su jurisdicción con exclusión de la misma potestad real'* (p. 347).

width of land; he wished to make it for the exclusive use of the monks and the monastery.

And he also ordained that if any guilty person or evildoer who was fleeing should take refuge within the *coto* he would in this way be made free without punishment. And he furthermore ordained that whoever, noble or not, should dare to take anything from the *coto*, however small of value, he should be forced for this to pay to the king five hundred *sueldos* of silver and another five hundred to the abbot.¹⁴⁴

As we have indicated above, the monastery's charter collection assigns the *coto*-grant to Alfonso III. As this charter is most likely a heavily reedited version of the original grant or a later reconception of a lost grant, it is not certain whether the error lies in the charter or the chronicle. Sahagún's charter collection preserves seven grants made by Ramiro II to the monastery, of local churches and territories.¹⁴⁵ As defined in the false charter, the *coto* would be some eight kilometres north to south and twelve east to west, but this has been suspected that this is an exaggeration.¹⁴⁶

The chronicle's description of the *coto* is also structured upon a sequence of verbs which describe Ramiro II's grant. As before, the narrative pattern supports the thematic message. A series of action verbs describing royal privileges and gifts order this historical narrative: 'endowed and ennobled' (*'doctó e ennobleció'*), 'assigned and designated' (*'asignó e aseñaló'*), 'ordained' (*'ordenó'*), and 'gave and granted' (*'dio e otorgó'*).

¹⁴⁴ *'E otrosí él primeramente asignó e aseñaló al dicho monasterio el coto, dentro del qual ninguna persona puede tener ni a sí apropiár aun tan solamente un palmo de heredad. Mas quiso que esentamente fuese de los monjes e monasterio.*

E quiso otrosí e ordenó que si algún culpado o malhechor fuyendo, al dicho coto se acogiese, tal como éste fuese libre e sin pena alguna. E aún ordenó más: que qualquiera que sea, o noble o non noble, que osase sacar e tomar del dicho coto prenda alguna, aun quanto quier pequeña, luego por ese mesmo fecho fuese obligado a pagar al rey quinientos sueldos de plata e otros quinientos sueldos al abbad' CAS, ch. 5, p. 11-2.

¹⁴⁵ Mínguez Fernández, *Colección diplomática* I, pp. 92-3, 115, 123-4, 129-34, 166-7: nos. 61, 84, 93, 97, 98, 99, 129

¹⁴⁶ See Carrera de la Red, 'Notas de toponomástica Leonesa', p. 363. and Mínguez Fernández, *Colección diplomática* I, p. 32, who thought the charter's description of the *coto* to be excessive, but without giving specific reasons.

The chronicle's description of the terms of the *coto* is both specific and vague and this is suggestive of its wider purpose in the chronicle. The chronicle is very specific on points such as the exclusivity of the preserve, forbidding outsiders from owning 'even a palm's width' of land ('*un palmo de heredad*'), and stipulating that it is to be for the exclusive use of the monastery ('*esentamente fuese de los monjes e monasterio*'). The strict exclusivity of the *coto* has a clear resonance in the chronicle's account of the conflict with the burghers which will see the burghers damaging and occupying the preserve. However, specific details such as the exemption from royal or noble justice for those seeking refuge in the *coto* and the amount (1000 *sueudos*) to be levied on violators of the *coto* do not have a direct purpose in the larger story of the conflict.¹⁴⁷ There are no stories of the accused seeking refuge in the *coto*, and though the burghers and Aragonese are charged by the chronicle with stealing from the woodland preserve of the *coto* there is no idea of imposing a fine in these instances. These details which are superfluous to the larger story of conflict presented in the chronicle suggest the stand-alone nature and purpose of the chronicle's account of the monastery's history. That is, this history conforms to generic tendencies particular to the 'defence of land and privilege' purpose of the cartulary-chronicle. The chronicle's use of documents in these early chapters tells the story of the history of the monastery's possession of its lands and the authority for that possess, and these lands will quite literally be the space on which many of the issues of power, force, and authority will be fought. But they also conform to the logic of the cartulary-chronicle which presents the documents as pieces of the legal and historical record for their own sake. Turning to the reign of Alfonso VI, we see this same double logic in the presentation of the two documents at the heart of the conflict and the chronicle's historiographical purposes in returning to the conflict.

The chronicle's account of the reign of Alfonso VI is marked by the same thematic concerns and narrative patterns as those of Alfonso III and Ramiro II, but the chronicle is able to fill in his reign with more events and more detail. From the reign of Ramiro II to that of Alfonso VI the chronicle jumps forward just over a century from the end of Ramiro II's reign in 951 to Alfonso VI's succession to the throne in 1065. The

¹⁴⁷ On the intended financial benefit of the monastic preserve through fines, as well as on the preserve as legal sanctuary, see comments in the conclusion of W. Davies & P. Fouracre, *Property and Power in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 254ff.

chronicle accounts for the gap this leaves in the chronology with a reiteration of the purpose of the chronicle given in the introduction of chapter one:

And now then, although it would be much too long to write and even to try to tell how the monastery, for more than one hundred and fifty years, flourished with the gifts of alms and possessions from kings, counts, and all the other nobles in Spain, yet, I will set out clearly in the following way how the kings and nobles of Spain constructed, enriched, and glorified the same monastery, and how the burghers and inhabitants of the town assailed the monastery, knocking it almost to the ground.¹⁴⁸

With the reign of Alfonso VI the chronicle passes from time-out-of-mind history to history which was still only eight or nine years past when the chronicle was written. At the time the chronicle was written there very well could have been elder members of the monastic community who had lived through Alfonso's rise to the throne, some fifty-two years past. Even the younger members would have remembered at least the end of his reign and his death in 1109. Alfonsine history was still very present history, and we will see in the chronicle the long shadow his figure casts upon the events following his death.

Alfonso VI plays the ideal king in the chronicle. His introduction is a set-piece description of his many gifts both secular and religious:

In the year of the Incarnation of the Lord one thousand and sixty-six, after the most noble king Don Alfonso, son of the king Don Fernando and the queen Doña Sancha, had assumed the lordship and dignity of the kingdom of Spain, a man who was certainly noble in the things of war, sober and discreet in managing his kingdom, just in his judgement, skilled and clever in secular business, but religious and pious in things ecclesiastical, without equal for enlarging and glorifying his kingdom, just but terrifying to his enemies and

¹⁴⁸ *'E pues agora, cómo e en qué manera allende de çiento y çinquenta años este dicho monasterio abundó e creçió en grandes dones, limosnas e posesiones, así de los reyes como de los condes e de todos los otros nobles varones de España, mucho luengo sería a lo escrevir e por menudo recontar; mas por qué orden e manera los reyes de España e nobles d'ella el dicho monasterio fabricaron, magnificaron e ensalzaron, e en qué manera los burgueses e moradores casi fasta el suelo destruyeron e derrocaron, por el estilo siguiendo avajo esplanado manifestamente lo porné e declararé'* CAS, ch. 5, p. 12.

wrongdoers, meek and benign to men of the church and his other allies, prudent and strong in adversity, moderate and frugal in prosperity and fortune.¹⁴⁹

The chronicle's account of King Alfonso's reign begins with his part in religious reforms which strengthened ties between his kingdom and the Burgundian monastery of Cluny and introduced links with the papacy of Gregory VII. The chronicle describes how:

This same man, among the many other pious and religious things that he did, in the eleventh year of his ascension to the height of the magnificent royal throne of his kingdom he strove to make all of Spain celebrate the divine service according to the custom of the Roman church, sending supplication to that man of most honourable life, the pope Gregory VII.¹⁵⁰

The reference here is to the liturgical reforms effected in Alfonso's reign which replaced the traditional Mozarabic rite of Christian Spain with the Roman rite, then the dominant liturgy in Western Europe. In the chronicle's version of events it was Alfonso VI who set these reforms in motion. In fact, a more complex picture emerges from wider sources.¹⁵¹ But, the chronicle follows the prevailing narrative pattern established in its account of the reigns of Alfonso III and Ramiro II. Thus it is Alfonso VI who 'strove' (*procuró*) to bring about liturgical reform. These reforms in the chronicle's account climax in the grant of the *libertas Romana*, a papal privilege exempting the monastery from all secular and religious powers save that of the papacy. We will consider this document itself in the final chapter of this study on the chronicle's documents.

¹⁴⁹ 'En el año de la Encarnación del Señor de mill e sesenta e seis, después que el muy noble rey don Alfonso [VI], fiijo del rei don Fernando [I] e de la reina doña Sancha, obo el señorío e dignidad del reino de España, varón, por çierto, en las cosas belicosas muy noble guerrero; en disponer bien su reino, proveído e discreto; en el juicio, muy derecho; en los negoçios seglares, astuto e entendido; mas en las cosas eclesiásticas, religioso e piadoso; en ensalçar y magnificar su reino, muy singular; a los enemigos e malfechores, muy justiciero e espantoso; a los varones eclesiásticos o a otros sus allegados, muy manso e benigno; en las cosas contrarias, prudente e fuerte; e en las prósperas e vienandantes, tenplado e manso' CAS, ch. 6, p. 12-13.

¹⁵⁰ 'El qual, después que suvió en el alteça e magnífico estado real de su reyno, entre otras cosas muchas que muy loable e religiosamente fiço, en el onçeno anno de su reino procuró, suplicando al barón muy onrrada vida Gregorio sétimo en la silla apostolical, que en toda España fuese çelebrado el divinal ofiço según que la iglesia Romana acostumbra' CAS, ch. 6, p. 13.

¹⁵¹ See Cowdrey, *Cluniacs* and Bishko, 'Fernando I and the Origins', 34ff.

The same narrative pattern determines Alfonso VI's role in establishing contact with Abbot Hugh of Cluny Abbey. The chronicle describes how:

in the fifteenth year of his reign, inflamed with the same spirit of zeal and devotion for the holy religion, he sent a request to the man Don Hugh, the abbot of the monastery of Cluny, asking if it might please him to send him some monks who might teach the religion, customs, and ceremonies of Cluny to this monastery of Sahagún.¹⁵²

As this passage describes, the relationship between Cluny and Alfonso VI resulted in the arrival of Cluniac monks who Alfonso installed at the monastery of Sahagún. Sahagún was to become the first Cluniac monastery in Alfonso's kingdom, from which Cluniac monastic practices could be spread. In fact, while the records suggest the Alfonso was a willing agent of reform in his kingdom, his role as the sole agent of reform is not at all clear.¹⁵³ Rather, the motives for reform seem to have evolved out of Alfonso's relationship to Abbot Hugh of Cluny and from the presence of papal legates who begin to travel to Castile and León at this time. The event was, however, certainly significant. Contact between King Alfonso and Pope Gregory brought together in cooperation the most powerful Christian king on the Iberian peninsula of his time with the most influential churchman of the era. Alfonso's relationship with the Abbot Hugh was also of great significance. Contact between Cluny and the Leonese monarchy had been established by Alfonso's father, King Fernando I. Fernando began the tradition of an annual payment of gold to Cluny, which Alfonso in his reign doubled. The relationship between Cluny and León eventually led to Cluniac monks being sent to León for the purposes of spreading further monastic reforms.

The imposition of the generous and giving king narrative pattern on these events in Alfonso's reign is especially conspicuous given the turbulent nature of these events. The chronicle allows for glimpses of some of these troubles but keeps these at the margins of the story. The chronicle says that when Abbot Hugh first granted the

¹⁵² *'e aún con decavo enflamado por çelo e devoçión de la santa religión, en el quinqueno anno de su reino enbió a Cluni, mucho rogando al varón don Hugo, abbad del monasterio del dicho Cluni, que por su contemplaçión le plugiese enbiarle algunos monjes, los quales mostrasen e enseñasen la religión, costumbres e çeremonias del dicho monasterio de Cluni en este monasterio'* CAS, ch. 6, p. 13.

¹⁵³ See Cowdrey, *Cluniacs*; Bishko, 'Fernando I and the Origins', p. 34ff.; and Bishko, 'Liturgical Intercession', pp. 53-76.

king's request to send monks to his Spanish kingdom he first sent two monks called Roberto and Marcelino. The chronicle says that the king found these two unsatisfactory, and so sent them back. In fact the monk Robert remained in Spain in Alfonso's government and was the source of intense controversy when Alfonso installed him as abbot of Sahagún, sometime in 1080.¹⁵⁴ Robert was the source of an irate letter from Pope Gregory VII which demanded he be sent back to Burgundy, which he ultimately was. It seems the source of the pope's anger was Alfonso's intervention in the monastery's affairs. The *Crónica* says that monks fled the arrival of the Cluniacs (this is also mentioned in the Gregory's letters). But the chronicle strategically reserves this notice until this scene where they are welcomed back into the fold, the controversy, as the chronicle has it at least, already past. The chronicle describes how:

all the monks native to this monastery, who in the first coming of the monks of Cluny had fled to diverse places, he welcomed back with filial love, teaching and instructing them in all the works of piety and making them flourish in exercises of devotion.¹⁵⁵

We see in the way that the uneasy history of the monk Robert and the monastic revolt at the imposition of the Cluniac customs and liturgy is passed over how the chronicle streamlines its narrative to focus more sharply on its story of the monastery's royal gifts and privileges. The ordering of the narrative around the verbs of devotion, giving, and authorizing in turn allow the chronicle to present a simplified storyline which smoothes out the historical complications surrounding the monastic and liturgical reform brought about during the reign of Alfonso VI. This narrative model continues through to the end of the chronicle's account of the reign of Alfonso VI. The final event the chronicle presents is the king's grant of the *fuero* of 1085. We will consider the *fuero* itself in the final chapter of this study. In considering the events that lead to the *fuero*-grant here our interest will continue to be on the way that the chronicle constructs and orders its historical narrative in these early chapters.

¹⁵⁴ For what follows see: Cowdrey, *Cluniacs*, pp. 230ff.

¹⁵⁵ *'todos los monjes criados d'este monasterio, los quales en la primera benida de los monjes de Cluni avían fuido por diversos lugares, él los recogió con amor filial, enseñando e dotrinándolos en todas las obras de piedad e en debotos exerçijos faciéndoles floresçer'* CAS, ch. 6, p. 14.

In chapter fifteen the chronicle says that Alfonso VI 'ordained and established' (*'ordenase e estableçiese'*) the creation of a town in Sahagún. It is this decree that leads to the arrival in Sahagún of burghers from all over Western Europe. The chronicle stresses that the king's decision was taken with the counsel of the abbot and monks of Sahagún and for their benefit: 'the said king glorified, magnified, and exalted that monastery, with counsel of the abbot and the monks, he established that a town would be created there'.¹⁵⁶ The chronicle also takes pains to point out that there were no burghers in Sahagún before this moment:

until that time there was no settlement of inhabitants, except the monks' dwellings and those of their dependant families serving their uses and needs; there were, furthermore, a very small number of noble men and women living there, who used to come here [to the monastery] in the time of fasting, in Lent or Advent, to hear the divine service, something which was of great trouble and annoyance for the monks.¹⁵⁷

The chronicle's insistence that the burgher population arrived only after 1085 and Alfonso VI's grant of the *fuero*, serves as an argument that the burghers' residence in Sahagún goes back only so far as the *fuero* of 1085 and, more than this, that the authority for their residence is only in the *fuero* and the authority of Alfonso VI behind the *fuero*. This is an argument which the chronicle returns to; the chronicle argues essentially that the burghers' have no legitimacy in Sahagún beyond the *fuero*, that they therefore have no claim to alter the terms of the *fuero* or contest the monastery's rule over them.

The chronicle goes on to describe how the creation of the town brought a class of burghers from all parts of Western Europe:

Now then, as the same king had ordained and established that there would be a town in that place, burghers from all the parts of the

¹⁵⁶ *'aqueste monasterio ... el dicho rei engrandeçiese, magnificase e enxalçase, con consejo del abbad e de los monxes, estableçió que se fiçiese aí villa'* CAS, ch. 14, p. 19.

¹⁵⁷ *'fasta aquel tiempo nenguna havitaçión de moradores avía, sacando la morada de los monjes e de su familia serviente a los usos e neçesidades d'ellos; eran otrosí algunas raras e pocas moradores de algunos nobles varones e matronas, los quales en el tiempo de los ayunos, así de la quaresma como del aviento del Señor, venían aquí para oír los ofiçios divinales, de los quales gran turvaçión e enojo se seguía a los monjes'* CAS, ch. 14, p. 19.

world of many and diverse trades, that is, blacksmiths, carpenters, tailors, furriers, cobblers, shield-makers, and men skilled in many and diverse arts and trades gathered there. And, furthermore, they were people of diverse foreign provinces and kingdoms, that is, Gascons, Bretons, Germans, English, Burgundians, Normands, Toulousians, Provençals, Lombards, and many other traders of diverse nations and foreign tongues. And thus the town was populated and grew large.¹⁵⁸

In the creation of the town of Sahagún and the arrival of the burghers, the generous and giving king narrative formula has a pointed effect. The suggestion is that this was a royal grant to the monastery just as any land grant or privilege that came before it. The chronicle says this explicitly in its insistence that the king made his decision with the counsel of the abbot and monks. However, the creation of the town and the arrival of the burghers has a more ambivalent future. The burgher class was certainly meant to provide extra income to the monastery through annual taxes and occasional fines. But the burghers revolt, attack the monastery, its lands, and challenge its authority. We will see in the course of this study how the chronicle looks back to this event during the conflict. What will be stressed is the burghers' debt to Alfonso VI for inviting them to Sahagún where they lived under favourable economic conditions.

This chapter has focused on the thematic framework and narrative structure with which the *Crónica* writes its version of the monastery's past. This version both conforms to the 'defence of land and privilege' purpose of the local chronicle and feeds in directly to the following narrative section of the chronicle describing the outbreak of the conflict. As we turn to the next section we will see how the narrative structure of the chronicle which has been driven forward and ordered by the acts of generosity and benefaction shown to the monastery by subsequent kings of León is disrupted by the outbreak of both political conflict at the regional level and the local quarrel between the burghers and the monastery.

¹⁵⁸ *'Pues agora como el sobredicho rei ordenase e estableçiese que aí se fiçiese villa, ayuntáronse de todas las partes del uniberso burgueses de muchas e diversos ofiçios, conviene a saver, herreros, carpinteros, xastres, pelliteros, çapateros, escutarios e omes enseñados en muchas e dibersas artes e ofiçios. E otrosí personas de diversas e estrañas provinçias e reinos, conbiene a saver, gascones, bretones, alemanes, yngleses, borgoñones, normandos, tolosanos, provinçiales, lonbardos, e muchos otros negoçiadores de diversas naçiones e estrannas lenguas. E así pobló e fiço la villa non pequenna'* CAS, ch. 15, pp. 19-21.

The first part of the chronicle tells the expected 'defence of land and privilege' story of the cartulary-chronicle. This story covers a long span of time: it progresses from the martyrdom of the monastery's patron saints in the Roman era to the death of King Alfonso VI in 1109. This story also comprises a broad set of historical and literary dimensions: hagiography, local history, peninsular history, royal history, land grants and privileges given by subsequent kings of León. Yet, this chronology and these diverse textual and generic elements are subsumed and ordered by the strict narrative order of the devotion and generosity of the kings of León towards the monastery of Sahagún.

Chapter Two: the outbreak of conflict

In this second chapter we move to the chronicle's account of the outbreak of conflict following the death of Alfonso VI. This is both regional political conflict between Queen Urraca and King Alfonso I of Aragón and local conflict between the burghers and the monastery of Sahagún. Here the stable political order of the reign of Alfonso VI is thrown into chaos. But more than this, the stable political order that according to the chronicle's version of this history stretches back to the reign of Alfonso III comes undone.

The direct juxtaposition in the chronicle between the history of the ancient relationship between the Leonese monarchy and the monastery of Sahagún and the chaos of the political struggles between Urraca and Alfonso I and the burghers' revolts against the monastery's local authority is stark and abrupt. The emphasis in the early chapters of the chronicle on the longevity and continuity of the monastery's history of royal privilege and prestige and subsequently in the next section of the narrative of the world-turned-upside-down chaos and conflict that threatens this history ensures this effect. We have seen that this juxtaposition was set out as a thematic confrontation between the monastery's institutional and royal history and the 'ugly deeds' of the burghers by the chronicle's brief but telling introduction. But, this transition as it happens in the chronicle in chapters seventeen and following is more complex and than just the story of how the burghers rose up and attacked the monastery with the emphasis of a thematic difference between, in the first place, stability, prestige, and piety, and, in the second, chaos, violence, and treachery.

We see in the way that the chronicle structures its account of the breakdown of order following the death of Alfonso VI how the narrative order that held sway in the account of the monastery's past is disrupted. The story of the unravelling of political order at the regional level is reinforced by the unravelling of the prevailing narrative order up to this point. From the dominant position of the Leonese monarchy as the sole agent in the narrative we pass to a situation where multiple individuals and parties, political, ecclesiastical, and local compete for power. A more complex, more confused, narrative picture emerges. But, rather than take this as a mark of the chronicler's lack of skill and sophistication, it is also possible to see how this confusion

becomes part of the story itself. This narrative chaos becomes the basis for a new narrative mode and structure which are put to particular historiographical purposes. The 'defence of privilege and property' narrative mode of the previous narrative section gives way to a narrative mode based around the contrast between the suffering and helplessness of the monks and abbot of Sahagún and the violence and cruelty of the burghers. The chronicle brings this contrast to life in its story with a rhetoric which describes violence and suffering in dramatic, hyperbolic, and subjective language. It is this rhetoric which puts into explicit terms as the chronicle sees it the utter political, social, and religious chaos into which the kingdom has been plunged.

Within the confusion of the narrative it is also possible to identify a narrative structure which provides a basic order to the story. This structure is formed around the distinction between the two levels of conflict with which the chronicle deals: the regional political conflict between Urraca and Alfonso I and the local conflict between the burghers and monastery of Sahagún. Although the chronicle's introduction presented a direct confrontation between the story of the monastery's past and the burghers' rebellion, as it happens in chapters seventeen and following the chronicle qualifies the burghers' role in the events that cause the conflict. Following the death of King Alfonso VI, the chronicle continues with the political narrative of the previous thirteen chapters (4-17) to show how the kingdom of Alfonso VI is thrown into disorder. It is only gradually in the course of this political narrative that the burghers emerge as agents of conflict and rebellion in their own right. Central to this story is the way that the burghers –through violence and treachery – take advantage of the wider chaos to realise their (in the words of the chronicle) greedy, proud, and cruel ambitions to challenge the monastery's local lordship.

As we left off in the first chapter of this study, the chronicle had presented its account of Alfonso VI's establishment of a town in Sahagún in chapter fifteen. Directly following this, the chronicle tells of the death of Alfonso VI. In chapter seventeen the chronicle describes the public outburst of grief in the streets of Toledo following the king's death:

With the king now dead, such a great lament and cry arose in the city that I could not express it in writing nor utter it by mouth. The Christians with their wives, the Jews and Moors with theirs, the elder

women with their husbands, the young men with their virgins, the servant girls with their infants, all together confused their voices and shrieks with their cries, making a great din and noise, such that one could say that all the city was but one sound of criers, saying:

“Today, on this day, the sun is born for the Moors and infidels, and is all dark to the Christians”.¹⁵⁹

And tearing their garments and pulling out their hair they raised their confused voices to the clouds, some calling him father, others lord, some of them called him king, others, father of the land, and others, knife and sword of the infidels and Moors; and it was impossible to see and hear all this without crying and wailing, for one could not see and consider such lament and grief with dry eyes. For eight continuous days while he lay dead in the city, day and night the crying did not cease.

His body was taken from the city on Seven Ides of July and with great honour brought to the town of Sahagún, and on the twelfth day of August he was laid in his sepulchre, worked out of a precious marble, next to Queen Constance, as he had ordered.¹⁶⁰

This scene marks a transition in the political order of the kingdom. The death of Alfonso VI will mean the breakdown of the political stability that prevailed during his reign as the chronicle presented it and this passage anticipates that change. This is, however, more than just a transition of events in the plot of the story. It is also a transition in the narrative mode in which the story is told. We move suddenly from the

¹⁵⁹ CAS, ch. 17, p. 25-6.

¹⁶⁰ *‘Muerto ya el rei, tal e tan grande cresçió el planto e lloro en la çibdad, qual yo por escriptura no podría declarar, ni por boca fablar, ca los cristianos, con sus mujeres; los judíos e moros, con las suyas; las biejas, con los biejos; los moços, con las vírgenes; las moças, con los ynfantes, confundiendo las boçes e alaridos en uno con los llantos, façian gran estruendo e ruido, en tal manera que se podría deçir que toda la çibdad no era otra cosa sino un sonido de llorantes, diçiendo ansí:*

“Oy en este día el sol es naçido a los moros e ynfielos, e es mucho tenebroso a los christianos”.

E rotas las bestiduras e destroçadas las crines, alçavan las boçes mui confusas fasta las nubes; unos le llamavan “padre”; otros le deçían “señor”; algunos le nonbraban “rey”; e otros, “padre de la tierra”; e otros, “cochillo e espada de los ynfielos e moros”, la qual beer e oir, non era otra cosa si non llorar e genir, ca los ojos secos, tan gran planto e dolor beer e considerar non se podían; por continuos ocho días, por los quales él estuvo muerto en la çibdad, de día e de noche nunca faltó lloro.

Llebóse el su cuerpo de la çibdad, séptimo ydus de julio, e con mui gran honra fue traído a la villa de Sant Fagum, e en el doçeno día de agosto açerca de la reina doña Costança, como él avia mandado, fue metido en sepultura, labrada de un preçioso mármol’ CAS, ch. 17, pp. 25-6.

impersonal historical mode of the first narrative section to a scene which is dramatic and emotional and involves a number of new literary conventions. The narrator now speaks in the first person (*'yo por escriptura no podría declarar'*), the implicit reader is imagined directly observing and participating emotionally in the scene (*'los ojos secos, tan gran planto e dolor beer e considerar non se podían'*), and Jews, Moors, and Christians all exclaim together in direct speech (*"Oy en este día el sol es naçido a los moros e ynfieles, e es mucho tenebroso a los christianos"*). These features are by no means unique to this text; they are *topoi* of medieval chronicles. Ruth Morse, for example, has commented on the self-conscious dimension of the trope in medieval writing: 'it is repetition which makes *topoi*: as soon as writers become aware that they are repeating a unit which has appeared before, their interpretation becomes self-conscious, because it expects readers to compare it to another'.¹⁶¹ But, the significance of this group of new conventions in the chronicle goes beyond simply their place among the conventions of their genre.

The narrative mode introduced here describes the breakdown of political order in terms which are subjective and hyperbolically emotional. The death of King Alfonso VI, after his more than four decade reign, was a momentous event in the kingdom, and the *Crónica* draws an especially emotional picture of things. This hitting on the high emotion of the moment will be a pervasive element of the new narrative mode of the text. There is 'lamenting' (*'planto'*), 'crying' (*'lloro'*), 'shrieks' (*'alaridos'*), 'wailing' (*'genir'*) and 'grief' (*'dolor'*), tearing of garments and pulling of hair (*'rotas las bestiduras e destroçadas las crines'*).¹⁶² This emotion has an inclusive tendency in this text. There is an imagined universal participation in the scene, with the text specifying Christians, Moors, Jews, elders, the young, and servants. But not only those imagined present in the streets of Toledo; here the voice of a narrator appears to both involve himself in the scene and to call upon the emotional involvement of the reader too. The narrator complains rhetorically that he cannot 'express it in writing nor utter it by mouth' (*'por escriptura no podría declarar, ni por boca fablar'*).

¹⁶¹ Morse, *Truth and Convention*, p. 108.

¹⁶² For an interesting etymological and sociological background to the use of clamor and noise making in disputes, see: R.E. Barton, 'Making a Clamor to the Lord: Noise, Justice and Power in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century France', *Feud, Violence, and Practice*, (eds.) B.S. Tuten & T.L. Billado (Farnham, 2010), 213-235.

This is our introduction to the dramatised narrator, the first-person voice that comments on the act of narration itself. This voice interjects to order the text, announce what will or will not be included in the story, or to react morally or, as here, emotionally to the events of the story. This voice also has the job of reaching out to the reader/audience of the text. This is another vital sense in which the narrative mode is made sympathetic. We shall, in chapter four of this study, consider more fully the role of the author/narrator in the story. In the scene under discussion here, the reader is not invoked directly, but we notice how the narrative opens the scene up to the possibility of a general participation by the reader. The cries and shrieks in the streets of Toledo are 'such that one could say that all the city was but one sound of crying': the sense of the city as one sound of confused noise that the chronicle is suggesting is put in the terms of a general frame of reference in which we would all experience the city according to the noise made by those in its streets. And, further down, this same public grief was such that 'it was impossible to see and hear all this without crying and wailing, for one could not see and consider such lament and grief with dry eyes': again, the narrator opens up the scene to a general participation; here not just sensory, but emotional: we would cry if we were there.

The sympathy of the narrative, then, can be seen to work on two axes in this scene (and we will suggest that this same pattern carries over into the rest of the text in specific ways). The first axis runs through the relationship between the narrator and the reader. The person writing the story stands apart from the story itself, and where he stands he can invite the reader—or, indeed, as in the scene above, all possible readers, all sentient beings, or really everybody—to also stand and see, hear, and feel the story. This space apart from the events of the story is significant as it bears directly on the way that the chronicle is meant to be read, interpreted, and used by its community of readers. It is here that intentionality, what the author of the text intends for his text to mean, is flagged up. We will return more comprehensively to this idea later, but, in short for present purposes, what we are moving towards is a notion of the sympathetic relationship between the narrator and his audience: this is a text which preaches to the converted. We are expected to already agree with the narrator and his interpretation of events. The polemic and militant rhetoric against a violent and

treacherous enemy that appears, is used to strengthen the sense of togetherness among those participating in the story.

The second axis of sympathy in the scene above runs through those that appear in the story. It is significant that this scene of public grief is in Toledo and not in Sahagún. The experience in Sahagún will be divided between friend/ally and enemy. In Toledo, however, away from the complexities and urgency of the local situation, the chronicler is free to imagine everybody joining in. This is not a text that has much to do with different religions; they do not bear upon the local conflict and so the chronicle largely leaves this topic out. This is one scene where they do appear. Here the common grief of the three faiths of the Toledan community is made a useful symbol of the universality that the chronicle wants to show. Not only all (three) faiths, but all ages, social classes, and both genders become one in their reaction to the king's death. Especially telling of the way that the text finds meaning in this representation of the universal is the way that the confusion of sounds that is the first metonym of their common participation turns into a singular articulation. Twice this pattern happens. The 'great din and noise' (*'gran estruendo e ruido'*), the single 'sound of criers' (*'un sonido de llorantes'*), suddenly channels itself into a speech: 'Today, on this day, the sun is born for the Moors and infidels, and is all dark to the Christians'. Once more, as they rend their garments and pull out their hair, the 'confused voices' (*'las boçes mui confusas'*) that they raise to the clouds, slips into a series of names for the deceased king: "father", "lord", "king", "father of the land", "knife and sword of the infidels and Moors".

This, in fact, points to a further way that the narrative behaves sympathetically. Meaning is found abundantly in its subject. In one sense the narrator can turn what is on the first take just noise into a meaning that suits his purposes: the prophecy of the dark days ahead for Christians and the sunny future for the Jews and Moors tells us the meaning of the incoherent noise in the streets of Toledo. But, it is also important that this message is actually delivered in the voice of the Toledan public. This is a kind of ventriloquism. The force of this scene is in the association of incommensurate groups that emote and speak as one. There is a sense of all voices, friend and enemy, joining in the chorus that answers the chronicler's purpose and meaning in the scene. Of course, in this instance this is more a reflection of the memory of King Alfonso: even

his religious others admit to the power he had over them. But, we will see how this same sympathetic momentum that pulls together various individuals and groups and, ventriloquist-like, induces them to speak the message of the chronicle is carried forward as a pervasive feature of the narrative mode that takes hold here and after.

Finally, the geographical arc of the narrative in this scene is yet another place that we can see things bending towards the chronicle's reference point. We begin in the streets of Toledo; this is not specified here (it is only called 'the city', in the last and second to last paragraphs of our quoted passage), but the previous chapter dealt with the king's death in Toledo; the religious diversity of the scene must also have invoked the newly-conquered city for the chronicle's audience. But what does this scene have to do with Sahagún after all? It is this local interest that the chronicle answers with the detail that after eight days in Toledo the body was carried to Sahagún and sepulchred next to his wife Queen Constance. This, of course, also fulfils the king's intention to be buried at Sahagún stated in chapter seven. This is one of the examples of how the first part of the chronicle is closely linked with the subsequent parts despite the shift in the narrative mode. But, more than merely justifying the scene in Toledo by linking it back to Sahagún, the force of the narrative is to emphasise and exalt the prominence of Sahagún in this great event and also to recall the favoured place of Sahagún with the illustrious king.

What I have called the exuberance of this scene is also a vital feature. Socially (in the text and in the narrative), linguistically, geographically, we have stressed the way that elements of the story are made to march in step to the chronicle's purposes. But, this is done in an overweening way. There is not just lament, but hyperbolic lament; the reader (or possible witnesses) are not only asked to consider the scene but to cry with the tears of Toledo; it is not just that the whole city came out into the streets, but a list is given (Christians, Jews, Moors, elders, etc.); not just that they called him their king, but a string of related titles ("father", "lord", "king", etc.). High drama, overwhelming emotion, hyperbolic rhetoric, even excited lists, will all be common features through the rest of the chronicle.

We have so far been calling attention to what are *topoi*. It must be asserted that we are not suggesting any relevance in any of the features of the above passage

discussed so far in themselves. Rather, we are suggesting that this text is of interest (I do not know how unique it is) for the way that it switches so completely into the narrative mode which includes these *topoi* after the previous section which comprised its own narrative logic and *topoi*. Furthermore, our purpose is to show how this narrative mode is productive for specific social, legal, historiographical, communal, purposes of the chronicle. In the sequence of chapters that follow chapter seventeen, we will see how the chronicle channels a sense of the chaos of the time following the king's death into a productive version of both thematic and narrative chaos. The chronicle tells us that there was chaos and this chaos is construed also in the narrative. The clear sense of narrative order that prevailed in the first section of the chronicle gives way to a multiplicity of themes, competing authority offices and figures, voices, violences, disorders, social groups, landscapes, etc. This is notionally a bad thing, and this is what the chronicle tells us. But, there is another sense in which the chronicle comes into its own in this chaos. This chaos is given dramatic coverage. The material and the way that the chronicle finds supporting meanings and messages in seemingly every detail of the story results in what we have called a narrative mode of exuberant sympathy.

We can cite the emphasis on the importance of Sahagún at this moment as a further example of the sympathetic sense in which all events are made to reflect the chronicler's local purposes, but this then begs the question of the chronicler's local purposes. Here we move to the way that the narrative of the following twenty-seven chapters of the chronicle is structured upon an exchange between the local and the regional. The primary meaning of this next section is worked out in terms of the way that the regional political crisis that followed the death of Alfonso VI, first, brings conflict to the local stage of Sahagún, and then, second, determines how this conflict is continued.

Medieval conflict theory

In this chapter our discussion will closely follow the narrative of the chronicle as it describes the breakdown of social, political, and ecclesiastical order that ensues the death of Alfonso VI. Though we will not take up the topic of 'medieval conflict' *per se*, nevertheless it will be useful to include here a brief discussion of scholarship on this

theme. Recent work on medieval feuds has emphasised the patterns of social order that underlie the apparently chaotic outbreak and continuance of conflict between local groups in the absence of mediating political or legal institutions. Titles on this topic are numerous.¹⁶³ We do not, however, need to give a full account of medieval conflict theory here. For our purposes the concept of order in chaos helps us to understand the ways that the conflict between the monastery and the burghers of Sahagún was governed by certain social understandings shared by the groups. This is especially useful for countering the chronicle's portrait of the burghers as mindless rebels bent on the destruction of the monastery and the overthrow of the whole political and religious order of the kingdom. In the model proposed by Steven White and others the burghers' challenge to the monastery should be read as an attempt to increase their position of power *vis-à-vis* the monastery through the temporary suspension of the normal rules regulating social order.

We are in a difficult and delicate position trying to establish the burghers' motives and strategies based on the monastery-biased account of the *Crónica*, yet reading through some of the hyperbole and invective certain patterns emerges. The most obvious example of how the burghers worked within the framework of authority and order governing their local relationship with the monastery is their production of a charter rewriting the terms of Alfonso VI's *fuero* of 1085. We will have opportunity to consider more closely this charter – which will be introduced in chapter twenty-seven – in the course of this thesis. Essentially, the burgher's charter is an effort to ameliorate some of the burdens of the monastery's dominance over their class; from what we can

¹⁶³ S.D. White, *Feuding and Peacemaking in Eleventh-Century France*, (Aldershot, 2005); S.D. White, "Tenth-Century Courts and the Perils of Structuralist History", in *Conflict in Medieval Europe: Changing Perspectives on Society and Culture* (eds.) W. Brown & P. Górecki (London, 2003), 37-68; S.D. White, 'From Peace to Power: The Study of Disputes in Medieval France', in *Medieval Transformations: Texts, Power, and Gifts in Context* (eds.) E. Cohen & M. de Jong (Leiden, 2000), 203-18; S.D. White, 'Feuding and Peace-Making in the Touraine around the Year 1100', *Traditio* 42 (1986), 195-263.; W.C. Brown, *Violence in Medieval Europe* (Harlow, 2011); B.S. Tuten & T.L. Billado (eds.), *Feud, Violence, and Practice* (Farnham, 2010); M.D. Meyerson, et. al. (eds.) 'A Great Effusion of Blood?', *Interpreting Medieval Violence* (Toronto, 2004); W.C. Brown & P. Górecki, *Conflict in Medieval Europe: Changing Perspectives on Society and Culture* (Aldershot, 2003); D.J. Kagay & L.J. Andrew Villalon (eds.), *The Final Argument: The Imprint of Violence on Society in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Woodbridge, 1998); W.I. Miller, *Bloodtaking and Peacemaking: Feud, Law, and Society in Saga Iceland* (Chicago, 1990); G. Halsall (ed.), *Violence and Society in the Early Medieval West* (Woodbridge, 1998). Such works rely upon more general anthropological work on social conflict. See, M. Gluckman, "The Peace in the Feud", *Past and Present* 7 (1955), 1-14; M. Gluckman, *Custom and Conflict in Africa* (Oxford, 1959); J. Black-Michaud, *Cohesive Force: Feud in the Mediterranean and the Middle East* (Oxford, 1975). W. Brown, *Unjust Seizure: Conflict, Interest, and Authority in an Early Medieval Society* (Cornell, 2001), p. 7, points out the pitfalls of too easily transferring such models to a European context.

tell from the chronicle's very limited account of this charter, the burghers were attempting to do away with certain tolls for their use of the town's mills and the monastery's ovens. It also appears that the charter evolved according to the events of the conflict. Towards the end of the chronicle, in chapter seventy-three, the chronicle shows the burghers claiming that their charter would have confirmed their possession of property and goods that the monastery claims the burghers stole during the conflict.

If this was the case it would strengthen the sense in which the burghers were using the charter as a dynamic tool in the conflict. Although it might have started as simply a list of long-standing grievances, it turned into a way for the burghers to try to make official their gains in the conflict. These gains begin as transgressions. According to the chronicle, the burghers joined with the Aragonese to violently take over and even destroy the monastery's orchards and woodlands. Here, then, is one way that violence, described by the chronicle as a senseless and wild use of force, can actually be seen to be part of a larger strategy that takes advantage of the means of the social and legal order. This approach by the burghers also involves alliances with royal power. The burghers will be joined with Alfonso I of Aragón and his Aragonese leaders and knights through most of the conflict. But the burghers also hedge their position by seeking deals with Queen Urraca during the periods that she controls Sahagún.

The monastery's strategy also involves entreaties to the higher powers of the land. The most important of these will be a series of efforts to secure ecclesiastical interdicts and excommunications against the burghers.¹⁶⁴ But, we might expect that the chronicle will present the monastery's strategy as a more logical response than its representation of the burgher's anti-social and unnatural revolt. As a religious institution, the monastery of Sahagún had further incentive to stress forms of aggression that did not involve outright violence, and so to both highlight and distance themselves from the burgher's use of violence. Both John Ward and Patrick Geary have emphasised the non-violence ideal of the religious institution as a disadvantage in

¹⁶⁴ On excommunication and the interdict respectively, see: E. Vodola, *Excommunication in the Middle Ages* (Berkeley, 1986) and P.D. Clarke, *The Interdict in the Thirteenth Century: A Question of Collective Guilt* (Oxford, 2007).

conflict with outside groups.¹⁶⁵ Of course, the production of the chronicle was another way that the monastery attempted to harness a form a cultural and legal power.¹⁶⁶

The breakdown of narrative order

What we find moving into the sequence of chapters following seventeen is that the burghers emerge in their role as aggressors against the monastery belatedly in the course of the conflict. The same narrative tendency to begin with a focus on regional affairs and in the last part to direct this focus back to local affairs in Sahagún that appeared in the quoted passage of chapter seventeen with which we began characterises this next sequence of chapters.

In the following chapters (eighteen through twenty-three), the chronicle tells the story of Urraca's marriage to Alfonso I of Aragón. Following this are the first political setbacks of their joint rule and their first separation. It will be helpful to give an outline of these chapters:

18. Nobles compel Urraca to marry King Alfonso I of Aragón; opposition of Archbishop Bernard.
19. Destruction of grape harvest by a great frost.
20. Alfonso I and Urraca travel to Galicia to put down revolt of a Count Pedro; Aragonese troops enter Sahagún.
21. Burghers join with Aragonese to attack monastery.
22. General peasant revolt; Abbot Diego meets rebels and is chased into exile; burghers secure safe exit for Aragonese knights when Urraca's forces besiege Sahagún.
23. Archbishop Bernard delivers papal letters of excommunication against the queen and king for their incestuous marriage.

These chapters take us from the Queen Urraca's marriage to King Alfonso I of Aragón to Archbishop Bernard's delivery of letters of papal excommunication against the queen and king. Focusing for the moment on just these eight chapters we will be able to explore in close detail how the chronicle begins to transition from history to

¹⁶⁵ Ward, 'Memorializing Dispute Resolution', p. 269-284; and P. Geary, *Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages* (Cornell, 1994), pp. 95ff.

¹⁶⁶ For a discussion of the production of books and chronicles as a response to conflict, see: Ward, 'Memorializing Dispute Resolution', p. 269.

present conflict. These chapters establish the political, ecclesiastical, social, and divine framework in which the marriage of Urraca and Alfonso I will be interpreted by the chronicle. Three new themes in particular emerge in these chapters: the ecclesiastical opposition to the marriage headed by Archbishop Bernard; the political setbacks of the king's and queen's expedition into Galicia to put down a noble revolt; and, the first incidence of burgher violence against monastery when a contingent of Alfonso I's Aragonese army occupies Sahagún. More than this a new narrative order is constructed upon the idea of disorder and the falling away of a commanding presence of agency in the historical narrative preceding.

The introduction of chapter one in the chronicle had anticipated the 'unspeakable evil deeds and great excesses' of the burghers against the monastic community of Sahagún following directly after the history of the monastery's 'first foundation'. But, as it happens after chapter seventeen, this transition is more complex than the introduction suggests. This is because of the way that the narrative toggles between the regional affairs of the marriage and separation of Queen Urraca and King Alfonso I and the local conflict between the burghers and the monastery of Sahagún. Furthermore, at the regional level the storyline is complicated by the nexus of cooperating and competing authorities: Queen Urraca, the memory of her father King Alfonso VI, King Alfonso I of Aragón, Archbishop Bernard of Toledo, Pope Paschal II. Where in the first part of the chronicle the narrative was driven exclusively by the succeeding kings of León, the narrative is now driven by this crowd of rivals and allies. Working out the complex set of relations between these various secular and ecclesiastical authority figures becomes a central concern of the chronicle.

As we move in the chronicle from history to conflict with the death of Alfonso VI there is continuity in the narrative focus. The narrative keeps with the Leonese crown, following the events that pull the kingdom into political, social, and religious disorder. The disorder that unfolds is mirrored by the unfolding disorder of the narrative: in the text, Urraca's inability to command her kingdom is also an inability to command the narrative. Rival authorities are let in (Alfonso I, his Aragonese followers, rebel nobles and counts in Galicia, Leon, Castile, as we will see) and authorities that had remained on the sideline are forced to intervene on behalf of Urraca and their own interests (Archbishop Bernard, Pope Paschal II). But, below the level of these

magnates, competition and rebellion also bubbles up from below. The burghers also seek to assert themselves in the affairs of these magnates in order to increase their power against the monastery. They too, then, are among those struggling for agency in the narrative.

Medievalists have found various ways of rationalising the incoherence of medieval-chronicle narrative. The majority of these have appealed to what Gabrielle Spiegel has called the social logic of the text.¹⁶⁷ The idea that the choice of genre and form carry a significance in relation to the social conditions under which a given text was produced, was given broad historical scope by the Michael Clanchy's study of the increase in pragmatic literacy from the eleventh century.¹⁶⁸ The lead provided by this study has been picked up by scholars attempting to make sense of the seemingly unwieldy nature of the medieval chronicle. It has been argued, in essence, that the pragmatic trumped the literary in the concerns of the chronicler. Stephen Vanderputten, working on chronicles of Northern France, has suggested that the cartulary-chronicle was a direct response to an ambiguity in the meaning and use of the text in the eleventh and twelfth century.¹⁶⁹

Although groups and institutions still mostly functioned and interacted by means of unwritten forms of communication, this period witnesses an explosive growth in the number of charters, cartularies, letters, chronicles and hagiographical narratives ... the enormous investments made by groups and individuals to transmit information in written form shows that documents were, in effect, being tested as levers for achieving political, social and economic goals ... The main problem was that those who tried to use written documents for this purpose did not know which, if any, type of written discourse would ultimately prove to be the most effective'.¹⁷⁰

More recently, Jennifer Paxton has given further support for the notion that medieval chronicles are products of their direct social conditions and purposes. In her work on the *Liber Eliensis* ('Book of Ely'), she argues that the all-inclusive narrative of the

¹⁶⁷ Spiegel, 'History, Historicism, and the Social Logic', pp. 59-86.

¹⁶⁸ Clanchy, *From Memory*, pp.1-2. 'The development of literacy from and for practical purposes of day-to-day business, rather than creative literature, is the theme of *From Memory to Written Record*.' p. 3.

¹⁶⁹ Vanderputten, 'Monastic literate practices', pp. 101-26.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 102.

cartulary-chronicle (much as Roger Ray described it in the quote we have given in the introduction to this chapter) is due to its attempt to shore up its argument against the uncertainty of the next conflict with many kinds of proof.¹⁷¹ She writes:

The narrative, charters and miracles authenticate each other, providing double or even triple support for the monastic community's claims to property and prestige. The *Liber Eliensis* occupies the middle ground between memory and written record, when neither charters nor saintly interventions are by themselves sufficient to guarantee the rights of Ely; the compiler hedges his bets by including as many forms of authority as he can for his version of Ely's past.¹⁷²

The *Crónica* is recognizable in this formulation of the cartulary-chronicle. The idea that the chronicle had a need to hedge its bets is a productive one. As we will see, the conflict between the monastery and the burghers is fought around both written and oral forms of authority: Abbot Domingo seeks documents of interdict and excommunication against the burghers as well as the oral oaths of the burghers; the burghers seek an ambiguous confirmation of their charter; and at the resolution of the conflict (at least for the purposes of the *Crónica*) at the Council of Burgos it is oral testimony which is sought by the papal legate. Yet, it should also be recognised that the *Crónica* did not invent the cartulary-chronicle form; the original pragmatic social logic which gave birth to the form, therefore, need not apply in an essential way to the *Crónica*. Those invested in writing the chronicle found the form useful enough to select it for their purposes, but this is not to say it was useful in all its social and textual strategies.

We can shift the focus put on the cartulary-chronicle by these studies in the case of the *Crónica*. The introduction of chaos into the narrative at the point where the kingdom is plunged into political chaos and authority and power becomes the pressing issue for the monastery's defence suggests a voluntary use of a jumbled, unwieldy narrative. Specifically, this is narrative disorder as a literary device, as opposed to a pragmatic socially-determined hedging. We can move now to the narrative of chapters

¹⁷¹ Paxton, 'Monks and Bishops', pp. 17-30.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 20.

eighteen through twenty-three for the way the chronicle constructs this narrative disorder and the implicit historiographical arguments it conveys in this way.

Following the scene of mourning in streets of Toledo, the chronicle launches directly into the events leading up to the marriage between Urraca and Alfonso I. In chapter eighteen, the chronicle tells how Urraca's nobles compelled her to marry:

“You will not be able to govern nor keep the kingdom of your father and rule over us if you do not take a husband. Therefore we suggest you take Alfonso I as your husband, whom none of us will be able to challenge; but all will obey him because he comes from a royal family”.¹⁷³

It is more likely that the marriage decision was taken by Alfonso VI himself, and so known before his death.¹⁷⁴ The *Crónica* might be recalling a decision to honour the marriage which Reilly suggests was made by the gathered magnates in Toledo following the king's death.¹⁷⁵ In any case, the effect of this version of events distances the controversial, and with hindsight disastrous, decision from Alfonso VI. Here then is an example of a decision being taken from the king, and in this case being re-assigned to the broader base of power among the nobility. Where previously the king's agency had acted as a magnet for decisions interpreted positively by the chronicle, such as liturgical and monastic reforms, by contrast, negative decisions are now distanced from the king. This moment in the narrative can, then, be read as the juncture at which the domination of the narrative by the king cedes place to other actors, be they competing or cooperating.

The chronicle follows up this meeting between Urraca and the nobles with the opposition of Archbishop Bernard to the marriage. This is the introduction into the narrative of Bernard as an ecclesiastical and political actor. Apart from the brief

¹⁷³ “*Tu non podrás gobernar, nin retener el reino de tu padre e a nosotros regir, si non tomares marido. Por lo qual te damos por consejo que tomes por marido al rei de Aragón, al qual ninguno de nosotros podrá contrastar ni contradescir, mas todos le obedesceremos por quanto él viene de generación real*” CAS, ch. 18, p. 26.

¹⁷⁴ See Reilly, *Urraca*, pp. 52-7. José María Ramos Loscertales had previously argued that the marriage had even taken place before the king's death, but Reilly shows the difficulty with this proposition (for Ramos Loscertales' argument see R. Loscertales, ‘La sucesión del Rey Alfonso VI’, *Anuario de Historia del derecho Español*, 13 (1936-41), p. 60.)

¹⁷⁵ Reilly, *Urraca*, p. 57, and B.F. Reilly, ‘The Chancery of Alfonso VII of León-Castilla: The Period 1116-1135 Reconsidered’, *Speculum* 51 (1976), 243-261 (p. 249).

mentions of Bernard's elevation to the archbishopric (chapter eight), his consecration of the monastery of Sahagún (chapter nine), and his presence at Toledo after Alfonso's death (chapter sixteen), this is the first we have seen of the church man since his journey to Rome to receive the *libertas Romana* (chapter six). Bernard will play a principal role in the story from this point on; it is a role that is both personal and institutional. In this instance, he is made the spokesman for an opposition to the marriage that sought its expression in ecclesiastical critique and sanction. Skipping ahead to chapter twenty-three, Archbishop Bernard delivers letters of excommunication against the king and queen from Pope Paschal II.¹⁷⁶ The charge against them was consanguinity based on a common great-grandfather, Sancho the Great of Navarra. Fletcher suggests that it was Bernard who was leading the campaign against the king.¹⁷⁷ Reilly suggests that Count Henry of Portugal was working with the archbishop in this as a rival claimant to the throne against Urraca.¹⁷⁸ The *Crónica* has it that Urraca was herself against the marriage. When Bernard delivers the excommunication Urraca meets with him and promises not to return to the marriage; the chronicle adds that 'the same queen suffered this sentence of excommunication patiently, for it gave her a reason to leave her husband, which she desired'.¹⁷⁹

What we are seeing is the emergence of new voices and determinations in the narrative. It is in relation to Urraca that these are introduced. After the death of the king, the Leonese monarchy continues (for the time being at least) to hold the central place in the narrative. But, it is Urraca's political weakness that allows other sources of agency to crowd in. These might manipulate, as with the nobles pressuring the queen into an unwanted marriage, or might support the queen, as with the archbishop helping her out of the same marriage, but in both cases it is Urraca's vulnerability that is emphasised. In terms of the dominant place of the kings of León in the narrative up to Alfonso VI, the queen's vulnerability becomes her inability to command, and so give order to, the narrative. It is also worth noting that excommunication itself, especially in

¹⁷⁶ These letters do not survive. However, the *Compostellana* includes a parallel letter sent to the Archbishop of Compostela.

¹⁷⁷ Fletcher, *Episcopate*, p. 16.

¹⁷⁸ Reilly, *Urraca*, pp. 53-4. The *Crónica* describes the intrigue variously among Urraca, Alfonso I, and Count Henry in chapters 25, 27, 33

¹⁷⁹ 'La qual sentença de escomunió la sobredicha reina paçientemente sufrió, por quanto avia ocasión de se partir de el marido, lo que ella deseava' (CAS, ch. 23, p. 38). Excommunication in the Middle Ages could be moralised as a benefit to those who would suffer it patiently and learn from its chastisement: see Vodola, *Excommunication*, p. 2, who points to a relevant quote from Pope Innocent IV (1243-54).

its Gregorian form, presented a disruption of the normal feudal order. In 1078, Pope Gregory VII had published a canon that forbade those bound to excommunicates from exercising their feudal obligations. The chronicle does not explicitly condemn the burghers for making the excommunicated Alfonso I their overlord (a charge made later in the *Crónica*).¹⁸⁰

The *Crónica* is not directly critical of Urraca. The queen is either shown to be ineffectual, or (as will become apparent) she becomes a living symbol of the rule and law of her father. The critical energy of the narrative instead takes aim at what we might call the enemies of order: that is, those that are hostile to Urraca, the memory of Alfonso VI, Archbishop Bernard, and the monastery. The notion of right order becomes itself a pervasive appeal in these chapters. The chronicle uses this notion to draw battle lines between those who work for and those who work against order. We might take the Archbishop as the new dominant voice of order, but for the moment the chronicle does not allow the archbishop a constant place in the narrative. He is made the representative of the ecclesiastical hierarchy; to the proposed marriage between Urraca and Alfonso I in chapter eighteen, Bernard is made to quote Pope Leo (I?): 'It is very difficult to bring things of bad beginning to a good end'.¹⁸¹ It is Bernard who presses the charge of consanguinity and who five chapters later delivers the papal letters of excommunication against the monarchs; in neither of these cases is Pope Paschal II directly named. This pope does, in fact, later make an appearance in the chronicle, and papal authority becomes a central concern of the chronicle in later chapters, so it can be taken as significant that at this point Bernard is given the whole role of ecclesiastical authority. Yet, I also take it as significant that his initial opposition and his subsequent excommunication are separated by four intermediate chapters.

At this point, Archbishop Bernard as a figure of ecclesiastical authority offers most emphatically a critique of those among the political class. The possibility of a solution is still unacknowledged. The chronicle's brief description of Bernard's delivery of the papal excommunication is used by the chronicle merely to express the complicity of Bernard and Urraca against the marriage. We will see that the chronicle

¹⁸⁰ Vodola, *Excommunication*, p. 22-3.

¹⁸¹ "Mucho es difícil aquellas cosas seer acabadas con buen fin que obieron mal principio" CAS, ch. 18, p. 27. I have not been able to track this quotation down.

later points retrospectively to King Alfonso I's anger against the archbishop for his delivery of the letters, but in this scene itself the king is omitted. The effect is to obscure any idea that the archbishop was acting directly against the king. Rather we are left to infer that he was simply doing his job to uphold the statutes of the pope against consanguineous marriage – and that this happened to suit Urraca's purposes and anger the king.

This critique mode extends in to the next chapter where the chronicle describes how a great frost blighted the harvest grapes that year. The chronicle explains:

It was then the time of the grape harvest, and it was when the vines were heavy with grapes and ripe for picking that on the night of that cursed and unholy union fell such a hard frost that the great plenty of grapes that had appeared were reduced to a great scarcity; and the few that remained on the vine were turned into I know not what kind of bitterness, and if the wine of those grapes was drunk it would wring the intestines and purge them, with great damage to the health.¹⁸²

The chronicle says that God allowed the marriage to go forth because 'he wanted to 'flog Spain with the cane of his wrath'.¹⁸³ And that the ruin of the vintage was 'just as if Our Lord desired to show very clearly by that sign that their marriage had been for the ruin and destruction of Spain, and not for her preservation'.¹⁸⁴ The chapter ends with this spelling out of the evil effects of the marriage of Urraca and Alfonso I:

That cursed copulation and union gave way to all of the evils that were born in Spain, for from this sprang much murder, plunder, and

¹⁸² *'Era entonces el tiempo de las bendimias, e como fuese en las viñas gran abastança de ubas e fuesen ya maduras para bendimar, en aquella noche de aquel maldito e escomulgado ayuntamiento, tan gran helada cayó, que la gran abastança del vino que ya paresçía, bolvióse en mui gran mengua, E aún aquello poco que quedó del vino, tornóse en so sé qué tal açedo sabor, el qual bevido retorçía las entrañas e purgávalas, no sin gran daño de la salud'* CAS, ch. 19, pp. 29-30.

¹⁸³ *'dispusiese de querer açotar a Espanna con el bastón de su sanna'* CAS, ch. 19, p. 28.

¹⁸⁴ *'así como si más claramente nuestro Señor por gran señal quisiese demostrar aquel ayuntamiento ser fecho para danno e destruiçión de Espanna, non para conserbaçión d'ella'* CAS, ch. 19, p. 30.

adultery, and nearly all of the laws and powers of the church were stripped away and overthrown.¹⁸⁵

This story serves to convey the most explicit expression of the transition from order to disorder that the narrative is moving through. This is, of course, the transition anticipated by the chronicle's introduction, which we looked at in the previous chapter. That introduction foretold simply the 'unspeakable evil deeds and great excesses and ostentation of the burghers'. The chronicle does not tell us how these hostilities arose, but if there are suggestions in its language, they must be the burghers' pretensions to more power, their 'excesses' and 'ostentation'. But as we have begun to see already, and as the above passage makes explicit, this transition pivots not upon the burghers' own ambitions, but upon the failings of political order that let loose the general outbreak of crime and unrest, which must include the local burgher rebellion against the monastery in Sahagún. As above, the chronicle explains how disorder moves from the political to the social and ecclesiastical, from incestuous marriage to 'murder, plunder, and adultery' and to an overturning of 'nearly all of the laws and powers of the church'.

In the following chapter the chronicle follows the newly-married queen and king on a military expedition into Galicia to put down the revolt of Count Pedro Froilaz.¹⁸⁶ It is now spring 1110. The chronicle uses this event to show the deteriorating political situation: this is especially seen in the chronicle's focus on the cruelty of Alfonso and in the failure of the expedition. The good-evil distinction between the monarchs is evidenced in an event that occurs when the pair is able to take control of the castle of Monterroso in Galicia. The chronicle describes how the queen found a knight, one Prado, inside who begged the queen to spare his life. Urraca agreed to his

¹⁸⁵ 'Aquesta maldita cópula e ayuntamiento fue ocasión de todos los males que nasçieron en Espanna, ca de aquí naçieron grandes muertes, siguiéronse robos, adulterios, e casi todas las leyes e fuerças eclesiásticas fueron menguadas e apocadas' CAS, ch. 19, p. 30.

¹⁸⁶ The *Historia Compostellana* also reports this Galican campaign. See also Reilly, *Urraca*, pp. 66-7, where he discusses this episode, basing himself primarily on the *Crónica*. Count Pedro Froilaz of the powerful Traba family had been brought up in the court of Alfonso VI. He established himself as a principal opponent of Urraca during her reign in support of her son Alfonso Raimúndez the future Alfonso VII, whose ward he was at this time. In 1123, he was imprisoned and had his lands confiscated by the queen, a final assertion of her power in the final years of her reign against an old foe (Falque Rey, *Historia Compostellana*, p. 336). He died in 1128. For his bibliographical 'stats' see S. Barton, *The Aristocracy in Twelfth-Century León and Castile* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 278. His role as ward of the future king was also the subject of A. López Ferreiro, *Don Alfonso VII, rey de Galicia, y su ayo el conde de Traba* (Santiago de Compostela, 1885).

request and granted him mercy. However, when Alfonso came upon the knight afterward he refused to show the same mercy. The chronicle explains, ‘as the king had no shame before the queen, like a cruel barbarian he took a hunting-spear into his hands and struck and killed [the knight]’. That there was a revolt against royal power was itself probably meant to suggest the weakness of the state. But the chronicle also draws a clear distinction between the cruelty of Alfonso and the mercy of Urraca. The queen’s power might be compromised by her nobles, by her marriage, and by her gender (though the chronicle does not explicitly make this an issue), but she is on the pious and just side of history. It is this act of violence that leads to the first split between the queen and king: the chronicle says that this cruelty on the king’s part frightened Urraca and her nobles and the queen returned to León resolved to divorce her husband.¹⁸⁷

But the chronicle continues with further examples of the king’s cruelty in Galicia. In the chronicle’s own words, the king stayed on in Galicia committing great cruelties and depopulating the towns, robbing the monasteries, plundering the altars, wasting their souls (both their own and those of the foreign [soldiers]), killing men, and doing injury and harm to the clerics, monks, and nuns.¹⁸⁸

As suggested in this quotation, the king’s violence is especially directed against the churches. The chronicle focuses on the most shocking details of this violence. One anecdote is given full description. In this case it is the king’s army that commits the terrible deed, but the king proves unresponsive when informed. The chronicle describes how

it happened that some of the Moors and infidels that accompanied him broke into a nunnery and the nuns fled to the church, and they raped them on the holy altar, and when such an evil and obscene deed was told to the tyrant, he only responded,

¹⁸⁷ *‘El rei non aviendo bergüença a la reina, a manera de bárvaro cruel, con sus manos tomó un benablo e firiólo e matólo, el qual fecho mucho desplugo a todos los nobles que benían con la reina; e a ella mucho más, ca pensavan que si tomasen fuerças en el reino, ellos serían de todo despreçados d’él.*

E entonces la reina, avido su consejo con los suyos, deliberó fazer diborçio e separaçión del marido’ CAS, ch. 20, p. 33.

¹⁸⁸ *‘façiendo grandes crueldades e despoblano las villas, rovano los monasterios, socavano los altares, perdiendo las ánimas, así de los suyos como de los estraños, matando los onbres, dando denuestos e façiendo enjurias a los clérigos, monjes e monjas’ CAS, ch. 20, p. 33.*

“I do not care what my army or soldiers do”.

The religious focus of this violence incurs a divine response (following the same pattern we saw with the divine response to the ecclesiastically prohibited royal marriage). The chronicle rationalises: ‘But divine vengeance did not allow such an evil deed to pass unpunished for within three months, with great dishonour, he was thrown out of there’.¹⁸⁹

It is following this shocking scene that the chronicle shows how these events of regional history connect with the local events of Sahagún. The chronicle describes the tension and violent outbreak when a contingent of Aragonese knights on their way from Galicia back to Aragón enter Sahagún and take up residence in a building which had been granted by Alfonso VI to the monastery. The chronicle continues saying that the Aragonese troops broke into the residence and broke the tables and benches and intended to unhinge the doors of the palace.¹⁹⁰ It is at this point that Abbot Diego goes out to meet the troops and suggest that they move to the houses of the burghers, and lodge there, ‘as [was] the custom’.¹⁹¹ The Aragonese responded with insults and Abbot Diego threatened to have members of his own family of dependents come to throw them out by force. It was at this point that the burghers were moved to come armed to the monastery and join with the Aragonese in attacking the monastery:

With knives, lances, bows and arrows they attacked the walls of the monastery and smashed up the palace that is near the cloister. They shot arrows and threw stones at the cloister and even had the audacity to destroy the abbot’s chamber and to try to kill him. They would have done this except he managed to escape and flee from the church, and he was fortunate also that night came then.

¹⁸⁹ *‘E acaesçió que algunos moros e ynfielos que le aconpannavan ronpiesen un monasterio de monjas e las monjas fuyesen a la yglesia, e ellos fornicaron con ellas ant’el santo altar, el qual tan gran mal fecho e deshonesto como fuese recontado al tirano, aquesto solamente respondió:*

“Non curo yo qué faga la mi hueste e mis guerreros”.

Pero la bengança divinal non sufrió que tal mal fecho pasase sin pena, ca ante espacio de tres meses, con gran deshonra, fue echado de allí’ CAS, ch. 20, pp. 33-4. As we see later in the chronicle, three months seems to be the usual time lag when it comes to the response of divine power (CAS, c.f. ch. 55).

¹⁹⁰ *‘por fuerça quebrantaron, desfaçiendo las mesas e escannos. / E aún estaban aparejados para desquiciar las puertass’ CAS, ch. 20, p. 35.*

¹⁹¹ *‘como es de costumbre’ CAS, ch. 20, p. 35.*

Features of this description of the burghers' violence introduce what will become a rhetorical pattern.¹⁹² Violence is specifically aimed at the monastery property, and when it comes to violence against humans the chronicle can only suggest that this violence was intended. This account of violence is also accompanied by verbal insults; in the chronicle this suggests the deeper character evils of the monastery's aggressors, summed up in the chronicle's description of the Aragonese as 'barbarous of heart and tongue'. The force of the insults are also the source of what is certainly meant to shock the chronicle's audience, the Aragonese says that they 'would deal with the abbot like they would a whore'.

The narrative arrangement in which the chronicle's account of regional events leads to an account of local events is also significant. This establishes a narrative pattern which recurs over the course of the following several chapters. In the chapter discussed so far, details of local events are revealed only after the narrative arrives in Sahagún. In this case, the chronicle says that the burghers had previously gone to Abbot Diego to request that the town be fortified with walls. The chronicle makes it clear that this was a controversial request, and that many of the monks opposed the idea. But Diego agrees to the burghers request anyway. When the Aragonese arrive before the walls are finished and the burghers attack the monastery the chronicler is critical, adding sarcastically, 'That is the protection and defence that we first had from the fortification of the town'. Over the course of the next several chapters the chronicle shows how the burghers were able to consolidate their position of increasing strength in the town by controlling the new gates.

In the next chapter the chronicle describes the local peasants' revolts that broke out at the time. These scenes of violence and social chaos add to the general sense of a world turned upside-down. In the first place this is said to be a regional

¹⁹² *Mas ellos, como son bárbaros de corazón e de lengua, respondieron palabras enjuriosas e de gran denuesto, diciendo que tanto farían por el abbad como por una meretriçe; lo qual como oyese el abbad, mandó algunos de su familia que los echasen por fuerça; el qual mandamiento del abbad, como llegase a las orejas de los burgueses, tomaron armas e fuéronse para el palacio e ayuntáronse con los aragoneses; arrevataron armas, cochillos, lanças, arcos e saetas; combatiendo las puertas del monasterio, quebrantaron e rompieron el palacio por fuerça que está açerca de la claustra, echando saetas e piedras sobre la dicha claustra, abiendo osadía de destruir la çámara del abbad y aún deseándolo matar, lo qual obiesen puesto por obra si no se escapara de sus manos e se fuyera a la iglesia, e aún mucho le ayudó ca entonçe anocheçie.*

Aquesta guarda e defensión primera abemos conseguido de la fortificación de la villa'. CAS, ch. 21, p. 36.

phenomenon in which ‘all the rustics and labourers and common people banded together, forming a conspiracy against their lords’. The peasants refused service and payment to their lords and like ‘wild beasts’ they rose up in a ‘violent revolt’. The chronicle goes on:

Through the valleys and hills they pursued [their lords] and attacked them. They smashed up the palaces of the kings, the houses of the nobles, the churches of the bishops, and the farm-houses of the abbot. They wasted all the bread and wine that is necessary for life and killed any Jews they found. They also denied service to their lords and denied to pay them their taxes and tributes.¹⁹³

Violence against their lords, against their bodies and their property, destruction of churches, wasting of bread and wine and murder of Jews: it is a picture of indiscriminate violence and destruction.¹⁹⁴ In the context of political instability and divine wrath, these peasant’s revolts are further proof of the general chaos and disorder facing Urraca’s realm. They do not have their own causes or solutions, but instead are the manifestation of political troubles – which in turn are the product of political offenses against the ecclesiastical and spiritual order. This ideology and method of historical reason is of course a product of the chronicler’s age and cultural. But what we see is that the relation between regional and local is not a constant in the chronicle, rather we can observe a progression.

The chronicle goes on to tell how Abbot Diego of Sahagún met the ‘brotherhood’ outside of Grajal to complain that the peasants of the town of San Andrés who were refusing to give the abbot labour owed to him (*‘labrança a él devida’*).¹⁹⁵ The chronicle says that the peasants hearing this complaint ‘with great excitement and noise wanted to kill him’ (*‘con gran ynpetu e roido quisiéronlo matar’*). In fear, the abbot fled back to Sahagún. When he arrived, however, he found that the burghers had closed locked the gates of the town. The chronicle says at 25.43 that the

¹⁹³ CAS, ch. 22, p. 36.

¹⁹⁴ On Medieval responses to peasant anger, see: P. Freedman, ‘Peasant Anger in the Later Middle Ages’, *Anger’s Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages* (ed.) B.H. Rosenwein (Cornell, 1998), pp. 171-188.

¹⁹⁵ *‘Acaesçió un día qu’el abbad fuese a un llano de la villa llamada Grajal, adonde estava ayuntada la dicha hermandad; e como a ellos mucho se quexase de los moradores de la villa de Sant Andrés, los quales le negavan la labrança a él devida, aquellos rústicos allí ayuntados, con gran ynpetu e roido quisiéronlo matar, lo qual como lo sintiese el abbad, apartóse de su ayuntamiento’* CAS, ch. 22, p. 37.

burghers had taken control of the gates, taking control from the abbot's gate-keepers (*'porteros'*). This is clearly seen as an abuse on the part of the burghers, but the chronicler had also directly criticised Abbot Diego for granting the abbot's request to have the town fortified. Presumably, the monastery did not feel that it needed defending. Abbot Diego continued in flight from the brotherhood, the chronicle says, fleeing to the monastery of Nogal where he was able to seek refuge.¹⁹⁶

At this point the narrative is filled in with more information on the burghers. The chronicle says that the burghers were anticipating the queen's desire to divorce from Alfonso I of Aragón. The chronicle says the burghers at first sought to protect the Aragonese troops 'with whom and for whom the burghers had attacked and damaged the monastery'.¹⁹⁷ But, as the town was under threat of siege from the counts and noblemen and the walls were not finished, the burghers were forced instead to bargain for safe passage for the Aragonese out of the town.¹⁹⁸

Emergence of burghers as narrative agents

The next three chapters continue to focus on the political struggles between Urraca and Alfonso I. In chapter twenty-four the chronicle describes how Alfonso I was denied passage through Astorga by the nobles there and only by taking hostages to is able to secure a safe retreat. Chapter twenty-five involves another extended account of the political intrigues and machinations between Urraca and Alfonso, introducing into the narrative Count Henry of Portugal and his wife (and Urraca's half-sister) Theresa. This chapter leads in the next chapter to the reintroduction of the burghers in the story and their emergence as full narrative agents. This chapter, twenty-six, also takes us into the monastery for the first time, where the monks must elect a new abbot facing the threat of Alfonso's intervention in their internal affairs. Three narratives, the political, the burghers, and the monastery, intersect here. It is, then, in relation to these other two narratives that the burghers emerge in their new role as aggressors against the monastery in their own right.

¹⁹⁶ CAS, ch. 22, pp. 36-7.

¹⁹⁷ *'con los quales e por los quales acometieron e quebrantaron el monasterio'* CAS, ch. 22, p. 37.

¹⁹⁸ *'los burgueses obieron gran temor; e estaban a gran peligro, por quanto non era fecha cava, nin fortaleça acavada ... rogaron que a los aragoneses fuese dada paz e que se fuesen, lo qual fue fecho'* CAS, ch. 22, p. 37.

In chapter twenty-five, the chronicle describes another extended episode of political difficulty: this one of intrigue, plotting, and treachery. The chronicle tells how count Henry (married to Theresa, Urraca's sister) made a pact with Alfonso I upon their return from France where they had gone to raise support for a military overthrow of Alfonso VI's kingdom after falling out with him before the king's death. The unified armies were victorious over count Gómez of Sepúlveda at the battle of Espina in October of 1110.¹⁹⁹ After the victory at Espina, however, Urraca is able to make a deal with Count Henry, promising him a split of her kingdom. Urraca and Henry march on Alfonso I at the castle of Peñafiel, but are unsuccessful in their siege. Theresa meets them and presses her husband to divide up the kingdom with Urraca and take his share. Urraca meets secretly with an advisor of the king. Then they proceed to divide the kingdom in Palencia. Afterward Henry goes to Zamora to take his part of the kingdom with the queen's knights (whom Urraca had already secretly ordered to prevent the count from taking the castle at Zamora). The queen then travels to Palencia and Sahagún ordering the gates of the towns to be opened to King Alfonso I upon his arrival. We are told she had already sent the count Fernán García to him in secret. Urraca goes to León leaving Theresa in Sahagún to be captured by Alfonso I, but she manages to escape before he arrives.

The scene is localised at Sahagún when Urraca comes to order the burghers, who the chronicle says had taken control of the gates, to open the gate for King Alfonso. The chronicle does not explicitly explain the purpose of this order, but it becomes clear that she was plotting to have Alfonso capture her sister Theresa who she believed intended to steal her crown.

And the queen also came to the town of Sahagún and in the same way ordered the burghers there to open the gates for the king, for the burghers had already taken control of the gates and guard posts from the abbot, so that if any of the monks wished to come in or go out they had to pass beneath the chain like the labourers. The burghers also cut wood from the monastery's woodland to finish

¹⁹⁹ For a reaction to this scene, based heavily on the *Crónica*, and a discussion of evidence for the date of the battle, see Reilly, *Urraca*, pp. 74-7. There has been disagreement over whether to date the battle in October of 1110 or 1111. This detail has no bearing on our reading of the *Crónica*; we can merely add here that, based on its location in the chronology, the *Crónica* would have it in 1110.

raising the towers. They did this without the permission of the abbot, they did not ask him before they did this, nor did they even tell him about it.²⁰⁰

The burghers' growing strength in Sahagún is still only shown as an afterthought of the larger political narrative, yet their position of power continues to grow: not only do they have control of the gates, and now the monastery's woodland, but they are the point of communication when the queen comes to Sahagún. The burghers' intervention into the political order will become a central piece of their strategy along with local confrontation with the monastery in the course of the conflict.

In the chronicle, the burghers' new role of political players is achieved by and for the purpose of intrigue, treachery, and machinations. We might appreciate how the burghers attempted to navigate their way between the competing powers of the warring king and queen, seeking their own advantage, but for the chronicle this is an illegitimate intrusion into politics above the burghers' social and political place. In the following chapter, the chronicle describes how the burghers set Alfonso I against the monastery:

The burghers, who had no shame before God or man, were frequently – but falsely – slandering the abbot and the monks [of Sahagún] before the ears of the king Alfonso I. The king was moved by this to great enmity and hostility against them. He then went to León and again, just as before, he entered into that cursed marriage with the queen.²⁰¹

This passage shows the burghers in a new role of agency in the narrative, moving other characters to action and emotion. They are shown manipulating and

²⁰⁰ *'E la reina otrosí beníase a la villa de Sant Fagum; e semexantamente mandó a los burgueses que abriesen al rei las puertas, ca ya los porteros de la villa e puertas los burgeses avían quitado del poderío del abad, en manera que si el abad o alguno de los monjes quisiese salir o entrar, devajo de la cadena avía pasar como un Labrador; otrosí cortavan madera del monte, para fazer e alçar las torres, sin liçençia de abad, e aún que non fuese sobre ello demandado nin façérse lo saber'* CAS, ch. 25, p. 43.

²⁰¹ *'Los burgueses, que nin a Dios temían nin abían vergüença de los hombres, muchos denuestos, pero falsos, contra el abad e contra los monjes a las orejas del rei frequentavan, por manera que mobiesen al rei con sanna e yra contra ellos. E luego fuese para León, e otra vegada con decavo ayuntóse a la reina por causa de las bodas malditas'* CAS, ch. 26, p. 43.

plotting events in their own interest: in this case setting the king against their local rivals the monks and abbot of Sahagún. This then leads to the detail that Alfonso I then went to León and remarried Urraca. No comment is made of this second marriage, which Urraca had promised Archbishop Bernard she would not do. The events are stacked up, in the style of annals. This puts them in the same discussion, associates them as part of the same story, without articulating in the narrative how they are related.

The narrative at this point moves within the walls of the monastery, to an account of how the then-abbot Diego decided to resign faced with the troubles of the kingdom. We will consider this in the context of chapter three on the monastic community. For now, we can note how the internal crisis provoked by Abbot Diego's decision to resign is framed specifically within the context of the emergence of the burghers as active players in the story, seeking their own advantage against that of the monastery.

At the end of chapter twenty-five is a second description of the burghers in their new role as active agents in the narrative, as 'inciters' of further violence and conflict, rather than as opportunists.

Meanwhile, the burghers – whose will was to destroy the places that were in the *coto* and leave them all a wasteland so that with the rustic and labouring inhabitants gone they would be able to take control of their fields, lands, and vineyards – sent a secret messenger (the abbot and the monks did not know about this) to the king of Aragón who was then in Carrión asking him to send knights to Sahagún to protect them from their enemies (although they had no enemies at that time).

When the king heard this, he rejoiced and he sent a viscount called Giraldo Ponce, and another called Pelayo García, who, though a noble knight, was very cruel and without pity or mercy. The said town of Sahagún was by now well guarded with strong towers and gates.

When the same two [viscounts] had come with Aragonese [knights], they joined with the burghers. First they attacked and wasted the plentiful town of Bercianos: with fire and sword they destroyed it, reducing it to ash; they robbed the bread and wine, and many jewels and beasts and animals; they robbed it all, and when they went they took all those precious objects and loot; they also killed some of the men; some they burned and others they took captive with their wives and children.²⁰²

In this case it is the burghers who invite the Aragonese back into the town, and lead them to plunder and destruction, as the chronicle describes it. The chronicle adds the detail that the walls had by this time been finished. This coincides with the burghers' taking over the town, the process of their consolidation of their control over the town, their alliances and their emergence in the narrative. The chronicle introduces the two Aragonese viscounts as men of rank but who use their power for impious ends. The chronicle refers to the burghers' motives, their aims as a group: to 'destroy' (*'desfeçiesen e destruyesen'*) the *coto* and leave it a 'wasteland' (*'hiermo'*). The logic of this is said to be to move the inhabitants of the *coto* out of their houses²⁰³ and to take control of their, 'rustics and labourers' (*'rústicos e labradores'*), 'fields, lands, and vineyards' (*'canpos, tierras e viñas'*). For this they secretly (*'oculmente'*) send a messenger to the king for the king to send Aragonese knights to Sahagún in order to protect them from their enemies, although they did not have any enemies at

²⁰² *'Entretanto, los burgueses, la boluntad de los quales se esforçava a aquesto para que desfeçiesen e destruyesen los lugares que eran dentro del coto e lo retornasen en hiermo, por aquesto, porque como quedasen las casas baçías de moradores e ellos poseyesen los canpos, tierras e viñas de rústicos e labradores, no saviéndolo el abbad e los monjes, oculmente al rei, que estava entonçes en Carrión, enbiaron mensajeros para que les ayudase, enbiando los cavalleros aragoneses a la villa de Sant Fagum, los quales, ansí como ellos deçían, los defendiesen de los enemigos, bien que ellos non obiesen ningún enemigo en aquel tiempo.*

Lo qual, como el rei lo oyese, goçóse e luego enbió a un bizconde llamado Giraldo Ponçe e otro llamado Pelayo Garçía, que era noble cavallero, mas mui cruel e sin piedad e sin misericordia. Era ya la dicha villa de Sant Fagum mucho guarnida de torres e mui firme de torres e puertas.

Beniendo ya los dos sobredichos con los aragoneses, ayuntada la mano de los burgueses, en la primería acometieron e quebrantaron la muy abastada villa de Briçianos. E destruyéronla con fuego e fierro e la desfeçieron en çeniça; el pan otrosí e el vino e muchas alhajas e bestias e animalias, todo lo robaron, e retornáronse con toda aquella prenda e robo; e de los hombres algunos mataron, a otros quemaron, e a otros con las mugeres e fijos truxeron captivos' CAS, ch. 26, p. 47-8.

²⁰³ *'quedasen las casas baçías de moradores'* *Ibid.*, ch. 26, p. 48.

that time.²⁰⁴ The king sends two Aragonese viscounts, Giraldo Ponce and Pelayo García, to Sahagún.

At this point, violence, which is said to be the first act of the Aragonese and burghers, is described through verbs of generalised destruction: the alliance of burghers and Aragonese knights ‘broke’ (*‘quebrantaron’*) Bercianos, and ‘destroyed it with fire and sword [lit. ‘iron’] and unmade it in ash’.²⁰⁵ This destruction is so far left in terms of abstract verbs of violence and attack. The chronicle also adds that they ‘wasted the bread and wine and robbed many jewels and beasts and animals and returned with all their ‘precious garments and loot’.²⁰⁶ After this the chronicle adds that they killed some men, burned others and took still others captive with their wives and children.²⁰⁷

The chronicle will return to the accusation and description that the burghers took men captive to torture and ransom or kill. This forms a strong part of the rhetoric of the shocking. The rhetoric of the shocking continues:

It was then the days of the holy feast of Lent; you would see through all this town the husbands and wives burdened with iron chains, so heavy that they could not raise their necks. And they were pale and without the natural heat that gives vigour to the body and the soul because they had no bread; and complaining of their hunger, they cried out. And also in this way they suffered great cuts from the strong knots of the chains with which they were bound. You would even see the small *mezquino* children crying as they hung from the dried teats of their bitter mothers, sucking but not able to take any milk and the young *mezquinos* suffering hunger would cross their eyes in death: Oh, what a great affliction this was for the mothers!²⁰⁸

²⁰⁴ *‘bien que ellos non obiesen ningún enemigo en aquel tiempo’* CAS, ch. 26, p. 47.

²⁰⁵ *destruyéronla con fuego e fierro e la desfeçieron en çeniça’* CAS, ch. 26, p. 48.

²⁰⁶ *‘el pan otrosí e el vino e muchas alhajas e bestias e animalias, todo lo robaron, e retornáronse con toda aquella prenda e robo’* CAS, ch. 26, p. 48.

²⁰⁷ *‘e de los hombres algunos mataron, a otros quemaron, e a otros con las mugeres e fijos truxeron captivos’* CAS, ch. 26, p. 48.

²⁰⁸ *‘Eran entonces los días del santo ayuno de la quaresma; berías por toda esta villa todos los maridos e mugeres cargados con ataduras de fierro, que non podían alçar los cuellos por las ataduras e gran peso de las cadenas. E como les faltase e desfalleçiese el calor natural que da bigor al cuerpo e al ánima, por la gran mengua del pan, aquexando la fanbre, davan grandes boçes. E así apremiados con los duros*

In this case, the chronicle uses the events surrounding the sack of Bercianos to include an extended rhetorical scene of suffering of the inhabitant of the town. The rhetorical nature of the description which the chronicle resorts to is a conventional description of suffering for its own sake, rather than a description of what the author actually witnessed or heard had happened in Bercianos. The description identifies the burghers with the traditional role of tyrant and enemy of the poor. Elements of the story which will be most shocking to readers are the focus of the narrative: that this happened in the time of Lent, the suffering of the captives without bread, and especially the suffering of the children and their mothers. Rhetorical devices are also employed, the reader is imagined as part of the story, invited to react emotionally to the suffering, this is seen in the repetition of the second-person conditional verb 'you would see' (*'berías'*). The author also reacts himself through a rhetorical outburst in the narrative 'Oh, what a great affliction this was for the mothers!' (*'¡oh, que gran aflicción era a las madres!'*).

The chronicle goes on to describe how they took the strong and healthy men that they found captive so that they could ransom them and whipped and tortured them, and when they did promise to pay a ransom, they were tortured more so that they would increase the promised amount. The extent of the destruction caused by the burghers is generalised in the chronicle by another assertion near the end of the account which says that:

With these and similar 'charities', the burghers carried on through the whole time of Lent in preparation for Easter, giving their bodies and souls to the Devil. They did not only destroy and plunder one village, but all the villages that were in the *coto*, with sword and fire they destroyed them all.²⁰⁹

The chronicle ties the events described into a specific time frame, Lent, emphasising the burghers' position as outsiders—their place outside of the rhythms

ñudos de las cadenas, sufrían gran laçería; berías aún los mezquinos pequeñuelos e niños llorando, colgados de las tetas secas de las amargas madres, chupar e non poder sacar alguna leche, e cómo el mezquino pequeñuelo torçiese los ojos en la muerte, aquexándolo la fanbre; ¡oh, que gran aflicción era a las madres!' CAS, ch. 26, p. 48.

²⁰⁹ *'Con tales e semejantes limosnas, los burgeses por todo aquel tiempo de la quaresma aparejavan a çelebrar la santa pasqua, dando al diablo los cuerpos y las ánimas. No tan solamente destroían e robaban una sola villa, mas todas las villas que estaban dentro del coto, poco a poco, con fierro e fuego avían destruido de todo en todo' CAS, ch. 26, p. 49.*

and patterns of life governing society, especially those that are religious. The rhetoric also shows the tendency to move from a specific description to a generalised description of destruction: the chronicle affirms the burghers ‘did not only destroy and plunder one village, but all the villages that were in the *coto*, with sword and fire they destroyed them all’.²¹⁰ We see this rhetorical strategy repeated through the rest of the chronicle. It makes a connection between the local and the regional, between the specific and the general. The specific nature of the conflict, how it connects with wider events, is not just a local matter. Framed in terms of larger conflict, violence that begins in Sahagún spreads through the *coto*, but is also rhetorically generalised. What this means is left unspecified.

Following this the chronicle says that despite these deeds the abbot and monks continued to pray for the king. What is stressed is the idea of the importance of royalty in the monastery’s history and present, their continued commitment to their role as the religious intercessors for the kings of the region. They do not see it as their role to criticise royalty.

And although the burghers committed all these cruelties with the help of the *cavalleros*, nevertheless, the abbot and the monks were continually praying that the Lord would grant the king His mercy, that it might please Him to break the necks of his enemies under His feet.²¹¹

The assertion that the abbot and monks continue to pray for the king despite his antagonism towards the monastery emphasises the role of the monastery, its place outside of conflict, its ideal role in conflict, its inability to carry on traditional violence. The chronicle moves to a description of the burghers in their new role as agents in the narrative:

Meanwhile, the burghers began to sow discord and bitterness [lit. ‘darnel’] among the inhabitants of the land, in order to set one against another, and little by little to increase enmity among them.

²¹⁰ ‘No tan solamente destroían e robaban una sola villa, mas todas las villas que estaban dentro del *coto*, poco a poco, con fierro e fuego avían destruido de todo en todo’. CAS, ch. 26, p. 49.

²¹¹ ‘E bien que los burgeses con ayuda de los cavalleros del rei fiçiesen estas crueldades, non de menos, el abbad e los monjes non quedavan continuamente de rogar por el rei la misericordia del Señor, porque le pluguiese de quebrantar so sus pies los güellos de sus enemigos’ CAS, ch. 26, p. 49.

And in particular they sought to injure and insult those that came from the town of Sahagún, both nobles and non-nobles, and they called them traitors.

And then, not content with harmful words, they began to put their hands on them, despising the abbot and dishonouring the monks. And they broke the laws and customs given to them by King Alfonso of blessed memory, and they wrote new ones according to their own will. They established new customs and rents for the millers' use of the mills, leaving out the customary toll for the oven. They decided that they would not let either the king or the queen enter the town until they had signed the same charter that they had written and given their oath to uphold its customs. They also took away the abbot's power over the woodland and the town, and although the abbot had given the town guards and deputies, nevertheless the burghers did nothing in reverence of these, rather they did whatever they wished; and, above all, they dealt falsely with the abbot and the monks. They sent secret messengers to the king of Aragón advising him to be wary of the abbot and the monks for they loved the queen with all their hearts and took her side against him and his knights, whom they abhorred. And as the king believed this he became their enemy. It was certainly true that the queen loved the monastery out of respect for the sepulchres of her father and mother.²¹²

²¹² *'Entretanto, los burgeses començaron a ençender discordia y çizanna unos contra otros entre los moradores e avitadores de la tierra, para más acreçentar enemistades poco a poco. E primeramente acometían a enjuriar e denostar a los que benían a la villa de San Fagum, así nobles como non nobles, e llamándolos traidores.*

E después, no contentos de las ynjuriosas palabras, començaron a meter las manos en ellos, despreçiando al abbad e deshonorando a los monjes, quebrantando las leyes e costumbres puestas a ellos de la buena memoria rei don Alfonso e otras nuevas façiendo, según su boluntad; a los molinos eso mesmo posieron nuevas costumbres e rentas por el uso del moler, negando el sueldo por el forno acostunbrado; estableçieron otrosí que el rei o la reina no entrasen primeramente en la villa fasta que firmasen e otorgasen de guardar con su juramento las costumbres que avían escrito e hordenado; quitaron otrosí el monte e la villa del poderío, e bien que el abbad asignase nonbrando guarda e bicario a la villa, non de menos los burgeses por reberençia d'ellos ninguna cosa façían, sino los que querían, e sobre todo façiendo engannosamente contra el abbad e monjes; begadas enbiaban ocultamente letras e mensajeros al rei, amonestándole que se guardase del abbad e monjes, por quanto de todo coraçón amaban a la reina, faboresçían su parte e a él aborresçían e a sus cavalleros aragoneses, a los quales él creyendo, ocultamente les enemigava. La reina por çierto amávalos por respecto de la sepultura de su padre e madre' CAS, ch. 27, p. 50.

The burghers achieve their place by 'sowing discord' (*'ençender discordia'*), by setting 'one against another' (*'unos contra otros'*), and by 'increasing enmity' (*'acreçentar enemistades'*) among the inhabitants of the land. The chronicle distinguishes specifically between verbal and physical attacks: first the burghers use insults (*'denostar'*) and call the inhabitants of Sahagún traitors (*'llamándolos traidores'*). Though the phrase 'to injure and insult' (*'enjujar e denostar'*) connects the two. The chronicle adds that the burghers were not content with 'injurious words' (*'ynjuriosas palabras'*) but upped their attacks to 'put their hands on [the abbot and monks]' (*'meter las manos en ellos'*): 'despising the abbot and dishonouring the monks'.²¹³ Here the chronicler says that the burghers made new laws and customs to replace those granted by Alfonso VI.²¹⁴ The burghers' charter is distinguished and characterised as different from the original *fuero* as written according to the burghers' own will (*'según su boluntad'*), that is, not according to the grant of a traditional, and therefore legitimate, source of authority.

The chronicle provides one detail as to the nature of the conflict and the burghers' attempts to overturn the previous legal arrangement between the groups. The chronicle says that the burghers wanted 'new customs and rents for the millers' use of the mills, leaving out the customary toll for the oven'.²¹⁵ The chronicle is also clear that the burghers had also begun to assert their power and to consolidate their power by taking control of the town and woodland: 'They also took away the abbot's power over the woodland and the town, and although the abbot had given the town guards and deputies, nevertheless the burghers did nothing in reverence of these; rather they did whatever they wished'.²¹⁶ The chronicle also adds that the burghers were not honest, but dealt falsely with the abbot and monks,²¹⁷ and began to send secret messengers to the king,²¹⁸ which the chronicle says the king believed and

²¹³ *'despreçando al abbad e deshonnrando a los monjes'* CAS, ch. 27, p. 50.

²¹⁴ *'las leyes e costunbres puestas a ellos de la buena memoria rei don Alfonso e otras nuevas façiendo'* CAS, ch. 27, p. 50.

²¹⁵ *'a los molinos eso mesmo posieron nuevas costunbres e rentas por el uso del molar'* CAS, ch. 27, p. 50.

²¹⁶ *'quitaron otrosí el monte e la villa del poderío, e bien que el abbad asignase nonbrando guarda e bicario a la villa, non de menos los burgeses por reberençia d'ellos ninguna cosa façian, sino los que querían'* CAS, ch. 27, p. 50.

²¹⁷ *'todo façiendo engannosamente contra el abbad e monjes'* CAS, ch. 27, p. 50.

²¹⁸ *'begadas enbiaban ocultamente letras e mensajeros al rei, amonestándole que se guardase del abbad e monjes, por quanto de todo coraçón amaban a la reina, faboresçian su parte e a él aborresçian e a sus cavalleros aragoneses'* CAS, ch. 27, p. 50.

became the monastery's enemy. Finally, the chronicle acknowledges the historical relationship between the monastery and the Leonese monarchy. Of course, this was the dominant theme of the first fifteen chapters of the chronicle. Yet, here the chronicle suggests that this historical relationship need not be understood to determine the present relationship between the monastery and royal power in an exclusive way. The chronicle makes it clear that the monastery was not hostile to Alfonso I of Aragón because of any traditional obligation to León.

The passage above puts the burghers' attempts to write themselves into a new social role in the specific context of political events, events that are shown to develop and change rapidly. Moving on, the chronicle continues the narrative pattern developed in these previous chapters in the next seventeen chapters (twenty-seven through forty-three). The focus is on the burghers' treachery in either colluding with the Aragonese or inciting them to further hatred and aggression against the monastery. This narrative continues to be woven into the Urraca-Alfonso political narrative, and the narrative of the victimisation of the monastery and its abbot and monks. We will have opportunity to look at particular episodes from these chapters in chapters three and four of this study. We will skip ahead in this chapter to the chronicle's transition into the final narrative section. We will begin the next section in this chapter with the chapters of this transition. Part of our interest in this transition will be in its implicit nature. It is not announced as a transition in the narrative and the events that mark it in the story do not present a chronological transition, rather it is rhetorical and thematic. Yet, something like formal terms for the transition are given at the end of chapter forty-three. Here the chronicle summarises the argument of the previous narrative section.

But these same burghers, as they rebelled against his daughter and grandchildren and were always against them, they put the Aragonese in her kingdom; and with them (as I have said before) they destroyed that same kingdom; and, as part of this, our burghers plundered and destroyed the land that is close by and around Sahagún, and they laid waste to it with iron and fire. And in this the chief evildoers were Sanchiáñez, first, and Guillelmo Falcón, second.

For, as I began to say already, when the burghers joined once more with the queen, peace and concord began to show somewhat, and all dwelled in their town or house, and moreover laboured in the fields, lands, and vineyards.²¹⁹

This passage is a useful transition for us as well. The chronicle's argument about the cooperation between the burghers and the Aragonese leads to the specific cruelties carried out in attacks on local villages. The ambiguous role of the burghers *vis-à-vis* the Aragonese – whether they are led by the Aragonese or whether they incite the Aragonese – resolves into an argument which is more coherent in its moral and emotional force: the burghers were cruel and unrestrained.

Conclusion

This chapter has focused on the transition in the narrative that follows the death of Alfonso VI as told by the chronicle in chapters sixteen and seventeen. We have shown how this transition is both thematic and narrative in dimension. In the chronicle's account of the history of the monastery the regional and the local are not distinguished from one another in the story of the devotion and gifts awarded to the monastery by the Leonese monarchy. As the chronicle moves to the outbreak of conflict, the interactions among groups acting between these two spaces and levels of political and ecclesiastical power become more complicated. An implicit argument is made in the telling of the story in this way. The burghers finally achieve agency in the story in the negative terms of a world turned upside-down as treacherous opportunists. This transition also introduces into the text a new narrative mode which compares the suffering and helplessness of the monastic community to the violence and cruelty of the burghers in terms which are subjective and dramatic. Looking forward to the third and final narrative section of the chronicle, and the next chapter in this study, we will see how this narrative mode is channelled into the ultimate purpose of the chronicle to present a new argument for the lordship of the monastery

²¹⁹ *'Pero estos, como contra su fija e nietos rebelándose e siempre contrariando, metieron en su reino a los aragoneses; e con ellos, como ya dixen, destruyeron el dicho reino, entre los quales, los nuestros burgeses, la tierra que está açercana e acostada a la villa de San Fagum rovaron e destruyeron e disiparon con fierro e con fuego, aviendo para ello prinçipales malfechores, conviene a saber, en la primería a Sanchiáñez, e después a Guillelmo Falcón'.*

Ca como ya comencé a decir, como los burgeses se bolviesen e ayuntasen a la parte de la reina, algún tanto paresçia naçer la paz e concordia, e cada uno morava en su villa e casa, e labraba otrosí los canpos, tierras e vinnas' CAS, ch. 43, p. 77.

over the burghers of Sahagún. The narrative confusion and chaos of the account of the conflict ultimately frames the chronicle's introduction of this novel argument, allowing it to be couched as a conservative reaction to the burghers' cruelties and 'excesses'.

In the second part of the chronicle the collapse of order after the death of Alfonso VI is described. This collapse of order is, in the chronicle, both political and narrative. The old political and narrative order that prevailed in the monastery's history comes undone; disorder now becomes a matter of competing agencies among various political and ecclesiastical actors and various social groups at both the local and regional level. In the chapters immediately following the death of Alfonso VI, the chronicle continues to focus primarily on the political events surrounding Queen Urraca's marriage and speedy divorce with Alfonso I; their loss of dominant authority, in their kingdom and in the narrative of the *Crónica*, remains for a time at the centre of the swirling chaos. It is in an adjunct storyline to this one that the burghers' increasingly active role as aggressors against the monastery and as interventionists in the affairs of Urraca and Alfonso I occurs. The chronicle's sustained interest in the political intrigues and struggles between Urraca and Alfonso I thus present a narrative framework in which it is only as treacherous colluders with King Alfonso I and his deputies that the burghers' take on their new adversarial role. The effect of this narrative framing is to invalidate the burghers' agency as challengers to the monastery's authority, as well as, crucially, to circumscribe their ambitions and legal sophistication in writing their own charter.

Chapter Three: the ecclesiastical strategy

In this chapter we come to the final narrative section of the story in which the chronicle tells how the monastery and its supporters pursued a strategy of ecclesiastical censure against the rebellious burghers. It is in this section that the chronicle advances its argument on the ecclesiastical nature of the lordship of the monastery of Sahagún over the burghers. As in the previous two chapters of this study, we will focus on how the text supports its thematic account of the conflict with particular narrative patterns and rhetorical expressions. We will also see how the previous two narrative sections of the chronicle lead into this third and final section.

The narrative mode of the chronicle's account of the outbreak of political conflict and the burghers' rebellion as we have described it carries over in this final section, but the rhetorical and thematic strategies of the narrative are put into a new arrangement and given new points of emphasis. We will begin this chapter with a look at a sequence of nine chapters which describe in grim detail tortures inflicted by the burghers on local peasants whom they captured and held for ransom money. We will suggest how these chapters serve as a thematic and rhetorical transition into the final phase of the narrative through emphasis on the cruelty of the burghers. These tortures charge the story with a dramatic moral energy which will be used as a prompt for the ecclesiastical and religious response of Abbot Domingo, Archbishop Bernard, and Pope Paschal II. The conflict is moved from the political stage of the struggles and intrigues between Urraca and Alfonso I to the church and to the spiritual realm which is associated with it.

The burghers' tortures allow the chronicle to present in the following chapters Abbot Domingo's new strategy of ecclesiastical censure as a necessary response to the burghers' crimes. These tortures allow the text to argue that it is the burghers who are guilty of excesses and pushing limits; the monastery only acts in defence of itself and the larger social, religious, and political order. The chronicle presents several scenes in which Abbot Domingo moves to solicit an interdict and then an excommunication against the burghers from Archbishop Bernard, and eventually an excommunication from Pope Paschal II. We will include these scenes for discussion in this chapter, but we will take them up again when we come to the documents and legal argument they

make in chapter five of this study. Here we will consider the rhetorical and thematic dimensions of the chronicle's account of these efforts of Abbot Domingo to bring the burghers back under the monastery's control.

With the expulsion of the burghers from the town by Queen Urraca in the autumn of 1116, the chronicle describes how Abbot Domingo re-appropriated the lands and possessions that had been stolen from the monastery, and burned the burghers' charter. With this the issues of stolen goods and authority upon which Domingo's many attempts to compel the burghers to swear an oath of allegiance had foundered were at a stroke swept away. The chronicle no longer needed to interest itself in specific terms of its lordship, the case of particular stolen possessions, or land boundaries. The chronicle is freed to deal with more abstract notions of the monastery's authority, and indeed advantaged in doing so. Thus, Domingo's attempts to confront the burghers over stolen land and rejected authority are couched in terms of 'persuasion', and more about general points of good and evil, authority and rebellion, than about building a detailed case of the burghers' crimes. Ultimately, this serves the chronicle's purposes in holding up the more abstract version of authority in the *libertas Romana* which is made to express at once the legal terms of the *fuero* of 1085, the spiritual power of the papacy and St Peter, and the personal relationships between Abbot Domingo and the ecclesiastical authorities Archbishop Bernard and Pope Paschal II.

Tortures

At the end of chapter forty-three, the chronicle describes attacks on local villages by Guillermo Falcón and his Aragonese followers and the burghers of Sahagún. This passage directly follows the final quotation of the previous chapter in this study, where the chronicle explains how peace prevailed as long as the burghers were allied with Queen Urraca, but how chaos and conflict returned when they tired of peace and returned to their alliance with King Alfonso I. Coming directly after this explication, the purpose of this scene is to show in dramatic action the violence and cruelty of the alliance of the Aragonese and the burghers in Sahagún. The chronicle describes the burghers' cruelty:

But when they joined with the Aragonese and Guillermo Falcón, this support gave them a great impulse, and they were like cruel and fierce lions out of their caves, or like rabid dogs. They then wasted little by little all the towns, with swords and flame, with hunger and plunder, taking all the provisions from the houses and even the beams, tiles, and roofs, as well as the doors, tables, winepresses, beds, benches, and all the treasures of the house and everything of the house they carried off with them. And what they could not carry with them, they threw in the fire. All the bread and wine, animals and livestock, everything of use to men they either stole or threw in the fire. And they carried off the men as well, or killed them there with lances or knives, or they hid them in the attics of the houses then set the houses on fire. They did all these things and only finished their work at night.

Certainly, it was better for those that were freed and died than for those that they took captive in their cruel hands. In their crafty and perverse way they came up with new kinds of tortures and punishments, of which neither Decius conceived nor Maximinus dreamed, and Diocletian never used; and even cruel Nero would have trembled and frightened had he seen them.²²⁰

The tortures described in the next eight chapters are the most gruesome of the chronicle. As shown by in the quote above, the chronicle is particularly interested in elaborating the different methods of torture used by the burghers. These chapters are short and each dedicated to a different form of torture, so that the emphasis is on the

²²⁰ *'Pero ayuntándose los aragoneses con Guillelmo Falcón, los burgeses, con esfuerço d'ellos, dieron gran salto, así como leones muy fieros e crueles salientes de la cueva, o çiertamente, como los canes muy ravisosos, e todas las villas poco a poco disiparon con fierro, hanbre e fuego, rovando toda la substancia e aún la bigas, bigones, texas e texados de las casas, puertas, mesas e lagares, lechos, escannos e todas las cosas que son a uso de casa e alhajas rovaron e consigo llebaron. E lo que non podían llevar, echávanlo en el fuego; el pan, otrosí, e vino, e todos los animales e ganados que son a uso e sustentación de los onbres, rovaron e llevaron o quemaron en el fuego. E a los onbres, o llevavan captivos, o, trespasándoles con lanças e cochillos, matavan; o abscondidos en los desbanes de las casas, puesto el fuego, quemavan. E aquesto todo façian e acavavan de noche'*

Por çierto, mejor libraban los que morían que los que llebavan captivos, sin duda, de la mano d'ellos muy cruel; e la boluntad artifiçiosa e perversa a todo mal fallava nuevas maneras de crueles tormentos e penas, los quales nin Daçiano falló, nin Maximino pensó, nin Diocleçiano usó; e aún el mui cruel Nero, bien que las biese, pero tenbló e espantóse de ellas' CAS, ch. 43, pp. 77-8.

variety of forms of torture as well as on the cruelty of the burghers and the suffering of the peasants. We can give a description of these eight chapters in outline:

44. The peasants are locked in arks with sharp rocks lining the bottom and given only a little bread and water each week.
45. The peasants are made to stand naked in the winter night. Water is trickled on their heads, when this freezes they are brought by the fire to thaw, then put back in the cold and the process is repeated.
46. The peasants are made to sit on sharp sticks with millstones hung from their feet.
47. The peasants are hung by their thumbs or virile members, smoke is released in their noses and then they are whipped.
48. The burghers stick splinters in the peasant's wounds and deprive them of food.
49. The burghers pull out the peasant's teeth over the course of several days.
50. The peasants are starved to death.
51. The captured peasants are bought and sold by burghers hoping to increase their ransom; and they kill those they are unable to ransom.

The description of these tortures is more detailed and intense than previous descriptions of cruelty that we have seen in the *Crónica*, yet there have been hints of this kind of violence and cruelty towards the weak and innocent in previous scenes. In chapter twenty-six, the chronicle described how the burghers had first joined with the Aragonese deputies Giraldo Ponce and Pelayo García to raid the local village of Bercianos. That previous description of a raid on a local town parallels the description of chapter forty-three, which we have quoted above. We have quoted some of the chapter twenty-six passage in chapter two of this study, but it is worth quoting here in order to see how closely these two passages at opposite ends of the second narrative section of the chronicle align in their descriptions of violence. In chapter twenty-six the chronicle tells how:

When the same two [Giraldo Ponce and Pelayo García] had come with their Aragonese knights, they joined with the burghers. First

they attacked and wasted the plentiful town of Bercianos: with fire and sword they destroyed it, reducing it to ash; they robbed the bread and wine, and many jewels and beasts and animals; they robbed it all, and when they went they took all those precious objects and loot; they also killed some of the men; some they burned and others they took captive with their wives and children.

It was then the days of the holy feast of Lent; you would see through all this town the husbands and wives burdened with iron chains, so heavy that they could not raise their necks. And they were pale and without the natural heat that gives vigour to the body and the soul because they had no bread; and complaining of their hunger, they cried out. And also in this way they suffered great cuts from the strong knots of the chains with which they were bound. You would even see the small peasant children crying as they hung from the dried teats of their bitter mothers, sucking but not able to take any milk and the young peasants suffering hunger would cross their eyes in death: Oh, what a great affliction this was for the mothers!²²¹

Here, as in chapter forty-three, the description of the raid on Bercianos the theft of precious goods and the wasting of bread and wine leads to taking the captive the peasants of the village. In this passage the details of suffering by the peasants, such as their starvation (*'les faltase e desfalleçiese el calor natural que da bigor al cuerpo e al ánima, por la gran mengua del pan'*), the weight and chaffing of their chains (*'apremiados con los duros ñudos de las cadenas, sufrían gran laçería'*) anticipate the grim tortures of chapters forty-four through fifty-one. The pathos of the

²²¹ *'Beniendo ya los dos sobredichos con los aragoneses, ayuntada la mano de los burgeses, en la primería acometieron e quebrantaron la muy abastada villa de Briçianos. E destruyéronla con fuego e fierro e la desfeçieron en çeniça; el pan otrosí e el vino e muchas alhajas e bestias e animalias, todo lo robaron, e retornáronse con toda aquella prenda e robo; e de los honbres algunos mataron, a otros quemaron, e a otros con las mugeres e hijos truxeron captivos.*

Eran entonces los días del santo ayuno de la quaresma; berías por toda esta villa todos los maridos e mugeres cargados con ataduras de fierro, que non podían alçar los cuellos por las ataduras e gran peso de las cadenas. E como les faltase e desfalleçiese el calor natural que da bigor al cuerpo e al ánima, por la gran mengua del pan, aquexando la fanbre, davan grandes boçes. E así apremiados con los duros ñudos de las cadenas, sufrían gran laçería; berías aún los mezquinos pequeñuelos e niños llorando, colgados de las tetas secas de las amargas madres, chupar e non poder sacar alguna leche, e cómo el mezquino pequeñuelo torçiese los ojos en la muerte, aquexándolo la fanbre; joh, que gran afliçión era a las madres!' CAS, ch. 26, p. 47-8.

focus on the suffering of the peasant children, unable to suck milk from their mothers (*'chupar e non poder sacar alguna leche'*), is also especially relevant for the shock dramatic purposes of the tortures of these later chapters. As we will see shortly, the dramatic outburst of the narrator at the end of this passage (*'¡oh, que gran aflicción era a las madres!'*) also anticipates a sequence of outbursts that occur in these chapters.

In chapter twenty-six the burghers were also seen ransoming their tortured peasants. There the chronicle had described how the burghers sought ransom for their captured peasants:

Certainly, any they found that were strong and sturdy of body, they would capture so that they could try to ransom them, and they tortured them with lashes and injuries. And as they were tortured, they would promise to pay something great or small to be free, then they would get their pain doubled so that they would promise more.²²²

We see this again in the tortures of chapters forty-four through fifty-three. In a clear echo of this earlier description, chapter fifty-one tells how some burghers began to deal in captured peasants, paying the ransom price for some in the hope of exacting a still higher ransom:

There were furthermore many other burghers that paid their ransom price, so that by buying them themselves they might seek a still greater profit from them. And, if they bought one for one hundred *sueldos*, they would punish them with starvation and kick them until they were willing to pay five hundred *sueldos*. And if by chance they paid five hundred *sueldos* for them, they would demand one thousand for their redemption.²²³

The tortures of chapters forty-four through fifty-three are not original in essence of their themes of violence and cruelty practiced upon the weak and innocent,

²²² *'Por çierto, si se fallasen algunos fuertes e reços de cuerpo, apremiávanlos a que se redimiesen, feriéndolos con açotes e tormentos; e ya por çierto si algunos de aquellos que eran feridos, por que así mesmo librase, prometía alguna cosa grande o pequeña, entonçes doblábanle la pena porque diese mucho más'* CAS, ch. 27, pp. 48-9.

²²³ *'Eran otrosí muchos de los burgeses que davan el preçio, conprando los mezquinos captivos por aver mayor ganancia d'ellos. E si conpravan uno por çient sueldos, afligíanlo con penas, fanbres e a coçes, fasta tanto que diese quinientos sueldos. E si por aventura le conprase por quinientos sueldos, mill le demandavan por su redención'* CAS, ch. 51, p. 81.

in the details and pathos of their descriptions, in their dramatic rhetoric, or in the their account of the burghers' motives as part vicious cruelty, part greed and profit. Rather, these scenes of torture stand out for the emphasis on the tortures themselves and the narrative and discursive purposes this serves in the text. Whereas the raid in chapter twenty-six was specific in location, in the town of Bercianos, and time, during Lent, these tortures stand outside of a specific place and time.

The introduction to these tortures at the end of chapter forty-three is only a general description of the kinds of attacks the burghers made when they joined with the Aragonese. Likewise in the course of the tortures themselves we are told only that they happened during winter; but as the cold of winter forms part of one of the tortures itself, we might still wonder if this is a precise setting for all the tortures. The tortures of chapters forty-four through fifty-three are an extension of the generalised account of violence and cruelty; this place in the narrative helps to highlight the degree to which we have moved into a thematic and rhetorical gap in the narrative, rather than an account of tortures which all happened in sequence and link chronologically with what comes before and after in the story.

The logic of this thematic and rhetorical digression in the narrative can be found in terms of the second narrative section of the chronicle: these tortures serve as a climax to the violence and cruelty of the burghers as it has been described in the chronicle's account of how local violence broke out in Sahagún. But we can also show how the dramatic and sympathetic energy of these tortures and the narrative pattern which they impose on the story leads into the third and final narrative section of the text. We can analyse the narrative purposes of these tortures as a transition between the second and third parts of the chronicle according to three effects:

First, the focus on the cruelty of the burghers, and the desertion of the Aragonese as collaborators, reintroduces a narrative order driven by one group acting in the story. Second, the seclusion and climax of the themes of cruelty and suffering smoothes the progress of a repositioning of the terms of the conflict from the political to the ecclesiastical. In turn, the force of these tortures gives a moral urgency to the story which frames the burghers' place in the town in abstract terms of the cleansing of their souls and the monastery's spiritual authority especially as expressed in the

libertas Romana and the spiritual power of the papacy and St Peter. And, finally, the emphasis on the assertion that these tortures were historically unprecedented, and were ‘innovations’, suggests how the narrative arrangement of the tortures and their dramatic, sympathetic, and moral force is used to frame the monastery’s reaction as an attempt to restore an original religious and social order.

The narrative focus of these chapters of torture recall that which prevailed in the chronicle’s first narrative section in which the narrative was ordered by the devotions, gifts, and privileges showered on the monastery by the kings of León. This suggests the way that these scenes function as a kind of travesty of the original correct social, political, and religious order. Indeed, the chronicle refers ironically to the burghers’ plundering and tortures in chapter twenty-six with implicit comparison to the favours shown to the monastery by the kings of León: ‘[w]ith these and similar charities, the burghers carried on through the whole time of Lent in preparation for Easter, giving their bodies and souls to the Devil’.²²⁴ We can see the narrative pattern that orders these chapters with a quick look at the first lines of five of these chapters which introduce in active verbs each new torture carried out by the burghers: ‘[s]ome ... would make arks’ (*‘Algunos ... façían arcas’*);²²⁵ ‘[t]here were still others that employed new methods of torture’ (*‘Eran aún otros que usavan nuebo modo de tormento’*);²²⁶ ‘[t]here were others that spun very fine cords of hemp and flax’ (*‘Avía otros que mesclavan cuerdas mui mui sotiles de cáñamo e de lino’*);²²⁷ ‘[t]here were others that ... made sharp splinters and rough-cut pieces of wood’ (*‘Otros avía que ... façían astillas ásperas e mal cortadas de madera’*);²²⁸ ‘[t]here were ... many of the burghers that paid the ransom price, buying captive peasants’ (*‘Eran otrosí muchos de los burgeses que davan el preçio, conprando los mezquinos’*).²²⁹

The positioning of the burghers as the sole torturers and the thus the sole narrative agents has a functional effect for how these scenes introduce the next narrative section of the chronicle. This effect is to shed the Aragonese as the burghers’

²²⁴ *‘Con tales e semejantes limosnas, los burgeses por todo aquel tiempo de la quaresma aparejavan a çelebrar la santa pasqua, dando al diablo los cuerpos y las ánimas’* CAS, ch. 26, p. 49.

²²⁵ CAS, ch. 44, p. 78.

²²⁶ *Ibid.*, ch. 46, p. 79.

²²⁷ *Ibid.*, ch. 47, p. 79.

²²⁸ *Ibid.*, ch. 48, p. 80.

²²⁹ *Ibid.*, ch. 51, p. 81.

partners in crime. Though in chapter forty-three the chronicle made the specific point that it was when the burghers joined with the Aragonese that conflict and chaos returned, and this tells us that these tortures happened in the course of attacks on local villages by the burghers and the Aragonese, the Aragonese are not mentioned again until chapter fifty-nine, and, as we will see when we arrive at this chapter, the role of the Aragonese is adjusted after this point. This allows the chronicle to put to one side the political dimension of the conflict. The central dilemma of the chronicle is redefined. In the previous narrative section, the chronicle was careful to put the outbreak of the conflict in a political framework, in this final narrative section the chronicle is careful to put the resolution of the conflict into an ecclesiastical and spiritual framework. The chronicle will now be about the attempts of Abbot Domingo and his allies to compel the burghers to end their rebellion, attempts which will focus primarily on imposing ecclesiastical censure upon the burghers.

The graphic descriptions of the tortures inflicted by the burghers act as a prompt, making the burghers' souls the central issue of the story in these final chapters and provoking a response from Domingo and the wider ecclesiastical community. These descriptions of torture are meant to shock. The burghers are as cruel, unnatural, and greedy as their victims are innocent and helpless. The chronicle's descriptions of the tortures give every little detail of how the burghers sought to increase the suffering of their victims. The chronicle describes how the burghers pulled the peasant's teeth out, but stretched it out over days in order to increase the pain:

with iron pincers they pulled the teeth of the captured peasants with force from the jaw; and, not all at one time, but, today one, tomorrow another, and, the third day, another, in order to prolong the pain of their tortures.²³⁰

It is specified that the ark that the peasants are locked in is lined with sharp stones pointing up (*'que la parte d'ellas que estava aguda ponían de cara arriba'*).²³¹ And locked in these arks, the peasants were starved and denied bread and water (*'negándoles el ayuda del pan e del agua'*).²³² The charge that they denied the

²³⁰ *'con tenaças de fierro arrancavan los dientes por fuerça de la quixada, non todos en una vez; mas oi, uno; cras, otro; e otro día, el terçero, porque la pena prolongada fuese más alargada'* CAS, ch. 49, p. 80.

²³¹ *Ibid.*, ch. 44, p. 78.

²³² *Ibid.*, ch. 44, p. 78.

peasants food and water is made several times and stresses both the cruelty and unnatural violence of the burghers. Food is used as a weapon of torture both as it is denied, and in chapter fifty as it is provided:

Others, after long hunger, when their intestines and innards because of their great hunger had closed up, when they went to eat bread their intestines were too shrunken, and they would die of swelling.²³³

Some of the most disturbing of the tortures are very physical. The chronicle describes how the peasants were set naked upon sharpened and hardened pikes with millstones hung from their feet so that the sharp ends are sent up into their 'backsides and the secret parts of their bodies' (*'las nalgas e secreta parte del cuerpo'*).²³⁴ In another place they are hung by their 'virile members and genitals' (*'miembros biriles e genitales'*). Others are hung upside down and smoke is released up their noses (*'a otros, por alguno de los pies, sometiéndoles fumo a las nariçes'*) and, as the chronicle says, 'the butchers tormented them, harshly wounding them, and whipping them with bullwhips, so that they cried 'do, da!' (*'los aquexavan los carniçeros, feriéndoles fuertemente e açotando con açotes de toro e clamando: "do, da"*).²³⁵

The attention given to the starvation of the peasants, and to food and water is telling. This theme matches the charge that the burghers wasted the bread and wine of the villages they attacked made in chapters twenty-six and forty-three, which we have quoted above. This charge is made several times throughout the chronicle. The meaning of bread and wine is made explicit when they are referred to as 'the things necessary for sustenance' (*'las cosas neçesarias al mantenimiento'*).²³⁶ Pointing to the close association between the peasantry and their work as food suppliers to the larger community, as well the importance granted to this role, the legal protections connected with the peace of god movement often extended to this social group.²³⁷ The charge is that they were unnatural at the very basic level of eating and drinking; and, in

²³³ *'Otros, después de luenga fanbre, sus tripas e estentinos, por causa de la gran fanbre, ya fuesen çerrados e quisiesen comer el pan, los dichos estentinos ya mucho enflaqueçidos, morían de hinchaçón'* CAS, ch. 50, p. 81.

²³⁴ *Ibid.*, ch. 46, p. 79.

²³⁵ *Ibid.*, ch. 47, p. 79.

²³⁶ *Ibid.*, ch. 22, p. 36.

²³⁷ H. Goetz, 'Protection of the Church, Defense of the Law, and Reform: On the Purposes and Character of the Peace of God, 989-1038', *The Peace of God* (ed.) T.F. Head & R.A. Landes (Cornell, 1992), 259-279 (p. 268).

turn, their perversion of the natural order of human sustenance is significant of the larger sense in which the burghers were working to overturn the social order. Likewise, the burghers' tortures employ the basic elements of heat and cold. The chronicle describes how the burghers took the peasants out into the cold winter night and poured water on their heads so that the 'members of the peasants froze hard in the cold' (*los miembros de los mezquinos con el gran frío se enrregeçían*'), and their tongues froze so that they could not speak ('*como la lengua d'ellos se enduresçiese, e ya perdido el bigor e esfuerço natural non podiesen fablar*'). At this point the burghers would bring the frozen peasants to the fire and rub them with their hands until they warmed and could speak again ('*frotándolos entre las manos, e regalándose la elada como se escallentasen, ya començavan a fablar*').²³⁸ And with this the process was repeated.

The very bodily nature of these tortures, and especially the prominent place of genitals and anuses, and perhaps we can add noses, teeth, and tongues, adds to the perversity of the burghers' tortures. Stephen White has suggested that peasants often faced the brunt of violence in disputes.²³⁹ In a formulation that can also be applied to these events in the *Crónica*, peasants served as easy victims of violence, where the violence itself was meant to raise the stakes of the conflict and strengthen a group's negotiating power. The violence of the burghers' tortures serves this function in the conflict of the *Crónica*, though we are of course reading it through the lens of the opposing party's (the monastery's) record of these events. We do not expect the *Crónica* to rationalise the burghers' violence in terms of its structural purpose in the conflict; indeed, it is the irrationality of the burghers' motives that are stressed. None the less, for its own discursive advantage, the chronicle does use the burghers' violence to structure and raise the stakes of the conflict as it looks forward to Abbot Domingo's tactics in bringing about a resolution. Given this ordering purpose in the chronicle's account of these tortures, and the literary dimensions in which the account takes shape, we can point to the metaphorical role of the peasants as scapegoats for a larger society under violent attack. This suggests the logic of the chronicle's close interest in the perverse and sadistic details of these tortures. The burghers aim their

²³⁸ CAS, ch. 45, p. 79.

²³⁹ White, 'Feuding and Peace-Making', pp. 216ff. & 260.

violence specifically at the orifices of the peasants. The necessary bodily functions of these are either prevented (they are hung by the genitalia, starved, suffocated with smoke in their noses, their tongues are frozen) or perverted (sharp sticks put up the backside: a perversion of sex and eating).

A further brief point might be proffered here. The strategic positioning of this violence in the chronicle is also suggested by the chronicle's previous omission of the violence of the passion of the monastery's patron saints, Facundo and Primitivo, in chapter two. We can suggest the way that the full force of violence has been reserved for scenes of the burgher's violence; in effect, it had been transferred from the passion of the Saints Facundo and Primitivo to the peasants. In this conclusion we concur with Belmonte who also suggested that the tortures of the peasants stand in for the absent passion of Facundo and Primitivo.²⁴⁰

More generally, the kinds of tortures the burghers employ are determined by their work and skills as traders and craftsmen. The chronicle emphasises how the burghers fabricated their instruments of torture. Thus, the burghers 'made arks narrow in length and short in height' (*'façían arcas brebes en longura e cortas en la altura'*);²⁴¹ in another place they 'smoothed a stick of wood and sharpened one end like a knife; and in order to harden them they cooked them in the fire' (*'adolaban un madero e de la una parte façían mucho agudo como navaja; e porque se enduresçiese tostávanlo al fuego'*);²⁴² in order to hang the peasants by their sensitive parts they 'spun cords of very fine hemp and flax', and in a mockery of driving their cattle, they 'whipped them with bullwhips';²⁴³ and again, they 'made sharp splinters and rough-cut pieces of wood'.²⁴⁴ To be sure of the low opinion the chronicler holds for these kinds of trades their practitioners are elsewhere called 'most vile people' (*'las personas muy biles'*) and designated as 'garment cutters, blacksmiths, tailors, furriers, cobblers, and even those that plied their trades in the underground houses' (*'cortidores, ferreros,*

²⁴⁰ Jiménez Belmont, 'Hagiografía y denuncia política', pp. 227-8.

²⁴¹ CAS, ch. 44, p. 78.

²⁴² *Ibid.*, ch. 46, p. 79.

²⁴³ *Ibid.*, ch. 47, p. 79.

²⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, ch. 48, p. 80.

xastres, pelliteros, çapateros e aún los que en las casas soterrañas façían sus ofiçios’).²⁴⁵

The mercantile nature of these tortures helps to suggest the way that the burghers’ reign of terror represents a travesty of the version of peace and security during the reign of Alfonso VI. This is what it would look like if these ‘vile people’ were in control, or at least left to run without restraint. The *Crónica* extends this notion of ‘rule by the craftsmen’ into a larger point about the dynamics of the conflict and its resolution. Along with the close interest in the variety of tortures inflicted by the burghers and the details of how these were constructed and implemented to achieve maximum pain and suffering, the chronicle explicitly stresses the unprecedented, novel nature of these tortures.

We read in the introduction to these scenes in chapter forty-three the chronicle’s assertion that such tortures as practiced by the burghers were beyond those ever dreamed up by Decius, Maximinus I, Diocletian, and Nero, the worst of the Christian-persecuting Roman emperors (*‘los quales nin Daçiano falló, nin Maximino pensó, nin Diocleçiano usó; e aún el mui cruel Nero, bien que las biese, pero tenbló e espantóse de ellas’*). Likewise, in chapter forty-six, the chronicle says that some of the burghers used ‘new methods of torture’. The effect of this emphasis on the novel nature of the burghers’ methods of torture in terms of what will follow in the chronicle is to establish the burghers as the group guilty of ‘excess’, of going beyond the social norms and limits, of introducing new practices and conditions to the function of power and authority in Sahagún. It is telling, for example, that the word ‘inventor’ (*‘inventor’*) to describe the burghers and their allies becomes current in this final part of the chronicle, but was not used previously.

We move now to the chapters following these scenes of torture. We have suggested the way in which the dramatic sympathetic and moral energy of these tortures will be channelled into a repositioning of the conflict from the political to the ecclesiastical. It is specifically the cruelty of the burghers that is shown in the chapters we have considered here. This raises the stakes of the burghers’ part in the conflict. We have shown how the chronicle brackets together the cruelty and violence of the

²⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, ch. 38, p. 72.

burghers in these chapters with their social role as traders and craftsmen. With the spiritual depravity and the manual and earthy social place of the burghers made a charged and urgent issue in the conflict, the chronicle moves the burghers into the ecclesiastical realm where they are shown to be both out of place and over their heads. This gives the chronicle a decided edge in staging the fight over the monastery's lordship over the burghers in these same ecclesiastical terms. Specifically, we will see how the new framework that the burghers' tortures introduce to the conflict will determine the chronicle's dramatic handling of the *libertas Romana* and the burghers' charter.

The burghers' threat

In the chapters immediately following the sequence of tortures we have considered above, the chronicle begins to show how these tortures lead into a broader story of conflict and argument about the monastery's lordship over the burghers. The simple torturer/victim narrative equation of these previous eight chapters is extended to other groups. The implication is that the burghers' tortures of the peasants present a threat to the ecclesiastical order, both locally in Sahagún and more broadly among the ecclesiastical hierarchy in which the monastery's authority is located. The metaphoric sense in which the peasants stand in for larger spiritual and social perversities of the burghers is given specific application here as a perversity of the ecclesiastical order.

In chapter fifty-two the chronicle introduces the burghers' clerics to the storyline, explaining how they encouraged the burghers:

The clerics, although they should have admonished the burghers to cease their devilish works, they incited them to yet worse deeds, saying:

"For every hundred rustics you kill we order you to the same penance as for one dead dog".²⁴⁶

Here the chronicle tells how the clerics also made threats against the larger political order:

²⁴⁶ *Los clérigos, aunque devieran amonestarlos e que çesasen de aquestas diabólicas obras, ençendíanlos a peor obrar, diçiéndoles:*

"Tanta penitencia vos daremos por muerte de çien rusticos, quanta daríamos por un can muerto" CAS, ch. 52, p. 81.

And, in their churches they were continually excommunicating the queen and nobles of the land and all the enemies of the Aragonese; and dousing lit candles in water they made their curses and threats, saying:

“This is how the enemies of the Aragonese will die”.

...

The burghers called the queen a public whore, and even adulteress.

They called all the nobles ‘men without law’ and cheats, perjurers, and liars.²⁴⁷

Likewise, the clerics end with curses against the archbishop:

Now certainly it shames me much to say and recount what great insults and injuries, all lies, they invented against the honourable man Don Bernardo, archbishop of Toledo.²⁴⁸

We continue here in the thematic mode: the introduction of the clerics does not happen along chronological lines, but rather serves the purpose of the chronicle in wanting to suggest the implications of the burghers’ tortures for the larger political and ecclesiastical order. It is significant that we move here to threatened violence, rather than violence that actually happens in the chronicle. Ultimately, this will allow for the ecclesiastical response of Abbot Domingo and his supporters in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. The chronicle does not ignore the political dimension of the conflict in these chapters following the tortures. Rather, what we will notice is how the grounds upon which the conflict is waged begin to shift in the chronicle’s account. In the outbreak of conflict the chronicle showed how Archbishop Bernard had confronted King Alfonso I with excommunication. This suggests the way that ecclesiastical authority will be used in this final part of the chronicle, but here this strategy is applied specifically to the burghers.

²⁴⁷ *‘Por ende, en sus iglesias continuamente escomulgavan a la reina e nobles de la tierra e a todos los enemigos de los aragoneses; e maldeçían e amatavan las condelas ençendidas en el agua, diçiendo: “Así perezcan e mueran los enemigos de los aragoneses”.*

...

Los burgeses llamavan a la reina “meretrize pública” e aún “engañadora”. Llamavan aún a todos los sus nobles “hombres sin lei” e “engañadores, perjuros e mentirosos” CAS, ch. 52, p. 82.

²⁴⁸ *‘Ya por çierto mucho me abergüeño a deçir e recontar quan grandes denuestos e ynjurias, mentiendo, fingían contra el honrrado varón don Bernardo, arçobispo de Toledo’ CAS, ch. 52, pp. 81-2.*

The chronicle continues to make the point of the wider threat of the burghers' aggression. Chapter three explains:

And, for siding with the queen, the burghers even called the bishops asses and cheats; and thus none of the bishops dared to enter the town of Sahagún. And they even cursed and excommunicated the clerics, monks, and abbots, greatly insulting and slandering them; and they called all of the knights of the land 'cheats'; and they cursed those who were absent, and harassed and spit upon those around them; and they tortured anyone that they could, whether poor plebeian or noble. Certainly, they pardoned no one.²⁴⁹

Now it is the whole social order all at once that comes under threat. Most telling, however, is the insistence in both the passages above that the clerics had excommunicated Queen Urraca and the monastic community of Sahagún (among others). The clerics are here engaging in anathema, a ritual cursing that in the twelfth-century was conflated with excommunication.²⁵⁰ This is a strategic anticipation of the strategy of interdict and excommunication soon to be employed by Abbot Domingo, Archbishop Bernard, and Pope Paschal II against the burghers. The order of scenes suggests that it was, in fact, the burghers and their clerics who bring ecclesiastical censure into the conflict at this point. Archbishop Bernard had previously excommunicated the king and queen, but here the clerics among the burghers excommunicate the abbot and monks of Sahagún. This positions Abbot Domingo in defence against the clerics' ecclesiastical aggressions.

The next two chapters tell of two confrontations between the burghers and the monks of Sahagún. We see in these scenes how the chronicle continues to channel the narrative energy of the torture chapters into new formations of violence and threat. From the clerics' threats and insults against the whole social order, we move now to direct confrontations between the burghers and the monks. Chapter fifty-four

²⁴⁹ *'E aún a los obispos, por quanto favoriçavan la parte e opinión de la reina, llamavan "asnos", "engannadores", e ninguno d'ellos osava entrar en la villa de Sant Fagum; aún a los clérigos e monjes e abades excomulgavan e maldeçían, façiéndoles e deçiéndoles enjurias e denuestos, e a todos los cavalleros de la tierra llamavan "hombres engañadores"; a los absentes maldeçían, e a los presentes fatigavan e destroçavan, e a los que podían, así plebeyos e gente menuda, como a los nobles, atormentavan; por çierto, a ninguno perdonavan'* CAS, ch. 53, p. 82.

²⁵⁰ Vodola, *Excommunication*, pp. 14-16.

reintroduces the burghers' charter first mentioned in chapter twenty-seven. The incident is described:

Without a doubt, I abhor to tell what happened one day, for the burghers, having entered the chapterhouse of Sahagún, showed the monks a charter in which new laws and customs were written, which they themselves had decided on and ordained, denying the customs which King Alfonso VI of good memory had established. And when they presented the same charter, they began to pressure the monks to sign their laws with their own hands. But when the monks refused to do it, saying we cannot sign this thing without our abbot, they harassed the monks with many insults and abusive words until they were satisfied; and leaving the chapter, they threatened the monks, saying that for as long as they lived they would continue their efforts to force all of the monks out of the cloister.²⁵¹

It is significant that in this scene the burghers confront the monks directly, without Abbot Domingo. The direct confrontation between the burghers and the monks can be read as a second staging of the burghers' direct attacks on the peasants in chapters forty-four through fifty-three. As we will see, this scene also prefigures a climactic moment that comes with another direct confrontation between the burghers and the monks in chapter seventy-three. Though the monks are only threatened, the suggestion is that 'we know what the burghers are capable of', and that their attempts to force the monks to sign their charter is another kind of violence towards the social order. The most telling sign of the way that the chronicle equates the two is the assertion in each case—of torture and of charter—that the burghers were conceiving of something new. They both 'came up with new kinds of cruel torture and ordeals'²⁵² and drafted 'new laws and customs' (*'nuevas leyes e costumbres'*). This also echoes an

²⁵¹ *'Sin duda ya mucho aborrezco recontar lo que acaesçió un día, ca todos los burgeses, entrados en el capítulo de Sant Fagún, demostraron a los monjes una carta en la qual eran escriptas nuevas leyes e costumbres, las quales ellos mismos para sí escogieron e ordenaron, quitando las costumbres que el de buena memoria rei don Alfonso avia estableçido. E, demostrando la dicha carta, començaron a apremiar a los monjes que las dichas sus leyes firmasen con sus propias manos; mas como los monjes rehusasen façerlo, diçiendo "non pertenesçer a nos firmar las semejantes cosas sin nuestro abbad"; e luego con muchos denuestos e vituperios de palabras fatigaron a los monjes fasta tanto que les fue satisfecho; e saliendo del capítulo, amenaçávanles diçiendo que si ellos obiesen bida, que ellos farían por manera que ninguno de los monjes quedase en el claustro'* CAS, ch. 54, p. 83.

²⁵² *'fallava nuevas maneras de cruels tormentos e penas'* CAS, ch. 46, p. 79.

earlier description in chapter twenty-seven of how the burghers ‘broke the laws and customs’ of Alfonso VI and ‘they wrote new ones according to their own will’ (*‘quebrantando las leyes e costunbres ... e otras nuevas façiendo, según su boluntad’*).²⁵³ Both forms of aggression are fit into the same framework of burgher and victim. The burghers’ violence against the peasants is made to stand in for an extended violence against the society that is at once broad (against the whole social order) and particular (against the archbishop, against the monastery of Sahagún).

In the following chapter, another confrontation between the burghers and the abbot (now said to be present) and monks occurs. The chronicler describes:

Nor do I think that I should omit what followed, for again they entered the chapter-house of Sahagún and forced the monks and the abbot to present all the ornaments of the church to them, whether they wanted to or not; and, although we did it against our will, we laid before their feet the altar vessels, all the ornaments, the reliquaries full of the remains of the saints, and everything that we had.

And with their dirty hands they began to touch the chalices, the relics of the saints, and the wood of the cross of the Lord, and without reverence or devotion they went around here and there, just like they were accustomed to touch their lamb skins, and when the abbot saw this he cried gravely, saying:

“Only the bishops are to touch these things with their hands anointed with oil, not you with your dirty and bloody hands!”

They scorned these words, saying:

“We want the sacristan to take these things from our hands and to tell us what they are for!”

We all responded to these words of theirs in one voice:

“No monk in this chapterhouse will take these things for you! It would be better for you to ask about the tools of your arts and trades

²⁵³ *Ibid.*, ch. 27, p. 50.

and leave us, already stripped of all our goods, to live, and if that which is not in our cloister [lacuna]”.²⁵⁴

This episode can be read as a second take on the last. Both begin with the first-person introduction of the narrator, and both involve the burghers’ intrusion into the monastery and into the space of the church. The chronicle uses this second episode to show the clumsiness of the burghers in this space. These are the same manual-labourers: vile burghers that the chronicle had described constructing their instruments of torture. The monks make the distinction between ‘your’ tools (*‘las ferramientas de vuestras artes e ofiçios’*) and ‘our’ tools—the religious objects which the burghers need to ask the uses of. The monks also make a direct comparison between the burghers and the bishops, suggesting that the chronicle’s presentation of the burghers’ attempts to confront the monastery as a travesty of the correct religious order. The ignorance of the burghers in the ‘tools’ can also be read back onto the previous scene to suggest how we should understand their attempt to rewrite the terms of their subjection to the monastery. If they cannot figure out how to use the things of the church how can they be trusted with the laws of the church? Of course this presupposes the question of the legal grounds for the monastery’s authority over the burghers. In the following chapter we will see more directly how the chronicle presents the monastery’s response to the burghers’ ecclesiastical threat in terms of the *libertas Romana*, and its version of ecclesiastical lordship.

With the narrative of the conflict focused specifically on the problem of the burghers as a threat to the ecclesiastical order, the chronicle moves to its account of

²⁵⁴ *‘Nin aún pienso que deva dejar lo que se sigue, ca ellos entrados otra bez en el capítulo de Sant Fagum, forçaron a los monjes e abbad que, quisiesen o non quisiesen, a ellos demostrasen todos los ornamentos de la iglesia, los quales nosotros, bien que contra nuestra boluntad, pusimos ante sus pies, así basos de altar como todos los ornamentos, custodias llenas de reliquias de santos e todo lo otro que teníamos.*

E ellos començaron a tratar con manos suçias los cálizes, las reliquias de los santos y el madero de la cruz del Señor, e sin reberençia e deboçión rebolvían de acá e de allá, así como eran acostunbrados a tratar las pieles de los corderos, la qual cosa beyendo el abbad, grávemente gimiendo, e deçia:

“A los obispos sólo perteneçia tratar estas cosas e a las manos untadas de olio santo, e non a bosotros cuyas manos son suçias e ensangrentadas”.

Lo qual ellos despreçiando dixeron:

“Queremos que el sacristán tenga estas cosas de nuestra mano e nos dé cuenta e raçón d’ellas”.

A aquestas palabras suyas por una boz respondimos:

“Non está en este capítulo monje que las guarde de vuestra parte, mas más ayna requerid las ferramientas de vuestras artes e ofiçios, e a nos, ya desnudos de todos los bienes, dexadnos bibir, e si al que non en nuestro claustro [lac.]” CAS, ch. 55, pp. 83-4.

Abbot Domingo's strategy to compel burghers to submit to his authority. This strategy is based upon the imposition of a series of interdicts and excommunications; and, as we will see, the chronicle is largely guided in the chapters that follow by its account of Abbot Domingo's work to secure these ecclesiastical censures and his attempt to use them to compel the burghers to submit to his authority. But along with these specific incidents the chronicle's account is also guided by more abstract notions of persuasion and spiritual absolution. In chapter five of this study we will look specifically at the texts of the archbishop's interdict and excommunication and the papal excommunication. Here we will be largely concerned with the way that the chronicle tells the story of the events that lead eventually to the resolution of the conflict. We have established so far how the graphic descriptions of the burghers' tortures makes the burghers' cruelty and violence more narrowly the central issue of the conflict, and how the chapters that follow these tortures channel their violent energy into a threat against the larger ecclesiastical order, both generally and specifically at Sahagún. Together these frame the response of Abbot Domingo as a defensive reaction against the 'new methods' of violence and 'new laws and customs' of the burghers.

The text shows in these scenes the breakdown of ecclesiastical order. Other chronicles of the period also expressed this theme. For example, *Historia Compostellana* gives a vivid account of how Queen Urraca and Archbishop Diego Gelmírez of Santiago de Compostela were attacked by local peasants:

Then, turning to the bishop [Diego Gelmírez], the queen said "Go father, go from this fire so that I may go with you also, for they will pardon you as their patron, their bishop, and their lord". Then the bishop responded: "This is not good counsel; for they hold me and my followers as enemies, and they want our deaths especially". From outside the people clamoured: "Let the queen come out if she will, we will give her alone safe passage and pardon to live, but the rest will die by sword and fire". Hearing this, as the flames had also grown more fierce and the bishop had urged her to go now that she had been guaranteed safe passage, the queen fled from the tower. But when the crowd saw her, they set upon her, and, grabbing her,

they threw her down on the muddy ground. They savaged her like wolves and they tore her garments. She was naked from the chest down; and with all this shame on her head she laid in the mud for a long time. Many also went to pelt her with stones, and among these an old women of Compostela badly cut her cheek with a stone.²⁵⁵

The dramatic elements of this scene mirror the *Crónica's* own picture of an ecclesiastical order under threat.

Persuasion

In chapter fifty-six, directly following the burghers' intrusions into the monastery, the chronicle shows Abbot Domingo in a new role. Here he rebukes the burghers directly. The chronicle describes how:

the abbot, as it seemed necessary to him, did not cease to admonish the same burghers in public and private with flattery and entreaties and with admonishing words, so that they might leave their wickedness now begun and refrain from such evils, for they would be held accountable before God if they continued to persecute the peasants.²⁵⁶

This is the introduction to Abbot Domingo's new strategy. The words 'seemed necessary to him' (*'le paresçia ser nesçesario'*) are significant as they provide the cue that Domingo has been constrained to act in response to the burghers' aggressions. The chronicle makes explicit that this reaction is provoked by the burghers' tortures. Domingo fights in words, both entreating and admonishing. But, his role is also

²⁵⁵ *'Tunc Regina conversa ad Episcopum inquit: Egredere Pater, egredere ab hoc incendio, ut ego tecum egredi audeam. Parcent enim tibi ut Patrono suo, Episcopo suo, Domino suo. Tunc Episcopus, non est hoc, inquit, sanum consilium: me etenim et contribules meos infestos habent, et ad necem nostram praecipue anhelant. Clamabant autem foris, Regina si vult egrediatur: illi soli egrediendi licentiam et vivendi facultatem concedimus: ceteri armis et incendio pereant. Quo audito, incendio intus iam convalescente, et Regina coacta ab Episcopo, accepta fidesecuritatatis ab eis egressa est a turre: quam ut vidit cetera turba egredientem, concursum in eam faciunt, capiunt eam et prosternunt humi in volutabrum: rapiunt eam more luporum, et vestes eius dilaniant: a papillis siquidem deorsum nudato corpore, et coram omnibus, diu humi jacuit inhoneste. Multi quoque lapidibus eam voluerunt obruere, inter quos anus quaedam Compostellana percussit eam graviter in maxillam lapide'* (Falque Rey, *Historia Compostellana*, bk. 1, ch. 94). Also discussed at M. Carmen Pallares & E. Portela, *La Reina Urraca*, (San Sebastián, 2006) pp. 175-6.

²⁵⁶ *'el abbad, como le paresçia ser nesçesario, non çesava de amonestar en público e en oculo a los burgeses con halagos e ruegos e palabras amonestadiçes, porque se dexasen ya de la maldad encomençada e se refrenasen de tantos males, porque no aparesçiesen culpados ante Dios de tantos omeçidos, perseverando en los tormentos e afliçiones de los mezquinos'* CAS, ch. 56, p. 84.

specifically figured as a religious intercessor on behalf of the burghers' souls. In all these ways this passage anticipates Abbot Domingo's part in this final part of the story.

At this point the chronicle continues with a version of a direct speech made by Abbot Domingo to the burghers:

“What do you gain by inciting war between the king and queen? You know well that you were brought here from foreign provinces and diverse kingdoms to lead safe and peaceful lives under the protection and aid of Sahagún. So now put an end to all these evils and plagues and renounce your secular lord; submit yourselves to God and his martyrs, and ally yourselves with me. And when the king or queen comes to this town, receive them with only a few knights, for they do not threaten you; they enter, do their business, and eat and drink; in peace they come and in peace they go”.²⁵⁷

The central complaint of the abbot's rebuke is that the burghers have been preventing Queen Urraca from visiting the tombs of her parents in the monastery. But, the chronicle also includes King Alfonso I in his complaint; the burghers are charged with acting out of their place in interfering between the queen and king. This is a reiteration of the part played by the burghers in the previous narrative section of the chronicle. It is significant, then, that it is now Domingo who articulates this point and who intervenes among the burghers on behalf of the king and queen. The way that this speech narrates the burghers' place in Sahagún according to royal and ecclesiastical authority is telling. Domingo is at first concerned with the burgher's relationship with the king and queen, and for this he rehearses the story of the burghers' arrival in Sahagún with the generosity of Alfonso VI. This was told in chapters fourteen and

²⁵⁷ *‘Entre tantas tempestades e semejantes ondas, por los burgeses de Sant Fagún, más aún, como diximos, toda España que de nos es avitada, era turvada e fatigada; pero el abbad, como le pareçia ser nesçesario, non çesava de amonestar en público e en oculto a los burgeses con halagos e ruegos e palabras amonestadiçes, porque se dexasen ya de la maldad encomençada e se refrenasen de tantos males, porque no aparesçiesen culpados ante Dios de tantos males, porque no aparesçiesen culpados ante Dios de tantos omeçidos, perseverando en los tormentos e afliçiones de los mezquinos. E aún les deçia:*

“¿Qué avedes a fazer con la vatalla del rei e de la reina? Vos bien sabades que d’estrañas provinçias e dibersos reinos, so las alas de Sant Fagum e su ayuda aquí para morar fuestes ayuntados, e troxistes e obistes bida segura e paçífica; poned ya fin a tantas pestilençias e males, e pospuesto e arredrado el señorío seglar, someted vos a Dios e a sus mártires, allegándovos a mi. E beniente el rei o la reina dentro de la villa, resçebid con pocas cavalgaduras, porque non vos enpeşan; entren, negoçien, coman e beban; con paz entren e con paz salgan” CAS, ch. 56, p. 85.

fifteen of the chronicle. But here the story comes with a particular message. The burghers are admonished to renounce their secular lords and to (in the first-person speech of Domingo) 'submit yourselves to God and his martyrs, and ally yourselves with me' (*someted vos a Dios e a sus mártires, allegándovos a mí*). Here is the first articulation of the formula for Abbot Domingo as ecclesiastical lord. The political is raised here as an issue in terms of the burghers' place in Sahagún in order to set apart ecclesiastical authority. We can also read in this speech a new role as narrative agent for Abbot Domingo. He identifies himself as an ecclesiastical lord in direct contrast to the burghers' other secular lords, who we know are Alfonso I and his deputies. It is significant then that it is he who is now tasked to represent the interests of the monarchs. The role of the political at this point in the conflict and the narrative is in this way defined in ecclesiastical terms.

The chronicle has Queen Urraca follow in stressing the centrality of the burgher-abbot relationship at this point in the conflict. The queen offers to allow the burghers free passage through the lands of her kingdom if they will submit to Abbot Domingo's authority, even if they continue to prevent her from entering the monastery to visit the tombs of her parents.

"Let the burghers of Sahagún refuse to receive me or the king of Aragón, but if they will honour and love the abbot as their lord they will be free to go safely throughout my kingdom and to trade freely where they like and where it best suits them".²⁵⁸

The burghers are unmoved by Domingo's admonition and Urraca's offer. At the beginning of the next chapter (fifty-seven), the abbot complains again:

"What does he gain who plays a guitar or instrument to an ass, or who makes a sweet melody or song to deaf ears? For both of them lose their time and effort".²⁵⁹

Abbot Domingo moves to a purely metaphoric and rhetorical expression of his strategy against the burghers. This is rhetoric of persuasion. It is directly following this that Abbot Domingo solicits Archbishop Bernard for an interdict against the burghers of

²⁵⁸ *"Los burgeses de Sant Fagum nin a mi reçivan, nin al rei de Aragón, mas a su abbad honren como a señor, e amen; e por mi reino bayan seguros a negoçiar do ellos quisieren e mejor les biniere"* CAS, ch. 56, p. 85.

²⁵⁹ *"Mas el qué façe quien canta con la guitarra o estomento al asno; o el que dulce melodía façe e l[a] canta a las orejas sordas? ca el uno e el otro pierde el tiempo e pierde el trabajo"* *Ibid.*, ch. 57, p. 85.

Sahagún, the first of a series of ecclesiastical censures brought against the burghers. The rhetoric of persuasion allows the chronicle a way of articulating the motivations of Domingo's strategy of ecclesiastical censure as well as the burghers' resistance to these pressures. It moreover provides the chronicle dramatic terms in which to narrate these events which lead finally to the resolution of the chronicle. As in the quote above, if the burghers fail to receive Domingo's message it is because of a lack of human reason and sensibility. Chapter fifty-seven is rounded off with a final affirmation of the lengths gone to convince and even entice the burghers to stop their rebellion.

The good queen and all the nobles of the land promised them many goods, and the abbot and the monks admonished them as they could, but they thought only of killing and doing evil, spilling their venom like the offspring of vipers.²⁶⁰

This final passage before the first interdict in Sahagún raises the dramatic stakes of the burghers' response to the efforts to persuade them with words and gifts. The dramatic element of persuasion also highlights Domingo's role in this final stage of the conflict. As we will see in the final scene of the chronicle, if Domingo is able to convince the burghers to resubmit to his power it is because of his ability to move the burghers with the rhetorical force and charisma of his words. The possibility of converting the burghers with words offers Domingo a new kind of narrative agency. This agency defines the final part of the chronicle in the same way that narrative agency has defined previous sections and junctures in the story: the devotion and privileges of the kings of León, the chaotic contest for a dominant agency in the breakdown of order after Alfonso VI's death, and the burghers constructing instruments of torture for the peasants. The dramatic and personal terms of persuasion will remain a crucial dimension of the chronicle's account of Domingo's solicitations of ecclesiastical censures. The chronicle is afforded a more abstract language in which to couch the more ecclesiastically and socially pointed aspects of its use of the *libertas Romana* and the burghers' charter.

Ecclesiastical censure

²⁶⁰ 'La buena reina e todos los nobles de la tierra prometíanles muchos bienes, e a todo bien el abbad e los monjes amonestavan, pero ellos, así como generaciones de bíboras, derramando el benino, pensavan en qué manera matasen e feçiesen todo mal' CAS, ch. 57, p. 85.

The interdict and the excommunication were the church's two principal weapons of coercion. In the post-Gregorian era the use of both had taken on greater purpose in the contest between church and state.²⁶¹ Notionally, the interdict was meant to punish a group for the sins of their leaders, while the excommunication was reserved for the punishment of individuals for their own sins.²⁶² Both were intended to bring about the correction of offenders through the disruption of both the normal religious and social order.²⁶³ For example, the idea that an excommunicant was contagious within a larger society, and was therefore fully or partially excluded, was intrinsic to the censure.²⁶⁴ In the *Crónica* we witness the use of both these censures by Abbot Domingo and his supporters as weapons against the burghers. Importantly, however, the chronicle stresses the defensive and last-resort nature of Domingo's strategy. The chronicle shows how the burghers made the options necessary by their disruption of the social and religious order. The chronicle tells us that the whole town began to chafe under the burden of the interdict: the burghers themselves (chapter sixty-two, p. 91), the nobles (chapter sixty-six, p. 98), and even the cloister monks (chapter sixty-six, p. 99).

When Abbot Domingo decides to solicit Archbishop Bernard for an interdict against the burghers, the chronicle stresses that this was a last resort to answer the burghers' resistance to previous attempts to persuade them. Chapter fifty-eight begins:

Yet when the abbot saw that by no entreaty or admonishment would the burghers agree to put away their evil intentions, wanting to destroy the church of Sahagún, and also to return all the surrounding areas into a wasteland, and he cried, for he had already seen much of this done, he then sent a messenger to the same honourable man, archbishop Bernard of Toledo, asking him to suspend the divine service.²⁶⁵

²⁶¹ Vodola, *Excommunication*, pp. 20-3; H.E. Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085* (Oxford, 1998), p. 270.

²⁶² Clarke, *The Interdict in the Thirteenth Century*, pp. 1 & 14ff.

²⁶³ G. Scheilbelreiter, 'Church Structure and Organisation', *The New Cambridge Medieval History* I, c.500-c.700, (ed.) P. Fouracre, (Cambridge, 2005), p. 695.

²⁶⁴ Vodola, *Excommunication*, pp. 46-7.

²⁶⁵ "Veyendo pero todavía el abbad que por ninguna manera de ruego o amonestación los burgeses querían desistir ni cesar de aquesta mala conçevida entención, a menos de querer desolar e desfaçer la iglesia de Sant Fagum, e aún tornar toda la tierra çircunstante yerma, e ya llorava, pues que lo beía ser

The stress here is on the defensive nature of Domingo's decision. The cruelty of the burghers is also stressed and this strengthens the sense of Domingo's role as a necessary reaction to a group that presents an imminent threat to the monastery and is in danger of losing their own souls in their attacks on the church. We see how the urgency of the violence and spiritual danger of the burghers' tortures have pushed the chronicle towards this moment. Narrative processes we saw beginning to work in those scenes of torture are given full effect here. The central issue of the conflict has been narrowed to the confrontation between the monastery and the burghers. The Aragonese are for the moment forgotten about. It is also significant that the chronicle had stressed that promises by Queen Urraca and certain nobles had been tried and failed. The direct confrontation between the monastery and the burghers becomes more narrowly about Abbot Domingo's spiritual power over the burghers and the efficacy of an ecclesiastical response where political approaches had failed.

The archbishop agrees to deliver the interdict in the town and in the monastery (the chronicle says that it was feared that the burghers would break into the monastery by force to hear the divine service if it was continued there). His letters are sent to the burghers:

the archbishop agreed to do what the abbot asked. He sent letters to the burghers putting them under interdiction. And as he feared that in their revolt of this sentence the burgher's pride would only grow and they would simply break into the church by force to hear the divine office (if it should be celebrated there) he stopped the divine office in the monastery as well.²⁶⁶

Here the chronicle describes the burghers' madly hostile reaction:

When the burghers read these letters they were moved to such anger and indignation that they went mad, and if the abbot had been there with them then they would have torn him to pieces like wild beasts. But the will of God had arranged it so that the abbot was

fecho en gran parte, entonces enbió mensajero al honrrado barón susodicho arçobispo de Toledo para que los suspendiese del ofiçio divinal" CAS, ch. 58, pp. 85-6.

²⁶⁶ *'el arçobispo consintió a fazer lo que demandava el abbad, e luego enbió letras a los burgeses, poniéndoles entredicho. E por quanto él temía que por aquesta contumaçia e rebeldía su gran soberbia crescería e de ligero quebrantarían los burgeses por fuerça la iglesia para oir el dibinal ofiçio, si en ella se çelebrase, e por aquesta causa e suspeçión, aún el dicho monasterio puso entredicho e defendió el divinal ofiçio'* CAS, ch. 58, p. 86.

then absent from them. And yet they could hardly be stopped, it was only by divine will, from throwing the monks out of the cloister on that day.²⁶⁷

The announcement of the interdict dramatically fails to persuade the burghers to give up their rebellion. This is not, however, taken to be failure of this new strategy. It is, as we have seen suggested before, the burghers' own failings of reason and soul that delay their capitulation. This also strengthens the motives of the original justification of ecclesiastical censure.

In this instance, the ecclesiastical letters are not put into the text of the chronicle, as will be the case in the future, but the chronicle continues to emphasise the burghers' own ecclesiastical attack lead by their clerics:

However, the clerics defied the interdiction of the archbishop and celebrated the offices (not divine but diabolical) in church and even (awful to say) in public houses where they put up tents. They also sent messengers to the abbot saying that if he wanted good counsel for his life, he would not dare to return to the monastery. When the abbot received these messengers, he fled. And without his garments or any of his things he went like a fugitive for two months.²⁶⁸

Certain details here, for example that the burghers sent messengers to Abbot Domingo, recall the role of the burghers in the previous narrative section of the chronicle. Sending messengers to King Alfonso I had been one of the principal ways that the chronicle had shown the burghers achieving agency in the narrative; there they sent messengers to Alfonso I to collude with him against the monastery, or to incite his hatred against the abbot and monks. Now these messengers are sent directly to the monastery emphasizing the direct confrontation between the groups.

²⁶⁷ *'Las quales letras resçevidas, los burgeses en tanta yra se ençendieron e con tanta yndignaçión se alteraron e enloqueçieron, que si al abad obiesen avido los ojos, en pedaços, a manera de bestias fieras, le obiesen despedaçado. Mas la bondad de Dios probeyó que sí acaesçió el abbad ser ausente, pero apenas se podieron refrenar, causándolo la divina permisión, que en aquel día non echaron a los monjes fuera del claustro'* CAS, ch. 58, p. 86.

²⁶⁸ *'Mas los clérigos, despreçiando el entredicho del arçobispo, el ofiçio, non divino mas diabólico, non tan solamente en las iglesias, mas aún, lo que es feo de deçir, por las casas públicas çelebraban, alçadas las tiendas. Enbiaron al avad mensajeros que si quisiese bien aconsejar a su vida, non presumiese de retornar al monasterio; e él resçevidos los mensajeros, fuyó. E desnudo e despojado de todas las cosas, andando fuidiço por dos meses'* Ibid., ch. 58, p. 86.

The chronicle now moves on to the next attempt to persuade the burghers with ecclesiastical censure. In chapter fifty-nine, the archbishop calls a general synod in León. The year is 1114. The chronicle says that Abbot Domingo attended and made a complaint of the burghers before the synod. The chronicle describes how:

the abbot of Sahagún was present at that synod, and he recited and told before the synod, which was full of the said prelates, the sorrowful story of the destruction of the monastery and of its great afflictions, sufferings, and banishments. When they heard the complaint, the whole synod was moved to compassion and determined that the burghers were deserving of ecclesiastical vengeance and damnation.²⁶⁹

The chronicle says that the sentence of excommunication was deferred. Some of the burghers were present at the synod and promised to satisfy the demands of the monastery. The dramatic terms of this scene of Domingo before the synod are significant. In effect, we are shown the desired response to Domingo's attempts at persuasion. Here Domingo's case is presented as a 'sorrowful story' (*historia llorosa*), and the whole synod is moved to 'compassion' (*compasión*) to hear it told. In later scenes this reaction will become more emotionally acute.

At this point the Aragonese re-enter the narrative. The chronicle says that Alfonso I sent a new deputy to take control of Sahagún at this point, one Giraldo Diablo ('Giraldo Devil'), as the chronicle says he is called. The chronicle goes into great detail over the cruel character of Giraldo, and even the ugliness of his face. When Giraldo learns that the burghers have come to Sahagún with Archbishop Bernard in order to satisfy Abbot Domingo, he sets traps for the archbishop, who only manages to escape by taking another road out of the town.²⁷⁰ With this the chronicle says that the bishops

²⁶⁹ *'a aqueste sínodo fue presente el abbad de San Fagún, e reçitó e declaró en el sínodo, lleno de los dichos prelados, historia llorosa de la destrucción de el monasterio e de sus grandes afliçiones, amarguras e destierros. Los quales quexos oyendo, todo el sínodo movido a compasión deliberó e sentençió los burgeses ser mereçedores de bndicta e eclesiástica maldición'* CAS, ch. 59, p. 87.

²⁷⁰ *'E como aqueste oyó que'l arçobispo avía de venir a la villa de Sant Fagum e los burgeses en su presençia abían de satisfaçer al abbad, pússole asechanças escondidamente, non para lo tomar, mas como el mui cruel después afirmava, para lo matar.'* ('And when he heard that the archbishop had to come to the town of Sahagún and that the burghers had to satisfy the abbot, he set a secret trap, not to capture the abbot, but (as this cruel man affirmed later) to kill him' *Ibid.*, ch. 59, p. 88.

of the synod decided to deliver the deferred excommunication.²⁷¹ Here the chronicle inserts the text of the excommunication itself.

We will look at the text itself in chapter five of this study, when we turn to an analysis of the documents of the chronicle themselves. The chronicle describes the burghers' hostile reaction to the excommunication, saying, 'of all the insults and injuries that they said against the abbot with their lips of venom, it would seem unpleasant and unnecessary for me to recount'.²⁷² With Giraldo the chronicle reintroduces the Aragonese to the story, now as a complicating factor in the effort to persuade the burghers with ecclesiastical censure. In the second narrative section the chronicle focused on the Aragonese as allies of the burghers against the monastery. It is this focus that continues to characterise the place of the Aragonese in the story.

With Giraldo installed in the town, the burghers once more have military force in their favour. In chapter sixty-one, Domingo is chased out of the town:

The abbot then fled from the face of Giraldo and of the burghers, fleeing like the hart flees before the hunter's arrows and the cruel dog's teeth. And, because he could not find a place that was safe, he went to the court of the queen, and went with her on horseback, not daring to leave her side even for an hour.²⁷³

However, the contrast is now between the burghers' new position of strength with the Aragonese returned as their allies, and Domingo's ecclesiastical authority over their souls and their place in the religious community. In the following chapter, the chronicle says that some of the burghers began to turn against the clerics who continued to hold mass in the interdict. The chronicle is ambiguous as to their true motives, at first presenting their change of heart as fact, but later asserting that their sincerity was only a ruse to gain Abbot Domingo's confidence. The chronicle describes how:

²⁷¹ *'Entonçes, llamados los obispos, que por aventura le çercavan su costado e aconpañavan, por acto de excomuniòn e maldiçión enredó e ató, así como era ordenado en el sínodo'* ('Then, with the bishops that happened to be with him, he bound the burghers with the excommunication and damnation that had been ordained by the synod') CAS, ch. 59, p. 88.

²⁷² *'quántos denuestos al arçobispo, quántos obprovios al abbad con los labios abeninados dixeron, feo me paresçe escrever e non nesçesario'* *Ibid.*, ch. 60, p. 89.

²⁷³ *'El abbd fuió entonçes de la haz de Giraldo e de los burgeses, alongándose así como el benado fuye quando bee las saetas de los çaçadores e los dientes de los canes crueles. E por quanto non podía fallar lugar que le fuese seguro, fuésede la corte de la reina, e con ella andava e cavalgava, e non se osava partir aún por una ora d'ella'* *Ibid.*, ch. 61, p. 89.

Some of the burghers began to abhor and revile the offices that the clerics were celebrating mass against reason or right; they said that they had rightly deserved the sentence of excommunication with which they had been punished. Yet they did all this with malice and deceit as it was clear afterward, thinking that if they could lure the abbot into their confidence and trust, they could then kill him more easily.²⁷⁴

In fact, as the story develops it appears that the burghers were willing to submit to Abbot Domingo but are prevented. Chapter sixty-two continues with an extended account of how the burghers travelled to Cea Castle where Domingo had sought refuge with Queen Urraca. The burghers request that the queen hand over Domingo to them, promising to return with him to Sahagún where they will swear an oath of allegiance. The queen and abbot are sceptical though they eventually give in. Domingo arrives back in Sahagún that night and is joyously welcomed by the burghers. They agree that the burghers will swear their oaths the following morning. The oath-taking ceremony goes well at first, but at the end of the day half of the burghers are still waiting to take their oaths. It is agreed that these will be postponed until the following day. However, that night Abbot Domingo is called away to perform the funeral mass for a nun at the local nunnery of San Pedro. He goes but during the mass he is attacked by Giraldo and a group of burghers. Domingo and his followers (one of these is the author of the chronicle) manage to escape. With this attack the narrative does not return to the burghers' oaths.

We will discuss this scene of the burghers' oath-taking and the attack at the nunnery of San Pedro again in the fourth chapter of this study where we look more closely at the role of the author in the narrative and the story of the chronicle. Here we focus specifically on the way that this dramatised episode presents a further step in the chronicle's expression of the monastery's ecclesiastical power over the burghers. This happens largely through a set of speeches made by the characters as first the burghers endeavour to persuade Abbot Domingo to return with them to Sahagún from

²⁷⁴ *'Algunos de los burgeses en este medio començaron a aborresçer e denostar el ofiçio que los clérigos contra raçón e justiçia celebravan; deçían que dignamente avían meresçido la sentençia de excomunió con que fueran feridos, mas todo aquesto façían e diçían, según que después paresçió claramente, con maliçia e engaño por si podiesen atraer al abbad a que les creyese e se confiase en ellos porque después ligeramente lo matasen'* CAS, ch. 62, p. 90.

Cea Castle and then as Abbot Domingo prepares to receive the burghers' oath. The scene of the burghers' arrival at Cea Castle is made more complex, in terms of the interactions of various characters and authorities, by the presence of Queen Urraca as Abbot Domingo's protector. When the burghers first arrive and request that Queen Urraca hand over Abbot Domingo, the chronicle says that Urraca was sceptical of their good faith and so was Domingo. The abbot expresses the vulnerability of his position in Sahagún:

“Certainly, me being with Giraldo in the town of Sahagún is just like the defenceless lamb being in the corral with the very cruel wolf, or just like the innocent fallow deer standing before the terrible lion. Certainly, I know the faith and loyalty of the burghers very well, and no longer can I trust their words”.²⁷⁵

In its language and metaphoric expression this speech looks back to chapter twenty-six where Archbishop Bernard reproached Abbot Diego for his decision to resign his abbacy: ‘not to abandon [the monks] nor leave them to be swallowed in the throats of the wolves’ (*‘que non los desmanparase, nin los dexase tragar en las gargantas de los lovos’*); and again: ‘not to leave or abandon the flock entrusted to him’ (*‘non dexase nin desmanparase la grei a él encomendada’*).²⁷⁶ In that episode of monastic crisis it was Abbot Diego who was looked to for protection of the monks, Archbishop Bernard who stepped in when Diego resigned, and eventually Abbot Domingo who was elected as the next leader of the flock. Now it is the abbot himself who is threatened. However, the problem of political and military support is put to one side by the burghers' response. It is the burghers that return to the ecclesiastical and spiritual issues at stake in their relationship to Abbot Domingo:

“we entreat you, father, for the sake of Jesus Christ and that religious habit which you wear, that you no longer desire for our bodies to be in perdition, nor our souls in lasting damnation. It is a long time now since we cried when we saw ourselves taken away from God and cruelly punished with the knife of damnation. And we have not been

²⁷⁵ “Por çierto, estando yo con Giraldo en la villa de Sant Fagum, semejante yo estaría con él como está el cordero sin armas en el corral con el lovo mui cruel; e así como está el gamo ynoçente ante'l león mui espantoso. Yo, por çierto, ya bien he yo conoçido la fe e lealtad de los burgeses, e de aquí adelante non puedo nin me devo confiar en sus palabras” CAS, ch. 62, p. 90.

²⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, ch. 26, p. 45.

able to enter our houses for they are full of the stench of unburied bodies. So we beg you on our knees, with all doubt cast aside agree to come with us now, for we are ready, from the least to the greatest, to return the town to your lordship and to promise you our faith and loyalty, making an oath on the four evangelists. Suffice it that until now we have been in error and judge us to have followed a way of injustice and inequality.”²⁷⁷

This is the fullest account of the burghers own take on their situation under the excommunication. The burghers may have made such a speech. But given the very deliberate arrangement of the scene as a vehicle for a demonstration of the relative functions and meanings of royal and ecclesiastical authority, the speech is best read as a ventriloquisation of the burghers’ voice for the chronicler’s own purpose. Indeed, the chronicle already suggested that the burghers’ part in this scene is disingenuous, yet the chronicle still proceeds to give the whole of the burghers’ speech. In this the ‘real’ meaning of the scene stands apart from the discourse of authority and lordship conveyed by the scene.

The burghers begin here to respond to Abbot Domingo’s new strategy. They have begun to be persuaded by the damaging effects of the excommunication. And this leads them to recognise Domingo’s power over them. This leads directly to the most pointed demonstration of Abbot Domingo’s ecclesiastical lordship over the burghers. Although the chronicle says that he remained wary of their motives, Abbot Domingo conceded to the burghers’ entreaty. The chronicle says that when the abbot met the burghers outside the castle they swore to him before the Queen and her nobles that:

²⁷⁷ *“rogámoste, padre, por Jesuchristo e por aquese ávito de religión que traes, que ya non quieras más dar nuestros cuerpos en perdiçión, nin nuestras ánimas a perdurable dapnaçión. Mucho tiempo es que gemimos beyéndonos alongados de Dios e cruelmente feridos del cochillo de maldiçión; e en nuestras casas non pudiendo entrar, seyendo llenas de fedor de los cuerpos non enterrados; pues de rodillas te rogamos, quitada toda dubda, tengas por bien de benir con nosotros, pues somos todos aparejados, del menor fasta el mayor, de someter a tu señorío toda la villa, prometiéndote fee e lealtad, façiéndote juramento sobre los quatro ebangelios; abástanos ya aver herrado fasta aquí e pésanos aver seguido cosa ynjusta e desyqual”* CAS, ch. 62, p. 91.

they would submit the town of Sahagún to his lordship and power, revoke it from the power of the king of Aragón. In other words, they promised to return it safe and sound to where they had taken it.²⁷⁸

The burghers welcome Domingo back to the town that night and it is decided that the oath-taking will proceed the following morning. When they were all gathered in the consistory and ready to begin, the implications of the distinction between the abbot's power and that of Alfonso I made in the passage above are made overt. The chronicle describes how Domingo came to meet the burghers and requested the *libertas Romana* be read to them:

And when he sat in the middle of them he requested that the privilege by which the bishop of Rome, Gregory VII of blessed memory, had made the church of Sahagún free from all power and service, secular or ecclesiastical, be brought in.²⁷⁹

Abbot Domingo's production of the *libertas Romana* just as the burghers are prepared to take an oath of fidelity makes the case that this is to be understood as an ecclesiastical oath.²⁸⁰ In fact, this is the moment when the abbot should have brought out the *fuero* of Alfonso VI. That, we know, is the document that establishes the burghers' submission to the monastery's lordship. The chronicle is able to use the *libertas Romana* in defence of the threat of Alfonso I. The chronicle is clear that this threat persists with Giraldo Diablo in the town. This defensive position, and the defensive nature of the *libertas Romana* which does not so much give power as give exemptions or protections against the interference of power, provides the initial cause to invoke the *libertas* at this moment. But the meaning of the privilege is extended beyond just protection to ecclesiastical lordship over the burghers. It is the burghers (as the chronicle has it) that read this meaning into Abbot Domingo's gesture, and the words of the privilege. The burghers respond:

²⁷⁸ 'la villa de Sant Fagum someterían a su señoría e boluntad, arredrando todo señoría e poderío de el rei de Aragón; en otra manera, que prometían de lo retornar sano e salvo de donde lo sacaban' CAS, ch. 62, p. 91.

²⁷⁹ "E como se asentase en medio d'ellos, por ruego suyo fiço traer el privilegio, con el qual el obispo de Roma de bien abenturada memoria Gregorio séptimo la iglesia de San Fagum ennobleció e fiço libre e esentó de todo poderío e servidunbre, así seglar como eclesiástico" *Ibid.*, ch. 62, p. 91.

²⁸⁰ See K. Pennington, 'Feudal Oath of Fidelity and Homage', *Law as Profession and Practice in Medieval Europe*, (eds.) K. Pennington & M.H. Eichbauer (Farnham, 2001), 93-115 (pp. 114-5 esp.).

“That is just. That pleases us. Let us live under the protection of the most holy Roman Church, the power of St Peter and the church of Sahagún.”²⁸¹

Here is the explicit expression from the burghers, and from the chronicle, that Domingo’s lordship over the burghers is to be understood as ecclesiastical lordship based on the terms of the *libertas*. It is presented in the chronicle without any explicit sense from Domingo or the burghers that there is anything novel in this oath. However, in the dramatic account of the episode, the burghers are made to celebrate the idea of gaining St Peter and the papacy as overlords. ‘That pleases us’ (*‘aquésto nos plaçe’*), they declare. This arrangement is also expressed with an imperative force: ‘Let us live ...’ (*‘que nos bibamos’*). These at least suggest an understanding on the burghers’ part that this is a new expression of the monastery’s lordship.

Yet, the chronicle also continues to stress the defensive need for such an approach. After the burghers had expressed their willingness to live under the lordship of St Peter and Rome, the oath is ready to go forward. Abbot Domingo calls for the gospel book to be brought out for the oaths. However, it is at this point that Giraldo shows up at the consistory with a fellow Aragonese soldier, one Eustochio. He insists that Abbot Domingo should swear allegiance to King Alfonso I before the burghers should swear an oath to him:

“When, O burghers, will you submit yourselves and this town to the king? It is now just and reasonable that the abbot should first give his faith and promise to the king; and, afterwards, that he should receive the same from you”.²⁸²

Giraldo’s provocation acts as a prompt for Abbot Domingo to reiterate the exemption powers of the *libertas*:

“It is not of my order to promise or swear to the king or queen, rather I will give just as much service and honour to whichever of them will take the kingdom as their own as the abbots of this monastery before me were accustomed to give to kings. In other

²⁸¹“*Aquésto es justo, aquésto nos plaçe; que nos bibamos so la guarda de la mui santa Romana iglesia e del señorío de San Pedro e del abad de San Fagum*” CAS, ch. 62, p. 91.

²⁸²“*Quando vos, o burgeses, a vos e a esta villa por vuestra boluntad al rei sometistes, justo es agora e raçorable que el abbad primeramente dé su fee e prometimiento al rei; e después conseguientemente lo semejante resçiva de vos.*” *Ibid.*, ch. 62, p. 92.

words, I will not submit this monastery to any mortal man for (as it has already been said) this monastery has been put under the protection of Saint Peter; and so that neither I nor any other should presume to do this, the Holy Father has prohibited it with his privilege".²⁸³

This argument which invokes the historical relationship between the monastery and the monarchy even as it maintains a distance between the two based on the terms of the *libertas* is one that has been made before in the chronicle. In chapter twenty-seven, for example, in the first wave of burgher attacks on the monastery, the chronicle complained about how the burghers had turned Alfonso I against them:

As the abbot and the monks were always accustomed to receive royal support and love, they thought that there would be no way to live peacefully without the royal blessing and support of Alfonso I; and, furthermore, they still thought that he might come to show them royal piety; for, as I said before, each day they prayed to the Lord for him, although he meant to do them harm.²⁸⁴

In this earlier chapter the invocation of the monastery's relation with the monarchy is made as a complaint over the monastery's lack of royal protection. In this latter scene there is a distancing from royal power and protection. The monastery's relationship with the monarchy is established custom but it does not signify dependency or submission. The chronicle says that at this point Giraldo went home to plot Domingo's death, and the oath-taking was allowed to continue. The episode ends with Domingo being called away in the night, and then attacked at the nunnery of San Pedro the next day. Thus, the force of the scene, the momentum it builds towards a new understanding between the monastery and the burghers of their relative positions as lord and subject is dissipated. In this we might, in fact, glimpse the space

²⁸³ "Non pertenesçe a mi orden que al rei o a la reina deva de prometer o jurar, mas qualquiera d'ellos que a sí apropiare el reino e le pertenesçiere, a tal como a queste yo daré tal serviçio e honor qual los mis antepasados abades acostunbraron dar e pagar a los reyes. En otra manera, a queste monasterio yo non someteré a ningún ome mortal, pues que ya como es dicho, so la guarda e proteçión de San Pedro es puesto, e porque yo nin otro alguno esto presuma façer, el santo padre por su privilegio luego lo bedó" CAS, ch. 62, p. 92.

²⁸⁴ 'El abbat e monjes, por quanto sienpre eran acostunbrados de reçevoir ayuda real e amor, pensávanse en ninguna manera poder vebir paçíficamente sin su bendiçión e ayuda real, pensando aún otrosí que él misericordiosamente usaría con ellos con piedad real, pues que por él, así como dixen, de cada día haçían plegaria al Señor, bien que el dicho rei aparejava a ellos daño' *Ibid.*, ch. 27, pp. 49-50.

between the legal argument that is conveyed in this scene and throughout these final chapters, and the episodic and chronological story in which the argument is conveyed. The argument over lordship controls the set-piece scene itself, the interaction between the characters and their speeches, but it does not carry forward beyond the scene. The dramatic storyline takes over to move events forward.

The next three chapters (sixty-three to sixty-five) tell of the Queen's capture of Giraldo and some of his men and the punishments meted out for their crimes. In chapter sixty-five Domingo is chased into exile once more and the chronicle says that he spent five months in Mayorga. In chapter sixty-six, the chronicle says that local nobles turned against the burghers because of the interdict and that their complaints pressured King Alfonso to seek peace with Domingo. The king suggests that he will drop his hostility against the monastery if Domingo will pardon Giraldo and absolve the burghers of their excommunication. Domingo is resistant, but the chronicle says that some of the monks who were anxious to have the interdiction lifted pressured him. Domingo agrees and the chronicle adds that he had the burghers swear an oath:

that each of them would place their right hand on the altar of Sahagún and promise to return in full everything that they had robbed or taken away from the abbot's lordship. But afterward none of them did this.²⁸⁵

The stipulation of the return of the monastery's property is significant. Previously, Domingo's attempts to secure an oath of submission from the burghers had focused only on Domingo's lordship itself, and it was established that this was ecclesiastical lordship in contrast to the political lordship of Alfonso I. Here a new element is added to the equation. We will see how property increasingly comes to define the central sticking point between the burghers and the monastery. At this juncture, however, the chronicle introduces Abbot Domingo's next effort to impose ecclesiastical censure upon the burghers.

At the end of chapter sixty-nine the chronicle describes how Abbot Domingo travelled to Rome to attend a Lateran council called by Pope Paschal II. The council was

²⁸⁵ *'que cada uno d'ellos posiese la mano diestra sobre el altar de Sant Fagum, prometiendo que todas las cosas que avían robado e usurpado del señorío del abbad enteramente restituyesen e reformatasen, la qual cosa después ninguno d'ellos cunplio'* CAS, ch. 66, p. 99.

held in March 1116.²⁸⁶ The chronicle describes how Domingo and a small retinue (which includes the author of the chronicle) made the difficult pass through the Pyrenees in winter and the long journey to Rome. The chronicle then describes how Abbot Domingo met with Pope Paschal and complained about the rebellious burghers. The chronicle describes the reaction of the papal audience:

And when we had kissed the feet of the holy father and he had received us kindly and with paternal affection, the abbot recounted to him all that he had suffered at the hands of the burghers: his expulsion from the monastery; the destruction of the monastery; the uprooting of the woodland; and the wasting of the entire region and province.

When they had heard of all these plagues, of the destruction of the monastery by the burghers, and how tyrants and evildoers had devastated that noble kingdom, the cardinals were overcome with fear, the bishops were stunned, the archbishops were astonished, the noble Romans present there cried out, and the holy father was moved to tears. And bathing himself in tears, he turned to the rest and told them about the place where that monastery was founded. That same man told them about all the delights of their woodland, the abundance of the monastery, and he praised above all the religiousness of that order; he even began to extol the noble king Don Alfonso VI, of blessed memory. And again and many times he repeated these things, for it happened that when he was a cardinal under Pope Urban II, of holy memory, he had visited this place, and had seen their great amity with the king.²⁸⁷

²⁸⁶ The record of the council is preserved at: J.D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 21 (Venice, 1776), p. 145-52.

²⁸⁷ *'E como ya obiésemos besado los pies del Santo Padre e él nos obiese resçevido benignamente e con afecto paternal, el abbad le recontó por orden todo lo que avía sofrido de los burgeses, e cómo d'ellos fue echado del monasterio, e de la destroición del dicho monasterio, del arancamiento del monte e desipación de toda la región e provinçia.*

Oída la turbaçión de tantas pestilençias e de la destruçión de aqueste monasterio fecha por los burgeses, e en qué manera los tiranos e malfechores obiesen desfecho el mui noble reino, espantáronse los cardenales, enbaçaron los obispos, espaboresçieron los arçobispos, gimieron los mui nobles romanos presentes, e el mui Santo Padre fue mobido a lloro; e bañado con lágrimas, bolvióse a todos, declarándoles el sito del lugar en que este monasterio es fundado. E eso mesmo començó a esplanar la delectaçión del monte, la abastança del monasterio, aprovando sobre todo la religión de la orden; e aún

This is the second time that we have seen Abbot Domingo's story move a sympathetic audience, after his complaint against the burghers at the synod of León in 1114 (chapter fifty-nine). In this case his speech is telling for the way that it begins to shift the central issue of the conflict. It had been more generally about lordship and the chronicle had suggested the ecclesiastical basis for this in contrast to the royal lordship of King Alfonso I. With the burghers' declaration of their willingness to accept St Peter, the pope, and Abbot Domingo as their ecclesiastical lords, the chronicle now looks to more material matters keeping the two sides apart. Abbot Domingo's complaint raises the past wrongs of the burghers; the abbot's many expulsions from the monastery and the burghers' attacks on the monastery's woodland are the two specific complaints in addition to the general charge of destruction of the whole region. We see in this how the chronicle, having established in speeches and in the dramatic narrative the argument for ecclesiastical lordship itself, begins to shift to the obstacles in the way of a resolution to the present conflict.

But, this scene is also a further iteration of the sustained argument about the nature of Abbot Domingo's authority. Specifically, this scene emphasises the personal nature of the relationship between Pope Paschal II and the monastery of Sahagún and Alfonso VI. At the beginning of the chronicle it was Alfonso VI who petitioned Pope Gregory VII to aid him in religious reforms, now it is this later pope who invokes the memory of the late king. The pope also lends his powers to the resolution of the monastery's troubles with the burghers. Pope Paschal agrees to grant Domingo anything that might help his cause: "Try and think how I might be able to help you, for with all my soul, in goodwill, I will help you in all that I can".²⁸⁸ The chronicle describes the abbot's response:

When the abbot received this promise and expression of goodwill, among the many things that passed between them, he asked that he might be given by his apostolic authority the power and ability to

comenzó a ensalçar alabando al mui noble rei don Alfonso, de buena memoria. E una e muchas beças repetía todo lo sobredicho, ca acaesçíerale, seyendo cardenal, so el papa Urbano segundo, de santa memoria, aber visto estas cosas con sus ojos e aver avido gran amistad con el rei' CAS, ch. 69, p. 105.

²⁸⁸ "Trata e piensa cómo e en qué manera te puedo ayudar, ca por la mi alma, de buena voluntad te do ayuda en todo lo que yo pudiere" *Ibid.*, ch. 69, p. 106.

bind and release, to excommunicate and absolve, the burghers in order to check and tame their arrogance and ferocity.²⁸⁹

We will discuss the implications of this grant of authority and the letters themselves in chapter five of this study. What interests us for the moment is the description of Domingo's return to Sahagún and his attempt to put his new power into effect against the burghers.

Abbot Domingo's return to Sahagún and his attempt to secure a new oath of submission from the burghers is told in chapter seventy-three of the chronicle. As in chapter sixty-two, where Domingo had the *libertas Romana* read to the burghers, at his return Domingo calls the burghers before him and has the pope's letters read. As in chapter sixty-two, the burghers again shout their willingness to live under the power of Saint Peter and Abbot Domingo:

"From this day on, we do not wish to be subjects neither of the king nor queen, nor any other mortal, but we wish to live under the protection of Saint Peter and the Holy Father, and the power of our abbot, so that we might escape the sentence of excommunication".²⁹⁰

The burghers agree to take an oath confirming their willingness to return to Domingo's power and the chronicle says that they also agreed to satisfy the abbot on certain points:

And also they consented and ordained that they would return in full the lands and vineyards that had been the monastery's, and also the orchards and all the things that they had stolen that belonged to the monastery.

Furthermore they promised to cast the new laws and customs that they had chosen and written into the fire; and swearing this, they agreed to renounce all lordship, submitting to the lordship of no mortal power and content to live according to the laws and customs

²⁸⁹ *'E el abbad, resçevido el dicho prometimiento e boluntad, entre muchas cosas que pasava e rebolvía entre sí, demandó que le fuese otorgado por autoridad apostólica derecho e facultad de atar e soltar, excomulgar e absolver en los burg[u]eses, por poder reprimir e domar la arrogancia e brabeça de ellos'* CAS, ch. 69, p. 106.

²⁹⁰ *"De aqueste día en adelante, non queremos ser sujetos nin a rei nin a reina, nin [a] algún otro mortal, mas so la gu[a]rda de San Pedro e protección del Santo Padre, e so el señorío del nuestro abbad queremos beber, porque podamos esquivir la sentençia de excomunió"* *Ibid.*, ch. 73, p. 110.

that in the time of the king Don Alfonso of good memory they were accustomed to live under.²⁹¹

Property becomes at this late stage in the dispute a central issue. The oath is confirmed, but the chronicle says that Domingo was reluctant to press the burghers on the return of the monastery's lands, fearing the fragility of the new accord. At this impasse, with the burghers willing to recognise Abbot Domingo as their ecclesiastical lord but unwilling to satisfy him on the return of the monastery's lands, he presses the burghers to make peace with Queen Urraca. It seems that Queen Urraca had reasserted her power in the town at this point. These final events of the chronicle are certainly being shaped by the back and forth of the civil war as each side takes and retakes control of Sahagún. The chronicle plays down the role played by these outside forces, as we will increasingly see, so that the focus remains on the role of ecclesiastical power and Domingo's personal ability. This episode is most likely also a contraction into a single incident of events that stretched out over weeks or months perhaps. A better clue to this comes at the end of the episode as we will see.

The chronicle says that Domingo began to regret that Urraca was still unable to visit the tombs of her parents and called on them to make peace with her. He reproaches the burghers:

“When, O burghers, will you renounce the power of men and come to the protection of the martyrs of Jesus Christ. It is right now that I work for all that might be of benefit to you, and that I take advantage of the moment so that you might live and rest in peace. You well know how the king Don Alfonso brought you together from diverse nations and provinces, and with what filial and paternal love and affection he dealt with you. So now it does not seem right that we should despise his daughter as if she were a foreigner and deny her to come to visit the sepulchre of her father and mother. For you must stop now and prudently understand that if you wish to live in

²⁹¹ *‘E aún estableçieron e ordenaron de restituir enteramente las tierras e viñas que avían seído del monasterio; eso mesmo los güertos e todas las cosas que avían rogado pertenesciente al monasterio.*

Otrosí prometieron que las nuevas leyes e costumbres que ellos avían fecho e ordenado, que las echarían e quemarían en el fuego; e, jurando, deliveraron de se quitar de todo señorío, nin se dar a señorío de ninguno de los mortales, contentos de vibir según las leyes y costumbres que en los tiempos del rei don Alfonso de buena memoria acostumbraron a bevir’ CAS, ch. 73, p. 110.

Spain your sons and grandchildren, whether they wish to or not, must live together with the sons and grandchildren of the king Don Alfonso VI; and you will be the guardians of a great treasure if you will leave the lordship of foreigners and join with the queen and use her as a friend. Let my sensible counsel please you, and let us receive the queen as a daughter of King Alfonso VI, and let us ally ourselves with her as our natural lord".²⁹²

Whatever might have been the political and military events that brought Urraca to Sahagún, the chronicler uses her arrival to give Domingo this speech in which he advocates for the queen. It is now Domingo, newly returned with his papal powers over the burghers, that intervenes on behalf of political power. It is a new confidence and potency for the abbot. Yet the plan to bring Urraca into the arrangement between the monastery and the burghers backfired. The burghers agreed to welcome the queen into the town, but when it was afterward suggested that they swear an oath of allegiance to her, the burghers backslide on their deal with Domingo and pressed the queen to sign their charter:

"O queen, we will never confirm this oath with you unless you confirm a charter which we have written and chosen, and confirm that the things of the monastery that we have we have bought, in turn from Sanchiáñez, Guillermo Falcón, Ramiro, the brother of the king of Aragón, and Giraldo, the son of the devil; we want you to confirm these customs that we have written after the death of your father that say that the lands of the monastery which we possess today are ours. Otherwise, we will not make peace with you".²⁹³

²⁹² "Quando jo burgeses!, despreziado el señorío de todos los onbres, vos pasastes a la proptección de los mártires de Jesuchristo, digna cosa es que yo sirva e procure todo lo que fuere a vos provechoso; e que aprobeche como bidades en reposo e en paz. Bien sabedes agora cómo e en qué manera el rei don Alfonso vos ayuntó de diversas naçiones e provinçias; e con quánto amor filial e afecto paternal vos trató. Pues agora non paresçe bien que a su fija despreçiemos ansí como a estraña, e neguemos que no benga a visitar el sepulcro de su padre e madre. Pues parad mientes agora e prudentemente considerad que vuestros fijos e nietos an de bivar, o quieran o non, si quisieren morar en España, con los fixos e nietos del rei don Alfonso; pues gran tesoro les guardáredes si, dexando el señorío de los estraños, vos allegáredes al serviçio de la reina e usáredes de su amistança. Plégavos pues agora este mi sano consejo: que la reina, ansí como a fixa del rei Alfonso, resçivamos e ansí como a natural señora nos allegemos" CAS, ch. 73, pp. 111-12.

²⁹³ "Por çierto, nosotros en ninguna manera jo reina! firmaremos contigo juramento si no confirmares a nosotros una carta que nosotros escrivimos e ordenamos, consentiendo en todas las cosas que por preçio

This is the first that we hear of the burghers' contention that they had gained the monastery's land and possessions from Alfonso I's deputies. The chronicle does not directly address this defence, but land has become the pressing issue on both sides according to the chronicle's account. It is revealing that the burghers' charter, which previously was given out to comprise new laws for such local functions as the use of the mills, is now said to contain an exemption for lands bought from the deputies listed. In fact, the burghers' charter was first mentioned in chapter twenty-seven; Sanchiáñez arrives in chapter thirty and the others after this. Either the burghers have added this point to their document or the chronicle has added this detail for its own purposes.

What happens next is disaster for the monastery. First, Queen Urraca sidesteps the burghers' demand that she sign their charter with an invocation of the exemption of the *libertas Romana*:

“You well know that in this town my father did not incline to take anything for himself; he yielded his royal lordship. For all these things are granted and consecrated to God and his martyrs, and no mortal may own or inherit any title or deed to them. But however that may be, I confirm that charter as it pertains to me”.²⁹⁴

Seeing that their first strategy has failed, the burghers pressure the queen to have Abbot Domingo sign their charter. At first he complains that they have failed to uphold their initial oath to recognise his authority over them:

“Forcing me to sign your charter, you ask me to do something unjust, for this is not what the Holy Father admonished you to do in his letter, nor is this what you agreed to in your oath. Where is that oath now? With God as a witness you swore to me on the four evangelists

conpramos, agora Sanchiáñez, o de Guillelmo Falcón, o de Ramiro, hermano del rei de Aragón, o de Giraldo, fijo del demonio; queremos aún que confirmes las costumbres que después de la muerte de tu padre ordenamos, porque las heredades de el monasterio que oy poseemos sean nuestras. En otra manera, non abremos concordia contigo, nin paz” CAS, ch. 73, p. 112.

²⁹⁴ *“Bosotros bien sabedes que mi padre en aquesta villa non quiso nin apropió a sí alguna cosa, sacando el real señorío, ca todas las cosas son dados e consagradas a Dios e a los sus mártires. E ninguno de los mortales, por razón e respeto de heredad e posesión, puede aver firmes nin seguras; mas que quier que ello sea, quanto lo que a mi pertenesçe, aquesta carta yo confirmo” Ibid., ch. 73, p. 113.*

and you promised to return all the things which you had stolen from us”.²⁹⁵

However, the burghers continue to press him and after a brief back and forth, the abbot follows the queen in sidestepping the issue:

“Then I confirm that charter for you, save always my order and the right of this monastery”.²⁹⁶

The chronicle says that the burghers did not understand the full meaning of this response, but recognizing that they would in the final place have to extract the oath from the monks themselves they demand that they confirm, and the monks agree, shouting, “We confirm it, just as the abbot confirmed it”.²⁹⁷

The narrative is immediately interrupted at this point by the narrator who explains that these confirmations were not valid given that the burghers had failed to keep their prior oath to Abbot Domingo and return the monastery’s property.

The abbot and monks did not confirm the same cursed charter, for their purpose was to justly see the return of all the things that unjustly had been taken from the monastery and belonged to it by right: to have all the things that had been removed from its power restored to its power.²⁹⁸

This is the final confrontation between the burghers and the monastery in the chronicle. Clearly, the monastery does not accept the burghers’ victory. Yet, it is also clear that Domingo’s attempts at persuading and compelling them with ecclesiastical censures have reached the limits of its efficacy. This strategy achieved oaths from the burghers in which they recognised Domingo as their ecclesiastical lord. It is not possible to determine what really happened and what was said in these confrontations, but in the chronicle at least, these dramatic episodes allow the

²⁹⁵ *“Cosa ynjusta façedes queriéndome forçar a la confirmar, ca el Santo Padre por sus escritos non bos obo así amonestado, nin vuestro ayuntamiento, faciéndome juramento, prometiera. Pues ¿dónde es agora el juramento que, testigo Dios, sobre sus ebangelios a mí feçistes, prometiéndome que me restituíades enteramente todas las cosas que aviades tomado e robado?”* CAS, ch. 73, p. 113.

²⁹⁶ *“E yo vos confirmo aquesta carta, salva sienpre mi orden e salva la justiçia d’este monasterio”* Ibid., ch. 73, p. 114.

²⁹⁷ *“Nos confirmamos, así como el abbad confirmó”* Ibid., ch. 73, p. 114.

²⁹⁸ *‘E el abbad e monjes non feçieron confirmación alguna a la dicha maldita carta, ca la orden del abbad e monjes era demandar e a sí apropiar justamente todas las cosas que ynjustamente les eran tomadas e la justiçia del monasterio pertenesçían, todas la cosas perdida a todo su poder restaurar e cobrar’* Ibid., ch. 73, p. 114.

chronicler to advance the argument for Domingo's ecclesiastical lordship, and to show how it was applied to the burghers. This final scene is especially difficult to read. It is pervaded by uncertainties and ambiguities. What did the burghers' charter say? What exactly did the abbot and monks confirm? Was Abbot Domingo's acceptance of the burghers' initial oath understood to have lifted the excommunication of the burghers? Why does Domingo neglect his new papal powers when confronted with the burghers' about-face when Urraca arrives in the town? To what degree are events of the civil war shaping this local confrontation? The chronicler reveals at the end of the scene that these had some effect. Addressing their decision to confirm an oath to Urraca, the chronicler complains:

they did not do this according to their will, but against it, for in that time the king of Aragón had lost the town called Burgos along with the same castle that he ruled there: and so if the town of Sahagún was besieged by the queen they would not have any assistance from the king.²⁹⁹

This episode, which began after Abbot Domingo's successful journey to Rome to gain new ecclesiastical powers over the burghers, ends with defeat for the monastery. The chronicler steps in to attempt an explanation, but this seems only half-hearted. In fact, in the events that lead to the resolution, which we will consider in the next section of this chapter, we see how the burghers' victory is undone and their charter found and burned by Domingo. The specifics of property and stolen possessions are in this way made irrelevant. But we will see how the ecclesiastical argument put forward in the episodes we have considered here lead into the resolution and continue to shape the chronicle's handling of its final events.

Divine Intervention

The chronicle's focus on ecclesiastical authority as the problem and solution to the burghers' rebellion is paralleled by an emphasis on divine intervention in the final narrative section of the text. In its latter chapters the chronicle more frequently invokes divine power as a hidden or manifest cause behind events. These interventions

²⁹⁹ *'no lo avían fecho de boluntad, mas contra su boluntad, ca ya en aquel tiempo el rey de Aragón avía perdido la villa llamada Burgos, e eso mesmo el castillo que enseñoorea d'ella, e si la villa de Sant Fagum fuera çerada de la reina, non obieran los burgeses conseguido nin alguna ayuda del rey'* CAS, ch. 73, pp. 113-5.

specifically relate to punishment and persuasion, and in this way add a further dimension to the strictly legal and documentary issues underlying the monastery's response to the burghers' rebellion. It was not uncommon for a monastic community to invoke their patron saint for violent acts on their behalf, and the violent justice meted out by a saintly figure was often a pervasive theme in hagiography.³⁰⁰

Divine intervention was dramatically invoked in chapter twenty-nine. In this chapter, the chronicle tells how King Alfonso I came to Sahagún at Easter to worship. He asked for the true cross to be brought out and after praying before it snatched it from the sacristan and made off with it. The narrator digresses into an extended apostrophe to the monastery's saints:

But I will now turn again my style to you, the holy martyrs of Jesus Christ, Facundo and Primitivo; if truly you have suffered your passion in Jesus' name—which I do not doubt, mentioning it only with great sorrow—and if truly you spilled your blood for Him, and rejoice now in His kingdom, draped with the stole of immortality—as we believe—then awake now, rise up and bring down to us the mercy of the Eternal Emperor (with Whom you rejoice and to Whom you sing with a clear voice the melodies of praise); act now—still I say it—asking for your mercy and indulgence for the sins of the soul of that king Alfonso VI who adorned and ornamented with an indescribable beauty the Lord's cross. But he who wrongly dishonoured you and defiled your altar, and took from us (although unworthy servants, your servants) such a beautiful and precious jewel, either correct him with your prayers, that he may be cured where he sinned, or with your prayers humiliate him, confound him, kill him.³⁰¹

³⁰⁰ Brown, *Violence in Medieval Europe*, pp. 106-16; D. Barthélemy, 'Devils in the Sanctuary: Violence in the *Miracles of Saint Benedict*', *Feud, Violence, and Practice* (eds.) B.S. Tuten & T.L. Billado (Farnham, 2010), 71-94.

³⁰¹ *'Pero yo agora tornándome e bolviendo el mi estilo a vos, santos mártires de Jesuchristo Facundo e Primitivo, si berdaderamente por el nombre de Jesuchristo sofristes pasión, lo qual yo non dudando, mas doliéndome mucho, lo digo; e si berdaderamente por él derramando vuestra sangre, en el palacio de su reino, así como creemos, bestidos con la estola de la ymortalidad, con gran goço bos alegrades, pues agora belad, levantadvos e abraçad la misericordia del eterno enperador, de la conpañia del qual bos vos alegrades, e con clara voz cantades, pagando las melodias de la alabança; abraçad, aún digo, pidiendo aún digo la su misericordia y demandando yndulgençia y perdón de los pecados de la ánima de aquel rei que a vos e a vuestro altar afeitó e ornó con fermosura non flabable de la cruz del Señor. Pero aquel que a vos e a vuestro altar enjustamente afeó e deshonoró e a nos, bien que yndignos siervos, pero*

This rhetorical outburst can be read against the formulaic liturgical practice of the clamour, in which the religious community would call upon the divine aid of their saintly protector.³⁰² The clamour was most commonly inserted into the divine service, either in the principal mass, or as part of a special separate service; in its Cluniac version the clamour would occur between the *Pater Noster* and the *Libera Nos Quaesumus Domine*. Part of the clamour would involve the humiliation of the relics, in which the sacred remains would be placed on the ground. In Geary's formulation this act was meant to disturb 'the proper relationships between the human and the supernatural orders'.³⁰³ Where the religious community did not have it in their power to legally suspend the divine service this act would at least reinforce the monks' intercessory place between the secular and divine through emphasis of their physical control over the spiritual world. It is, therefore, significant that this version of the clamour in the chronicle is put as a response to the theft of the monastery's piece of the true cross on Palm Sunday. It is the king who has disrupted the relationship between the human and the divine orders. This makes the chronicler's clamour appropriate in the wider sense in which the relic has been humiliated in a divine service. Strategically, the chronicle responds with a clamour for justice in response to the provocation of King Alfonso I. Thus the chronicle stresses the defensive and divinely appropriate and authorised nature of its call for correction or punishment.

The call for divine punishment anticipates the prevalence of this same theme in the chapters leading to the resolution of the conflict. But as with the question of authority and specifically of the meaning of the *libertas Romana* in the context of the conflict, what is in the above outburst strictly aimed at Alfonso I is re-focused against the burghers in later chapters.

As with the new focus on ecclesiastical authority, the burghers' tortures of the peasants become the initial impetus for the chronicle's emphasis on divine intervention. Both chapters fifty-four and fifty-five contain assertions of divine intervention in the events in the chronicle. As with further instances in these chapters

vuestros, de tan gran hermosa e preçiosa joya nos despojó, o por vuestras plegarias corregid, porque emiende en lo que pecó, o tanto alcançad por vuestras oraciones que él sea trabucado e derrocado e perezca' CAS, ch. 29, p. 53.

³⁰² See Geary, *Living with the Dead*, pp. 95ff.

³⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 96.

leading to the resolution of the conflict, these assert the intervention of the divine hand as a punishment of the burghers. In chapter fifty-four the burghers enter the monastery to force the monks to sign their charter; when the monks refuse and the burghers leave, the chronicler declares:

But the Lord's avenging hand would not suffer these things to pass without punishment, for one of them that had made the worst insults [against the monks] was very cruelly cut down by his enemies: the knife of the Lord took vengeance on him.³⁰⁴

And in the next chapter, after the burghers force the monks to present their religious tools before them, the chronicle again refers to the divine punishments that follow:

They suffered this with annoyance, and went off threatening us. But, three months later, the one who had been the cause of all this was cruelly injured by his neighbour, and fell down dead.³⁰⁵

Similar instances follow. In chapter fifty-eight the chronicler declares that after the imposition of the interdict it was only by divine will that the burghers were prevented from throwing the monks out of the cloister.³⁰⁶ In the following chapter, when Archbishop Bernard manages to escape from the trap set by him in Sahagún after meeting to receive the burghers' oath after the deferral of the excommunication sentence against the burghers at the Synod of León in 1114, the chronicler similarly credits divine intervention.³⁰⁷ The text makes several assertions of divine intervention in relation to Giraldo, and these begin to refer to increasingly violent acts of divine punishment. At the end of chapter sixty-two, after the attack at the nunnery of San Pedro, the chronicler explains:

But in all these things the right hand of God, the avenger of evil, did not cease to strike the evil principal plotters of the said evil, and very

³⁰⁴ *'Mas la mano bengadiz del Señor no sufrió que esto pasase sin pena, ca luego uno de aquellos que avía dicho más fuertes denuestos cayó muerto de sus enemigos por muerte mui cruel, bengándolo el cochillo del Señor'* CAS, ch. 54, p. 83.

³⁰⁵ *'Lo qual ellos sufrieron con enojo, e amenaçándonos se partieron; pero en espacio de tres meses, aquel que avía seído causador de lo sobredicho, llagado cruelmente de un su beçino, cayó muerto'* *Ibid.*, ch. 55, p. 84.

³⁰⁶ *'Mas la bondad de Dios probeyó que sí acaesçió el abbad ser ausente, pero apenas se podieron refrenar, causándolo la divina permisión, que en aquel día non echaron a los monjes fuera del claustro'* *Ibid.*, ch. 58, p. 86.

³⁰⁷ *'El arçobispo luego fuese por otro camino a Palençia, e savido que por mandado de los burgeses Giraldo le abía puesto çelada, dio gracias a Dios, pues le libró de sus manos'* *Ibid.*, ch. 61, p. 88.

justly they received everlasting death. And many times before the eyes of mortal men they were despised and dishonoured, for when Giraldo went to Palencia to visit the king he found himself besieged by the queen's knights; as they sought to capture him, he was forced to escape through the roof naked and without his possessions. So he that had despoiled the abbot of his things now rightly found himself fleeing without his clothes. He entered the town of Sahagún in great confusion; and upon entering, that same *alférece* of the devils, Juan Turonés, died, whom we have mentioned before when he helped to plot not the dishonour but the death of the abbot in his house. His damned spirit was undone by cruel death and he was sent to the ministers of hell forever to receive torture without end.³⁰⁸

Similarly, in the next chapter the chronicle tells how Urraca besieged Cea castle where she captured and imprisoned Giraldo. The chronicle also says that Urraca captured a castellan to whom Urraca had entrusted the castle, but who had helped to betray it to Giraldo and Alfonso I's men. The chronicle describes his punishment:

And as he was captured, as I said already, he was taken before the presence of the queen and she ordered that he eyes should be taken out and he should be made blind. And certainly it was right that that one who had despised the queen of heaven and earth and had dared to kick her door, that the queen of the earth should deprive him of his earthly vision and he should live deprived of the common light.³⁰⁹

This, however, leads to further reflection by the chronicler on the nature of divine punishment. This reflection comprises the following chapter:

³⁰⁸ *'Mas entre estas cosas la mano diestra del Señor, bengadora de la maldad, non quedava nin çesava de ferir a los malvados e prinçipales ynventores de la dicha maldad, y muy justamente eran dados a la muerte perdurable. E muchas beçes aún en los ojos de los mortales eran amenguados e deshonnrados, ca como el dicho Giraldo fuese a Palencia a visitar al rei e dentro de una villa fuese çercado de los cavalleros de la reina; e ya que lo querían prender, escapóse foyendo por el techo, desnudo, perdidas todas las cosas. E el que avía despojado al abbad, dignamente quedó desnudo. E lleno de gran confusión entró en la villa de Sant Fagum. E ay en su entrada aquel alférece de los diablos ya susodicho Juan Turonés, por el cuyo ynduçimiento e en cuya casa, non digo deshonna, mas la muerte del abbad fuera tratada, allí morió. E el maldito su espíritu, por cruel muerte desecho, e a los ministros del ynfierno dio para sienpre, resçevidos tormentos sin fin'* CAS, ch. 62, p. 96.

³⁰⁹ *'El qual como fuese preso, según que ya dixé, ante la presençia de la reina fue traydo e ella mandó que le sacasen los ojos e quedase çiego. E çiertamente digna cosa fue que aquel que despreçió a la reina del çielo e de la tierra e fuese osado de acoçear su puerta, que por la reina de la tierra careçiese de la vista terrenal e vibiese privado de la luz común'* CAS, ch. 63, p. 97.

What worthy thing can I say in praise of the divine piety of her great goodness?

For divine clemency avenges with a cruel death any of the burghers that oppose us in that way and rise up against us irreverently and incite others to do the same.

And this I say: I do not rejoice in the death of the evil, but rather in the consideration of the will of the divine am I made happy; and rightly, certainly, I would rejoice with the just to see vengeance meted out to the evil if I should wash my hands in the blood of the sinners. For he who considers with reason how the sentence of divine punishment is passed against the evil, he moderates his vices; and receiving punishment for his excesses he seeks out the good and prays for divine aid.³¹⁰

We see here how divine punishment is rationalised according to its ability to persuade.³¹¹ The chronicle also shows the other side of the connection between divine intervention and persuasion. In chapter twenty-nine, as we saw at the beginning of this section, the chronicler called upon the monastery's saints to correct or kill Alfonso I after his theft of the monastery's piece of the true cross. It is in chapter sixty-nine that San Facundo comes down to rescue a captured peasant from the burghers. It is a dramatic episode with Facundo appearing clothed in radiant white robes and asking the peasant why he does not rise and walk out of the dungeon where he is held in chains. The peasant explains that he cannot escape his chains, but when Facundo persuades him to rise up, his chains break and fall away. He then is able to open the dungeon door, but finding snoring dogs and on the other side flees back to his cell

³¹⁰ *¿Qué cosa digna de alabanza, yo recontaré a la divina piedad por su gran bondad?*

Ca qualquiera de los burgeses que en aquella fortuna contra nos magnifiestamente e sin reberençia se levantava e ençendía a otros para nos fatigar, aqweste luego la divina clemencia bengadora punía por muerte cruel.

E aquesto yo digo: non que me goçe yo con la muerte de los males, mas de la consideración de la divina bondad me alegre, e dignamente por çierto me alegraría con los justos beyendo la bengança de los malos, si las mis manos labase en la sangre de los pecadores, ca el tratando e considerando raçonablemente la sentençia de la pena divinal feriente a los malos, él tenpla los biçios e por las cosas e exçesos que fiço, puniendo, asimismo, por la penitencia, demanda la bondad e ruega por la ayuda dibinal' CAS, ch. 64, p. 98.

³¹¹ On Medieval views of blinding and kingship, see: G. Bühner-Thierry, "Just Anger" or "Vengeful Anger"? The Punishment of Blinding in the Early Medieval West', *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages* (ed.) B.H. Rosenwein (Cornell, 1998), pp. 73-91.

fearing they will wake his guards. Again Facundo reassures him and is able to step past the dogs and his guards and is able to flee to the church where he finds the monks performing matins and is able to tell his story to the sacristan. But, the chronicler complains that this miracle is not able to convince the burghers to stop their tortures:

But the burghers were neither frightened by the deaths of the evil nor converted by these miracles. But rather, with flame and fire, as I have said, they tortured the men of the local place and killed them with a variety of cruel and unheard of punishments.³¹²

It is significant that the chronicler chooses occasions of miracles and violent punishments to reflect upon the morality and efficacy of these as methods of correction and the burghers' continuing intractability. The same reflections do not surround Domingo's more specifically legal strategy. In this way the chronicle emphasises divine punishment as the controversial strategy, and miraculous appearances by San Facundo as the dynamic force of the monastery's agency in its attempts to exert power over the burghers.

Resolution

We move now to consider two episodes at the very end of the chronicle in which are contained the resolution of the conflict between the burghers and the monastery. After the chronicler's abrupt intervention in the narrative to explain away the monastery's confirmation of the burghers' charter at the end of chapter seventy-three, the matter is put aside for the moment. At this point the chronicle moves on to tell of an ambush on the town of Sahagún plotted by Giraldo Diablo and one Count Bertrán (Beltrán in the text), who were in Carrión at the time. In fact, the failure of this ambush will lead to the expulsion of the burghers from Sahagún and the destruction of their charter, so the burghers' charter and the matter of authority in the town is still very much at stake in the episode to which we will now turn.

It seems, in fact, that there was very little time between the confirmation of the burghers' charter and its destruction. With the burghers believing that they had

³¹² *'Pero los burgeses nin por las muertes de los malos eran espantados, nin por los milagros se conbertían. Mas los honbres çircunstantes, con fuego e flama, como ya dixen, atormentavan e dibersas penas de muertes mui crueles e non oídas davan'* CAS, ch. 69, p. 104.

achieved an important coup against their overlord the abbot, this space of time was potentially one loaded with meaning for future relations between the monastery and the burghers. The question is the date of the confirmation of the burghers' charter in the summer of 1116. The letters of Pope Paschal II are dated March 1116. It must have been late Spring or early summer by the time Abbot Domingo was back in Sahagún to present the burghers with the papal letters (as we saw, the chronicle says he was confined in Aragón for five weeks by Alfonso I). The events of the ambush happen in September of 1116. Reilly suggests that it was August that Urraca put a siege around the town;³¹³ this would also be when we would date the episode of the confirmation of the burghers' charter. This would, in fact, leave very little time for the new arrangement established by the burghers' charter to be put in effect. The chronicle is not interested to correct this, and so the effect is as if the confirmed charter is put into a state of suspended authority, not actually coming into effect before it is destroyed.

The chronicle tells how Giraldo Diablo and Count Bertrán of Risnel, in alliance with some of the burghers of Sahagún, planned to ambush the town of Sahagún. Their plan went as follows: It was the time of the grape harvest and a small group of Aragonese knights were to be sent to attack the harvesters in the fields outside Sahagún. This would attract the queen's knights from the town in defence of the harvesters. However, a larger Aragonese force was to be hiding in the hills and with the queen's knights lured from the town they would attack. Meanwhile, the burghers would shut the gates to prevent their retreat. Then, when the rout of the queen's knights was complete, the gates would be reopened and the town delivered to Giraldo and Count Bertrán.

The chronicle also tells how this plot was told to Abbot Domingo by messengers sent to warn him by the burghers of Carrión. Abbot Domingo then took the lead in preparing to defend the town against the ambush. He had extra locks put on the gate and more guards assigned to their defence. His strategy after this is expressed in a direct speech made to their townsmen:

“Each day before sun rise, let two knights on good horses, swift and speedy, traverse the valleys and hills surrounding the town and also

³¹³ Reilly, *Urraca*, p. 114.

patrol the woodland, so that if by chance the knights of Carrión have set an ambush it will be exposed. And, afterward, in the second hour of the day let the men go out into the fields to do their work and bring their livestock out to graze”.³¹⁴

This daily patrol frustrates the attackers for some days, until, finally, ‘ignited in their rage’ (*‘encendidos en saña’*)³¹⁵ they decide to attack the town during the night. Their rage is also the occasion for them to deny the abbot’s power over the control of the town and its defence:

“Who gave the abbot the power to choose the guards of the town, or to appoint the gatekeepers, or to control the coming and going of the burghers? By the arm, by the blood, by the eyes of God, we will not delay to kill any of the guards that are sided with the abbot!”³¹⁶

The effect of this speech is to suggest that Abbot Domingo’s authority over the town continues to be in a fundamental sense at issue in these events. It is an indication of how to connect Abbot Domingo’s role in the defence of the town. His role as the town’s overlord is expressed in the action of the episode. We have seen similar prompt-questions previously in the chronicle. In the second narrative section, these served to emphasise the abbot’s inability to act. In this case, the question emphasises what will be Abbot Domingo’s successful defence of the town.

With the new guards in place the abbot and the monks are left to pass the night in nervous waiting. The chronicler speaks directly to his audience: ‘[s]o consider you who read this how long and anxious that same night was for us’ (*‘Pues considerad bos, los que leedes, cuánto la dicha noche a nos fuese tardosa e pereçosa’*).³¹⁷ The narrative continues with the story of how the attack by Giraldo and Bertrán was prevented:

³¹⁴ “Que cada día, ante del sol salido, dos de cavallo, sobre buenos cavallos corredores e ligeros, discourriesen e çerasen los valles e collados que estavan açerca de la villa, e eso mesmo cavalgasen trabesando por el monte, porque si por abentura los de Carrión toviesen alguna çelada, fuesen vistos e barruntados. E después, a la segunda ora del día, fuesen los hombres a façer sus obras e façiendas por los canpos, e echasen los ganados a paçer” CAS, ch. 74, p. 116.

³¹⁵ *Ibid.*, ch. 74, p. 116.

³¹⁶ “¿Quién dio al abbad disponer las guardas d’esta villa, o tener que mandar a los porteros, o ordenar la entrada o salida a los burgeses? ¡Por el braço, por la sangre, por los ojos de Dios, a quantos fueren de parte del abbad puestos en guarda de la villa, luego sin tardança les daremos la muerte!” *Ibid.*, ch. 74, p. 117.

³¹⁷ *Ibid.*, ch. 75, p. 118.

It was then that same night in which the Holy Mother Church throughout all the world celebrates the memorial and solemnity of the archangel St Michael by offering to the King of Heaven praise and joy; and, as we later came to know from what the guards and others that were stationed on the towers told us, Giraldo came as far as the waters of the river that is called Baldaradué with the men from Carrión, but when he heard the sounds of the horns and shouts he was stunned, and stopped where he was. And sensing that the secret of his treason was discovered, he left in confusion.³¹⁸

The delivery of the town hinges on its place in the religious calendar, and the ignorance of the attackers of the reason for the town's celebration. Chapter fifty-five, in which the burghers forced the monks to lay all the monastery's treasure before them but then prove that they did not know their uses, showed us another scene in which the significance was the revelation of the burghers' inability to act appropriately in the religious space. In this case it is the church calendar that stages this ignorance.

The next morning Queen Urraca is brought into the town and hearing of the burghers' treachery demands that they make amends through trial by single combat.³¹⁹ The burghers reluctantly choose their combatant, but that same night he flees.³²⁰ Hearing this, Urraca meets with the 'richest and most important' (*los más ricos e principales*) of the burghers. She reminds them of the now familiar story of how her father brought them to the town to prosper and how he 'chose that monastery [of Sahagún] for his tomb from among the limits of his entire kingdom and put it under

³¹⁸ *'Era aquella noche en la qual la santa madre iglesia por todo el mundo façe memoria e gran solepnidad al archángel sant Miguel, al rei de los çielos ofresçiendo alabança e alegría, e según que después sopimos de las guardas e de los que nos lo recontavan que estavan en las puertas sobre las torres, Giraldo vino fasta las aguas del arroyo que se llama Baldaradué con los de Carrión. E oídas las boçes de las boçinas e de las belas, estudó e paróse algún tanto. E sintiendo que ya el secreto de la traición era discubierto, partióse con confusión'* CAS, ch. 75, p. 118.

³¹⁹ A document shows that Queen Urraca was in Sahagún in October of 1116 to grant the monastery the right to mint coins: Fernández Flórez, *Colección diplomática* IV, p. 47: no. 1195. On the topic of trial by battle, see: R. Bartlett, *Trial by Fire and Water: The Medieval Judicial Ordeal* (Oxford, 1986), 103-126.

³²⁰ S. D. White, 'Proposing the Ordeal and Avoiding It: Strategy and Power in Western French Litigation, 1050-1110', *Cultures of Power: Lordship, Status, and Process in Twelfth-Century Europe* (ed.) T. N. Bisson (Pennsylvania, 1995), 89-123; E.S. Procter, *Curia and Cortes in León and Castile, 1072-1295* (Cambridge, 1980), p. 40.

the protection and guard of the Holy Roman Church'.³²¹ Finally, she orders that the rest of the burghers are to be expelled from the town. Her speech is given as a direct address to the principal burghers, speaking of the lower orders of burghers:

“Now then, they must all go, these jugglers and villains, furriers and cobblers, these who took my kingdom from me and denied you their reverence. It comes to my ear that none of you dared to speak to those present, nor to say any good word of me; now then, I order that they must go and leave me to live in peace with you and you with me”.³²²

With this the burghers are expelled and make their way from the town. The chronicle anticipates the Council of Burgos of 1117, where the burghers will later claim that their women were mistreated by the queen’s knights:

When this was said, they all left together. None of them were injured, beaten, harmed, or killed; none of their daughters were violated or dishonoured; none was treated wickedly, but rather prudently and without commotion, however it will be said.

Besides looking forward to the coming trial, the chronicle also uses a set of terms to describe the spiritual and divine dimensions of the burghers’ banishment. The text continues:

That filthy ditch was emptied and cleaned; and thus that abhorrent cesspit was cleaned; and thus that fetid gutter was emptied; any wise person might plainly see how they had caused so much displeasure to God, and how the cries of the peasants had risen to the ears of the Most High.³²³

³²¹ ‘aqueste monasterio él escogió para su sepultura en todo el espacio de su reino e so la guarda e protección de la santa iglesia de Roma puso’ CAS, ch. 75, p. 119.

³²² “Pártanse pues agora todos estos joglares e truhanes, cortidores e çapateros que a mí me tomaron el reino e a vos negaron la debida reberençia. Que en mis orejas es benido e notificado que ninguno de bosotros osaba fablar ellos presentes, nin de mi deçir alguna buena palabra; pues agora mando luego que ellos se partan, e déxenme bibir con bosotros e a vosotros conmigo” *Ibid.*, ch. 75, pp. 119-20.

³²³ ‘Lo qual dicho e manifestado, todos se partieron ayuntadamente. Ninguno fue ferido, ninguno batido, ninguno llagado e ninguno fue muerto; ninguna fenbra allí fue corrunpida, nin sufrió deshonorra, ninguna fue torpemente tratada, mas saviamente e sin ruido, como quienquiera deçir, aquel suçio аваñar quedó vaçio e alinpiado. E ansí aquella latrina aborresçible fue alinpiada. E ansí aquella fedionda cárcava fue baçiada como cada un discreto puede conoçer manifestamente que ellos obiesen mucho enojado a Dios e a sus mártires, e los clamored de los mezquinos aver suvido en las orejas del mui alto’ *Ibid.*, ch. 75, p. 120.

The chronicle expressly connects this expulsion with the tortures of the peasants: that is, the burghers' guilt for these past crimes is still at issue. The burghers' expulsion, then, is converted in the strident figurative language of the narrative into a cleaning of their sin from the town. The figurative meaning of cleaning continues in a passage a little further along in the text. The chronicler describes in a rhetorical outburst:

O, how frightful is what follows! For when the houses of the burghers came to be cleaned after the departure of their occupants, there was found underneath a crib inside the house of one of them who was a eunuch seven buried skulls; and one of them was of a man who had been seen recently, and his skull was not yet fully clean, but only decomposed halfway.

Certainly it was that eunuch that numbered among those whose custom it was to buy captives: and tormenting them with great tortures, they demanded seven times what they had given for them.

It is a final shock and surprise of the torture scenes: some of the moral urgency of those scenes is carried over into this scene where the burghers finally receive punishment for those crimes. The chronicle invokes the tortures in part to counter the burghers' later argument (as we will shortly see) that they were maltreated in this expulsion. But more than simply arguing for the appropriateness of the expulsion of the burghers, the above passages show how the chronicle presents the burghers' chastisement in spiritual terms which suggest an absolution of the town and the burghers' houses. The wickedness of the burghers' crimes brings on a spiritual resolution. Abigail Frey has recently traced a 'House of Conscience' metaphor in Christian literature.³²⁴ Here the house cleaning is rendered in the dramatic terms of the chronicle into a cleansing of the burghers' sins.

With the sense that the burghers had finally faced spiritual justice for their tortures of the peasants, the chronicle goes on to describe how Abbot Domingo re-appropriated the monastery's stolen lands, gave away the burghers' houses, and destroyed the burgher's charter:

³²⁴ A. Firey, 'Blushing Before the Judge and Physician: Moral Arbitration in the Carolingian Empire', *A New History of Penance* (ed.) A. Firey (Leiden, 2008), 173-200 (p. 185).

When the burghers had left, the abbot, with the queen's consent, took all the lands, vineyards, and orchards which they had usurped and returned them to the monastery. And he gave away their houses among the nobles and knights of the land, but with this condition: that they pay to the monastery the same toll as the burghers had according to the ancient custom; and they should pay all right of lordship to the abbot also without any kind of dispute.

Furthermore, he very carefully searched out the document of the cursed charter; and when he found it, he cast it in the fire to burn. And the customs established by Alfonso VI, that prince of blessed memory, he reinstated.³²⁵

The lapse committed in confirming the burghers' charter is undone. More than this, all the gains made by the burghers, in land as well as rights, are overturned in a stroke. Just as the confirmation of the burghers' charter enacted the high point of the burghers against the monastery, and for all purposes a burgher victory over the monastery (from what we can discern from the monastery's account of the burghers), this is the victory of the monastery over the burghers. All matters of stolen land and possessions and the legitimacy of rights are done away with. One issue that remains is the legitimacy of the expulsion as an end to the conflict. This will be taken up at the Council of Burgos (discussed below), but the chronicle's emphasis on the burghers' past crimes and the correctness of this punishment as a spiritual absolution shows how the chronicle has already begun to account for this complaint. Another issue that remains is the legitimacy of the event as an end to the chronicle. The burning of the burgher's charter has important implications for the writing of the conflict. We will

³²⁵ ¡O, cómo es espanto lo que se sigue!. Ca como las casas d'ellos se alinpiasen de aquellos que avían de morar en ellas, dentro de la casa de un burgés e eunuco, devajo de un pesebre, fueron falladas siete cabeças de hombres enterradas; de las quales una fue vista reçiente e aún no pelada, mas quasi medio corrupta.

Era por çierto, aquel eunuco del cuento e número de aquellos que acostunbraban conprar los captivos: e dándoles grandes tormentos de diversas maneras, demandávanles siete tanto de aquello que avían dado.

Ellos ya salidos e ydos, el abbad, otorgándolo la reina, las tierras e viñas que avían tomado e usurpado e los güertos en que moravan restituyó al monasterio. E sus casas partió e dio a los nobles e cavalleros de la tierra, pero con esta condiçión: que paguen al monasterio según la costunbre antigua, como façían los burgeses; e eso mesmo paguen todo derecho al abbad sin contienda alguna.

Otrosí buscó con gran diligençia la carta e escritura de las malditas costunbres. E, fallada, echóla e quemóla en el fuego. E las costunbres establesçidas de don Alfonso, príncipe de santa memoria, renobó' CAS, ch. 75, p. 121.

take up this question again in chapter five of this study where we consider the chronicle's use of documents in the narrative. There we will explore the significance of this development for the chronicle's historiographical purpose and use of documents: the burghers' victory happened with the production and confirmation of a charter, the monastery's victory happens with the destruction of a charter.

At this point the chronicle moves directly to the events of the Council of Burgos. This was held in the early months of 1117. The chronicle describes how the some of the burghers who had settled in Burgos after their expulsion met the papal legate Cardinal Boso of St Anastasia (called Bosón in the text).³²⁶ The chronicle suggests that it was at the Lateran council in 1116 in Rome where Abbot Domingo had presented his complaint against the burghers that Pope Paschal II decided to send the legate to Castile: 'from the account of the abbot (as well as from other magnates of Spain), as I have indicated, who had travelled to the Church of St Peter ... he learned of the previous struggles and battles of Spain' (*'por relación del abbad así como dixe (e de otros príncipes de España), que avía ydo a la iglesia de San Pedro ... supo las amarguras e las batallas anteriores de España'*).³²⁷ Records of the council show Boso as a confirmant.³²⁸ The burghers make their complaint of Abbot Domingo upon Boso's first arrival in Burgos, and it seems the burghers were anxious for the case to be heard, but the cardinal explains that it is his intention to first travel to the tomb of the apostle at Santiago de Compostela, and to hear the case at a council upon his return. Thus the council was held in February of the following year (1117).³²⁹

The chronicle makes it clear that Boso had been sent to find a peace settlement between the warring queen and king:

³²⁶ Pope Paschal II's announcement sending Cardinal Boso to Spain as papal legate is dated 23 May 1116 (J.P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina* 163 (Paris, 1854), no. 469: p. 406. A survey of the cardinal's appearances in the documentary record can be found at: S. Weiss, *Die Urkunden der päpstlichen Legaten von Leo IX. Bis Coelestin III. (1049-1198)* (Cologne, 1995), 70-81.

³²⁷ CAS, ch. 76, p. 122.

³²⁸ Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 21, p. 150. See also: Reilly, *Urraca*, p. 120. For a useful background to the role of the legate, see: R.A. Schmutz, 'Medieval Papal Representatives: Legates, Nuncios and Judges-Delegate', *Studia Gratiana* 15 (Rome, 1972), 443-463.

³²⁹ The extant canons of the council deal exclusively with matters of ecclesiastical discipline: Fita, 'Concilio nacional de Burgos', pp. 394-98; R. Fletcher, *St James's Catapult: The Life and Times of Diego Gelmírez of Santiago de Compostela* (Oxford, 1984), p. 200, discusses the implications of the council from the Galician perspective.

The same holy father, desiring to check the said struggles and conflicts with the power given to him by the apostle St Peter, sent a cardinal of the Roman Church, and a close associate of his, called Boso, who as a mediating judge was to bring peace and harmony to the conflict between the queen and king; and if either of them should fail to comply with his apostolic decisions, they would be cut with the knife of damnation.³³⁰

Yet this is the last that we hear of the king or the queen in the chronicle. This is a clear indication of the narrow sense in which the resolution of the conflict will be an ecclesiastical matter and directly about the local relationship between the monastery and the burghers.

Before the trial, the burghers are assigned a representative, who happens to be Count Bertrán.³³¹ It is clear that he was to side with the burghers as their *assertor*, or advocate;³³² the chronicle says that they had put ‘all their trust and hope’ (*‘toda su fiuça e esperança’*)³³³ in the count. However, it also becomes clear from the unfolding of events that lead up to the presentation of the case that his responsibility before the court was also partly determined by the traditional role of the court advocate or proctor.³³⁴ Both offices served the court itself, screening cases, interviewing the participants, and advising judgements in the pursuit of impartial and legally informed judgements. The role of the court advocate and the court proctor blended together in many ways, and both were subject to change over the course of centuries, but in general the difference between them was one of formality. Advocates would have had

³³⁰ *‘El dicho Santo Pedro, deseando refrenar las dichas batallas e discordias por el poderío a él dado por el apóstol san Pedro, enbió un cardenal de la iglesia Romana e de su lado, llamado Bosón, el qual entre el rei e la reina posiese paz e concordia, ansí como juez medianero; e a qualquier d’ellos que non quisiere obedesçer a los mandamientos suyos e apostólicos, podiese e deviese ferir con el cochillo de maldición’* CAS, ch. 76, p. 122.

³³¹ On the role of the advocate in the Spanish context, and with specific reference to this case, see: Barton, *The Aristocracy*, p. 137.

³³² See E.S. Procter, *Curia and Cortes in Leon and Castile, 1072-1295* (Cambridge, 1980), p. 37.

³³³ CAS, ch. 77, p. 123.

³³⁴ On the role of the advocate in the Medieval Period, see: Vodola, *Excommunication*, pp. 124-7; J.A. Brundage, ‘The Advocate’s Dilemma: What Can You Tell the Client? A Problem in Legal Ethics’, *Medieval Church Law and the Origins of the Western Legal Tradition* (eds.) W.P. Müller & M.E. Sommar (Washington D.C., 2006), 201-210; J.A. Brundage, *The Medieval Origins of the Legal Profession: Canonists, Civilians, and Courts* (Chicago, 2008), pp. 19ff.; and J.A. Brundage, ‘“My Learned Friend”: Professional Etiquette in Medieval Courtrooms’, in *Readers, Texts and Compilers in the Earlier Middle Ages* (eds.) M. Brett & K.G. Cushing (Woodbridge, 2009), 183-196.

legal training, and by the thirteenth century this role had become a more formal legal profession.

As the burghers' advocate the count still had a responsibility to try to determine the facts of the case, and in the lead-up to the trial we witness him interviewing the burghers.³³⁵ At first the burghers charge that their women had been violated by the queen's knights during their expulsion from Sahagún: "[c]ertainly, they lied with their untrue story in their departure of how the knights of the queen had violated their young women and their wives, and done other things that cannot be spoken of".³³⁶ However, Count Bertrán dismissed this charge and demanded to know the whole story from the beginning. Here the burghers confess the truth:

they told him, as it had happened, how they had received the conditional faith of the abbot, how they had made an oath to him, and how they had gone against the abbot to force the queen to sign the cursed charter, and then also how they had broken the gates of the town and had taken power over the town from the abbot, revealing everything they had said to have been vain lies and inventions of their hate and ill-will.³³⁷

These are the events of chapter seventy-three in the chronicle. Did the burghers really confess to rejecting their own oaths, to forcing the queen to sign their charter, to attacking the town gates, and that everything they had said was a lie? It seems clear at least that the burghers lost the support of Count Bertrán. He rebuked them for their lies, called perjury (*'perjurio'*) in the text, insisted that they would not be able to compete with Abbot Domingo before the Council, and advised them to seek his mercy and have the case dropped. The burghers agree and their request is taken to Domingo. But he insists that the trial proceed:

³³⁵ On this role of the court advocate see: Brundage, 'The Advocate's Dilemma', pp. 201-3.

³³⁶ *'Fingían, por çierto, los burgeses con su mentira, de los cavalleros de la reina, en su echada, las moças ser violadas e las mugeres adulteradas, e otras muchas cosas que non son de decir'* CAS, ch. 77, p. 124.

³³⁷ *'por horden ellos manifestaron cómo acaesçió, declarando en qué manera ellos eso mesmo avían recebido condicionalmente la fee del abbad e aun en qué manera ellos avían dado juramento al abbad e en qué manera avían forçado a la reina, contradiciéndolo el abbad a confirmar la carta de la maldita escriptura, e aún en qué manera ellos avían quebrantado las puertas de la villa e esa villa avían quitado de poderío del abbad, manifestando aún todo lo que deçían ser vano e lleno de mentira e ynfingido e ynventado con odio e malquerençia'* Ibid., ch. 77, p. 124.

“Once more, O generous count, as you well know before the burghers in their madness rebelled against me you were an intimate friend to me; and though you come from your land, of a prudent family and a noble birth and benevolent, yet I want to submit the examination and decision of my case to your wise judgement, confident in the righteousness and probity of your virtuous person. Without any doubt, nearly all of Spain knows how many times they have threatened me and how many things I and the church of Spain have suffered and have been made to bear”.³³⁸

Count Bertrán declares that they do not want to compete with him in justice, but Abbot Domingo insists that the case must be heard:

How can I do what you ask me? Those burghers speaking their filth, lies, and slanders have defamed my person and the monks that serve God under Christ’s pleasant yoke in the cloister of Sahagún; and they have spit from their mouths their poison of evil through all the towns and cities, continually insulting us; nor is there in this holy synod and meeting a bishop or abbot that has not heard what I have said with his own ears or heard it from another. And how can I cover up with my silence such great dishonour, and words so vile and obscene?”³³⁹

In effect, the case is decided at this point before the trial. Abbot Domingo insists it go ahead as a public hearing of the burghers’ wrongs. In this way, the trial will also allow the pre-trial judgment to be rendered in a public performance. In fact, this was not an uncommon development in the workings of Medieval justice: Stephen White has shown that it was common for decisions of justice to be resolved before trial was

³³⁸ *“Otro tiempo, yo, generoso conde! ante que los burgeses comenzasen a se enloquecer contra mí, como vos bien savedes, a mí fuestes mucho amigo entrañal; e vien que seades de su tierra e persona discreta e de noble generaçión, de buena boluntad, enpero, yo me quiero someter al examen e determinaçión de vuestro buen juicio, confiándome yo en la derechura e proeça de vuestra virtuosa persona. Sin dubda ninguna, quasi toda España conoçe en cuántos peligros ellos me han puesto e cuántas cosas yo e padescido e a sostenido la iglesia de Sant Fagún”* CAS, ch. 77, p. 125.

³³⁹ *“Cómo e en qué manera yo puedo façer lo que me rogades?. Ca esos burgeses, deçiendo cosas torpes, mentirosas e engañosas, an difamado a mi persona e las de los monjes que so el yugo plaçentero de Christo sirven a Dios en el claustro de San Fagum; e por todas las villas e çiudades en echado por sus bocas ponçoña de gran maldad; nin ay en este santo sínodo e ayuntamiento obispo o abad que esto que yo e dicho non aya oído con sus orejas o non lo aya conoçido, recontándolo otros. ¿E cómo [126] yo podría tan gran deshonorra encobrir e, callando, ençelar palabras tan biles e maldichas?”* Ibid., ch. 77, pp. 125-6.

reached, so that the trial would then proceed as a public performance of the decision.³⁴⁰

Archbishop Bernard even determines the nature of the burghers' punishment: they are to perform public penance and humiliation for 'crime of perjury and the evils they have committed, first in deed and after in word' against Domingo:

"In this case the burghers should confess and give open testimony of their crime of perjury and the evils they have committed, first in deed and after in word; and at that point it is right and reasonable that they should in the presence of the whole synod, with bare feet, stripped to the waist, and carrying withies in their hands, throw themselves at your feet and humbly beg pardon for the evil they have committed and the lies and falsehoods they have spoke".³⁴¹

At the trial, Cardinal Boso makes clear that the trial is to represent the end of the conflict, and suggests that he had also heard complaints from the monks and seen the damage to the monastery:

"Two and even three days we have waited for you, generous Count Bertrán, for we did not want to address and hear the cause of the burghers' expulsion from Sahagún; for when I first came, descending from the heights of the Pyrenees to the Church of Santiago, I heard going and coming loud complaints in every place. And I also heard the complaints of the monks of the cloister about the ruin and destruction of the monastery; this was something that I could not look upon without great sadness. And so now, the abbot is present, the burghers are here, and we three are sat, with the knife of St Peter in our hand: let the cases of each party be called for and heard, and let these be examined and put to justice, and given a final end so

³⁴⁰ S.D. White, 'Pactum . . . Legem Vincit et Amor Judicium: The Settlement of Disputes by Compromise in Eleventh-Century Western France', *The American Journal of Legal History* 22.4 (1978), 281-308 (pp. 292-99).

³⁴¹ "Pues que estos burgeses confiesan e manifiestamente dan testimonio aber seído criminosos de perjurio; e por fechos, primeramente, e después por dichos malamente aver fecho e cometido, cosa mui digna e raçonable es que agora, en presençia de todo el sínodo e ayuntamiento, descalços los pies; e ellos medio desnudos, llevando las minbres en sus manos, se derriben e echen a vuestros pies e de la maldad cometida e de la mentirosa e falsa fabla con gran humilldad vos supliquen e demanden perdón" CAS, ch. 77, p. 126.

that no one can say tomorrow or the next day “I sought justice and wanted judgement but I found no one who would hear me”.³⁴²

The trial begins with the testimony of Count Bertrán, who tells the court of how the burghers had admitted they had lied in their complaints to Cardinal Boso, and how he had been won over by Domingo’s offer to have him decide the fate of the trial:

“Certainly, holy fathers and lords, until now I was a great enemy of the abbot, for I had been deceived by the malevolent words of his enemies. Yet, five days ago I saw the abbot in Palencia before the presence of the queen, and I took strong issue with him for the chaotic expulsion of the burghers. He responded to me, before the ears of the whole court of nobles accompanying the queen: “I should like you, count, to put aside all your previous hate and love towards either side and be the intermediary, judge, and arbiter between me and the burghers. And when you have heard the reasons and allegations of each side, decide the case as your own judgement leads you, for I promise you that I will comply with everything that you decide in your justice”.

I say that when I heard these words so amiable and gracious, I was stunned and could only marvel that he should choose me, his enemy, to be his arbiter and intermediary.”³⁴³

³⁴² *‘A vos, generoso conde Beltrán, dos e aún tres días avemos esperado, ca non quisimos en vuestra ausencia tratar e conocer la causa de la echada e alanzamiento de los burg[u]eses de Sant Fagun, ca en la primera mi entrada, descendiendo de las alturas del monte Pireneo fasta la iglesia de Santiago, yendo e retornando, por todos los lugares oí grandes guerellas d’ellos. E eso mesmo entendí la querella de los monjes que son en el claustro sobre los daños e ynurias de los burg[u]eses a ellos fechas, e con mis ojos acaté la gran destruiçion e disipaçion del monesterio. Lo qual, por cierto, sin fran dolor beer non pude; pues agora presentes son el abbad, e los burg[u]ese, e aún pre[sen]tes nos tres, el cochillo de Sant Pedro tenientes. Pues agora sea oída la causa e buscada de amas las partes, e sea esaminada, e así sea puesta en el juiçio, e finalmente sea difinida e terminada en manera que ninguno diga mañana o otro día: “demandé justiçia e quise juiçio e non fallé quien me oyese” CAS, ch. 78, pp. 126-7.*

³⁴³ *“Yo, por çierto, santos padres e señores, fasta aquí mucho era enemigo al abbad, por quanto yo era engañado por las malíbolas palabras de sus enemigos. Pero como ante çinos días, ante la presençia de la reina en Palençia biese estar el abbad e a él mucho me turbase por la confusa echada de los burgeses, él me respondió, oyéndolo toda la corte de los nobles que aconpañavan a la dicha reina çuerría yo, conde, apartado todo odio e rencor e amor de qualsequiera, entre mí e los burgeses bos fuédes medianero, juez e árbitro; e oídas las raçones e alegaçiones de cada una de las partes, determinásedes lo que vuestro buen juiçio bos diere a entender, ca yo vos prometo de non me tirar afuera de todo aquello que ordenádes mediante la justiçia?”*

Count Bertrán recommends that burghers throw themselves at the mercy of court and beg to be returned to their houses. Here the burghers are given a chance to speak:

“Señor cardinal, we all confess and declare that we have done evil against God and have sinned greatly against the abbot, and have offended him in many ways. We admit that the things that we said against him were lies and falsehoods; but now, with our knees on the ground, and with great humility, we request for you to intercede however you might on behalf of us, peasants, with the abbot, so that he might pardon us and that it might please him to allow us to return to our houses” .³⁴⁴

The council agrees to grant the burghers’ plea for mercy. It is decided that because of the crowd in the council the burghers’ penance will be performed in the church at Burgos. Two bishops, Hugh of Portugal and Paschal of Burgos, are chosen to accompany the burghers, Abbot Domingo, and Count Bertrán of Carrión to witness their atonement according to the previous prescription of Archbishop Bernard. Thus, the chronicle concludes:

So the above-mentioned men with the abbot followed them to before the altar of the blessed mother of God, and ever-virgin María; and according to what had been decided they satisfied the abbot; and thus they achieved the pardon of the abbot and were received with the kiss of peace; and thus they were restored to their houses.³⁴⁵

Yo digo e manifiesto que, oídas estas palabras tan amigables e blandas, enbacé, e mucho maravillando, me espanté que a mí su enemigo, quisiese escojer por árbitro e medianero” CAS, ch. 78, p. 127.

³⁴⁴ *“Señor cardenal, todos confesamos e manifestamos aver fecho yniqua y malamente contra Dios e mucho aber pecado contra el abad, e en muchas maneras aberle ofendido; las cosas que contra él deçíamos, notificamos averlas dicho mentirosa e falsamente; mas agora, de rodillas en tierra, con gran humilldad vos suplicamos que a nos, mezquinos, queráis socorrer e con él fagades, por qualquiera manera, que él nos quiera perdonar e le plega de nos reformar e en nuestras casa nos dexer estar” Ibid., ch. 78, p. 128.*

³⁴⁵ *“Pues los sobredichos barones con el abad, siguiéndolo nos ant’el altar de la bienabenturada madre de Dios e sienpre virgen María, e según la orden estableçida, satisfiçieron, e así alcançaron perdón del abad e fueron resçividos al beso de paz, e así luego fueron reformados en sus casas’ Ibid., ch. 78, pp. 128-29.*

There are ambiguities in the chronicle's account of the council. There are questions that the chronicle prevents us from answering: What precisely is the nature of the burghers' accusation against Abbot Domingo? What is the trial about? What is at stake in the trial?

In chapter seventy-five the chronicle shows Queen Urraca expelling the burghers, without any suggestion of Abbot Domingo's participation. In their interview with Count Bertrán, the burghers charge specifically that their women had been violated by the queen's knights. So what is their complaint against Domingo? Does the chronicle intentionally omit this? The chronicle begins with the burghers' interview with Bertrán, so by the time the narrative comes around to Domingo the burghers' case has already fallen apart. At this point they find themselves on defence for perjury in bringing false charges against Domingo.

With the unravelling of the burghers' case, and their sudden need to beg for the mercy of the court and Abbot Domingo, what is the trial about? What do the burghers perform penance for? In their final speech the burghers confess that 'the things that we said against [the abbot] were lies and falsehoods' (*'las cosas que contra él deçíamos, notificamos averlas dicho mentirosa e falsamente'*). Yet, before this, Archbishop Bernardo, in assigning the burghers' penance, speaks of the 'evils they had committed, first in deed and after in word' (*'e por fechos, primeramente, e después por dichos malamente aver fecho e cometido'*). Likewise, Abbot Domingo had assured Count Bertrán that 'nearly all of Spain knows how many times they have threatened me and how many things I and the church of Spain have suffered and have been made to bear' (*'quasi toda España conoçe en cuántos peligros ellos me han puesto e cuántas cosas yo e padesçido e a sostenido la iglesia de Sant Fagún'*). The chronicle has Cardinal assert that the court means to render a final judgement (*"demandé justiça e quise juiçio e non fallé quien me oyese"*). Are these reflections of the dual nature of this episode: a trial of perjury but also the end of the conflict in the chronicle's version of events?

In a way, this point is inconsequential, for regardless of the nature of the case between the monastery and the burghers, the council brought an end to the civil war, the burghers lost their Aragonese allies, and the local conflict was also ended. The

chronicle returns to this event for its convenience as an end to the story of conflict that it wants to tell. Thus, we can understand the indistinct picture that emerges of the trial itself. According to the chronicle's account the only thing at stake is the burghers' return to their houses. It is this that the burghers plead for, and this is the reward for their penance.

We have suggested that after the destruction of the burghers' charter and the re-appropriation of the land taken from the monastery the conflict was in effect over. The difficult issues of land, property that had held up previous attempts by the monastery to reassert control over the burghers were cleared away and the monastery could be relieved at its complete victory over the burghers. At the time the sense of relief might have been guarded. The civil war was not over yet, and neither had the burghers been returned to their place under Domingo's power. But as the story of the conflict is written the council presents a distinct opportunity.

The chronicle shows a different side of Abbot Domingo at the trial. It is the abbot's character and charisma that are the focus of this version. This is manifest in the abbot's interaction with Count Bertrán before and at the trial. Domingo's gesture of entrusting himself to Bertrán's judgement is made out to be an act of Domingo's good character. It is significant too that Domingo reveals that he was once Bertrán's friend (*'a mí fuistes mucho amigo entrañal'*). This can be taken as a coded reference to the common social status of the two. Janet Nelson, in 'Dispute Settlement in Carolingian West Francia',³⁴⁶ has shown, in a different context, the ways that courts decisions were controlled by those with resources and power.

Thus, though Domingo and the burghers confront one another in an ecclesiastical council, it is not necessary to interpret the significance of the proceedings and judgement of the case in a religious way. This is also true of the burghers' performance of penance: we do not need to think of penance in strictly religious terms, although here it is performed in an ecclesiastical court. Sarah Hamilton points out that penance often had a feudal purpose. Penance was often performed by a rebellious subject for reconciliation with a lord. Thus, penance, or ritual humiliation,

³⁴⁶ J.L. Nelson, 'Dispute Settlement in Carolingian West Francia', in *The Settlement of Disputes in Early Medieval Europe*, (eds.) W. Davies and P. Fouracre (Cambridge, 1986), 283-307.

was not strictly a religious gesture.³⁴⁷ It is significant that the chronicle says no more about the *libertas* or the *fuero* at this point. We have said that Queen Urraca and King Alfonso I are entirely absent from the chronicle's account of the council; we can also point out that Archbishop Bernard of Toledo plays a very small role, recommending the judgement of the penance, but disappearing after this. In this way, the chronicle allows Abbot Domingo in his role as the burghers' lord to take centre stage.

Conclusion

In the third part of the chronicle, the story of the outbreak of conflict gives way to the story of how Abbot Domingo and his supporters bring about the conflict's resolution. This transition is effected in the series of eight chapters that describe in grim detail the burghers' tortures of local peasants. In these chapters the Aragonese fall away in the narrative as aggressors. In their absence, the chronicle's account of the burghers' tortures is the occasion for a refocusing onto the burghers' violence and cruelty as the urgent point in question of the conflict. This gives way to Abbot Domingo's strategy of ecclesiastical censure against the burghers. The resolution of the conflict, of both the civil war between Urraca and Alfonso I and the local conflict, will now happen in terms of this strategy. Where the Aragonese and Queen Urraca appear in this final part of the narrative, it is as a function of this local conflict, and often in the service of the more formal argument that the chronicle makes through its dramatic story: the Aragonese show up as the example of secular intervention in the monastery's affairs that the *libertas Romana* prohibits; Queen Urraca appears in order to express the limits of her royal power in Sahagún, while at the same time she reminds the burghers of their historical debt to her through her father. The burghers' tortures lead to a series of episodes in which the dramatic urgency and moral force of these scenes is transferred on to the suggestion that the burghers and their clerics intended a larger attack on the ecclesiastical order. It is in this way that, one, the political is replaced by the ecclesiastical, and, two, Abbot Domingo's solicitation of ecclesiastical censures against the burghers is shown to be a necessary defensive strategy on his part. His strategy is further softened by the terms of rhetorical persuasion and spiritual correction in which it is couched. In chapter sixty-two, Domingo presents the burghers with the *libertas*

³⁴⁷ S. Hamilton, *The Practice of Penance, 900-1050* (Woodbridge, 2001), pp. 184-5.

Romana and they agree to live under the authority of St Peter, Rome, and the monastery of Sahagún. Here is the full expression of the argument for Domingo as ecclesiastical lord over the burghers. In the following chapters this argument continues to be made, as in the papal letters sent with Domingo by Pope Paschal II on the abbot's visit to Rome, but after this the chronicle begins to emphasise the matter of land and rights in the confrontations between the burghers and the monastery. This anticipates the problematic events of the end of the conflict: the confirmation of the burghers' charter by the abbot and monks (chapter sixty-nine), and the expulsion of the burghers from Sahagún by Queen Urraca, which is the opportunity for the monastery's re-appropriation of its stolen lands and the burning of the burghers' charter (chapter seventy-five). The monastery anticipates the historiographical problems of using these events as the end of the conflict by showing how the burghers had previously agreed to return the stolen land and to burn their charter. Finally, the chronicle moves to the Council of Burgos, where the conflict is brought to an end. Here, with the matters of land, property, and lordship dealt with and out of the way, the chronicle ends with a set-piece scene that shows Domingo as the successful defender of the monastery. Abbot Domingo defeats the burghers and receives their penance in terms which are neither overtly political nor ecclesiastical, but instead show him winning over of Count Bertrán, previously his enemy. With this the burghers are allowed to return to their houses and the monastery's power over them is reinstated.

Chapter Four: the author in the story

This chapter looks at the role of the author in the narrative of the *Crónica*. The author as a rhetorical feature of this chronicle (or ‘author-function’, as it has been called elsewhere) includes both the voice of the author as the narrator of the story and the figure of the monk who calls himself ‘I’, or ‘we’, and participates in the events of the story. The voice and person of the author have separate roles to play in the story – the narrator’s voice is more directly rhetorical and the participating monk more directly personal and social – and can be approached as distinct subjects of analysis. However, understood within the total framework of the of the chronicle’s narrative strategies, they can also be approached as interrelated features. There are moments in the story where these two manifestations of the author overlap, for example, the first-person voice speaks simultaneously as both the ‘participating author’ and the narrator. Such instances clue us in to the ways that the narrator and the author in the story work together towards larger effects and purposes in the text.

In this chapter we explore the role of the author both according to its place in the narrative and according to its part in the dramatic story of conflict the chronicle tells. The role of the author in the narrative conforms to the three part narrative structure we have described in the previous chapters. The author plays a very limited role in the chronicle’s account of the monastery’s history. With the outbreak of conflict, the author appears in a series of scenes in which the monks are attacked by the burghers; in these the authorial presence serves to dramatise the victim role of the monks. In the final narrative section, the author accompanies Abbot Domingo on a series of journeys away from the monastery, first to a dependent nunnery where they are attacked by the Aragonese and the burghers, and, second, to Rome to bring their complaint against the burghers to the papal audience. The author’s participation in these scenes allows the narrative to travel with him away from the monastery.

A closer look at the part the author-function plays in the voicing and staging of a communal subjectivity in the narrative brings our attention to how the argument concerning the monastery’s authority is expressed according to both the internal relationships and scenery of the monks and abbots in their buildings and on their lands, and an external set of personal relationships between the monastic community

and figures of the ecclesiastical and political hierarchies. Ultimately, the relationships between the author, his monastic community, the telling of the story, and the expression of the monastery's authority points to larger issues in how this chronicle creates meaning and how we are to read this meaning which will qualify our argument concerning the chronicle's social and legal purposes.

Useful distinctions have been drawn between the various ways that a medieval author might appear in his or her text. Sophie Marnette, begins her essay, 'The Experiencing Self and the Narrating Self in Medieval French Chronicles',³⁴⁸ with a distinction between the 'author' which 'is to be understood as what the text posits as the creative entity at the origin of the narrative' and the 'narrator' which is the 'entity which tells the story'.³⁴⁹ She then goes on to divide the manifestations of her authors according to types: 'I as Narrator qua Narrator' the 'I as Narrator-Author', the 'I as Moralizer' and the 'I as Witness and Story Participant'. This exercise is a common to other studies on vernacular authors.³⁵⁰

We could apply each of these author-functions to the *Crónica*. We could also add identities relating to the author's place within the monastic community of Sahagún: 'author as monk' and 'author as close associate of Abbot Domingo'. Yet, while useful for suggestion that the author has different rhetorical functions in different places, these strict definitions are too limiting. The author of the chronicle often appears in several functions at once; and each single function listed above could be further divided according to more subtle differences within each. The author's identity as a monk is particularly significant here. The chronicle makes it clear that this audience at least partly included the author's fellow monks of Sahagún. At other times the author uses the first-person plural 'we', speaking for himself and the whole

³⁴⁸ S. Marnette, 'The Experiencing Self and the Narrating Self in Medieval French Chronicles', *The Medieval Author in Medieval French Literature* (ed.) V. Greene (New York, 2006), 117-136.

³⁴⁹ Marnette, 'The Experiencing Self', p. 117.

³⁵⁰ A similar scheme appeared in E.B. Vitz, *Medieval Narrative and Modern Narratology: Subjects and Objects of Desire* (New York, 1989), pp. 41-44 concerning the dream structure in the *Roman de le Rose*. See also: D. Hult, 'Author/narrator/speaker', *Discourses of Authority in Medieval and Renaissance Literature*, ed. K. Brownlee & W. Stephens (Hanover, 1989) 76-96; A. C. Spearing, *Textual Subjectivity: The Encoding of Subjectivity in Medieval Narratives and Lyrics* (Oxford, 2005), p. 52; and P.M. Mehtonen, 'The Apophatic First-Person Speaker in Eckhart's Sermons', *Modes of Authorship in the Middle Ages*, (ed.) S. Rankovic (Toronto, 2012) 79-96. Given the mystic nature of Eckhart's *Sermons*, the last a particularly wide range of identities for the 'I' voice: the 'God-I', the 'epistemological I', the 'commentator-I', the 'object-I' and the 'character-I' (p. 82).

monastic community. The author, then, speaks not just to an unspecific rhetorical audience, but to and for specific members of the community around him, and this is significant for the way that we should understand the text and its author-function. This recognition also suggests that we leave open the question of whether 'I' (or 'we') of the text signifies a real person. If the author himself were to read his text to the monks, or if another monk were read the text with its occasional 'we' voice, then the distance of time and space between the author and the text's first-person voice would have disappeared. The textual first-person might still be understood as a feature of the rhetorical and grammatical system of the story, whether read on the page or overhead in the cloister, but the point to be made is that the relationship between author and audience is complex and subject to change. A text that is anonymous to us (such as the *Crónica*) might not have been anonymous for another group in another time and place. This same idea has been expressed by Elizabeth Tyler and Ross Balzaretti, who have explained that medieval texts are

completed by a web of social and textual relations which call into question modern expectations that coherence relies on a single author's vision, or that closure must be woven into the text rather than, for example, supplied by a shared understanding of the progress of time within salvation history, or by the social ritual in which a text played a part, or by the place of a poem within poetic tradition.³⁵¹

It is a notion that is very easily applied to the close communal context of the monastery.

The changing meaning of the author-function in an anonymous text is part of a more general difficulty of understanding medieval texts. Medieval authors are more elusive than modern authors, so in most cases we have only the traces left behind in their texts to work from.³⁵² This is, of course, the case with the *Crónica anónima*. But, it has also been pointed out that the medieval notion of the 'I' was less rigid than it

³⁵¹ E. M. Tyler & R. Balzaretti, eds., *Narrative and History in the Early Medieval West* (Turnhout, 2006), p. 2. The idea that medieval texts were often designed to take on their full meaning only within a certain social context is the argument of Spiegel's 'History, Historicism, and the Social Logic', p. 59-86.

³⁵² V. Greene (with reference back to Barthes' *The Death of the Author*) put it this way: '[t]o kill Balzac may make sense as a symbolic gesture, but since there is so little of him, to kill Chrétien de Troyes sounds absurd' in V. Greene, 'What Happened to Medievalists after the Death of the Author', *The Medieval Author in Medieval French Literature*, (ed.) V. Greene (New York, 2006), p. 213.

would become in later centuries. This was the message of Leo Spitzer's often cited assertion that 'in the Middle Ages the poetic 'I' had more freedom and more breadth than it has today'.³⁵³

The author in the narrative

The figure of the author in the story is not a constant: it has its points of entry and departure. We have seen in previous chapters how the positions of individuals and groups such as the burghers, King Alfonso I and his Aragonese deputies, and Queen Urraca are strategically arranged by the text, so that they become part of the way that the text tells its story and conveys certain arguments within that story.

The first episode we will discuss comes in chapter twenty-six, where the chronicle tells how Abbot Diego resigned his position despite the many rebukes from Archbishop Bernard of Toledo, and how Abbot Domingo was eventually elected abbot in his stead. It is here that we suggest the author enters the chronicle, both as a figure in the events of the story, the 'author as participant', and as a voice in the narrative, the 'author as narrator'.

It is worth pointing out before we get to our discussion of chapter twenty-six that there are traces of the author before the dramatic scene of Diego's resignation and Domingo's election. In the story of the monastery's history the chronicle uses first-person narrative tags in several places; these are short formulaic interjections in the narrative, such as 'I have said already'.³⁵⁴ In one other place, at the end of chapter five in the digression between the reigns of Ramiro II and Alfonso VI, this narrative gesture is more emphatic: the author announces 'I will set out clearly below in the following way'.³⁵⁵ The author also calls attention to his own involvement in the events of the monastery's history in two places. At the end of chapter six, with the return of Abbot Bernard from Rome with the *libertas Romana* the author declares 'to this day we keep the same privilege with us with great care and consolation'.³⁵⁶ And then, at the end of

³⁵³L. Spitzer, 'Note on the Poetic and the Empirical 'I' in Medieval Authors', *Traditio*, 4 (1946), p. 414-415.

³⁵⁴'*ansí como ya dixé*' CAS, ch. 13, p. 18. Others are: 'of the which we have said much' / '*del qual abemos fecho larga fabla*' CAS, ch. 6, p. 13; 'as I already began to say above' / '*ansí como ya arriva començé a hablar*' CAS, ch. 14, p. 19; 'as I have said already' / '*según que ya dixé*' CAS, ch. 14, p. 19.

³⁵⁵'*por el estilo siguiente avajo esplanado manifiestamente lo porné e declararé*' CAS, ch. 5, p. 12.

³⁵⁶'*el qual privilegio con nos oi día tenemos con gran guarda e consolaçón*' CAS, ch. 6, p. 15.

chapter sixteen, among those gathered in Toledo with the death of Alfonso VI and hearing of the king's decision to leave his kingdom to his daughter Urraca, the author declares 'this I happened to hear, for I was present there'.³⁵⁷ Yet, these do not take up much space in the fifteen chapters of the monastery's history, nor is their effect on how this story is told very great. Instead, in the introduction – the place where we might normally expect a monastic medieval chronicler to announce himself (if he is going to announce himself), and where this announcement would have most ready effect – the chronicle employs an impersonal voice. Chapter one introduces the monastic community (mentioning 'the abbots, monks', and 'the abbot Don Domingo the first') but the chronicler himself does not appear. Rather, impersonal phrases are used. Chapter one is introduced: 'Here begins the chronicle' (*'Aquí comienza la crónica'*);³⁵⁸ and Chapter two starts with an impersonal invocation of the text's readership and audience: 'To all the readers of the present book and chronicle, and attentive listeners ... let it be known' (*'A todos los leedores del presente libro e crónica atentos oidores ... sea manifiesto'*).³⁵⁹ The minimal role of the author in these chapters, and the use of impersonal expressions in places normally reserved for direct words from the author, stands in stark contrast to the large role that the author will take on in later parts of the story.

Chapter twenty-six

Chapter twenty-six introduces the narrative to the inner world of the monastic community. This is the first time in the story that we go behind the monastery's walls to see the monks in their own residence. The occasion for entering the monastery is the resignation of Abbot Diego from his leadership of the monastery. With the escalation of the burghers' attacks and the general chaos sweeping the region (as the chronicle describes it at least), Diego's resignation is cause for bitter rebukes by Archbishop Bernard of Toledo (who happens to be there at the time) and distressed complaints by the monks. The author appears in this scene of internal controversy as both the 'I as Narrator-Author' and the 'I as Witness and Story Participant'. We see

³⁵⁷ *'la qual cosa me acontesció oír, porque yo allí era presente'* CAS, ch. 16, p. 25.

³⁵⁸ CAS, ch. 1, p. 9.

³⁵⁹ CAS, ch. 2, p. 9. Further examples of impersonal narrative tags found in these chapter: 'It should now be known' / *'Es agora a saver'* CAS, ch. 4, p. 11; 'it will be explained below' / *'abaxo se manifiesta'* CAS, ch. 11, p. 18.

here how these two roles of voice and figure interact within the storyline of one episode, which is particularly communal. Specifically, we will focus here on the dramatic role of the 'we-voice' of the author-monk and the distancing role of the author-narrator in relation to the contradictory points of view of those involved in the internal conflict. Furthermore, this episode will also be significant both in the development of a plot surrounding the fate of the monks in the cloister and for dramatizing questions of authority as given in the *libertas Romana*.

The context of Abbot Diego's resignation is an intensification of attacks by the Aragonese and the burghers. It is this same chapter, as we have said, that the burghers finally emerge as agents in the narrative. The chronicle says that Archbishop Bernard happened to be at the monastery at that time and he takes it upon himself to dissuade Diego. He takes it upon himself to persuade Abbot Diego to remain in his position. The emphasis here is on the back and forth exchange between the two, with the archbishop accusing the abbot of abandoning his flock and the abbot sticking firm to his decision to resign. For three days the dispute continues. The first day the archbishop and the monks all rebuke him together. On the second day the entire convent prostrate themselves before him and beg him not to leave. The chronicle describes what happens next:

On the third day Abbot Diego asked the archbishop if it might please him to come to the chapterhouse. When he had come, the abbot prostrated himself before him and repeated everything he had said the past two days. But, when the honourable archbishop admonished him and told him he would not give way to his request to resign, the abbot called for his chamberlain and he went to the church to get his crosier from the altar; and when he returned to the chapterhouse, he laid it before the feet of the archbishop.

And the archbishop admonished him again and again and reproached him with harsh words for abandoning the flock under his care at such a time, warning he would be stand accused before God for such ostentation. Yet, the abbot stretched his hand out to the venerable sign of the passion of the Lord that was on the wall, and swore thus:

“By that holy cross and by the judgment of Death, from this day on I will not be abbot”.³⁶⁰

With Abbot Diego’s gesture towards the cross on the wall, Archbishop Bernard at last accepts the inevitability of his resignation. Here he turns dramatically to address the congregation of monks:

“Now then, my beloved sons, find a father. And though the holy church is beset by the waves of a great storm, we must still remember the dignity and privilege of the Holy Roman Church, under whose protection this church resides. In that privilege it says that if the abbot should die, nobody, be he king or prelate, secular or ecclesiastic, should dare for whatever cunning, deceit, or cleverness to elect or ordain the abbot in this monastery. The abbot should only be elected by the brothers and monks of this same congregation, or of another, by sane counsel and with the fear of God before them”. For, by that same privilege of liberty the monastery was to be ennobled in Spain, as the monastery of Cluny is resplendent in France.³⁶¹

This is the first appeal to the *libertas Romana* privilege after its introduction in chapter six. This is the first time that we see the terms of the *libertas* presented in a specific context. There were no stipulations for the election of a new abbot as the

³⁶⁰ *‘El terçero día, rogó al arçobispo que le plugiese de venir al capítulo. E entrado en el capítulo, el dicho abbad postrado con todo el cuerpo ant’él, replicava todo lo que ya avía dicho por los dos días pasados. El qual, como el honrrado arçobispo le contrastase por muchos amonestamientos e ruegos que non lo quisiese façer el mesmo, llamando su camarero, fue a la iglesia y tomó el báculo de encima del altar; e tornando en el capítulo, ante los pies del arçobispo puso el báculo.*

E como el arçobispo otra e otra vez le amonestase e reprehendiese con asaz palabras bien ásperas que en tal tiempo non dexase nin desmanparase la grei a él encomendada, porque non fuese ante Dios culpado de tanta ostinaçión, pero él, estendida la mano contra la señal venerable de la pasión del Señor que estava en la pared pintada, juró diçiendo así:

“Por aquella santa cruz e por el juicio de la muerte, desde este día en adelante non seré abbad”
CAS, ch. 26, p. 45.

³⁶¹ *“Pues agora, mis fijos muy amados [buscad] padre; e bien que la santa iglesia sea turvada con grave tenpestad de las ondas, non de menos devédenos de recordar la dignidad e privilegio de la santa Romana yglesia, so la guarda de la qual está, en el qual privilegio es contenido que, muerto el abbad de Sant Fagún, ningún rei nin gran perlado, ningún seglar ni persona eclesiástica sea osado en este monasterio, por qualquiera saviduría o encobierta o astucia, elegir al abbad o ordenar, salvo aquel que los hermanos e monjes de la misma congregaçión o de otra, por más sano consejo, mediante el temor de Dios, escogieren.*

Porque por aquella misma prerrogativa de libertad sea ennobleçido aqueste monasterio en Espanna, según que resplandesçe en Françia el monasterio de Cluni” CAS, ch. 26, p. 45-6.

chronicle originally introduced the terms of this privilege. But, here the archbishop references specific terms; these charge the monks themselves to choose their new abbot in language which has a defensive tone. The monks are to be wary of the 'cunning, deceit, or cleverness' (*'saviduría o encobierta o astucia'*) of interfering powers. We are soon told the reason for this fear. The chronicler explains:

Certainly, it was feared by us all that the king Alfonso I would demand a say in the election of the abbot, or that he would install in the abbacy some Aragonese or Navarrese, or one of his own men, who would scatter us all.³⁶²

The heightened sense of guarding against an impending intrusion strengthens the sense of communal identity among the monks even as this intrusion threatens to dissolve this same community. We notice that the author steps into the scene here, so that the fears of the monks are expressed in a common first-person voice. There is a sense in which this emphasises the togetherness of the monks in the situation. The pervading imagery of the scene shows a fear based on the threat of chaos and dissolution against security and order. The monks fear they will be scattered or spilled forth (*'nos derramase a todos'*). The archbishop imagines the church 'beset by the waves of a great storm'. There is a logic in the dramatization of the communal identity that perhaps urges the author's participation in the scene. They are all in it together, defined together by a common threat. The imagery points very clearly to the role that a powerful figure such as Archbishop Bernard has in protecting and preserving the community. The archbishop, in his attempt to dissuade Diego from resigning, had admonished him 'with harsh words for abandoning the flock entrusted to him in such a time'.³⁶³ The imagery of the scene points very clearly to the central role of authority for keeping the monastic community safe and whole.

The centrality of authority at this juncture at least seems clear. However, the complicated ways that different forms and persons of authority are shown to interact is more difficult to keep straight. We have Abbot Diego abandoning his responsibility; the archbishop stepping in to temporarily fill this vacuum; King Alfonso I threatening to

³⁶² *'Por cierto, de nos todos mucho se temía que el rei fuese savidor e demandado consejo sobre la elección del abbad, e que quisiese entremeter en la abbaçia algún aragonés o algún navarro o alguno de los suyos que nos derramase a todos'* CAS, ch. 26, p. 46.

³⁶³ *'con asaz palabras bien ásperas que en tal tiempo non dexase nin desmanparase la grei a él encomendada'* CAS, ch. 26, p. 45.

intervene; and, Abbot Domingo waiting in the wings, about to be elected. There is also the textual authority of the *libertas Romana* which, as the archbishop asserts it, is meant to determine the correct procedures for the succession of the abbacy. This calls on yet another position of authority, the papacy. In this, it also excludes all other external authorities; in the circumstances, as the monks tell us, this means specifically King Alfonso.

This juncture in the chronicle's account of the conflict is a critical moment for establishing the relationships of cooperation or competition between these various authority figures as relative to the monastery. But, it is also a critical moment for defining the monastic community according to these forms of authority. The scene is particularly significant because the monks find themselves without a leader. It is the *libertas* that encourages the monks to act. The defensive terms of the *libertas* set the monks in direct opposition to hostile and cunning secular and religious powers, or, according to the circumstances, King Alfonso. But, it is not a moment for the monks' triumphant assertion of their authority against the king; the monks remain the abandoned flock throughout the scene.

The imagery of the scene continues to emphasise the helpless situation of the monks. Despite their fears, the monks manage to elect a new abbot called García; but it turns out he was ill, and he dies eight days after his ordination. The community is cast back into crisis; their situation is described:

Yet, we had some time to breathe and none of us drowned; for through the great waves of our tribulation the father of all Spain was present, he who reigned as the primate of the church of Toledo, that is, Don Bernardo, who, as we have already said, was papal legate, to whose paternal affection and counsel we flew, just as to a safe port, and we were strengthened by his presence.³⁶⁴

The condition of the monks without their abbot continues to be defined by their relationship to a strong authority figure. The monks were the abandoned flock. Their

³⁶⁴ *'Enpero, algún tanto teníamos de espacio para respirar e non del todo nos afogar, pues que en tan grandes ondas estava presente a nuestras grandes tribulaciones el padre de toda Espanna, el qual regia el primado de la iglesia Toledanna, conviene a saber, don Bernardo, el qual, así como ya diximos, tenía las beças del papa al cuyo afecto paternal e consejo corriamos, así como a un puerto muy seguro, por la qual presençia éramos fortificados'* CAS, ch. 26, p. 46.

deliverance, however, is not imagined in terms of a new shepherd returning to round up the scattered sheep. Rather, the monks adrift together on a turbulent sea, wind up in the safe port of the archbishop's paternal intervention. This metaphor underscores the incidental circumstances of the archbishop's intervention. He is not directly responsible for the monks, but happens to be there. He is both a figure of far-reaching authority—'the father of all Spain', 'the primate of the church of Toledo', 'papal legate'—and the paternal figure who was formerly the abbot of Sahagún.

We have so far focused on the way in which the communal identity of the monks is both defined and dramatised in this scene according to the terms of the *libertas*, and in relationship to the different roles of authority figures: abandoning, intervening, threatening, etc. Furthermore, we are not solely interested in the meaning of this scene for itself, but also for what it suggests more generally about the communal shape and purpose of the chronicle. The narrator does not, as in chapter seventy-three intervene directly for us, the audience, in order to interpret the scene, but the role of the author/narrator in the scene does add a further dimension which suggests something about the function of this scene in terms of the larger communal story of the chronicle. In the two passages quoted above the fears of the monks are expressed in the first-person 'we' of the author and the monks. We have suggested the way that this emphasises the communal nature of the monks' situation. There is both a dramatic rhetorical and social purpose to the author's place in the moment. But, as we know from chapter seventy-three where the narrator distances himself from the monks at the critical moment of their confirmation of the burghers' charter, this identification with the rest of the monks is not even. In this scene too, with these central moments of a common voice of fear and anxiety, there are also signs of a more complex approach to the author's relation to his fellow monks.

Returning to our theme, as I have said, after Domingo had been elected and the honourable archbishop had made sufficient examination of him, and ordained him abbot, the same Bernard returned to his church; the king's anger against him grew as he had ordained the abbot without his knowledge; but he was not

concerned about the king's anger and wrath, for he was righteous and a lover of justice.³⁶⁵

The archbishop's intervention here is not unknown in Cluniac religious houses that held the *libertas Romana*. Giles Constable points out that though the practice did make some uncomfortable it did sometimes happen.³⁶⁶ The archbishop makes a strong defence of the *libertas* against the king. This will be contrasted in the later scene of the confirmation of the burghers' charter where both Queen Urraca and Abbot Domingo sidestep the burghers' demands and so leave the monks to decide the matter. Here, Archbishop Bernard's role is to charge the monks to fulfil their role in electing a new abbot, but he is also willing to incur the wrath of King Alfonso I for this. The place of the narrator is also put to particular use in this chapter. When the convent finally elects Domingo the narrator speaks up:

After all this, the convent chose with the archbishop's counsel a young and dutiful monk, shaven in humility, ennobled by chastity, graced by learning, prudent and noble in ecclesiastical things, and wise and discrete in secular business, who came from a noble family, and was called Domingo.³⁶⁷

And lest I am seen to praise him too much, the following things will testify to his strength in adversity, and all the things that he suffered.³⁶⁸

There is here a passage of authority from the archbishop to the new abbot. The praise of Domingo echoes Bernard's arrival at Alfonso VI's court in chapter six. The scene can in one sense be read as a continuation of the previous mode. The *libertas* of course looks back to that history, and the role of the archbishop enacts the strong

³⁶⁵ 'Tornando con decavo, como ya dixen, como fuese ya electo e fecha de él suficiente exsaminación e del honrrado arçobispo ordenado, este mesmo barón tornóse a lo suyo, acreçentada contra él mucho la ira del rei por quanto avía fecho la ordenación del abbad sin lo él saver; pero por quanto él era derecho e amador de la justicia, non se curó de su yra e sanna' CAS, ch. 26, p. 47.

³⁶⁶ G. Constable, 'Cluny and Rome', *The Abbey of Cluny*, G. Constable (Berlin, 2010), 19-41 (p. 24).

³⁶⁷ Diego had resigned by end of year (after 15 December 1110); his successor, Domingo, was in place by 11 February 1111 (Fernández Flórez, *Colección diplomática IV*, p. 16: no. 1180; p. 27: no. 1183).

³⁶⁸ 'E después de todo, el convento, avido e pensado su consejo, escogió un monje mançevo e presto a toda obediencia, afeitado por humildad, enoblesçido por castidad, esguarneçido por letras, prudente e noble en las cosas eclesiásticas, e en los negoçios seglares savio e discreto, el qual benía de noble generación, manso por natura e benigno, llamado Domingo.

E porque non sea yo visto alabarlo demasiadamente, las cosas siguientes dan testimonio de quanta fortaleza e qual aya seido en las adbersidades, e quantas cosas él sufrió.' CAS, ch. 26, p. 47.

authority that governs over a new moment in the monastery's history. The narrator steps in to look forward, to establish a new understanding with the reader. The text from here will be about the fortitude and suffering of the abbot. A new purpose is given to the narrative. Or rather it is a refocusing as the burghers' attacks on Abbot Domingo were already announced by the introduction of chapter one. The events of the story are translated into a narrative purpose.

In fact, in this scene in which the narrator and the burghers meet, the narrator is still able to create a space apart from the monks and archbishop. The narrative does not solely identify with their perspective. The narrator introduces Diego's resignation in this way:

Certainly the abbot tendered and put forward reasons just enough, for the queen and the nobles had somewhat displayed enmity against him for no other reason than that in the time of the most pious king Don Alfonso VI he had contested her and them many times in the interest of defending and guarding the goods of Sahagún; and declaring these things and listing the causes of the impossibility of him staying in his position, he entreated the archbishop to allow him to live peacefully in the cloister.

And this entreaty stunned the archbishop and terrified the convent, and they began to try to convince him not to leave the flock under his watch in such tribulation: for just as in the time of joy and consolation he had guided his sheep through meadows and pleasant pastures, so in the time of the frozen seas and great tribulation it was right to continue to guide and support them with all his strength; they continually admonished him and prayed to him in this way.³⁶⁹

³⁶⁹ *'Por cierto, el [abbad] demostrava e manifestava causas asaz justas, por quanto la reina e los nobles algún tanto le demostravan enemistad, non por otra cosa sino que en el tienpo del mui piadoso rei don Alfonso contrastava a ella e a muchas beçes por guardar e defender los bienes de Sant Fagún; aseñalando estas cosas e ennumerando las causas de su ynposibilidad, por tanto, mucho le suplicava que le dexase bivar ferialmente en el claustro.*

E aquesta su suplicación enbaçó al arçobispo e espavoreció todo el convento, e començaron a tratar con él que le pluguiese de non dexar en tanta trivulación la grei a él encomendada, mas así como en el tienpo de las delicias e consolaciones él avía guiado sus ovejas por prados e pastos delitosos, así conbenía que en el tienpo de la helada de los mares e gran tribulación sostubiese e las guiase con todas sus fuerças, deçiéndole sienpre semexantes amonestaciones e ruegos continuados' CAS, ch. 26, pp. 44-5.

The narrative creates here a space for sympathy with Diego's position. There is an allowance for the logic of Diego's decision ('reasons just enough') and the unreasonableness ('for no other reason than') the queen's antagonism. For the chronicle at this moment, Diego is a victim of tensions inherent in his role at the monastery: on one hand, he must stay within the good graces of the queen and her nobles, on the other, he is called upon to protect the interests of the monastery. These have diverged, in Diego's case, to a degree that has made his position untenable. The injustice of this occasion which the chronicle is allowing for is that these tensions will have only a temporary resolution in the moment through the resignation of Diego. He takes a personal fall for only doing his job. The enmity of the queen and her faction can be aimed personally at Abbot Diego so that when he retires to the cloister he can be replaced and the queen and the monastery can continue in a relationship of mutual interest.

But, this is not at all how the archbishop and the monks see the situation. The narrative turns abruptly to their reaction to his announced resignation. Shock and fear set in and Diego, no longer the victim of his job defending the monastery, is now the fair-weather abbot who abandons his flock when things get difficult. What is of interest here is the way that the narrative hedges itself between these two perspectives. The narrator himself stays out and allows the two possible takes on Diego's resignation to speak for themselves. It is a juncture which not only reveals an inherent tension in the conflicted interests of the abbacy, but which also opens up a tension in the narrative itself. Like the tensions that led to Diego's resignation, it is not one which will be resolved.

Chapter seventy-three

We can turn now to chapter seventy-three. This is the final scene within the monastery in the chronicle. This episode is of particular historiographical relevance to the chronicle as it is here that the abbot and monks (and Queen Urraca) confirm the burghers' charter. At best this presents an historiographical embarrassment for the monastery, at worst an admission of the burghers' legal claims for exemptions from the abbot's social and economic rights. Noticeable here is a dramatic unfolding of the scene which recalls that of chapter twenty-six. Especially for the way that this

unfolding puts the question of the monastery's authority on the monks alone, this scene means to be read with chapter twenty-six. In a similar way, too, the chronicle allows us to see internal contradictions within the monastic community, but stops short of choosing between various points of view. In contrast to chapter twenty-six, here the author maintains the distance of the narrator; he does not show himself participating with the monks as they agree to confirm the burghers' charter. Also significant is the difference in the nature of the threat and enemy in these parallel scenes. In chapter twenty-six the threat is specifically the royal intrusion into the monastery's internal affairs by Alfonso I. In chapter seventy-three, it is the burghers' charter and the loosening of authority over the burghers. Both ultimately become occasions for the chronicle to assert the abbot's authority especially in terms of the *libertas Romana*. What we see is the way that the actions of Abbot Domingo are defended, through an implicit blaming of the monks—a blame, however, which is transferred to the external threat of the enemy. Finally, we see how the episode of chapter seventy-three points back in its implications, just as chapter twenty-six pointed forward.

In chapter seventy-three we are once again inside the monastery, this time with Queen Urraca, the burghers, the monks, and Abbot Domingo. How this group has come to assemble together here is significant. Returning from Rome in the spring of 1116, Abbot Domingo has the papal letters granting him the power of excommunication and absolution over the burghers read to the burghers. They exclaim their willingness to live under the power and protection of Saint Peter, the papacy, and Abbot Domingo. Then they make the following oath to Abbot Domingo:

And, when that oath had been ratified and signed and they had sworn on the four evangelists, the abbot received their oath on the condition that they reject above all the lordship and gifts of all men, just as they had promised in their oath. And, when they had thrown off evil customs, they should desire to live under the lordship of the monastery according to the order of the ancient laws; and, the abbot, overlooking all ill-will and resentment for their injuries towards him, would take power over them; and, the abbot would

make every effort to forget the insults of the past, and they would live in peace.³⁷⁰

The agreement is forged, but afterward Domingo is reluctant to push for the return of the monastery's possessions, fearing the fragility of the peace. At this point the queen is invited to Sahagún. Domingo pushes the burghers to make a peace with her, but it is here that they renege and press the queen to confirm their charter. She does, but at the same time reminds them that her confirmation is without force given the monastery's exemption from political power in the *libertas*. The burghers then turn to Domingo and press him to confirm. He copies the queen's strategy. The narrative continues:

And so, when the abbot saw that there was no other way to avoid confirming it, he hushed the room and, with everyone listening, he asked:

"Do you want me to authorise that charter by confirming it?"

And together, as if with one heart and mouth, they responded:

"We do desire it!"

And, after asking them a second and a third time in the same way if they wanted him to confirm that charter, and they responded each time "Yes", he said to them:

"Then I confirm that charter for you, save always my order and the right of this monastery".

Although they did not understand this, they knew his interjection of that word 'save' was bad.

Then they got into a great hurry to see the monks also confirm that charter. And despite all the many times that the abbot denied that the hearts of the monks would ever incline to confirm that document, the queen then began to ask the abbot to have the monks confirm it. Now when the abbot told the monks they had to

³⁷⁰ *'despreçando sobre todo señorío e donación de todos los honbres, así como por su juramento prometían; e quitadas las malas costumbres, según el estableçimiento de las antiguas leyes, quesiesen beber so el señorío del monasterio, e él, apartada de si toda escrupulosidad e saña por las ynurias a él fechas, toviere mando sobre ellos; e aún que él se esforçaría en quantas maneras podiese, non se recordando de los denuestos pasados, que ellos bibiesen en paz'* CAS, ch. 73, pp. 110-11.

confirm it (as he could not oppose the queen), they all responded as one:

“We confirm it, just as the abbot confirmed it”.

Now then, consider for yourself clever reader how the burghers had committed the crime of perjury, and how the abbot and monks did not confirm the same cursed charter, for their purpose was to justly see the return of all the things that unjustly had been taken from the monastery and belonged to it by right: to have all the things that had been removed from its power restored to its power. Moreover, they thought that the abbot had been released from his bond as he had made this condition to them:

“If I judge you to have been faithful and loyal in what you promised, I will not remember the evils you committed against me”.

And how can it be said that the queen had confirmed the cursed charter? They had promised allegiance to her and made her an oath; but, as one will understand from what follows, they did not do this according to their will, but against it, for in that time the king of Aragón had lost the town called Burgos along with the same castle that he ruled there: and so if the town of Sahagún was besieged by the queen they would not have any assistance from the king.³⁷¹

³⁷¹ *‘E beyendo que non le quedava remedio para foir la dicha confirmaçión, fecho gran silençio e todos oyendo, les dixo así:*

“¿Queredes bosotros que yo, confirmando, autoriçe aquesta carta?”

E como todos de un corazón e de una boca respondiesen:

“Queremos”.

E como aún la segunda e la tercera bez semejantemente les dixese si querían que confirmase la dicha carta, e respondiesen otra vez que sí, el abbad entonçes dixo:

“E yo vos confirmo aquesta carta, salva sienpre mi orden e salva la justiçia d’este monasterio”.

La qual cosa, bien que ellos non la entendiesen, pero súpoles mal el entreponimiento de la dicha palabra.

Dieron aún gran priesa porque todos los monjes confirmasen la dicha carta. E como mucho luengamente contradixese el abbad, diçiendo que nunca se ynclinarían los coraçones de los monjes a confirmaçión de la dicha escriptura, entonçe començó la reina a rogar al abbad que él mobiese e aconsejase a los monjes para confirmar la dicha carta. Pero como a ellos les fuese dicho que debiesen confirmar, lo qual ya non poniendo negar, todos en uno respondieron:

“Nos confirmamos, así como el abbad confirmó”.

Pues agora tú, savio leedor, considera que los burgeses cometieron crimen de perjurio. E el abbad e monjes non feçieron confirmaçión alguna a la dicha maldita carta, ca la orden del abbad e monjes era demandar e a sí apropiar justamente todas las cosas que ynjustamente les eran tomadas e la justiçia del monasterio pertenesçian, todas la cosas perdida a todo su poder restaurar e cobrar; e aún más piensan la fee del abbad que les avía dado ser suelta quando condiçionalmente les dixera:

This is a crucial juncture in the text. As we know, the burgher's success here will not be long lasting: this charter will be burned at the end of a series of events which take up the next two chapters (seventy-four and seventy-five). But, even if only momentarily, what we see is the victory of the burghers over the monastery's lordship. This is what they have been fighting for during the last fifty or so chapters. This is what a burgher victory should have looked like if they had not been expelled by Urraca and their charter subsequently burned. Moreover, as we have suggested, the burning of the burgher's charter raises problems. Is this a legitimate way to undo the confirmation of the burghers' charter by the queen, abbot, and monks? How does the chronicle return to this episode without actually making the burghers' case (as we might imagine it) that the monastery had signed their charter and should therefore honour it?³⁷²

As often in the *Crónica*, the dramatic nature of the scene belies the way that the scene is carefully constructed according to an argument about authority. Abbot Domingo's presentation of the papal letters asserting his new power to excommunicate and absolve over the burghers forms the backdrop to this scene. But, that power and the burghers' forceful outburst agreeing to live under the protection of Saint Peter, Rome, and Abbot Domingo seems quickly forgotten, not only by the burghers, but by the abbot and monks facing the burghers' aggressions in the event and the chronicle. This would seem to be the moment for Abbot Domingo to exercise his new power. Where he does remind them of their late oath, he only complains that they have not returned the possessions taken from the monastery:

“Forcing me to sign your charter, you ask me to do something unjust, for this is not what the Holy Father admonished you to do in his letter, nor is this what you agreed to in your oath. Where is that oath now? With God as a witness you swore to me on the four evangelists

“Si vos yo fallare fieles y leales como prometedes, yo non me recordaré de los males que contra mí feçistes”.

Mas ¿a do la reina fue vista consentir confirmando la maldita carta?. Ellos otrosí le avian prometido fidelidad e dado so juramento; mas como se puede dar a entender de lo consiguiente, no lo avian fecho de boluntad, mas contra su boluntad’ CAS, ch. 73, pp. 113-5.

³⁷² In chapter thirty-three the chronicle tells how the burghers chased down King Alfonso I to demand that he honour the pact that he had made with Urraca at Peñafiel. So the honouring of deals made had been made an issue before in the story.

and you promised to return all the things which you had stolen from us".³⁷³

We see in the way that Domingo returns to the issue of papal authority what a change there has been. The purpose and advantage with which Domingo had returned from Rome (which was especially strong after he was freed from his captivity at the court of Alfonso I) has evaporated. Instead, the scene looks back to earlier confrontations between the monastery and burghers. There is a definite sense in which this scene is returning to the narrative of chapter twenty-six. Narrative patterns such as the dramatic back-and-forth between the actors (then between Abbot Diego and Archbishop Bernard, here between the burghers and the queen, abbot, and monks) show how we have returned to a certain narrative mode. The most concrete similarity, however, is the way that in both scenes the monks are left to defend the monastery without the help of the abbot. In chapter twenty-six, this pressure came from the threats of Alfonso I. We have seen how the transition through the scenes of torture largely remove the Aragonese from the equation, and so here it is specifically the burghers that the monks face.

The continuity between the scenes is also seen in the arguments over the nature of the burghers' submission to the monastery. Though Abbot Domingo is reduced to pleading for the burghers' obedience, Queen Urraca makes a more direct argument, but of course her purpose is to sidestep the burghers' own demands for her to confirm their charter:

"You well know that in this town my father did not incline to take anything for himself; he yielded his royal lordship, for all these things are granted and consecrated to God and his martyrs, and no mortal may own or inherit any title or deed to these. But however that may be, I confirm that charter as it pertains to me".³⁷⁴

³⁷³ *"Cosa ynjusta façedes queriéndome forçar a la confirmar, ca el Santo Padre por sus escritos non bos obo así amonestado, nin vuestro ayuntamiento, façiéndome juramento, prometiera. Pues ¿dónde es agora el juramento que, testigo Dios, sobre sus ebangelios a mí feçistes, prometiéndome que me restituiríades enteramente todas las cosas que aviades tomado e robado?"* CAS, ch. 73, p. 113.

³⁷⁴ *"Bosotros bien sabedes que mi padre en aquesta villa non quiso nin apropió a sí alguna cosa, sacando el real señorío, ca todas las cosas son dados e consagradas a Dios e a los sus mártires. E ninguno de los mortales, por razón e respeto de heredad e posesión, puede aver firmes nin seguras; mas que quier que ello sea, quanto lo que a mí pertenesçe, aquesta carta yo confirmo"* CAS, ch. 73, p. 113.

The chronicle should, perhaps, be more critical of Urraca. The *libertas* offered the monastery protection from the unwanted intrusion of royal power; Urraca invokes it here to get herself out of a confrontation with the burghers. The chronicle even says she pressured the abbot to have the monks confirm the charter. Still the chronicler excuses her at the end. The chronicle's indecision between conflicting lines of action within the monastery, or its royal supporters, also echoes chapter twenty-six (when the chronicle sympathises with both Abbot Diego and Archbishop Bernard).

The monks exclaim their willingness to follow their abbot in confirming the burghers' charter and the narrator abruptly stops the action. There is a pause at the moment of catastrophe and we are redirected to the narrator's interjection. It is directly to the reader that the narrator turns. His logic is that of two wrongs making a right. Though, as the scene is dramatised, it is not said that the burghers agree to return the monastery's property in exchange for confirmation of their charter, this is the narrator's point. The argument also hinges on the conditional nature of the original agreement.

The emphasis again, one line down, is on the conditional nature of the arrangement (*'condicionalmente'*, p. 111). Significantly, the conditional nature of the agreement is made to hinge on the past. As it is expressed in the narrator's paraphrase at the end of the chapter: "If I judge you to have been faithful and loyal in what you promised, I will not remember the evils you committed against me". The burghers' wrongs of the past (at this point, Spring 1116) seven years are on trial. Even as the monastery reaches its low point of power *vis-à-vis* the burghers, the chronicle insists that it is the burghers that are on the defence, and that it is they who still have to make good. True as this may be (especially in the monastery's eyes), the opposite is also true. The monastery has suffered defeat on their own terms, specifically that is, in the contest of documents. It is now the monastery that is made to null and void a charter, and eventually to burn a charter. It was the burghers who were charged with 'breaking the laws and customs of Alfonso VI'³⁷⁵ and going forth with 'iron and flame'.³⁷⁶ Now it is the monastery that denies a charter (signed by Queen Urraca) and

³⁷⁵ *'quebrantando las leyes e costumbres puestas a ellos de la buena memoria rei don Alfonso [VI]'* CAS, ch. 27, p. 50.

³⁷⁶ *'fierro e flama'* CAS, ch. 31, p. 57.

will destroy the burghers' charter with fire. We do not need to argue that there is no perceivable difference between the *fuero* of Alfonso VI and the burghers' charter, or between burning a charter and sacking a village, to understand the hurdles of the chronicle's task. The differences needed to be expressed. This in itself involves a distinction between kinds of texts: those that are legitimate and must be followed and those that are illegitimate and must be got rid of.

This scene, then, is significant as the moment of a specific historiographical problem for the chronicle. It is also significant as the last of a sequence of group scenes in which the subjective focus of the narrative is on the community of monks of Sahagún. We will consider the role of documents in the narrative in the next chapter. Our interest here is in the role of the author in scenes such as the confirmation of the burghers' charter. It is a scene located within the monastery's walls. It is a group scene, with part of the action and speech occurring between the burghers and the monks, whom are described as speaking as one. It is also a scene which dramatises the way that power is represented by and between certain individuals and groups involved in the conflict. Finally, it is a scene in which the author/narrator intervenes in the action. Here the author stands apart to offer his own interpretation of events, intervening with the reader in direct terms on behalf of the monks and abbot.

Here again the narrative creates a space beside apart from the action of the scene. The reader is brought in to participate (and agree with) the narrator's excuse for the decision of the monks, abbot, and queen. The narrator's logic is telling. It makes the scene about the past: all the past wrongs committed against the monastery. The narrator insists that it is to be understood in these terms. The narrator's interjection also cuts the scene off: we learn no more about the implications of this confirmation for the relationship between the burghers and the monks. Chapter seventy-four jumps to the failed plot of the burghers and Aragonese to take the town with an ambush and their eventual expulsion from the town.

The author in the monastery

In this section we will consider a sequence of episodes which return us to the internal space of the monastery. These are all to be found in the following chapters of the second narrative section of the chronicle, and characterise the use of the author-

function as specifically communal. Here the text dramatises the victim-role of the monks. These scenes all continue the narrative story of the fate of the community begun by chapter twenty-six.

The dramatization of common suffering appears as a linking theme in a sequence of scenes that like this one moves the narrative within the monastery's walls. In chapter thirty-eight, the chronicler describes the helpless abbot and monks cowering in the cloister in fear of the burghers:

And when the abbot and ourselves heard these things, we shut up in the cloister, just as mice in a cave, many times repeating and saying within us the words of that same prophet David:

“Lord, when will you judge those that persecute us?”³⁷⁷

We have discussed the first part of this same scene previously: here the burghers threaten to cut off the heads of the abbot and monks if they dare to complain about the burghers' attacks on the monastery's lands.³⁷⁸ The internal space of the monastery now appears as a refuge from the threats of the outside world. The dilemma driving this scene, as we noted before, is the inability of the abbot and monks to respond to the burghers, but it is finally not just an inability to act but the effective surrender of the monastery's lands to the attacking burghers on which the scene ends. The refuge that was previously made into the metaphor of a ship seeking harbour now appears as the pitiable image of mice seeking a cave. Finally, as previously the text of the *libertas* was invoked, now it is the Bible that is the referential text. The idea of interiority is given a deeper dimension, now the words of the psalm become the prayer of the community, their thoughts blending into the Biblical text. The text chosen by the chronicler is also significant for calling out for divine intervention, pointing to the way that the monastery will be able to move beyond their present impasse. Both the monastery's actions and the downfall of the monastery's enemies will be attributed to divine intervention. We will consider the role of the narrator in reaching out and identifying divine intervention at a later point in this chapter.

³⁷⁷ *E nos e el abbad, oyendo estas cosas, dentro del claustro nos ençerrávamos, ansí como los ratones en sus cavernas, muchas beças dentro de nos rebolbiendo e deçiendo aquel dicho del profeta David:*

“Señor, ¿quándo farás de los que nos persiguen juicio?” CAS, ch. 38, p. 73. A reference to Psalm 119:84: ‘How long must your servant wait? / When will you punish my persecutors?’

³⁷⁸ “He who put such an estate into the possession of the monks comes return trip from the devil” / “If anyone should say one word of this, we will cut and smash his head” CAS, ch. 38, p. 73.

In another instance that we can consider, the author joins his fellow monks outside the monastery walls, but within the obediences. This is in chapter thirty. Alfonso I had come to the town and with his knights and the burghers had chased Abbot Domingo into exile. He left a knight Sanchianes in control of the town and departed. Sanchianes with the burghers took over the monastery's lands and the chronicler says that the monks were forced to either submit to the Aragonese or retreat to the cloister.

In this chapter the exclusivity and safety of the inner world of the cloister come under threat. Abbot Domingo was safe within the cloister, but when Alfonso I arrives and joins the burghers with him, they contrive to lure him out and drive him from the town. The chronicle describes the king's arrival in the town:

he returned to the town of Sahagún, and after calling on the burghers and consulting with them, he sent his knights to the abbot to call him into the parlour outside the cloister, as if they desired to speak with him; and when he came out, they closed the cloister doors and threatened him, saying that he could go where he liked but was not to enter the obediences or fields of Sahagún, or they would certainly catch and imprison him.³⁷⁹

For the monks left behind the only safe place was the cloister; those that were in the obediences were forced to 'either to submit to the Aragonese or enter the cloister'.³⁸⁰ However, some monks still have business about town and they are subject to further abuse. The chronicler describes:

Thus, when any the monks of the obediences would pass through the town square for some business, the burghers would mock and insult him.

I remember one day when they pulled a chamberlain named Monio, a religious man, from off his horse, and threw him on the ground.

³⁷⁹ *'en el burgo de Sant Fagum tornóse, e llamados los burgeses e avido con ellos fabla, mandó a sus cavalleros que llamaron en el parlatorio al abbad fuera de la claustra, quasi a aver fablar con él; a los quales, como él saliese, çerráronle luego las puertas de la claustra, amenaçándole e deçiéndole que se partiese e fuese a do quisiese, con esto, que non entrase en las obediencias e granjas de Sant Fagum. E si non lo fiçiese, obiese por çierto que lo prenderían e encarçelarian'* CAS, ch. 30, p. 54.

³⁸⁰ *'o que obedeçiesen al aragonés, o que se entrasen en la claustra'* CAS, ch. 30, p. 55.

In that time none of us were called by our name; we were called “gluttons”, “drunks”, and whatever other name of discredit and dishonour.

I remember well that one day as I was speaking with the said Sanchianes, among other things, he told me:

“In an evil hour and under a bad omen you invited the burghers into this town, for this monastery will be destroyed by them”.³⁸¹

The monks are made into a common group in the negative terms of the burghers’ insults. The experience of the author and the common experience of the monks are related in a complex way. The attack on Monio is, in fact, a memory of the author: an event which finds its way into the narrative according to the particular perceptive experience of one of the monks (the author) and his later experience in recalling the event, and choosing to include it, and how to write it, in the narrative. This account of a single memory of a single attack then gives way to a broader notion of common insults, where everyone is called ‘glutton’ and ‘drunk’: a series of events which can be expressed as a thematic situation, one in which all the monks are made to share. Finally, it is again a single memory of a single experience which brings the author as participant into the scene. Here, however, his experience is not of abuse or threat, but of a conversation. Anecdotally, ‘one day’, he happens to speak with Sanchianes, and he is told what he clearly already knew, but what seems worthy of notice as it comes from his enemy.

The subjectivity of the confrontation, the author’s memory, the burghers’ insults which define the collective of the monks according to their hostility towards the group, finishes with an added spin of complexity. Sanchianes give his own take on the situation. Presumably, Sanchianes’ assertion is of interest to the chronicler precisely

³⁸¹ *‘Entonces, si alguno de los monjes obedenciales, pasase por la plaza de la villa por algún negocio, escarneíanle e ynjuríanle.*

Yo me recuerdo que un día que al camarero llamado Monio, barón religioso, derrocaron del cavallo que estava, e echáronlo a tierra.

Ninguno de nosotros en aquel tiempo era llamado por su nonbre, mas héramos llamados “garganeros”, “beberrones”, e semejantemente por otro qualquiera nonbre de mengua e deshonor.

Aún bien me remienbro yo que un día, como yo fablase con el dicho Sachianes, entre las otras cosas, me dixo:

“En mala ora e por mal agüero allegastes estos burg[u]jeses en esta villa, ca por ellos este monasterio será destruido” CAS , ch. 30, p. 55.

because he is supposed to be the monastery's enemy and he seems to be offering a critique of the burghers. It was under an 'evil omen', he says, that the burghers were invited to the town. There is an objective distance between what Sanchianes says and his own role in the scene. He attacks the monastery himself even as he comments on the misfortune of the monastery's destruction from the monastery's perspective. It is through the author's own involvement in the scene he is able to assert through the words of his enemy what serves as an objectivised perspective on the burghers.

At the end of the chapter the preserve of the cloister is trespassed. The chronicle describes how the king sent his brother Ramiro, a monk, to Sahagún to replace the exiled Abbot Domingo:

And the king was troubled that though everything outside the cloister had been robbed and ruined, yet the things inside remained whole and intact; and therefore he sent for and called his brother, a false and evil monk, called Ramiro, and sent him to enter in the monastery of Sahagún and lord over the monks and take charge of them.

Certainly, he was young in age, but much younger in manners, and imprudent and lacking judgement.

And when he entered into the monastery, he demanded that all the rich things of the monastery be brought to him. And these were placed before him: tapestries, pillows, bed mats, covers, sheets, vessels of gold and silver, custodials with the relics of the saints, and other ornaments of the church of many and diverse kinds; and he went through all these things and took what he liked, and set them apart. And little by little, to I know not what parts, he took them away.

Among these things he took the thumb of Saint Mary Magdalene; and he took the precious stones from the crosses of gold and put bits of plaster and dog's teeth and bones in their places. Nevertheless, I have the witness of the Lord of heaven that I saw with my own eyes

what I report; and if anyone should by chance doubt it, the crosses remain in place so that anyone can see them with their own eyes.³⁸²

This scene anticipates the burghers' trespass into the monastery in chapter fifty-five. In that instance too, the burghers demand that the monks put before them all their treasures. This, then, is the first great intrusion into the monastery's inner sanctum by its enemies. Later the specific argument that these intrusions constituted a violation of the terms of exemption of the *libertas* will be made explicit. The assertion by the author to an imagined sceptical reader that the evidence of this theft and profanation of the monastery's relics still remains suggests the way that something like a legal case is being made against the monastery's enemies. But the emphasis here is also on the dramatic. As with the later scene of the burghers' intrusion, the chronicle also shows Ramiro to be a travesty of the normative religious order. The narrative continues:

It was said that he was a deacon, but he usurped for himself the office of a presbyter, and went around blessing the cierges and candles and palms; and what is more, in processions he was not ashamed to go solemnly with cape and crosier; and with priests and sacerdos present, he said prayers for the dead, though he was neither a priest of the mass nor an elected abbot.

And he lived with us; and he distributed amongst his own men the things he found in the storeroom and vestry; and mules and many things of the obediences, and cups of silver and chalices of gold, and many other things that do not occur to my memory at the moment:

³⁸² *'E el rej, doliéndose que, bien que todas las cosas que estaban fuera del claustro él obiese robado e dissipado, non de menos las cosas que eran dentro del claustro enteras quedavan e sanas; e por tanto enbió e llamó a un hermano, falso e mal monje, llamado Ramiro, e mandóle que entrase en el monasterio de Sant Fagum e se enseñorease a los monjes e tobiese presidençia sobre ellos.*

Hera por çierto moço por hedad, mas mucho más moço por costunbres, e de toda ynprudencia e nesçesidad.

El qual, ansí como entró en el monasterio, mandó que le presentasen toda la sustança del monasterio, al qual, como le fuese antepuesto e presentado todo, conbiene a saber, tapetes, almohadas, coçedras, coberturas, sábanas, basos de oro e de plata, custodias llenas de reliquias de santos, e ornamentos de la yglesia de muchas e diberas maneras; e de todas estas cosas escogió e tomó lo que mejor le pareció, e púsosele aparte. E poco a poco, non sé a qué partes lo traspasó.

Entre las quales cosas, tomó el pulgar de Santa María Magdalena; otrosí, de las cruçes de oro llevó las piedras mui preçiosas, e en su lugar metió yeso e huesos de perros e dientes. Empero, traigo en testimonio a Dios del çielo ca lo que bi por mis ojos digo; e si por abentura alguno dudase, las cruçes son en pie, que las puede cada uno beer por sus ojos' CAS, ch. 30, p. 56.

these were all taken away by the hands of his servants and taken we know not where.

It was said that he had taken these things to the monastery of Saint Pons de Thomières, for that was where he had received the monk's habit. Although he was the king's brother still he was abhorrent to the Aragonese, for (as I have said already) there was nothing good about him. Yet, the burghers liked him very much because, for some vile gift that they gave him, he let them cut down the great elms and ash trees to build their houses.³⁸³

The detail that the burghers paid Ramiro to harvest trees from the monastery's woodland anticipates the burghers' defence in chapter seventy-three (which we discussed in chapter three). This is a scene of the theft of the monastery's communal possessions and an intrusion into their communal space. It prefigures a later intrusion by the burghers, in part three of the chronicle in which the chronicle refocuses upon the burghers as the sole subjects of Abbot Domingo's policy of seeking ecclesiastical sanctions. It also anticipates the climactic scene of the confirmation of the burghers' charter in which the monks and burghers confront one another within the monastery. Here the author appears as narrator, not in a dramatic role, but to confirm the truth and tell the story to the best of his memory: 'to I know not what parts, he took them away' (*'non sé a qué partes lo traspasó'*); 'I have the witness of the Lord of heaven that I saw with my own eyes what I report; and if anyone should by chance doubt it, the crosses remain in place so that anyone can see them with their own eyes' (*'traigo en testimonio a Dios del çielo ca lo que bi por mis ojos digo; e si por abentura alguno*

³⁸³ *'Aún sin lo ya dicho, como fuese diácono, usurpava a sí e apropiava el ofiçio del presbiterado, dando bendiçión sobre los çirios e candelas e ramos. E aún más: en las proçiones non se abergoñaba de ir solenemente con capa e báculo; e, seyendo presentes los prestes e saçerdotes, deçía la oraçión sobre los defuntos, como él non fuese preste de misa nin abbad electo, como ya dixen.*

E morava con nosotros, e las cosas de la çellereçia o bestuario que podía fallar expendíase con los suyos, e aún las mulas mucho buenas de las obediencias, e basos de plata, e cálice de oro, e muchas otras cosas, que al presente no me ocurren a la memoria, por manos de los servían tomó e non sabemos adonde lo traspasó

Deçíase pero que al monasterio de San Ponçe traspasava estas cosas, ca ay avía resçivido el ábito moncal; el qual, bien que él fuese hermano del rei, era aún mucho aborresçible a esos aragoneses, porque según que ya fablé, era de ningún provecho, mas a los burgeses mucho era açeto, porque por qualquiera bil don les otorgava que tajasen los grandes olmos e fresnos para edificar sus casas' CAS, ch. 30, p. 57.

dudase, las cruçes son en pie, que las puede cada uno beer por sus ojos’); ‘taken we know not where’ (*‘non sabemos adonde lo trespasó’*).

A more dramatic reaction is reached in a scene following this. In chapter twenty-nine, the chronicle tells how Alfonso I stole the monastery’s piece of the true cross. The monks’ reaction to the news of the theft is reported in this way:

When this was told to the abbot and the monks there was great wailing and sadness throughout the whole cloister: the elders and the young men, the servants and infants screamed out fiercely and poured many tears, and there was none that could be consoled after such a great treasure had been thieved. And as we have said before, it was by the inducement and leading on of the burghers that the king was the abbot’s enemy. Nobody dared speak out about these things; the burghers wanted with all their heart to destroy their mother church of Sahagún, and they gave no place for the monks to protest; rather, they had to suffer these wrongs and harms with patience.³⁸⁴

It is only when the narrative stretches into a more general point about the purposes of the burghers and the suffering of the monks that the narrator appears at all, and then only the ubiquitous ‘as we have said before’. It is, moreover, directly after this passage that the narrative moves to a direct invocation of the martyrs of Sahagún by the narrator. We will consider this invocation later in this chapter, but the sudden arrival of the narrator directly following this scene calls our attention to his present absence. It is a scene which is highly charged. It is an occasion for the chronicle to point to the religious perversity of Alfonso I, especially in relation to the memory of Alfonso VI: the first Alfonso piously gave the cross to the monastery; the latter Alfonso impiously robbed it. The narrator, then, does not necessarily enter into the scene with his fellow monks, as either the participating author or the commenting narrator.

³⁸⁴ *‘La qual cosa como fuese recontada al abbad e monjes, gran llanto e tristura obieron todos en el claustro; los biejos e mançevos, moços e ynfantes gemían fuertemente, hechando muchas lágrimas, e non era quien consolase, arrebatando tan gran thesoro; e según que ya diximos, por subjección e consejo de los burgeses, el rei era enemigo del abbad, ninguno fue que osase fablar; mas los dichos burgeses, que con todo corazón deseavan destruir esta su madre yglesia de Sant Fagum, no dieron lugar a que los monjes deviesen quejarse, mas sofrieron con paçiençia tanto daño e mengua’* CAS, ch. 29, p. 52.

We are now in a position to consider generally the purposes and effects of the first-person voice in these scenes which focus on the monks of Sahagún. We have seen that this strategy has both a rhetorical and social dimension. The author identifies himself with his fellow monks, speaking in a common voice with them, to ratchet up the narrative stakes of the scene; though, as we have shown, this is not a necessary strategy. This strategy also stresses the subjective proximity between the chronicle—its story and its meaning—and the monks. In chapter twenty-six, the author participates with the anxiety of the monks as they speed to elect a new abbot. There is here also a sense in which it is the monks which happen to participate with the author's anxieties, and especially his praise of the archbishop, with whom he shows himself in independent personal contact in two instances.³⁸⁵ In this sense, it is the monks that are made to participate in the voice of the narrator. This also occurs in chapter thirty-eight where the author, abbot, and monks are commonly identified by their like situation; the burghers are after them all. In the same way the placement of the narrative within the monastery's walls is also significant. The cloister in these first two occasions is the preserve of the monks, where they can retreat to safety, but where danger still threatens.

When the monks move outside of the monastery walls in chapter thirty, a different communal arrangement is made by the narrative. Here the monks as a groups are collectively targeted by the burghers' insults, but individuals also appear, such as the chamberlain who is pulled from his horse and Sanchianes. In the final two scenes which we have considered, the narrator both participates and maintains a critical distance. This same distance appears in chapter seventy-three. In these cases, a degree of critical space is preserved, though the critique offered is subdued. The monks are exposed in their position of helplessness, not only by burgher and Aragonese aggression, by the abbot's denial of personal authority in chapter seventy-three, but in these cases by the narrator as well.

Space is also used by the chronicle to frame a moral argument. In chapter twenty-six, Archbishop Bernard defines for the monks the laws governing their internal space. The archbishop's knowledge of and insistence on these laws stands in

³⁸⁵ See *CAS*, ch. 16, p. 25; and *CAS*, ch. 77, p. 125.

opposition to the ignorance of the burghers, first as they intrude into the monastery and show themselves ignorant of the uses of religious objects, and finally as they misinterpret the abbot's declaration in chapter seventy-three. It is specifically the way that the terms of the *libertas* are to be applied to the monastic community that the burghers are unable to follow: after Domingo affirms he will sign their charter 'save always my order and the right of this monastery', the chronicle says of the burghers: 'Although they did not understand this, they knew his interjection of that word 'save' was bad'.³⁸⁶ Space within the monastery's walls becomes a way of undermining the burghers' success (at least temporarily) with their charter. That the confirmation of the burghers' charter happens within the monastery is made significant. The monastery itself comes to be defined according to the terms of the *libertas*, the burghers' attack on the *fuero*, then, is interpreted in line with the burghers' missteps and ignorance within their holy surroundings.

Author and abbot

In this chapter we move to the use of the author-function in the third narrative section of the chronicle. We will consider here two extended episodes in which the author accompanies Abbot Domingo away from the monastery. The first of these involves a trip to Rome to bring a complaint against the burghers directly to the papacy. This trip literally has the author and abbot tracing the monastery's direct link to the papacy defined by the *libertas Romana*. The personal links with the pope are also emphasised here. In this way both the personal and legal horizons of the monastery's ecclesiastical authority are expanded. It is on this occasion that Abbot Domingo is granted by the pope letters which condemn the burghers and grant him the papal power to excommunicate and absolve the burghers. These letters contain most clearly the combined ecclesiastical and political argument for the abbot's authority over the burghers. We will consider these in the next chapter. In this chapter we will focus on the construction of this event around the close association of the author and the abbot, and especially on the dramatic elements of the narrative and the story which characterise this relationship.

³⁸⁶ My translation expands the actual words of the text to clarify their intended meaning: '*La qual cosa, bien que ellos non la entendiesen, pero súpoles mal el entreponimiento de la dicha palabra*'. CAS, ch. 73, p. 114.

In chapter sixty-nine the chronicle describes how Abbot Domingo and the author travelled to Rome to attend a general synod called by Pope Paschal II. This was in March of 1116. This trip leads directly into the scene in which the monks confirm the burghers' charter discussed at the beginning of this chapter. The scene develops as follows:

And from there we began our journey. In the middle of winter we laboured to pass through the Pyrenees; and, coming through the great mountains, we arrived at Rome.

And when we had kissed the feet of the Holy Father and he had received us kindly and with paternal affection, the abbot recounted to him all that he had suffered at the hands of the burghers: how he had been thrown out of the monastery; the destruction of the monastery; the uprooting of the woodland; and the wasting of the entire region and province.

When they had heard of all these plagues, of the destruction of the monastery by the burghers, and how tyrants and evildoers had devastated that noble kingdom, the cardinals were overcome with fear, the bishops were stunned, the archbishops were astonished, the noble Romans present there cried out, and the Holy Father was moved to tears. And bathing himself in tears, he turned to the rest and told them about the place where that monastery was founded. That same man told them about all the delights of their woodland, the abundance of the monastery, and he praised above all the religiousness of that order; he even began to extol the noble king Don Alfonso VI, of blessed memory. And again and many times, he repeated these things, for it happened that when he was a cardinal under Pope Urban II, of holy memory, he had visited this place, and had seen their great amity with the king.³⁸⁷

³⁸⁷ *'E de allí, andando por el camino comenzado, por la meitad del ynbierno pasamos los montes Pireneos con gran trabajo, e pasadas las grandes montañas, llegamos a Roma.*

E como ya obiésemos besado los pies del Santo Padre e él nos obiese resçevido benignamente e con afecto paternal, el abbad le recontó por orden todo lo que avía sofrido de los burgeses, e cómo d'ellos fue echado del monasterio; e de la destroiçión del dicho monasterio, del arancamiento del monte e desipaçión de toda la región e provincia.

The personal connections of Paschal to Sahagún are especially stressed. The abbot's trip to Rome expands the geographical horizons of the text. This trip gives narrative to the links of protection and authority established by the *libertas Romana*. We see them pushing their way through the Pyrenees. Before they could journey through Aragón, however, they had to gain a guarantee of safe passage from King Alfonso I. This the king granted, demanding only that they stop in Aragón to meet with him. The chronicle says they did this, though does not say what was said. At Rome, Domingo was given the opportunity to request, and was given, the papal power to excommunicate and absolve the burghers. The chronicle includes a copy of this document (which we quoted in the previous chapter). It is a moment of persuasion. Though it is a receptive audience, it can also be seen as a staging of the intended effect of the abbot's story: tears and sympathy. A link in power is also established between the papacy and the monarchy of Alfonso VI. This recalls the original grant of the *libertas* (in chapter six), and, furthermore, the journey of then-abbot Bernard to Rome to receive the privilege. This establishes a narrative system of memory and association within the text. In this way it looks back to the past. But it is also the moment for a new grant. We have seen how the pope's letter reinforces the terms of the *fuero* even as it redefines the abbot's power in ecclesiastical terms. The narrative not only stresses the personal links between the pope and the monastery, but the pope stresses the personal relationship between the king and the monastery. The system of authority in which the monastery is defining its own power is expressed through this rhetoric of personal relationships. The bare argument of authority is developed in terms which are geographical, personal, and emotional.

The effect of the author's participation in this scene is to follow the abbot. This brings the narrative outside of the monastery and its territory, not on his own initiative but in the service of the abbot. We have noted how in the scenes where the author

Oída la turbaçión de tantas pestilençias e de la destruçión de aqueste monasterio fecha por la burgeses, e en qué manera los tiranos e malfechores obiesen desfecho el mui noble reino, espantáronse los cardenales, enbaçaron los obispos, espaboresçieron los arçobispos, gimieron los mui nobles romanos presentes, e el mui Santo Padre fue mobido a lloro e bañado con lágrimas, bolvióse a todos, declarándoles el sito del lugar en que este monasterio es fundado. E eso mesmo començó a esplanar la delectaçión del monte, la abastança del monasterio, aprovando sobre todo la religión de la orden; e aún començó a ensalçar alabando al mui noble rei don Alfonso, de buena memoria. E una e muchas beçes repetía todo lo sobredicho, ca acaesçiórale, seyendo cardenal, so el papa Urbano segundo, de santa memoria, aber visto estas cosas con sus ojos e aver avido gran amistad con el rei' CAS, ch. 69, p. 105.

speaks with/for the monks, there is a strong sense that the voice of the monks happens to coincide with the narrative voice, rather than that the author is moving towards the monks. In this scene the 'we' voice describes the journey itself, but once in Rome, the author is there to report on the abbot. It is the abbot that tells of his travails and is empowered by the pope. The distance is governed by the different purposes and roles of the two in the journey and by the singular identity of the abbot. There is only one abbot and he has particular powers and responsibilities.

The return journey of the abbot and author is told in chapter seventy-one. The chronicler describes:

Once we had obtained this authority and with it the blessing of Saint Peter, we quickly returned.

How many dangers and what harms we suffered on our return, I wish to leave out of this work in order to spare the reader tedium.

Certainly, we were imprisoned five times, but thanks to Divine Protection we escaped without harm from the hands of those that held us.

And, as it now seemed to be the time that one could reasonably expect us to return, the burghers, remembering all the evils they had committed against the abbot, sent messengers to Aragón to ask the king to detain the abbot and not to let him go until he had forced an oath from him, and to warn him that, failing this, he would lose his lordship over the town of Sahagún. But we, who were confident in the pledge that the king had given us, had no suspicion or fear of any of this. We made our return journey through Aragón; and it was there one day, as we came to a castle called Estrella, that a Frenchman called Grofedo, who had disowned his monk's habit, captured us, for the king had sent him to do this. He took our horses and all that we had, leaving us only the clothing that we had on. He took us from the hostel where we were lodging and moved us to another where he put guards upon us.

Only at great pains were we able to lodge in the same hostel; and though this was granted, we were made to sleep nowhere but before the bed of the lord of the house and his wife.

After three days we were brought from there before the king. All the nobles that followed him were moved to great mercy and compassion concerning us; and they were inflamed with great anger against the king, whom they hated in public and in secret, for imprisoning the abbot. His deed seemed evil to them, for certainly they had much love for the abbot.

In his strained effort to charge the abbot with some offence, the king said that the abbot had made some sinister slanders against him before the Holy Father. Keeping to the truth, the abbot denied these false inventions and declared that he had made no mention of the king there.

But, though the king had found the abbot to be innocent of what he had accused, nevertheless, keeping to his stubbornness, he detained us for five weeks.

If I knew it would bring any good to my reader, I would tell here in a sad style of all the frustration and distress that tormented us and wore upon us, and of all the hunger and terror we suffered. Yet, Divine Piety consoled us, for all the nobles and all those that served the king sympathised with our suffering, and helped us as they could. And they cursed the king's counsellors for approving of our imprisonment.

Although this did not afford us any help, it was yet a consolation to us, and an embarrassment for our enemies. As the king could not find any guilt in the abbot, nor anything to accuse him of, and as he could not dismiss the protests of his nobles and knights, who admonished him each day to calm his anger and let the abbot go in peace, finally, after five weeks, he let us go without any pact, oath, or

condition. So we arrived, with God guiding us, in peace at the cloister, and were received with joy.³⁸⁸

This scene takes the narrative into enemy territory. The sense is very strong from the description of this scene that we are in the secular world. The abbot and monks are humiliated by being made to sleep before the bed of the hosteller and his wife. It is a story of both suffering and triumph. It is a story of successful resistance to a cruel and irrational enemy. The abbot is the noble and patient sufferer in the face of adversity. The sense of sympathy with his pains comes from both the voice of the narrator and the members of the court. The scene is introduced in the voice of the

³⁸⁸ *'Resçevida pues ya la dicha autoridad e en uno avida la bendición del Santo Padre, apriesa nos retornamos.*

Quántos peligos, quántos daños sofrimos en la tornada, quiero dexar de enxerir en esta obra, porque al leedor non benga enojo. Por çierto, çinco beçes fuimos presos, e tantas por la protecçión divinal, escapamos de las manos de aquellos que nos tenían presos, e sin daño alguno.

E como ya paresçiese el tiempo que raçonablemente se presumía ser nuestra tornada, los burgeses, aviendo en memoria quantos males avían fecho al abad, enbiaron mensajeros al rei de Aragón, rogándole que prendiese al abad e non lo dexase tornar fasta que le tomase juramento; en otra manera, sopiese por çierto que careçería del señorío de la villa de Sant Fagum. Pero nos, que fuéramos confiantes en la fee que nos el rei diera, non aviendo ante nuestros ojos de qué obiésemos reçelo o miedo, feçimos nuestra tornada por Aragón; e ahe un día, como biniésemos a un castillo llamado Estrella, un francés de la religión monacal avía apostatado, por nonbre Grofedo, prendiónos, ca para esto del rei fuera enviado; tomáronnos aún las cavalgaduras e todas quantas cosas avíamos, dexándonos tan solamente las bestiduras de que hérmos bestidos; e sacándonos de la posada donde héramos hospedados, departiéronnos por otras posadas, poniéndonos buenas guardas.

A gran pena, podimos alcançar que yo e el abbad quedásemos en una mesma posada. E como nos fueses otorgado, non nos fue permitido que yaçiésemos en otra parte si non ante'l lecho en el qual el señor de la casa con su propia muger yaçía.

E como dende a tres días fuésemos ante la presençia del rei, todos los nobles que le seguían e aconpañavan se mobieron a gran misericordia e compasión açerca de nos, e grande yra e saña contra el rei se ençendieron por la presión del abbad, que públicamente e secretamente aborreçían, e les paresçía mal tal fecho, ca sin dubda todos avían gran amor al abbad.

Forçávase el rei a poner culpa e aver alguna ocasión contra el abbad, deçiendo que en la presençia del sacro palaçio e Santa Padre alguna cosa siniestra e non conbeniente el abbad contra el rei obiese dicho, las quales falsedades e astuçias ynbençiones el abbad, prosequiendo la berdad, desfiço, e declaró que en ninguna manera d'él obiese fecho mençión.

Mas bien que el [rey Alfonso I] obiese fallado al abbad sin culpa de lo que le aponían, non de menos perseberando en su obstinaçión, nos detuvo por çinco semanas.

En quánto enojo e tristeça nos fatigó en al dicho espaçio e nos atormentó, e quánta fanbre e pavor sofrimos, con estilo lloroso esprimiría si cognoçiese a mi benir algún pro[v]hecho e al leedor alguna consolaçión; enpero, consolava la dibina piedad, ca todos los nobles e los que tenían los ofiçios del rei se condolían de nuestra turvaçión, e como podían nos ayudavan; e maldeçían los consejeros del rei porque aprovavan la presión d'el.

Bien que aquesto non nos traxiese nin diese ayuda, era pero a nos gran consolaçión; e, a nuestros adbersarios, gran confusión. E como non podiese fallar culpa alguna, nin cosa en que pudiese acusar al abbad, e aún como non podiese despreçiar los ruegos de los nobles e cavalleros suyos, que cada día le amonestavan e remordían que perdiere sa ña e dexase el abbad yr en paz, pues finalmente, después de espaçio de çinco semanas, nos dexó sin demandar pacto alguno o juramento o condiçión. E así benimos en paz, e guiándonos Dios, el conbento claustral con gran alegría nos resçivió'. CAS, ch. 71, p. 109.

narrator directly addressing the reader. Later in the passage, the narrator again invokes the reader with the trope that there is too much to tell. Divine Providence is also invoked. It is in this rhetorical vein that the scene is introduced. The king is criticised in this, but the burghers are also implicated. As in the previous scene, where the papal audience was moved to tears, now it is the members of the king's court. The appeal to divine intervention also pervades this scene. The voice of the narrator is used to reach out to both the reader and God.

Chapter sixty-two covers the event of the burghers' oaths of loyalty to Abbot Domingo. They had travelled to Cea, where Domingo was sheltering with Queen Urraca, to persuade the queen to turn the abbot over to them so they could bring him back to the town and restore him to power. Half of the burghers had performed their oaths when night came, and it was agreed that the rest would be postponed until the following morning. Meanwhile Domingo received a request from the nunnery of San Pedro to perform a requiem mass for a nun who had recently passed away. The narrative continues from here:

And when the council and assembly had finished, Abbot Domingo prepared to go there; when we told him that it would be better to remain at the monastery and to receive the burghers' oath according to what had been arranged above, he pulled me and my companion, the previously-mentioned Pedro, aside and said to us:

"Certainly, I don't know what dread my spirit divines. I don't know what my heart misgives. I don't want to stay in this monastery tonight; let us go and we will return in the morning".

At this we responded to him:

"You are our father and abbot and wherever you want to go we will follow".

They go and arrive at dawn the next morning. The requiem mass was soon underway, and the chronicler says that it was during the abbot's reading of the Gospel that:

suddenly we heard a great commotion, the whinnying of horses, the rattling of swords, and the shouts of men, saying:

“Death to traitors, death to thieves!”

When the Gospel was finished, I went to the door of the church and standing fixed I saw Giraldo Diablo and the burghers, armed and hollering:

“Death to traitors, let none escape!”

My partner mentioned above, I don’t know where the abbot had sent him, was before the doors of the church mounting his horse; and when he saw these men approaching, shouting their shouts, he thought that they were joking.

But Giraldo came up to him and grabbed hold of the edge of his cape or monk’s habit and as he held it he said:

“Today you will be hanged, you traitor and thief!”

And when he felt himself caught, he left his cape or monk’s habit behind in Giraldo’s hands, and fled wearing only his stammel. But Giraldo pursued him on horse, coming up behind him, and grasping on to his stammel. Now this woollen undergarment was torn from head to toe and Pedro fled nude, leaving it in Giraldo’s hands. And he came in flight into the church, crying:

“Giraldo and the burghers are all speeding here armed to kill the abbot and ourselves!”

When I heard this, I closed the door of the church with the heavy bar, and I even put across the door the wood on which the nuns were accustomed to kneel when they prayed to God; but when Giraldo and the burghers arrived at the doors they beat them with their lances and kicked them, shouting:

“Give us the traitor abbot and his *compañeros* and we will go”.

But, as the abbot still did not know what din and confusion of thunder he was hearing, when he came to the *Te igitur*, he made a sign asking what all the noise was about, and I whispered back:

“Giraldo and the burghers are armed and at the door and they want to kill you and us!”

He signalled to me to be silent, and as he cried heavily seeing his own death before him, he began to pray the *Te igitur*. But the burghers continued their evil.

They kicked at the door to break it down, but as they were unable (although it was very weak, God was preventing them), they went around the monastery. There they climbed up on the roof with their weapons and shields, and they leapt down into the cloister. One of them, an archer, broke a hole in the nun's choir and through it he could see the abbot standing at the altar; he pulled back his bow, ready to shoot him in the back. And though death flew in the swift arrow, one of the virgins put out her arm and caught it in her sleeve, and it fell harmless on the ground.

And as one man, only one man, that was with the abbot went after the man with his knife drawn in his hand to kill, the nuns stopped him, surrounding him with their mantles, for they would not have the church corrupted with the death of that sacrilege; and, thus, they saved him from death.

And as all the nuns saw armed men crawling across their roof, they pulled their hair and scratched their faces with their nails; and they fled to the church and began to ring the bells; and then they went prostrate upon the ground and began to recite the seven psalms and litany, not singing, but crying, sobbing, and heaving tears. And the company of the Devil went here and there through the monastery robbing whatever they could get their hands on. But they did not find any of the nuns or their servants outside of the church.

...

When the abbot finished the Mass he did not take off his holy vestments until he knew that these men had left. Then he took them off, without the help of any of the servant that had come with him,

and he fled. And me and my companion fled separately, following him, nude, almost to his very foot.³⁸⁹

³⁸⁹ *‘E acavado el conçilio e ayuntamiento, aparejávase e aperçevía de sa[l]ir para allá, al qual, como nos dixésemos que más era conbeniente quedar en el monasterio según lo sobredicho resçevir juramento de los burgeses, entonçes el mesmo abbad a mí e a mi conpañero, su camarero ya sobredicho Pedro, apartó en secreto e dixo:*

“Por çierto, yo non sé qué espanto la mi boluntad adevina, non sé qué teme el mi coraçón; non querría que quedásemos aquí esta noche, mas nos partiésemos, e otra bez por la mañana retornásemos”.

A aquesto nos le respondimos:

“Tú eres nuestro padre e abbad, e do quiera que tú quieras ir, nos te seguiremos”.

...

ahe que súpitamente començamos a oir grandes estruendos, relinchos de cavallos, meneos de armas, sonidos de honbres e grandes boçes diçiendo:

“Mueran los traidores, mueran los ladrones”.

Acavado el evangelio, paré mientes por la puerta de la iglesia, e luego bimos a Giraldo Diablo e los burgeses que benían armados e a grandes boçes diçiendo:

“Mueran los traidores e ninguno escape”.

E mi conpañero, ya arriva sobreescrito, non sé a qué lugar el abbad le enbiada, e quería cavalgar e estava ante las puertas de la iglesia; e como los biese que se le açercavan e diesen grandes boçes, pensava que lo fiçiesen burlando e jugando.

Pero Giraldo, como se le açercó, asiólo por la orilla de la capa o de la cogulla e túbolo, diçiendo:

“Oí serás enforcado, traidor e ladrón”.

E él, como se sintió ser tenido y preso, en sus manos dexada la capa o cogulla, cobierto de la estameña, fuyó e se escapó. Pero el que estava a cavallo siguiólo, yendo en pos d’él, e asiólo por la estameña. E él, resgada la dicha estameña desde la caveça fasta los pies, e dexada en sus manos, escapó desnudo, e foyendo entró en la iglesia deçiendo a grandes boçes:

“Giraldo e los burgeses todos armados bienen a gran priesa e se aparejan de matar al abbad e a nosotros”.

Lo qual, como yo oyese, çerré apriesa la puerta de la iglesia con la tranca, e aún contrpuse la firma, en la qual los monjes acostunbraban a fincar los ynnojos quando adoravan a Dios, pero Giraldo e los burgeses, allegados a la puerta de la iglesia, començaron a enpuxarla e estremeçerla con coçes e cons astas, dando boçes:

“Dádenos al traidor del abbad e a sus conpañeros e luego nos partiremos”.

Mas como el abbad non sopiese qué ruido o confusión de estruendo tan grande fuese, allegado al Te ygitor, fiçome señal, diçiéndome que qué ruido era aquel, e yo so silençio le dixi:

“Giraldo e los burgeses armados ante las puertas quieren matar a vos y a nos”.

E él fiçome señal que callase, e, gravemente gimiendo, beyendo ante los ojos la suya en nuestra muerte, començó a reçar el Te igitur; pero los burgeses perseberavan en el mal.

La puerta de la iglesia estremeçían a coçes por la quebrantar; mas como ellos non podiesen quebrantar la puerta, bien que mucho era flaca, queriéndolo el Señor, partiéronse de allí e çercaron todo el monasterio. E dende sobieron armados e escudados sobre el techo, e a salto entraron dentro en el claustro, de los quales, un ballestero de arco, por medio ronpiendo el coro de las monjas, como pudo beer al abbad estando ante el santo altar, estendió el arco con la saeta, queriéndolo con ella traspasar por las espaldas. E como ya la muerte bolase en la saeta mui presurosa, una de las vírgines, con la manga de la piel estendida, resçivió e detovo la saeta bolante, la qual luego sin llaga alguna cayó en tierra.

E como uno e solo onbre—que era con el abbad—fuese contra el que tiró la saeta, el cochillo sacado en la mano por lo matar, las monjas retobiéronle, çercándole con sus mantos, porque la iglesia non fuese corronpida con la muerte de aquel sacrilego, e así lo defendieron de la muerte.

E todas las monjas, beyendo sobre los tejados del claustro andar los honbres armados, mesaban sus crines e rascando sus caras con las unna, e así fuyéronse a la iglesia e començaron a tañer las campanas, e luego postradas en tierra començaron a deçir los siete salmos e letanía, non cantando, mas llorando e lagrimando e grandes solloços echando. Pero los conpañeros del Diablo, discurriendo por el

This scene also takes us away from the monastery, though in contrast to the imprisonment in Aragón we are in a religious setting. This is emphasised in dramatic terms. The scene finds many opportunities for dramatic action. This puts the emphasis on the confusion of the scene. The scene is also full of tropes: the nuns tearing their hair, Pedro and then Abbot Domingo fleeing without their clothes. The act of following the abbot also makes up the dramatic details of the scene: “You are our father and abbot and wherever you want to go we will follow”. Scenes such as these make lively reading. We can also imagine as their audience the monks of Sahagún who would have an interest in what happened on that occasion, outside the monastery. Indeed, we can imagine how the story was told in dramatic terms upon the return of the group to the monastery and how this story would have developed into generic forms.

The drama of the scene is also closely bound up in the celebration of the Mass. The scene from the arrival of Giraldo and the burghers to their departure is ordered according to the stages of the Mass. They arrive as the Gospel is being read; Abbot Domingo hears their kicking at the door as he begins the canon with the *Te igitur* prayer; the archer who breaks a hole in the choir finds Abbot Domingo still celebrating the Mass; finally, Abbot Domingo waits for the attackers to leave before taking off his vestments.³⁹⁰ As we have seen elsewhere in the chronicle, the attacks by the monastery’s enemies are directly set off by the religious ceremonies and customs of the monastery. These attacks are given a direct religious context. At one place the celebration of the Mass even spills forth into the principal drama of the scene. The *Te igitur*, the plea for acceptance, first said as part of the liturgical formula, is suddenly repeated as a spontaneous prayer by Domingo now fearing for his life. Similarly, the nuns in their frantic state of fear begin to recite the seven penitential psalms of the

monasterio de acá e de allá, e todo aquello que sus manos podían fallar robaron. Pero non fallaron fuera de la iglesia algunas de las monjas o servidoras d’ellas.

...

Pero el abbad, acabada la misa, non desnuyó las santas bestiduras del altar fasta que conosjó los sobredichos averse partido. De las quales bestiduras él desnuyo, sin ningún servidor que lo aconpañase, fuyó; al qual yo y mi conpañero apartadamente, fuyendo desnudos e casi a pie, lo conseguimos’ CAS, ch. 62, pp. 93-6.

³⁹⁰ An outline of the stages of the Roman Mass (which I have found it useful to consult) can be found in K. Young, *The Drama of the Medieval Church I* (Oxford, 1933), pp. 21ff. On the significance of the Gospel and the *Te igitur*, see J.A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development* (trans.) F.A. Brunner (London, 1959), pp. 283ff., 389ff.

requiem Mass. The effect of setting Giraldo's attack against the requiem Mass is to set these attacks in a religious context, one that works both spatially and temporally.

Conclusion

This chapter has focused on the role of the author-function in both the narrative structure of the chronicle and the argument concerning the authority of the abbot of Sahagún over the burghers. We have particularly emphasised the communal subjectivity which surrounds the author's voice and figure in the chronicle and which reaches out to the audience, to the other monks, and to Abbot Domingo. This suggests the internal purposes of the chronicle and suggests the chronicle can only be fully understood by appealing to its original monastic audience. However, the author-function has an ambivalent role in relation to the monastic community. In the second narrative section of the chronicle, the author identifies closely with the monks and their sufferings and fears in the conflict. In the third section, however, the author identifies more closely with the abbot, and even distances himself from the monks in the controversial moment of the confirmation of the burghers' charter. The effects of the author-functions shifting associations and twin role as narrator and author is to create a complex narrative strategy which at times adds pathos and drama to the narrative, emphasizing the burghers' cruelty, to transfer this suffering and victimization to the purposes of a key transition of the chronicle where the monastery goes on the attack, and then to emphasise the personal suffering of the abbot on his trip to Rome. The author-function, then, represents a complex narrative strategy which operates in the story, in the communal experience of the chronicle, and in the chronicle's social and legal ambitions.

Chapter Five: the use of documents

The *Crónica* integrates into its narrative a number of documents. In its account of the monastery's early history the chronicle mentioned the land grants of Alfonso III and Ramiro II, and incorporated the *libertas Romana*, and the *fuero* of Alfonso VI. In the final section of the chronicle, as the narrative steers towards the resolution of the conflict, there was the series of ecclesiastical letters, one from Archbishop Bernard and two from Pope Paschal II. There was also the burghers' charter. This the chronicle calls the 'cursed charter'. After the expulsion of the burghers by Queen Urraca in chapter seventy-five, the chronicle tells us that Abbot Domingo searched among the burghers' houses for this charter and had it burned. The chronicle also hesitated to reveal the terms of this charter, preferring to focus on the illicit way that it had been drawn up by the burghers 'themselves' and imposed upon the monastery.

This chapter considers the central place of documents in the *Crónica*: the *fuero* and the *libertas* in the monastery's history; and the three letters of ecclesiastical authority by Archbishop Bernard and Pope Paschal II. As with authorship, this theme too can be seen to form its own subplot. Our focus here is on how the narrative mode makes room for this subplot, and especially how the productive chaos of the narrative allows for an innovation in the interpretation of these documents. The narrative allows the *fuero* and the *libertas* to be merged, and the *libertas* to be applied to the burghers. This purpose is not made subtly by the chronicle.

This chapter, then, argues for the intimate connections between the shape of the conflict itself and the way that documents are presented and employed by the *Crónica*. The chronicle's handling of key documents highlights the fundamental problem of interpretation left to the monastery after the Council of Burgos in 1117. In short, this is the problem of the unclear conclusion of the conflict. The monastery's 'victory' over the burghers is shown to rest on two events: the queen's expulsion of the burghers from Sahagún in the autumn of 1116, and Abbot Domingo's success at Burgos in 1117. Neither of these were victories for the monastery. In the autumn of 1116, the monastery nearly escaped an ambush on the town and Urraca stepped in subsequently to reassert her control over local affairs. At Burgos in 1117, the burghers brought a complaint against Abbot Domingo. The chronicle shows how positions were

quickly reversed and the burghers were put on the defensive, but the purpose of the trial was still to hear the burghers' case. The burghers' case fell apart and they were made to do penance, but, what was this penance for? They were condemned by the Council for bringing false complaints against Domingo, the chronicle makes this clear; on whether it was understood by the judgement against them that they were also doing penance for past crimes against the abbot—whether this was meant to decide the end of the whole of the seven-year conflict—the chronicle is unclear. The only clear indication of the chronicle's interpretation of the burghers' penance as the end of the conflict is that the chronicle ends here. However, the last line of the chronicle, 'and it was in this way that the burghers were returned to their houses', leaves the future in question. What was the new understanding between the groups? Are the burghers truly and finally willing to accept Abbot Domingo's lordship over them?

Just as the burghers' near escape from disaster in the autumn of 1116 was owed to Urraca's intervention, so the story of the Council of Burgos in 1117 was also of the political and military affairs of the king and queen. The monastery's success in reasserting its control over the burghers might also (much more convincingly) be credited to the political settlement reached between the embattled monarchs, to Alfonso I's withdrawal to Aragón, and Queen Urraca's assertion of sole control of her father's kingdom. It is in this sense that the Council of Burgos actually represents the end of local conflict. But, this recognition undermines the idea that the monastery had triumphed over their local challengers. The chronicle's omission of this larger political narrative at the end evinces its careful historiographical footwork around these interpretive difficulties. The burghers could have told their own version of events, ultimately more convincing too. It was they who had won: they had forced the monastery to confirm their charter surrendering significant and profitable terms of their authority over the burghers. This victory had been snatched from their jaws by the intervention of Urraca and the political decision reached at Burgos. But, this was only a last-minute stroke of luck for the monastery. In terms of local relations, the lessons for the burghers were at least partly encouraging. They had made alliances and wielded influence amongst both King Alfonso I and Queen Urraca. They had drafted their own charter and pursued a legal strategy which had brought momentary success. They could also in the end claim to have demonstrated their own strength and the

weakness of the monastery. Though the status quo had been re-imposed, yet the lessons of the conflict might be remembered and prove useful another day.

We do not, of course, know the thoughts of the burghers during or after the conflict. The thoughts of Abbot Domingo and the members of his monastic community are similarly obscured behind the chronicle's purposes in returning to the events of the conflict. Nevertheless, the chronicle's handling of certain documents allows us one way to express this equation of victory and defeat in the chronicle's own terms. In this equation, the problem for the monastery was the lack of a document at the end of the conflict. The burghers did their penance, returned to their houses, and then what? We are left to infer the return of the status quo of the monastery's hegemony. This points us back to the original document of this hegemony, the *fuero* of Alfonso VI; indeed, the abrupt ending can be seen as pointing us back to the past. There is no future to allude to because that would suggest that something had changed, that there was a future different to the past, when the chronicle wants instead to suggest a return to the past; and so, the future is denied and the burghers' return to their houses is effectively a return to the past and how things used to be.

But the return to the past also threatens a return to the same dangers of the burghers' challenge—if the burghers had already assailed the *fuero* once, what prevented them from doing it once more? It was a compromised document. The chronicle's other problem, in addition to their lack of a document of victory, was the continuing presence of a document already destroyed. Their victory had been realised with the destruction of a document rather than the attainment of a new one. The chronicle is, then, set the task of explaining or showing why they have emerged stronger, why they are no longer vulnerable to the same assault. One key way that the chronicle does this is through its presentation of documents. These documents are made to tell a story about the monastery's local hegemony over the burghers. Certain documents are loaded into the narrative and their place among other events of the conflict, their place among parallel conversations about authority in the chronicle (the effect of speeches made by authority figures about authority which run through the story), and the way that they speak to one another (documents corroborate or contradict other documents) constructs a novel argument about the nature of the monastery's local authority. But, this is not presented as a novel argument or as an

argument at all. It is never made explicit in the chronicle itself; rather it is confined to documents and to speeches of authority figures.

This chapter pieces this argument out from the narrative. We will begin with the way that the chronicle begins to focus the conflict onto the question of documents through taunts made by the burghers to the abbot and monks. This will lead to the legal strategy pursued by the burghers against the monastery, the drafting of their own charter and their attempts to pressure the king and queen and the monastic community to confirm it. This leads to chapter seventy-three, which tells how Queen Urraca and the abbot and monks did at last confirm the burghers' charter; and to chapter seventy-five where the charter is burned up by Abbot Domingo after the burghers' expulsion from the town. It is this sequence of events which determines the chronicle's defensive position regarding documents. It must neutralise the threat of the burghers' charter and the memory of its confirmation by Urraca and the monastic community; this moves its interest away from a legal discussion of the terms themselves, but to other ways to bolster the force of its legal argument. From here we proceed back to the chronicle's original account of the concessions of the *libertas Romana* and the *fuero* of Alfonso VI in the first part of the chronicle. The focus here will be on the way that the chronicle associates these documents with certain authority figures/positions of authority which will later rehearse arguments about the nature of the monastery's local hegemony. One example of how the monastery connects these documents together across the centuries is through its focus on the land of the monastery as a common concern of all these privileges. Another factor linking these documents is the traditions of royal and ecclesiastical power which underlie them. Political and ecclesiastical authority also blends together in place. We will consider the speeches of Queen Urraca and how they move from a political version of the monastery's authority to an ecclesiastical one. Finally, we will move to the strategy of persuasion (as the monastery frames it) in the final stage of the conflict: how the *libertas* is used in action, and the procurement of two papal letters which complete the work of knitting the two documents together.

Documents in the monastery's royal past

Documents take a central role in the chronicle's account of the monastery's past from the founding of the monastery at Sahagún in 905 by Alfonso III to the founding of a town in the same place in 1080 by Alfonso VI. We had an opportunity to point to these in chapter one of this study. The documents that interest the chronicle in the monastery's history are those that grant privileges to the monastery. In the reigns of Alfonso III and Ramiro II these privileges are specifically for the possession and use of land. Land, in fact, in the course of the chronicle comes to occupy a central place in the expression of the argument for the lordship over the burghers, as we will see. More immediately, however, these land grants help to fill in the history of the growth of the monastery as a powerful and royal favoured institution, and especially one with hegemony over its surrounding territory. The privileges used for the reigns of Alfonso III and Ramiro II are referenced indirectly: the chronicle describes the act of the privileges being granted and then describes some of their legal terms. Writing of Alfonso III's land grant to the newly founded monastery of Sahagún, the chronicle describes how the king 'granted and gave by the authority of his royal privilege all the lands, worked and un-worked, with vineyards and all other things pertaining'.³⁹¹

In the next chapter the chronicle moves to the land grants made by Ramiro II. The king's reign is introduced and concluded with general assertions of the many grants he made: 'he gave and ennobled [the monastery] with large gifts and rents of

³⁹¹ *'le otorgó e dio por autoridad de su privilegio real todas las tierras, así labradas como por labrar, con viñas y las otras cosas çircunstantes'* CAS, ch. 4, p. 11. As we will indicate further below, there is some confusion between the *Crónica's* citation of privileges and those that are extant in the monastery's charter collection. This collection preserves records of three land grants made by Alfonso III around the time of the founding of the monastery: 22 Oct. 904, 30 Nov. 904, and 30 Nov. 905 (*Colección diplomática*, ns. 6-8). These are, in fact, among the very earliest charters preserved by the monastery (only five are earlier from between the years 857-904). Formulaic wording such as that of the land grant referenced by the *Crónica* matches that of two charters of grants made by Alfonso III. In a charter dated 30 November 904, Alfonso granted a monastery called 'Sancti Felicis' to Sahagún and the charter stipulates: '*cum omnibus adiacentis vel prestationibus suis, domibus, atriis, terris, ortis, molinis, pratis, padulibus cum suis antiquis productilibus aquis aquarum, cum aqueductibus earum ...*' (*Colección diplomática*, p. 29: n. 7). Exact wording appears in the next charter, dated exactly one year later, 30 November 905, in a grant of the monastery's *coto*: '*cum omnibus adiacentiis vel prestationibus suis, domibus, atriis, terris, ortis, molinis, pratis, padulibus, cum suis antiquis productilibus aquis ...*' (*Colección diplomática*, p. 30: n. 8). The similar phrasing between the *Crónica's* reference and that of charter collection surely allow that the *Crónica* is referencing specifically one of these documents, though at the same time the formulaic nature of all of them prevents us from certainty, this is further underscored by the word-for-word likeness between the two charters. In fact, the last of these documents is thought to be either a forgery or a heavily edited version of an original (*Colección diplomática*, pp. 32-7). To add to the confusion, the *Crónica* will attribute the *coto* to Ramiro II (see below).

many towns and places',³⁹² and 'he gave with a generous hand many other benefits and noble donations to this monastery'.³⁹³ But, it is only the grant of the *coto*, a preserve of land including villages, woodland, and farmland under the exclusive control of the monastery,³⁹⁴ which the chronicle deals with specifically. The *coto*-grant is described:

And furthermore he assigned to the same monastery the *coto*, in which no person could possess or take for themselves even a palm's width of land; he wished to make it for the exclusive use of the monks and the monastery.

And he also ordained that if any guilty person or evildoer who was fleeing should take refuge within the *coto* he would in this way be made free without punishment. And he furthermore ordained that whoever, noble or not, should dare to take anything from the *coto*, however small of value, he should be forced for this to pay to the king five hundred *sueldos* of silver and another five hundred to the abbot.³⁹⁵

These terms appear to be both an amalgamation and exaggeration of a tradition of grants made in the monastery's history.³⁹⁶ The surviving charter attributes the grant to Alfonso III, complicating the question of the *Crónica's* use of the charter collection.³⁹⁷

³⁹² *'doctó e ennobleció con grandes dones e rentas de muchas villas e lugares'* CAS, ch. 5, pp. 11-12.

³⁹³ *'muchos otros beneficios e nobles donaciones a este monasterio con muy larga mano dio e otorgó'* CAS, ch. 5, p. 12.

³⁹⁴ On the monastery's *coto*, see M.F. Carrera de la Red, 'Notas de toponomastica Leonesa', pp. 347-363. There it is described as: *'una superficie notable de terreno alrededor del monasterio, donde el abad ejerce su jurisdicción con exclusión de la misma potestad real'* (p. 347).

³⁹⁵ *'E otrosí él primeramente asignó e aseñaló al dicho monasterio el coto, dentro del qual ninguna persona puede tener ni a sí apropiar aun tan solamente un palmo de heredad. Más quiso que esentamente fuese de los monjes e monasterio.*

E quiso otrosí e ordenó que si algún culpado o malhechor fuyendo, al dicho coto se acogiese, tal como éste fuese libre e sin pena alguna. E aún ordenó más: que qualquiera que sea, o noble o non noble, que osase sacar e tomar del dicho coto prenda alguna, aun quanto quier pequeña, luego por ese mesmo fecho fuese obligado a pagar al rey quinientos sueldos de plata e otros quinientos sueldos al abbad' CAS, ch. 5, p. 11-2.

³⁹⁶ For example, problems with royal *sayones* entering the town and *coto* of Sahagún come to light in a grant of Alfonso V dated 19 November 1018 (*Colección diplomática* II, pp. 49-50: n. 404) with the king prohibiting royal tax collectors entering the monastery's lands.

³⁹⁷ The *coto*-grant charter is that dated 30 November 905 (*Colección diplomática*, p. 30: n. 8). This authenticity of this charter is in doubt, however (see above), which only complicates our understanding of the relationship between the *Crónica* and the charter collection. If the charter collection has it right then perhaps a separate tradition that ascribed the grant to Ramiro existed at one time, or perhaps the *Crónica* just got it wrong. Or, it is possible that the *Crónica* has it right. It is difficult to see any clear motivations on the part of the *Crónica* to manipulate the attribution. An Alfonso III attribution would

Despite this difficulty, however, at least according to the narrative effect of this account of the *coto*-grant, we have moved from the vaguely described grant of worked and un-worked lands in the time of Alfonso III to a grant with amplified and stringent terms for its exclusivity and protection, and the consequences for breaking these terms. This contrasts with the grant of Alfonso III, but also more strongly with the historical mode that prevailed before the intervention of Sahagún's royal benefactors.

In chapter two the chronicle appeals to the 'the sure knowledge and true account of the ancient fathers'.³⁹⁸ Does this refer to oral traditions or ancient texts? It is clearly a very rhetorical gesture towards the outset of the history. As it serves to introduce the also much stylised account of the martyrdom of the monastery's patron saints it is appropriate to the moment of a particular narrative mode. It is not accidental that this overly-wrought rhetoric should appear here: to some degree it covers for the lack of historical data. The appeal to the 'true account of the ancient fathers both reinforces the importance of texts for writing history (the need for an authority) at the same time that it probably reveals the lack of an exact text that contains the story of the martyrdom of Saints Facundo and Primitivo.

The later use of specifically and individually referenced documents presents a contrast then. History is now revealed and known through the detailed terms of specific texts. But, there is also continuity as the royal privileges are used for the original purpose of knowing and relating, or finding out and verifying, history. Furthermore, the rhetorical trappings surrounding texts likewise continue. They mean more than they say, signifying a legitimate and prestigious historical tradition beyond just their stipulations for land control and use. The ambiguity in the meaning of texts in the narrative according to their place in the story and the rhetoric that surrounds them will continue to characterise the chronicle's use of the monastery's privileges and letters.

The *libertas Romana*

have been older; though a land grant was already made there and the Ramiro II attribution allows for the land-grant narrative to include more kings—a point we discuss further on in this chapter. Sahagún's charter collection preserves seven grants made by Ramiro II to the monastery, of local churches and territories (*Colección diplomática*, pp. 92-3, 115, 123-4, 129-34, 166-7: ns. 61, 84, 93, 97, 98, 99, 129). None of these mention the *coto*.

³⁹⁸ 'cierta cognición e de los padres antiguos vera relación' CAS, ch. 2, p. 9.

This takes us to the chronicle's introduction of the *libertas Romana*. This is the next document introduced in the course of the chronicle's story of the monastery's past and comes at the very beginning of the account of the reign of King Alfonso VI. According to the chronicle's monastery-centred account of Alfonso's reign, the first events of his reign lead directly to the grant of the *libertas Romana*. No sooner has the king taken his royal office but he addresses himself to Pope Gregory VII for the purposes of liturgical reforms and he addresses himself to Abbot Hugh of Cluny for the purposes of monastic reforms. Then Bernard, a Cluniac monk sent by Hugh, arrives at the court of Alfonso VI and is directly sent to Rome to be confirmed as abbot of Sahagún and receive the *libertas Romana* for the monastery. The *Crónica* describes Bernard's arrival at Rome:

When Don Bernardo arrived at the threshold of the gates of the blessed apostles Saint Peter and Saint Paul, he was received most kindly by the same Gregory VII of good memory, bishop of the apostolic seat. Then, as he gave [the pope] the letters that he carried from the king with his petition and supplication, without delay he was made abbot of the monastery of Sahagún; and [the pope] made the monastery exempt and free from the yoke of service to or control by any state or church, receiving it unto himself under the protection and defence of the holy church of Rome. And by the authority of his apostolic privilege he extolled and glorified [the monastery]; and to this day we keep the same privilege with us with great care and consolation.³⁹⁹

The immediate significance of the grant of the privilege in this story is to be found in the royal motivations and decisions that have set events in motion. We made a point in the first chapter of this study of the chronicle's focus on the king's lone role as the agent of the religious reforms that were ushered in by contact with Abbot Hugh

³⁹⁹ 'El qual don Bernardo, llegado a los unbrales e puertas de los bien abenturados apóstoles san Pedro e san Pablo, mui benignamente fue rescivido del ya sobredicho e de buena memoria Gregorio séptimo, de la silla apostólica obispo. Al qual, como él diese las letras que llevaba del rey, luego, según la petición e suplicación, sin más tardar le ordenó abbad del monasterio de Sant Fagum, al qual monasterio fiço esento e tiró de todo yugo e servidunbre e poder de qualquier estado, así eclesiástico como seglar; e so la guarda, protección e defensión de la santa yglesia de Roma, en sí retovo para sienpre jamás. E por la autoridad de su privilegio apostolical le ensalcó e ennobleçió; el qual privilegio con nos oi día tenemos con gran guarda e consolación' CAS, ch. 6, pp. 14-5.

of Cluny and Pope Gregory VII. The *libertas* is the culmination of these reforms which for the purposes of the *Crónica* represent most directly the favour and dedication of Alfonso VI towards the monastery. This narrative setting determines the immediate meaning of the privilege in the story. The express purpose of its terms of freedom from all political and ecclesiastical powers save the papacy itself has little direct meaning in the story so far. As far as the story is concerned neither political nor ecclesiastical powers exist which might threaten the monastery. There are only the devoted and generous kings of León, and it is one of their numbers who sent Bernard on to receive the privilege. The immediate significance of the privilege, then, is as a mark of general prestige, as a further mark of the close relationship between monarchy and monastery, and as a mark of the new relationship between the monastery and the papacy.

The chronicle is also very brief on the terms of the privilege, listing simply that the monastery has been made 'exempt and free from the yoke of service to or control by any state or church' and that it has been received by the pope into 'the protection and defence of the holy church of Rome'. This is in contrast to the terms of the *coto* – another defensive privilege without immediate purpose in the story – which went into details such as the ban against royal or noble agents chasing wrongdoers into the preserve and the exact amount to be paid by trespassers.⁴⁰⁰ It also contrasts sharply with the extended terms given for the *fuero* of Alfonso VI, which we will discuss in following.

The chronicle's sparse account of the terms and implications of the privilege in part corresponds to the narrative purposes of the immediate scene in which it appears, but it also corresponds to the nature of the document. The *libertas Romana* had been a feature of the relationship between the papacy and the dispersed religious houses of Western Christendom since the ninth century. It was not an arrangement with a fixed definition. The purposes and interpretations of the *libertas* were always bound up with the nature of the papacy and the relationship between secular and religious power, and as these changed over the centuries so did the privilege. The implications of the *libertas* also had to be worked out at the local or regional level. As

⁴⁰⁰ On Medieval Immunities generally, see: B.H. Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space: Power, Restraint, and Privileges of Immunity in Early Medieval Europe* (Cornell, 1999), pp. 1-9.

Hugh Cowdrey remarks, 'the *libertas Romana* was not a generalised or an abstract concept. Every instance of it was marked by its own particular character'.⁴⁰¹ Cowdrey is writing specifically about the role of institutions subject to the *libertas* in Gregory VII's reform programme. But the general/particular dichotomy that he brings attention to is useful. We see in the *Crónica's* use of the privilege this same split between the terms of the document itself and the need to give it definition and context.

Though a surviving letter of Gregory VII to then-abbot Bernard gives the terms of the *libertas* in phrasing which matches that of the *Crónica*, the *Crónica* could have filled these terms in. The surviving letter of Pope Gregory declares:

We take this monastery into the safe keeping of our perpetual defence and of the Roman liberty, and we lay down that it is to be free from the yoke of every ecclesiastical power ... It is especially to cleave to the Apostolic See after the pattern and form of Cluny which, in God's providence and the under Roman liberty, shines more clearly than daylight through almost all parts of the world, because of the fame of its religion, reputation, and dignity. It is likewise to enjoy a perpetual and an inviolable security. Thus like Cluny in France, Sahagún may be illustrious in Spain for its prerogative of liberty. As by the grace of God it will be its peer in religion, so let it be its equal in the confirmation of its rights by the Apostolic See.⁴⁰²

The chronicle's own description of the terms not only shows a logic consistent with its immediate uses in chronicle's story of the monastery's past, but it also matches what we find in the document record. Yet, it is worth adding here that there was a stake in defining precisely the implications of the privilege in the local context.

⁴⁰¹ Cowdrey, *Cluniacs*, p. 3.

⁴⁰² 'sub perpetue defensionis et Romane libertatis tutela prefatum monasterium suscipimus ipsum que ab omni Ecclesiastice seu Secularis Potestatis iugo fore sancimus ... sancte apostolice sedi specialiter adherens ad instar et formam cluniacensis cenobii quod sub libertate romana Deo auctore pene per omnes partes terrarum fama religionis et onestatis atque amplitudine luce clarius resplendet perpetua et inviolabili securitate fruatur ut sicut illud in Gallia it istud in ispania libertatis prerogativa clarescat, et quod opitulante Deo consimile erit in religione par etiam sit apostolice sedis confirmatione' (Colección diplomática III, n. 809, pp. 102-5); also in: L. Santifaller, *Quellen und Forschungen zum Urkunden- und Kanzleiwesen Papst Gregors VII*, I (Vatican City, 1957), n. 209, pp. 243-6. I have taken the English translation of Cowdrey, *Cluniacs*, pp. 241-2.

The *Crónica* seems to have conditions for the *coto*-grant that it ascribes to Ramiro II and it will do the same for the *fuero* of Alfonso VI (as we will see below). Not only in these cases does it add terms not found in the document record, but adds terms (such as the prohibition of arresting wrongdoers in the *coto*) that have no apparent relevance to the broader story of the *Crónica*.

The terms of the *libertas Romana* were not fixed. They commonly included the obligation of the payment of a census by the monastery to the papacy. The terms of the census varied considerably. Cluny's foundation charter (the express model of many subsequent charters, such as that of Sahagún) stipulated the payment of ten solidi every five years.⁴⁰³ Others payments were more symbolic. The monastery of Romans in France paid a pint of almonds and the monastery of Woffenheim in Germany provided a golden rose for the pope to carry of the fourth Sunday of Lent.⁴⁰⁴ Sahagún itself was to pay two solidi on an annual basis.⁴⁰⁵ The *libertas* privilege commonly included the right of the monastery to the free election of their abbot.

As we will see, the *Crónica* only later in the course of its story finds the opportunity to stress this right. Specifics concerning the application of the privilege to existing jurisdictional boundaries and political and ecclesiastical power hierarchies could also be problematical.⁴⁰⁶ The privilege commonly stipulated the exemption from episcopal control in the administrative and spiritual functions of the monastery, but this could be qualified. This spiritual exemption against the right of a bishop to perform public Mass at Sahagún became especially important. Sahagún's charter record shows territorial conflict between the monastery and the bishopric of León.⁴⁰⁷ The monastery

⁴⁰³ Cowdrey, *Cluniacs*, p. 5.

⁴⁰⁴ Examples taken from I.S. Robinson, *The Papacy, 1073-1198: Continuity and Innovation* (Cambridge, 2004), p. 270.

⁴⁰⁵ The surviving version of Gregory's letter to Bernard stipulates: '*pensio duorum solidorum illius terre monete annuatim reddatur*' (*Colección diplomática* III, n. 809). On the evolving nature and meaning of the census payment, see Robinson, *The Papacy*, pp. 269ff., and I.S. Robinson, 'The Institutions of the Church, 1073-1216', *The New Cambridge Medieval History 4: c.1024-1198*, II (eds.) D. Luscombe & J. Riley-Smith (Cambridge, 2004), 368-460 (pp. 402ff.).

⁴⁰⁶ A brief but useful overview of the varying conditions of the *libertas Romana* can be found in U. Blumenthal, 'The Papacy, 1024-1122', *The New Cambridge Medieval History 4: c.1024-1198*, II (eds.) D. Luscombe & J. Riley-Smith (Cambridge, 2004), 8-37 (pp. 11-12).

⁴⁰⁷ Disputes between the monastery of Sahagún and the Bishop of León centered on the right to collect the *tercias* tax in lands to which both laid claim. Sahagún had its long tradition of royal charters to attest to its many royal grants for the land, but León contended that these were temporary in nature and that the right to tax had reverted back to it. The first record of this dispute is found in a charter dated to 1087 (*Colección diplomática* III, n. 885, pp. 198-200). The Bishop of León won the *libertas Romana* in

of Vézelay presents another example of a religious house needing to defend itself from a rival ecclesiastical power itself endowed with the *libertas Romana*, which was in fact Cluny.⁴⁰⁸ Exemption was usually extended to the control of secular powers among monarchs and nobles, but this too could be complicated. One way secular power might align or conflict with the purposes of the *libertas* was through the tradition of advocacy. Lay lords often acted as advocates for a religious house and went on in this capacity in conjunction with the grant of the privilege. Such lords might be seen as a further part of the monastery's strategy of defence and power; the role could also be abused.⁴⁰⁹ Advocacy did not feature in Germany as it did in Spain; and, as the privilege came to Spain in the time of Gregorian reforms, the strong sense of precluding lay control was present from the beginning. The *Crónica* stated the exemption from state control in its initial version of the terms of the privilege (quoted above), in the *fuero* granted to Sahagún in the years following the *libertas* (which we devote discussion to below), Alfonso himself spoke of giving Sahagún to 'the Roman Church and to St Peter',⁴¹⁰ and as we will see in the course of this chapter, Urraca continually stresses Sahagún's exemption from secular (and therefore her own) power. Yet, we see in both the principal role of Alfonso VI in the events which lead to the granting of the privilege and later in Archbishop Bernard's role in seeing that the monks do freely elect their next abbot after the resignation of Abbot Diego (chapter twenty-six), that to a large extent the monastery itself (or at least the chronicle) saw the advantage of a continuing presence of royal and ecclesiastical power in its own affairs.⁴¹¹

1104, and after that both sides were anxious to see their privileges confirmed by successive popes. The nature and history of the dispute is told in three overlapping essays in the collection of essays *Escritos dedicados a José María Catón* (ed.) M.C. Díaz y Díaz (León, 2004): V. Ángel Álvarez Palenzuela, 'Jurisdicción episcopal y monástica. Su delimitación entre el obispado de León y el monasterio de Sahagún', 65-85; C.M. Reglero de la Fuente, 'La Querrela entre el abad de Sahagún y el obispo de León: Recuerdos de un enfrentamiento', 1149-1176; T. Villacortes Rodríguez, 'Conflictos de jurisdicción entre el obispo de León y el abad del monasterio de Sahagún', 1445-1496. The story of this ongoing dispute helps to frame an important distinction in the *Crónica's* use of the *libertas*: the *Crónica* aims the *libertas* specifically at the monastery's lordship over the burghers, rather than its lands and subject churches.

⁴⁰⁸ See Hugh of Poitiers, *The Vézelay Chronicle*, p. 16.

⁴⁰⁹ Advocacy was particularly important to the secular and ecclesiastical power structure in Germany: see Cowdrey, *Cluniacs*, pp. 210-213. On the evolution of the *libertas* in the reforms of Gregory VII to eventually preclude all forms of lay control, see also S. Wood, *The Proprietary Church in the Medieval West* (Oxford, 2006), pp. 842ff.

⁴¹⁰ '*Romanae ecclesiae et beato Petro*', Muñoz y Romero, *Colección de fueros municipales y cartas pueblas* (Madrid, 1972) pp. 302-3.

⁴¹¹ Barbara Rosenwein makes the point that immunities were often used to forge bonds between kings, churchmen, and magnates (Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*, p. 13).

This chapter's focus on the *libertas* privilege takes us closest to the central argument of this study: that the *Crónica* is at heart a bid to redefine the terms of Abbot Domingo's lordship over the burghers as an ecclesiastical lordship in the experience of the conflict. It is in the continuing assertions of the terms of the *libertas* in the conflict that the *Crónica* will express most directly Abbot Domingo's ecclesiastical lordship. In terms of the nature of the *libertas privilege*, the *Crónica* can also be read as the monastery's attempt to fix the definition of its privilege specifically *vis-à-vis* the burghers. The *Crónica* argues that the *libertas* not only extends to the burgher class, but covers all the terms of the *fuero*, even in the event that monks confirm a charter superseding the *fuero* (which, of course, is what happens). The *libertas* becomes useful for the monastery's purposes in the conflict and in its subsequent historiography precisely because of its at once precise and abstract nature. Even if the relationship to the papacy and the exemption from secular and ecclesiastical interference were subject to definition, the specific ideas of prestige and protection in the relationship to Rome and the negative idea of exemptions could at least be asserted readily and emphatically. At the same time, the open questions surrounding the force of the privilege in the monastery's territories allow it to be readily applied to a social group that arrived in Sahagún some years after the *libertas* was granted.⁴¹²

As we have explained throughout, our general argument does not stop here, as we also take up the larger literary strategies which together emphasise, interpret, and mask the chronicle's argument according to its social-legal purposes and circumstances. The argument of this chapter also extends more generally beyond just the *libertas*. We take up the way that the *libertas* and other documents are fitted into the dramatic and personal/communal narrative of the story. We also take up the chronicle's treatment of the burghers' charter. This document is ideologically, legally, and socially disregarded and eventually physically destroyed. The prominence of the burghers' charter rhetorically and thematically points to a negative purpose as regards documents central to the *Crónica*. It simultaneously publishes the monastery's

⁴¹² T. Villacortes Rodríguez has commented on the ambiguity of some of the *libertas*'s terms; in this respect he points specifically to whether the terms of exemption extend to all the monasteries and churches under Sahagún's jurisdiction (including the churches of the burgo) (Villacortes Rodríguez, 'Conflictos de jurisdicción', p. 1462).

documents and effaces the burghers' charter (yet, conflictingly, still publishing the burned document in the record of its effacement). This alerts us to another feature of the *Crónica's* handling of the *libertas*, which we only now have the opportunity to call attention to as the chronicle also leaves it as an unfinished thought at the end of its account of the *libertas*. Where the chronicle takes pains to show the ultimate destruction of the burghers' charter, it also takes pains to assert the physical presence in the story of the *libertas* privilege. Of the *libertas*, the chronicle tells us, 'to this day we keep the same privilege with us with great care and consolation'. The same is not specified concerning the *fuero*. We will see that this is the document which in one of the final direct confrontations of the monastery and burghers, Abbot Domingo has pulled out and read. Although the confirmation of the burghers' charter in a sense undoes the *fuero*, the physical survival of the *libertas* and its reiteration in further papal letters shows this document to ultimately carry the day.

The *fuero* of Alfonso VI

In chapter fifteen, the *Crónica* tells how Alfonso VI decided to establish a town at Sahagún, and to carry this out he invited burghers from all parts of Western Europe to settle in Sahagún. He also granted to the burghers a *fuero*, or town charter, which set out the legal conditions under which they would settle and take up their trades. The *fuero* was essentially a set of privileges, exemptions, and laws granted by a king or local authority to a certain population. Between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries the *fuero* was particularly associated with the need to populate lands taken in the Reconquest and with burgher settlements in the Northern kingdoms along the *Camino Francés*. The latter need, of course, describes the circumstances which led to Alfonso VI's grant of a *fuero* to Sahagún. Privileges and exemptions from customary obligations proved an effective way to attract new settlers to established trading-communities in the Iberian peninsula; we quoted in chapter one the passage from the chronicle describing artisans and traders arriving from France, England, Germany and Northern Italy. These settlers were desired to increase the wealth of their lords who would collect taxes on their residence, trade, and crimes. The *fuero* of Sahagún of 1085 clearly shows this purpose. The *fuero* grants the royal exemptions to the burghers, but it also establishes very firmly the terms of the monastery's economic and legal lordship over the burghers.

The *fuero* of 1085 also survives outside the *Crónica* in two identical later copies of 1307 and 1402.⁴¹³ That these copies represent an authentic original version is

⁴¹³ ‘... ideo que igitur ego Adefonsus prolis Fredinandi regis et Sancie regine cum voluntate Abbatis et monachorum do vobis hominibus populatoribus Sancti Facundi consuetudines et foros in quibus et serviatis ecclesie, et monasterii suprataxati.

1. In primis ut non eatis in expeditionem, sed quando fuerit Rex obsessus aut suum castellum; et tunc cum fuerint ante vos tertia die usque ad Valcarcer.

2. Et quod nunquam habeatis dominum, nisi Abbatem et Monachos.

3. Quoniam quidem oportet vos de vestris artibus et mercaturis vivere et ire per diversas terras, mando et detesto quod nullus aliquis pignoret vos pro alfoz, nec pro hereditate Sancti Facundi, nec illis pro vobis.

4. Quando populator acceperit solum, dabit uno solido atque duobus denariis. Et ita unumquemque annum, de singulos solos dabuntur singulis solidis. Sane vero si in ipso anno non populaverit illum, perdet eum. Si sane pro populato solidum non dederit, accipient ei portam et hostium vel aliquid quod valeat solidum donec tectum accipiant. Et usque ad duos precones de octo in octo diebus reddentur pignos accepti pro solido. In solo si nec tectum, nec aliquid pignus invenerint, illum accipiat abbas, et det cui vult.

5. Qui emerit solum censatum et cum suo copulaverit, duos census dabit. Et si multos in unum coagulaverit, multos dabit. De uno si unum, aut multos per venditionem fecerint, quantas partes fecerint tantos solidos dabunt qui in eis habitaverint.

6. Post mortem parentis quando filii solum partierint, quanti fuerint tantos solidos dabunt. Si autem unus de eis partes fratrum in unum conexus fuerit, dabit unum censum.

7. Nullus vendet solum nisi tantum illi comparatori quem abbas pro suo homine prius receperit.

8. Vicinus autem aut extraneus qui domum vel aliquam partem calumpniaverit, tam ipse qui querit quam necnon ille de quo querit, dent abbati fidiatores in sexaginta solidos. Et qui fuerit victus persolvat sexaginta solidos abbati.

9. Parietem que in ante mutaverit, vel nullam fecerit, quingentos dabit solidos. Et quod fecit, emendabit.

10. Quisquis presumptor vel per violentiam alienam domum intraverit, dabit abbati trecentos solidos et domino domus dampnum quod fecit.

11. Qui alium dominum aliumque clamaverit nisi abbatis, capiatur ipse et domus eius. Si domum non habuerit, expellatur. Et qui expulso per qualicumque modum receperit, det abbati sexaginta solidos.

12. Qui domum suam dimiserit et de foris exierit pignorare, perdat illa. Sed si postea pro foro de villa dare directo et accipere voluerit, det abbati prius sexaginta solidos.

13. Nullus habeat ibi furno vel patella, sed ubi fuerit invento, frangatur. Et det abbati quinque solidos. Ita fiat de mensura de cibaria et de cunctis omnibus falsis mensuris.

14. Si in manu alicuius vel in domo invenerint ramum de saltu, det quinque solidos, si ad radicem succiderit, capiant eum et faciat abbas quod vult de eo.

15. De suspecta intrabunt in domum et scrutabunt omnia, ut arbores et vinee et pratos herbe habeant suum robur ad opus monasterii.

16. Cum monachi suum vinum vendere voluerint, alius in villa non vendat.

17. Pannos, pisces recentes et ligna ad furnos necessaria nullus emat quandiu monachi emere voluerint. Qui fecerit, perdat quod comparavit et det quinque solidos.

18. Qui pro saione directum ipsa die non dederit, det quinque solidos.

19. Directum neque fidiatorem non dando, si eum percusserit, sexaginta solidos det.

20. Homicida cognitus dabit centum solidos et tertia pars sit condonata pro rege. Si negaverit, iuret quia non fecit, et ad torna litiget; et si ceciderit, pectet centum solidos, et sexaginta solidos de campo, et quod alter expendit in armis et operariis et expensis.

21. Homicidium de nocte factum qui negaverit, si accusatus fuerit, litiget cum illo qui dixerit “quia ego vidi”; et si ceciderit, pectet centum solidos et quod alter expendit in armis, et operariis et expensis et sexaginta solidos de campo.

22. Qui per fraudis molimina hominem necaverit, quingentos sueldos dabit.

23. Homo percussus si ad mortem venerit et dixerit clerico “quia ille homo percussit me unde morior”, per testimonium clerici dabit homicidium.

24. Qui alium impellaverit, aut cum pugno percusserit, quinque solidos dabit abbati. In capite si percusserit vel cum solo pugno, quindecim solidos det.

strongly doubted.⁴¹⁴ Instead, it is likely that what survives is a text which combines two or more versions of later *fueros*.⁴¹⁵ This is not a vital setback for our study; concerned as we are with the strategies of the chronicle *per se*, we can put to one side questions of reconstructing the original *fuero* or the chronicle's possible distortion of the legal record. Nevertheless, the 1307-1402 version can provide a useful comparison if only as another possible version of the kinds of statutes an original might have included. The *Crónica's* version does not differ significantly from the 1307-1402 version, but comparison between the two suggests how the chronicle shaped its version according to its specific historiographical purposes.

The chronicle's *fuero* gives nine principal statutes; we can quote these here in the body of the text (numbered for easier reference), before going on to consider their implication and compare them with the 1307-1402 version, which we only quote in the footnote above. Directly after its description of burghers arriving in Sahagún from far and wide, the chronicle inserts its version of the *fuero*:

1. And then the king made such a decree that no one that lived in the town might possess, inherit, or bestow any field, vineyard, orchard, land, or mill, but that they should have it only as a lease from the abbot. One might have a house within the town, but for this each one should pay to the abbot one *sueldo* for census and lordship.
2. And if any of them should cut anything pertaining to the monastery, even a branch, from the woodland, he should be

25. *Coram monacho si eius hominem ferierit, aut pepulerit, roget sicut qui inonorat dominium suum.*

26. *Si duo unum in terra iactaverint, sexaginta solidos dent. Unus ad alium, quinque solidos.*

27. *Qui oculum turbaverit aut dentem excusserit vel mebrum secaverit seu dampnaverit, sexaginta solidos dabit abbati.*

28. *Per falsam inquisitionem, quam aliquis fecerit vel dixerit, aut per falsum iudicium quem dederit, vicinum suum aliquid perdere fecerit, det ei quod pro eo perdidit, et abbati sexaginta solidos. Ita et de tota causa et calumpnia remque factam pecto abbati et res domino suo dent.*

29. *Venditor domus det solidum unum; entor duos denarios.*

Istas consuetudines et foros per voluntatem Abbatis et collegio fratrum dedi ego Adefonsus Imperator hominibus Sancti Facundi per quos serviant eis sicut Dominus in submissione et humilitate plena' (Muñoz y Romero, *Colección de fueros municipales*, pp. 301-6).

⁴¹⁴ Doubt on the authentic nature of the document surrounds especially its list of confirmants, see: A.M. Barrero García, 'Los fueros de Sahagún', *Anuario de historia del derecho español (AHDE)* 42 (1972), pp. 385-597.

⁴¹⁵ Two more *fueros* were given in 1152 Alfonso VII, and 1255 by Alfonso X. See: Barrero García, 'Los fueros de Sahagún'.

imprisoned and redeemed only at the will and pleasure of the abbot.

3. Furthermore, he decreed that all [townsmen] had to cook their bread in the monastery's oven; but, as this was very burdensome and annoying to the burghers and inhabitants [of the town], they begged the abbot that it might be lawful for them to cook [their bread] where it might suit them better, and that he would receive [for this] one *sueldo* each year. This was granted to them and confirmed by charter, that is, that every year each one of the burghers and inhabitants [of the town] would pay to the monastery two *sueldos*, one at Easter for the oven [exemption], and another on the feast of All Saints, for the sake of the census and lordship.
4. Furthermore, the king decreed that none of the counts or nobles should have a house within the town of Sahagún, only the burghers, whether French or Castilian. But if it should happen that the abbot gives his consent for a noble to have a house there, that noble is obliged to obey the abbot and pay the census just as if he were one of the burghers.
5. And because this decree and statute to all the nobles was established, the pious king [Alfonso] gave to God and to his martyrs under the authority of [his] contract the palace and church of Santa María Magdalena and the baths that the same Queen Constance had built as her own residence and at her own expense, saying, "it is not God's will that any of my family or relatives should inherit the land or the town which the holy martyrs [of Sahagún] dampened with their own blood and bought with their bodies".
6. In the same way, the market that was originally held in Grajal, which is a royal town, was moved to Sahagún. And this was done in order to provide for the food and support of the monks; and he confirmed this act by his royal authority.

7. And, furthermore, he decreed that in reverence of the martyrs of Jesus Christ [Facundo and Primitivo] that the burghers of Sahagún would be exempt from the payment of any toll or tribute whatsoever.
8. Furthermore, he decreed that [the burghers] would not be obliged to accompany the king's army on any of his military expeditions, though this was the custom of the other cities and places, except, a thing displeasing to God, if the person of the king was anywhere besieged by his enemies.
9. Furthermore, the king demanded that if any tax collector or official minister of the king should attempt to assert with the use of force his royal right within the boundaries or the town of Sahagún he should be killed. And the killer would be free from any penalty.⁴¹⁶

⁴¹⁶ '1. E luego el rei fiço tal decreto e ordenó que ninguno de los que morasen en la villa, dentro del coto del monasterio toviese por respeto hereditario o raçon de heredad, canpo, nin vinna, nin huerto, nin hera, nin molino, slavo si el abbad por manera de enprestido, diese alguna cosa a alguno d'ellos, pero pudiere aber casa dentro de la villa. E por causa e respecto d'ella, por todos los annos pagase cada uno d'ellos al abbad un sueldo por censo e conosçimiento de señorío.

2. E si alguno d'ellos tajase o cortase del monte que pertenesçe al monasterio aún tan solamente una rama, que sea puesto en la cárçel e sea redimido a boluntad e beneplaçito del abbad.

3. Otrósí ordeno que todos devan de ir a coçer el pan al forno del monasterio, la qual cosa como a los burgueses e moradores fuese mui grave e enojoso, con grandes plegarias rogaron al abbad que a ellos fuesse lícito e permiso de coçer adonde mejor les viniese, e que de cada uno d'ellos él reçiviese en cada un año un sueldo, lo qual les fue otorgado e por escriptura firmado, conviene a saver, que por todos los annos, cada uno de los burgueses e moradores pagase al monasterio dos sueldos, uno en la pascua por respeto del forno, e otro por la fiesta de todos santos, en nombre de çenso e señorío.

4. Ordenó otrósí el rey que ninguno de los condes e nobles toviesen casa o havitaçión en la villa de Sant Fagum, sino tan solamente los burgeses, françeses e castellanos. E si por aventura, por consentimiento e otorgamiento del abbad, alguno de los nobles ay obiese casa o havitaçión, deviese obedesçer al abbad semejantemente así como uno de los burgueses, e eso mesmo deviese pagar el ençenso.

5. E porque este decreto e estatuto a todos los nobles fuese estable e firme, el palaçio e iglesia de santa María Magdalena e el vaño que la reina Costança susodicho a su costa e propia mesión avía hedificado, el muy piadoso rei donó a Dios e a sus mártires so autoridad de testamento, diçiendo: non plega a Dios que alguno de mi generaçión e parentela sea heredero de la tierra o villa, la qual los santos mártires con la propia sangre regaron o con su sagrada muerte conpraron.

6. Semejante, el mercado que primeramente se façía en Grajal, que es villa real, traspasó a la villa de Sant Fagum. E esto porque aprobechase a la refecçión e a la ayuda de los monjes, e este estableçimiento confirmó con su autoridad real.

7. E aún ordenó por reberençia de los martires de Jesucristo que los burgueses de Sant Fagum no pagasen al rei portadgo nin trivuto alguno.

8. Otrósí, aún ordenó que en la expediçión del rei o hueste suya non sean obligados a ir, aunque sea costunbre de las otras çibdades e lugares de ir, salbo si, lo que Dios non plega, la persona del rei fuere çercada de sus enemigos en algùn lugar.

The charter's version of the *fuero* begins with the first three terms giving laws regarding the burghers' occupation of houses in the town, the exclusion of the monastery's woodland from the burghers, and the use of ovens in the town. The idea of the monastery's lordship is expressed most strongly in the first statute. The burghers can only possess houses and lands with the abbot's consent and as a lease (*'por manera de enprestido'*). And for this they are to pay a yearly sum as a census in recognition of the abbot's lordship (*'por censo e conosçimiento de señorío'*). The 1307-1402 version expresses the monastery's lordship more directly in its second statute: 'You shall have no lord except the abbot and monks'. Statute eleven adds to this: 'whoever shall recognise a lord other the abbot, he shall be apprehended and his house forfeited. If he does not have a house, he shall be expelled. And if any shall receive him in whatever way, they shall pay the abbot 60 *soldi'*. Statutes 4-10, 12, and 29 address the conditions for the burghers' occupation of the town's houses. Number four gives more specific instructions for payments to the abbot: 'The inhabitant shall give one *soldus* and two *denari* upon receipt of his house. Likewise, each year he shall give one *soldus* for each house ... '. These are followed up with further details on joining multiple plots together or dividing plots into smaller shares (5), rules for inheritance (6), regulation against selling houses (7), disputes over land (8) moving wall-boundaries (9), causing damage to houses (10) abandoning one's house (12), and payment of a tax to the abbot for buying and selling houses (29).

Terms two and three of the chronicle's *fuero* strengthen the idea of the monastery's dominance over the burgher class. The order that the burghers bake their bread in the monastery's oven is matched by point thirteen of the 1307-1402 version. The prohibition against the burghers taking wood from the monastery's woodland in term two of the chronicle is matched by a sequence of more invasive laws in the 1307-1402 version in points fourteen and fifteen. In fifteen, suspicion of being in possession of a 'branch from the woodland' (stipulated in 14) allows for inspection of the house, so that 'the vigor of the trees, vines, and meadow-grasses will be for the needs of the monastery'.

9. *Otrosí, si algún recaudador, o ministro oficial del rei dentro del coto o villa de Sant Fagum por fuerça presumiere de usar algún derecho real, manda que le maten. E el matador que quede sin pena'* CAS, ch. 15, pp. 22-24.

Here the versions deviate more widely. The chronicle focuses on the application of its powers in the town to other social classes (nobles, Castilians) (4), further gifts of the king (Queen Constance's bath house)⁴¹⁷ (5), and the translation of the market of Grajal to Sahagún (6)⁴¹⁸. Finally, 7-9 tell of benefits granted to the burghers: exemptions from royal tax and military service (7 and 8) and the exemption from royal tax collectors (9). The 1307-1402 version also gives the exemption from military service (1), it does not mention exemption from royal tax (though this presumably was assumed), and says nothing of exemption from royal tax collectors, and the right to kill them without penalty.⁴¹⁹ Instead, this version focuses on trading restrictions: the burghers cannot sell wine when the monks are selling (16), and cannot sell bread, fish, and firewood while the monks are selling (17). Numbers eighteen and nineteen have to do with the repayment of sureties to the abbot's agents in the town. Finally, terms 20-28 deal with murder (20-24), violence (25-27), and false witness (28).

Comparison between the *Crónica's* version of the *fuero* and that of the 1307-1402 version is especially useful for an idea of what the *Crónica* has left out of its version. Terms regarding murder, violence, and punishment are omitted entirely, though many of these mandate fines paid to the abbot by offenders. The trading restrictions given in the 1307-1402 version are also omitted by the *Crónica*. The chronicle instead narrows in on the monastery's lordship, adding conditions for the burghers' use of their houses and prohibitions against the burghers' use of the woodland. These are the kinds of terms we should expect considering the purposes of the *Crónica*. At the end the chronicle also spells out exemptions from royal taxes and military service for the burghers. As we have seen, these will play into the two-pronged argument that the burghers had been corrupted by their economic success (end of chapter fifteen), and that Alfonso VI had treated them well, loved them, and they had repaid his love with evil when they rebelled against his daughter Queen Urraca.

But, more than the chronicle's selective purposes with the *fuero*, deeper grounds for difference appears in the narrative character of the *fuero* in the chronicle.

⁴¹⁷ Recorded in a document dated 22 November 1093 (*Colección diplomática* III, n. 914).

⁴¹⁸ Sahagún is granted a market in a document dated 25 October 1093, but there is no mention that it was moved from Grajal (*Colección diplomática* III, n. 911).

⁴¹⁹ Mentioned 1190.

In fact, the chronicle makes clear that it is presenting not a particular text but a tradition of texts and grants. The chronicle gives the sense of relating a string of individual grants. In one after another the kind 'decrees' or 'demands' and separate documents are even referenced: 'This was granted to them and confirmed by charter' (3); 'he confirmed this act by his royal authority' (6). This furthermore appears in term three, which contains its own narrative involving the relationship between two grants: the king ordered the burghers to use the monastery's oven, they protested and were granted an exemption in exchange for another annual payment of one *sueldo* (L. *soldus*). Some of the provisions have been drawn from the larger *fuero* tradition of the monastery (such as 4 and 9), but five and six draw in grants which are entirely independent from any *fuero* grant in the charter record. Where the *fuero* of the 1307-1402 version is impersonal (signalled through subjunctive verbs: '*dabit*' '*perdet*'), the chronicle fits it into its narrative pattern of the generous and devoted king ('*king made such a decree*'). The chronicle stresses in this way the historical continuity in the monastery's successive grants and more generally in its close relationship with the monarchy, but it also stresses more specifically that the *fuero* was primarily for the benefit of the monastery. We are specifically told that the establishment of the market to Sahagún was intended 'to provide for the food and support of the monks'. And, similarly, when Alfonso VI grants Queen Constance's bathhouse to the monastery he is made to voice his desire to exempt the holy site of Sahagún from his royal power: "it is not God's will that any of my family or relatives should inherit the land or the town which the holy martyrs [of Sahagún] dampened with their own blood and bought with their bodies".

According to its place in the narrative, the *fuero* is made to represent the final stage of the monastery's history. We have come from the original events of the monastery's religious and institutional foundations, the martyrdom of Saints Facundo and Primitivo and the founding of the monastery by Alfonso III, to the arrival of the burghers. It is an ambiguous event (and document), however, which both continues the narrative of political privilege and prestige and looks forward to the eight years of conflict following the death of Alfonso VI. The chronicle is sure to convey the terms of the *fuero* which define the monastery's dominance over the burghers, the abbot's control of the burghers' houses, the payment of annual tribute by the burghers, strict

prohibitions against the use of the monastery's woodland. But, it is also clear that the document is not presented as a document for legal consultation. Looking ahead to the story of conflict with the burghers, these terms can be said to matter in only limited and indirect ways. At the Council of Burgos, in the final scene of the chronicle, the burghers must perform penance in order to return to their homes. Accusations and complaints against the burghers' use and destruction of the woodland is continually a focus of the chronicle's account of the burghers' abuses. When the Aragonese come to occupy Sahagún (chapter twenty) they are said to quarter themselves in Queen Constance's palaces. The *fuero* provides a legal background to each of these complaints. But, in none of these cases does the chronicle itself refer us back directly to the *fuero*. Instead, the chronicle's introduction of the *fuero* is narrative in character. It is a place where two narratives cross: it acts as a pivot between the monastery's history and the ensuing conflict with the burghers. The chronicle stresses the ways in which the *fuero* fits into the monastery's history of privilege, but the *fuero* is more immediately hedged into a story about the burghers. No sooner do the burghers arrive with their trades from 'all parts of the universe', than they are put into their houses under the terms of the *fuero*, and no sooner do they begin their living and working under the favourable terms of the *fuero* but they become proud and corrupt.

The *fuero* reappears in three places in the chronicle. It is recalled in Urraca's invocations of her father's generous treatment of the burghers. Here it is remembered not as a document specifically, but as an act of royal benevolence which determines a kind of social contract between monarchy and burghers. Where it is later referenced as a document this is in relation to other documents. First, it is remembered as the 'laws and customs' of Alfonso VI which the burghers' charter tries to amend. Second, it appears in two papal letters which confirm the monastery's ecclesiastical powers over the burghers, and rebuke them for breaking the customs of Alfonso VI. Yet, even in these cases the chronicle does not return to the specific terms of the *fuero* which are listed here. The *fuero* comes to be significant of the monastery's history of royal prestige and privilege itself, and the burghers' place in this history. We see in this the way that the chronicle uses its document according to their broader social, political and religious associations. As we shall see, this is due to the fate of the burghers' charter. When the burghers' charter is burned the conflict is no longer about the

burghers' challenge of specific terms of the *fuero*. In writing about the event, then, the chronicle's interest in these documents surrounds their broader meanings, their relative meanings, and their place in the story. We transition now into the role of documents in the chronicle's account of the conflict that follows the death of Alfonso VI. We begin, specifically, with the way that the initial events of the conflict, in the second narrative section of the chronicle, function as a prompt for the question of the monastery's authority and the chronicle's formulation of an answer which will be based around the *libertas*, the *fuero*, and subsequent letters from the Archbishop Bernard and Pope Paschal II.

Raising the question and a new strategy

The *Crónica* reveals an anxiety to speak to the questions of law and authority at issue in the conflict. We can point to scenes in which the monastery's enemies are made to provoke just these questions. In chapter thirty-six, amid the chaos of a burgher attack on the monastery's lands—they were uprooting the monastery's great elms and knocking down their fruit trees—the chronicle turns away from this violence to verbal threats made by the burghers. The burghers (so the chronicle reports) despised the queen's lordship⁴²⁰ and demanded that Alfonso I to send more troops to Sahagún,⁴²¹ and then 'in public and in private they threatened this, saying:

“Who made the abbot and the monks to lord over so many noble men and such great burghers? Who gave them possession of these great lands, fields, vineyards, and orchards?”⁴²²

At this point the narrative returns to the burghers' attacks on the monastery's orchards. Scenes like this show the way that the chronicle tends to stack up its themes and rhetorical strategies. Violence against the monastery's lands gives way, as if in the same narrative breath, to accusations about the burghers' treatment of Urraca, their communications with Alfonso I, and then to a direct quote of the burghers' taunting over the grounds for the monastery's possession of its lands.

⁴²⁰ *'despreçiado el señorío de la reina'* CAS, ch. 36, p. 67.

⁴²¹ *'demandasen al rei de Aragón e trajiesen e metiesen en la villa sus cavalleros'* CAS, ch. 36, p. 67.

⁴²² *'lo qual ellos en público e en oculo amenazavan, diciendo:*

“¿Quién dio que el abbad o monjes se enseñoreen a tantos nobles barones e tan grandes burgeses?, ¿quién dio, eso mesmo, que ellos deviesen poseer tales e tan grandes tierras, canpos e viñas e güertos?” CAS, ch. 36, p. 67.

In another instance a description of a burgher attack on the monastery's lands similarly gives way to a taunt over the possession of that land. In chapter thirty-eight, the chronicle tells how the burghers went armed with bows and arrows and 'weapons of diverse kinds'⁴²³ to the monastery's woodlands and put it under assault: stealing the vegetables of the fields, the fruit of the trees, the hay of the meadow, and purposely seeking out the sprouts and buds of the plants tore these out or stamped upon them to prevent future growth.⁴²⁴ The chronicle says that Abbot Domingo was too fearful to protest, and if anyone did, the burghers responded: "He who put such an estate into the possession of the monks comes return trip from the devil".⁴²⁵ And then they swore 'by the arm, by the eyes, by the blood of God': "If anyone should say one word of this, we will cut and smash his head".⁴²⁶

In both these cases, an attack on the monastery's land leads to a verbal attack on the authority by which the monastery can claim possession of that land. Whether the burghers really said these things we cannot know. More relevant, is the effects that the arrangement of these scenes produce. We can best understand how the narrative works in these scenes if we pay attention to the way that the chronicle shifts between specific action (for example, the burghers pulled down our elm trees) and vaguer, ambiguous types of action. Action that is not specific might be intended action, threatened action, secret action, or abstract action. We will notice in these scenes that we have pointed out above how the chronicle constructs its meaning out of a pattern of action and ambiguous action (as we can simply call it). The thrust of the narrative in these scenes is to move from action to ambiguous action, from what the burghers did to what they would have done, did in secret, or did at another time.

Focusing for the moment on the first of the examples given above (from chapter thirty-six) the accusations that the burghers 'despised' the queen and demanded that Alfonso I send more troops to Sahagún represents this narrative shift from action to intended action. 'Despised', as used here, does suggests a sense of

⁴²³ *'armas de dibersas maneras'* CAS, ch. 38, p. 72.

⁴²⁴ *'rovaban las berças de los güertos, las frutas de los árboles, e el feno de los plados, e las ramas nuevamente salientes fuera de los montes, los pánpanos de las vinnas, taçando e destroyendo antes que llegasen a saçon, ca lo uno arrancavan con las manos, lo otros pisavan con los pies, en tal manera, que todo lo disipavan e destruían'* CAS, ch. 38, p. 72.

⁴²⁵ *'por el braço, por los ojos e por la sangre de Dios'* / *"De parte del diablo fue e vino quien donó a los monjes poseer tal heredad"* CAS, ch. 38, p. 73.

⁴²⁶ *"Si alguno dixere palabra d'estas cosas, su caveça cortaremos o quebrantaremos"* CAS, ch. 38, p. 73.

action; it should be read in the feudal sense of a failure to pay due service or honour to a lord (here Queen Urraca), rather than a feeling akin to hatred, the current meaning in English. However, with both these accusations it is only in a very abstract sense that we can read them as actions. They are not given the effect of association with other actions or events in the narrative: how did the burghers despise the queen? Did Alfonso receive the burghers' demands and did he send more troops to Sahagún? Rather these function as cues to more reaching connections which the chronicle wishes to make between various themes of the story. It is by this narrative strategy that the chronicle gives more complex meaning to the events of the narrative.

The use of direct speech in these scenes is also significant of the way that the chronicle moves away from specific action. In both of the narrative examples that we have given above, the chronicle makes the burghers speak in their (supposed) own words, taunting, insulting and threatening. In one case, the burghers threaten further violence against the monks, decapitation. The association made is between two types of violent action; violence against the monastery's lands becomes violence against the monks themselves. It is a manner of redirecting the violent attacks of the burghers to a more personal, and so for the monks more frightening and shocking, target; but it also works by an inductive logic which suggests *if the burghers are capable of such an attack on our property, imagine what they would do to us.*⁴²⁷

In contrast to this threat, the other examples of direct speech do not point to further action, but instead point with mocking irony and insult to the conditions of the monastery's claim to control of its lands. These speeches are themselves presented as ambiguous actions. We are tipped off to this by the assertion that the burghers were saying these things 'in public and in private'. This quotation does not reflect words spoken at any specific moment, but rather words spoken on more than one occasion, in different social circumstances: they are words that happen independent of the narrative's chronology and have no chronology of their own. The distinction between public and private indicates a deeper sense of the ambiguous action of these words. It is affirmed that they happened in public, where they were heard by a witness, and so can be known to our chronicler; but they also happened in private, which (as I take it)

⁴²⁷ This logic is to be found throughout the chronicle.

means among themselves, or even within themselves, where no one but themselves can know them.⁴²⁸ There is, then, a hypothetical nature to these words. The chronicle has it both ways. They are actual words (have a social presence) and they are also words that the burghers must have, or would have, said: words that if they did not say, they meant to say.

Like the accusations that the burghers despised the queen and demanded more troops from Alfonso I, these speeches also happen without immediate connections to other actions or events. There is no response from the monastery, though the possibility for action is pointed out. Before the burghers' insult that "He who put such an estate into the possession of the monks comes return trip from the devil", the chronicle says Abbot Domingo was too fearful to speak out. This fear is vindicated by the subsequent threat, "If anyone should say one word of this, we will cut and smash his head". The anticipation of this violence creates a kind of negative action, the abbot's unwillingness to do something.

These speeches call on action at the same time that they prevent it. The burghers' mockery and insults invite and dares the monastery to answer them with proof of their claim to authority. But, at this moment in the story, oppressed by the burghers' attacks and threats, they are unwilling or unable. The chronicle's shift from specific action to ambiguous action opens the scene to issues of power and authority that lie beneath the immediate violence of the story. The ambiguous actions that the narrative shifts to also allows the chronicle to express the monastery's inaction as a part, as an event, of the story. But the action that is dared—answering, speaking, and demonstrating authority—is not itself action in the same sense as the burghers' violence.

There are other examples from this part of the chronicle of frustrated action. We can indicate two examples, both of which involve Abbot Domingo's intentions to travel to Rome and present his case against the burghers to Pope Paschal II. In chapter thirty-one, Abbot Domingo has fled to seek refuge with Queen Urraca who is in the town of Huesca, in Aragón. He complains to her of his treatment by King Alfonso. The queen in turn (as the chronicle's narrative sequence goes) complains to her nobles of

⁴²⁸ Other instances in their hearts: Indeed in chapter thirty-eight, internal prayers of abbot and monks.

how this cruel treatment of Domingo shows the king's enmity towards her, she raises funds by exchanging some of the king's Muslim hostages for gold with the ruler of Zaragoza, she takes Aragonese nobles whom Alfonso had expelled into her ranks, and then she has Domingo write letters in her name to the castles and garrisons of Aragón commanding them to guard them against the king's entry until she should return from her journey (to León). The chronicle then says that when the queen was too long in returning Abbot Domingo grew restless and expressed his desire (now she has returned?) to take his complaint to the papacy, but Urraca is against this, and persuades him to stay with a promise to refuse dealings with the king until he returns Domingo to the monastery.

Moving to chapter thirty-seven, Domingo expresses his intentions to take his case to Rome for a second time. In this scene the burghers have brought Guillelmo Falcón, another Aragonese *tenente*, into the town at dawn. They shout "Long live the king",⁴²⁹ and when Domingo hears this he goes out to meet them. The burghers claim they have brought Guillelmo in for the abbot's protection, and to this he responds reminding them that the possessions of the monastery have been given by the monarchs and nobles for the sake of their souls. Then, after this invocation of the monastery's royal and noble benefactors, the abbot reproaches the burghers :

"You know very well what injuries this church of Sahagún has suffered, and how it has been abused inside and outside, reduced almost to dust. If you are going to do what you are now threatening to do, there is nothing that I can do except this that I will do: I will make it known to everybody, to the abbots, bishops, clerics, and laymen, even to the last and least member of the Roman Church, that this church belongs to Saint Peter, and I will complain of what you are doing to the court of the Roman Church and to the ears of the holy father".⁴³⁰

⁴²⁹ "Biba, biba el rei" CAS, ch. 37, p. 71.

⁴³⁰ "Bosotros bien sabedes quales e quan grandes daños aya reseçevido la iglesia de Sant Fagum. E en qué manera de dentro e de fuera ella sea maltratada, e quasi fasta el polvo destuida e desfecha. E por tanto, si vosotros aquesto fiçiéredes, yo non puedo más, pero esto faré, que me queda; mostrarlo [h]e a los abbades, magnifestarlos a los obispos e a los clérigos e legos e al último e postrimero allegado de la iglesia Romana, ca este monasterio posesión es de San Pedro; demostrarlo [h]e aún al padre santo, e a las orejas de la corte romana yo reçaré esta querella" CAS, ch. 37, pp. 71-2.

The abbot's complaint now focuses specifically on religious authority. More than this, his threat to take his complaint to Rome is expressed as a response to the impossibility of immediate action against the burghers. The threat is based on the power of the papacy to punish the burghers (which is what will happen later on in the chronicle). But, Domingo is also invoking the monastery's privileged relationship with the papacy; hence his declaration that "this church belongs to Saint Peter". It is through speeches such as this one that the chronicle begins to reposition the terms of the argument over the monastery's local hegemony. In this light the burghers' provocations seem all the more strategic on the part of the chronicle. The question just asked in the previous chapter (thirty-six) suggests that this issue needed clarification—that the burghers after all really did not know the legal grounds for the monastery's hegemony. This subtly allows the chronicle to begin to express a novel version of this legal argument.

The ecclesiastical authority argument also comes to be associated specifically with the problem of the impossibility of action. The problem of the monastery's impasse allows the appeal to ecclesiastical authority to be expressed as a last resort. This might be seen to help the chronicle shift the justification of appealing to the ecclesiastical hierarchy to the dramatic emotional and moral terms of its victimization by the burghers. In this way the threat to go to Rome is not the monastery's premeditated (or post-meditated) strategy, but the result of the burghers' cruelty and deceptions. The chronicle shows how this strategy develops in the experience of the conflict with the burghers.

This looks both forward and back: forward, to the latter stages of the chronicle where religious authority takes on a more emphatic and more active role; back, to the history of the monastery's original links to the papacy, to the privilege which contains terms of this link and to the event of its concession.

The archbishop's interdict

We can move directly to the chronicle's use of documents. These can be shown to continue the documentary tradition established with the *libertas* and the *fuero*. We jump now into the third part of the chronicle, to the string of events following the tortures of chapter forty-four through fifty-three. The events which lead to the

archbishop's letter of excommunication unfold in the chronicle in the following way. In 1114, the archbishop calls a synod at which both Abbot Domingo and the burghers appear. Domingo addresses the synod with a complaint against the burghers, and it is agreed that the burghers should be excommunicated. However, the burghers show up in time to promise to satisfy the abbot's complaints and the excommunication is avoided. Things are upset when Giraldo Diablo shows up in town. He sets an ambush for the archbishop, who only narrowly escapes. With this the archbishop and the bishops present with him decide to excommunicate the burghers. The chronicle directly quotes this text in the next chapter:

“Bernard, by the grace of God archbishop of the Toledan see, elected by the holy Church of Rome, to the burghers of Sahagún, French and Castellanos, greater and lesser, if you will obey, greetings. As I brought some of you to live under the wings of Sahagún, I will always love you with a paternal affection. And still with this love, I admonish you to return entirely from the lordship of the king or any other person the lands and lordship of Sahagún and all the lands of the abbot which you took; and for you to renounce the lordship of all men and submit yourselves to the lordship of the martyrs of Jesus Christ. If you delay not wishing to obey our commands, from this day on you will be subject to the excommunication which we have made with all the bishops and abbot at León. Under which no Christian might communion or associate, neither in speech, eating, drinking, or prayer, neither might they buy anything from you or sell anything to you, but you will be put under excommunication for despoiling the sanctuary of the living God and submitting yourselves to mortal men. And also the clerics who have defied our interdict and have presumed to celebrate mass, let them also be subject to the curse of excommunication, until you and the same clerics satisfy worthily and dutifully God, the martyrs of Jesus Christ, and ourselves. If you are

obedient in the above things, you will earn good benefit and reward".⁴³¹

The archbishop's letter threatening the burghers with excommunication argues for a specifically ecclesiastical and religious version of authority governing the burghers' residence in Sahagún. The argument goes beyond an argument for the authority of the synod's excommunication. The archbishop remembers his own role in the arrival of the burghers to Sahagún when as abbot of Sahagún he was involved with Alfonso VI's grant of the *fuero* of 1085. After this, the authority of the church is specifically contrasted with secular authority. The burghers are ordered to return the land they have appropriated themselves or put under the control of Alfonso I and to renounce their allegiance to Alfonso I and 'all men' (*'todos los honbres'*). The archbishop's order that the burghers of Sahagún submit to the 'lordship of the martyrs of Jesus Christ' (*'señorío de los mártires de Jesuchristo'*) echoes the speech of Abbot Domingo quoted above from chapter fifty-six. This is an innovation in the argument over the nature of the abbot's lordship over the burghers. In these instances, the argument for an ecclesiastical and divine basis of lordship is aimed at the burghers' relationship to political powers, their hostility to Queen Urraca and their alliance to Alfonso I. In this way, the burghers' crimes are that they despoiled the church (*'despojastes el santuario de Dios bivo'*) and put the church under the power of secular men (*'le sometistes a honbre mortal'*).

Journey to Rome and papal excommunication

⁴³¹ "Bernardo, por la gracia de Dios, arçobispo de la silla Toledana, elegido de la santa iglesia Roma, a los burgeses de Sant Fagum, fraçeses e castellanos, mayores e menores, si obedesçieren, salud. Por quanto algunos de vosotros, so las alas de Sant Fagum, yo traxe a poblar, sienpre vos amé con amor paternal, e aún vos [amando], mas [vos] amonesto que las heredades de Sant Fagum e el señorío de toda la tierra que al abbad tomastes, enteramente restituyades sin señorío del rei o de otra persona, e a vos mesmos quitedes de señorío de todos los honbres e vos sometades al señorío de los mártires de Jesuchristo, lo qual, si detardades non queriendo obedesçer a nuestros amonestamientos, de aqueste día en adelante, a la excomunió, la qual con todos los obispos e abbades en el sínodo de León feçimos, seades sometidos. Por lo qual, ningún christiano comulgue, nin partiçipe con vos, nin en fabla, nin en comer, nin en beber, nin en la oraçión, e ninguno conple de vos alguna cosa o vos benda, mas seades sometidos a excomunió, por quanto despojastes el santuario de Dios bivo e le sometistes a honbre mortal. E aún los clérigos, los quales, despreciando nuestro mandamiento, contra el nuestro entredicho e proibición, presumieron çelebrar misas, sometemos a excomunió e maldeçión, fasta que vos e los dichos clérigos digna e debidamente satisfagades a Dios e a los mártires de Jesuchristo e a nos. Si fuerdes obedientes en lo sobredicho, bien abredes e provecho alcançaredes" CAS, ch. 60, pp. 88-9.

The next instalment of authoritative letters is connected to Abbot Domingo's trip to Rome to attend the Lateran council in March 1116. Chapter sixty-nine tells how Domingo travelled to Rome and there presented his case against the burghers to the papal audience. His tale is said to have 'stunned' the bishops and archbishops and moved the pope to tears. Pope Paschal invites the abbot to request any aid that the pope might be able to provide. Domingo requests the papal authority of excommunication and absolution over the burghers. This is granted by the pope. The next chapter gives the letter containing this power:

"Paschal, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to his beloved son Domingo, abbot of the monastery of Sahagún, health and apostolic blessing. It is necessary for us, made the highest of pastors, to confront thieves and evildoers, and to humble and overcome the impudence and presumptions of secular men with the authority of our decrees. In our time, certainly, during the very long and fierce war that has been fought between the king Don Alfonso, son of the king Don Sancho, and Doña Urraca, daughter of the king Don Alfonso, the burghers of Sahagún have risen up and rebelled against you, who is the abbot of that place, and against the monastery. They have chased you out of the town and they have brought into the town soldiers and knights, and with these they have cruelly, with fire and sword, destroyed and laid waste to the surrounding lands. They have seized the fields and lands, and the vineyards and orchards of the monastery, and divided these up between them. They have also moved into the cemetery and built houses there. They have broken the customs of the king Don Alfonso [VI] and of the ordained abbots, and made new customs according to their own will and now follow these. Now then, in order to suppress and subdue this great arrogance and audacity, we give and grant to you Abbot Domingo, our beloved son, the power and authority to bind and release, to excommunicate and absolve, the burghers, lay as well as cleric, and

above all those that have dwelled within the *coto* which was set apart and delineated by the abovementioned king Don Alfonso”.⁴³²

The papal letter begins with the papal concern of ecclesiastical versus secular power. But then the letter goes on to tell a story of the conflict between the burghers and the monastery. It describes how the burghers rose up against the monastery in the course of the civil war between Urraca and Alfonso and how they brought armed men and knights into the town, who wasted the surrounding fields, vineyards, and orchards, and built houses in the cemetery. The pope then describes how they broke the laws of Alfonso VI and wrote new ones according to their own desire and will. The pope invests Domingo with power to excommunicate and absolve all the burghers, religious and secular, within the *coto*.

The abbot is given direct papal authority to censure the burghers in the domains of the *coto*. The pope also condemns the burghers for breaking the laws of Alfonso VI. Papal power is seen as reinforcing political power. The two authorities are aligned, with papal authority reinforcing political authority. When Domingo returns to Sahagún with the papal letters admonishing the burghers for their attacks on the monastery and the abbot's authority over the town, demanding that they submit again to the abbot's power, or incur the wrath of the apostolic see, the burghers at first agree to obey the letter, to renounce claims to the king or queen, and to live under "*la guarda de San Pedro e protecçión del Santo Padre, e so el señorío del nuestro abbad*

⁴³² "Pasqual, obispo, siervo de los siervos de Dios, al amado hijo Domingo, abbad del monasterio de Sant Fagum, salud e apostólica bendición. Nos, puestos en la gran altura de los pastores, neçesario nos es contrastar a los ladrones e malfechores, e quebrantar e domar por estableçimiento e autoridad de nuestro decreto la presunción e osadía de los honbres seglares. Por çierto, en nuestro tienpo, como entre el rei don Alfonso, fixo del rei don Sancho, e donna Urraca, fixa del rei don Alfonso, batalla mui luenga e fiera obiese estado, los burgeses de Sant Fagum contra tí, abbad de ese lugar, e contra el monasterio, en tanto se levantaron e contraposieron; que a tí echaron fuera del monasterio e traxieron en la villa gente de armas e cavalleros, con los quales toda la tierra en derredor, con fierro e fuego, mui cruelmente gastaron e destruyeron; e aún los canpos, tierras e viñas e güertas del monasterio entre sí conpraron e partieron; e el çimiterio usurparon, en él casas hedifiçando; las costumbres del rei don Alfonso e de los abbades hordenadas quebrantaron, e otras nuevas, según el su querer e boluntad, a sí apropiaron. Pues agora, para reprimir e refrenar tan gran arrogança e osadía, nos a tu persona, fijo mui amado, abbad Domingo, poderío e autoridad de atar e de soltar e de excomulgar e absolver sobre los dichos burgeses, así legos como clérigos, damos e otorgamos, e sobre todos aquellos que avitan e moran dentro del coto apartado e aseñalado e limitado del dicho ya nonbrado rei don Alfonso" CAS, ch. 70, p. 107. The monastery's charter collection preserves two letters from Paschal II following the council (*Colección diplomática* IV, pp. 43-6: no. 1193-4). The first grants Domingo excommunicative powers over the burghers; the second confirms the monastery's papal charters.

queremos beber, por que podamos esquivar la sentençia de excomuni3n."⁴³³ As the papal letter had ordered the burghers also agreed to return the '*tierras e viñas ... los güertos e todas las cosas que avían rogado pertenesçientes al monasterio.*'⁴³⁴ They also agree to throw the charter of new customs which they had written into the fire ('*las nuevas leyes e costunbres que ellos avían fecho e ordenado, que las echarían e quemarían en el fuego*'⁴³⁵), and to live according to the '*leyes y costunbres que en los tiempos del rei don Alfonso de buena memoria acostumbraron a beber.*'⁴³⁶

The significance of this episode comes primarily from the abbot's decision to take his case to Rome. In this decision already is a conflation of the theoretically distinct powers granted by the *fuero* and the *libertas*. The two powers are linked, as we have seen, in the terms of the pope's letter, but before this a personal memory and connection are established. When Domingo presents his sad tale, the pope responds with his own personal experience with the monastery:

And that same man began to tell of the delights of that place [Sahagún] and the abundance of the monastery, and above all he approved of the religiousness of the order; and he also began to extol the very noble king Don Alfonso, of good memory. And again and many times he repeated this point, for it happened that being cardinal under the pope Urban II, of blessed memory, that he saw these things with his own eyes and had a great friendship with the king.⁴³⁷

In the early chapters of the chronicle it was the strong monarch Alfonso VI that reached out to distant ecclesiastical powers, now it is those same powers that are called upon to lend their authority to support the late king's privileges. The personal relationships create a link behind the documents which knits them together in the story. It also emphasises the personal ties between the monastery and the papacy.

⁴³³ CAS, ch. 73, p. 110.

⁴³⁴ CAS, ch. 73, p. 110.

⁴³⁵ CAS, ch. 73, p. 110.

⁴³⁶ CAS, ch. 73, p. 110.

⁴³⁷ '*E eso mesmo començó a esplanar la delectaçión del monte, la abastança del monasterio, aprovando sobre todo la religión de la orden; e aún començó a ensalçar alabando al mui noble rei don Alfonso, de buena memoria. E una e muchas beçes repetía todo lo sobredicho, ca acaesçierale, seyendo cardenal, so el papa Urbano segundo, de santa memoria, aber visto estas cosas con sus ojos e aver avido gran amistad con el rei'* CAS, ch. 69, p. 105.

Two letters of excommunication

The final document to consider is papal letter addressed to the burghers which Domingo brings back with him from his journey to Rome. This letter is given in chapter seventy-three:

“You, put under the favour and aid and protection of Sahagún, must faithfully join yourselves to all which will be in service of the monastery; and as much just as we have heard you have raised your neck against the abbot and monks, destroying and robbing the good of the monastery, and opposing the ancient laws and customs of the monastery, by the which, to you all, by the present document, we order that which by right belongs to the monastery you restitute, and then you quit the royal governor that you have over you. And removing and distancing from you all lordship of whatever person, you be subject and submitted to the abbot alone and his vicars; otherwise, you will incur in the fury and indignation and vengeance of the apostolic see.”

“Certainly, we give and grant power to the abbot of our authority to use and exercise justice above you”.⁴³⁸

These two letters form the fullest articulation of the ecclesiastical authority supporting Domingo’s claim of local authority. In both letter the pope specifically mentions the laws and customs given by Alfonso VI in the *fuero* of 1085. As we have seen, at the end of chapter seventy-three, the abbot and monks are reduced to signing the burghers’ charter which would have overturned (as the monastery puts it) or at least modified the *fuero*. But, the chronicle does not make explicit that this letter is meant to answer the burgher’s charter – even when the chronicler interjects to

⁴³⁸ “*Bosotros, puestos so el favor e ayuda e protección de Sant Fagum, devezes fielmente allegarvos a todo lo que fuere servicio de su monasterio; e por quanto así como abemos oído alçastes vuestra çerviz contra el abad e monjes, destruyendo e robando los bienes del monasterio, e trastornastes las leyes antiguas e costumbres del monasterio, por lo qual, a todos vosotros, por los presentes escritos, mandamos que todo el derecho pertenesciente al monasterio restituyades, e luego quitedes el adelantado real que sobre vos tenedes. E quitado e apartado de vos todo señorío de qualquier persona, seades sujetos e sometidos al abbad solo e a su vicario; en otra manera, [en] la saña, yndignación e bengança de la see apostólica yncurrédes*”.

“*Por çierto, nos al abbad dimos e otorgamos poderío que por nuestra autoridad use e faga justiçia sobre vos*” CAS, ch. 73, pp. 109-10.

rationalise the decision to confirm the charter. In this case, the chronicler only refers back to the burghers' agreement to satisfy the abbot according to the agreed conditions. This is largely left to the dramatic arrangement of these letters with the speeches given by Domingo and Queen Urraca in the confrontation between the groups.

The Queen's speeches

Compared to the *libertas Romana*, the *fuero* sees very little use in the conflict. The great space and emphasis afforded to the terms of the *fuero* resounds in only dimly-heard echoes in the course of the conflict itself. Notably, the *fuero* is referenced and its authority reaffirmed in two papal letters that Domingo secures on his trip to Rome. We will turn to these later. Besides these papal letters, the only other place we can look for the manifestations of this privilege is a sequence of speeches given by Queen Urraca in the chronicle. In fact, Urraca calls upon not the *fuero* itself, but upon the memory of her father, Alfonso VI, the generosity and paternal care with which he treated the burghers when he invited them to Sahagún, and consequently on the debt owed by the burghers to his memory and his daughter (that is, Urraca herself). The queen's speeches summon pathos, so it is appropriate that the first occasion of these is after Alfonso I has the queen tried before a meeting of nobles for attempting to poison him (the accusation had been made by Countess Teresa) and finally expelled in shame from the city of Astorga. On the road back to León, in her pitiable state, the queen meets some burghers on their way to see the king; the queen implores them:

“Let the Lord on his seat in heaven judge whether my father king Alfonso treated all you honourably when he brought you from your diverse lands and regions to this land. You were then poor but he made you rich with gold and silver, and made you to shine with all riches. And then you brought into my father's land the man who cast me, homeless and despised, out of my father's house”.⁴³⁹

⁴³⁹ “Bea el Señor de la silla çelestial e juzgue si mi padre el rei don Alfonso a vosotros todos de estrañas gentes e de dibersas tierras e regiones, benientes a su tierra, honoríficamente bos trató; e como fuédeses mui pobres, de oro e de plata bos enriqueçió, e vos fiço resplandeçer en todas las riqueças, e vos trajistes e metistes en el reino de mi padre al hombre que me echa desnuda e desconsolada, e con gran mi despreçio, de casa de mi padre” CAS, ch. 34, p. 64.

Though this speech does not speak of the *fuero* itself, there is reason to include it in the scope of this discussion. In the first place, in her attempt to shame the burghers into treating her better by reminding them of the good turn her father did them, Urraca recalls specific elements of the chronicle's own account of Alfonso's concession of the *fuero*. Her phrase 'diverse lands' repeats the chronicle's earlier description of the burghers coming from 'diverse and foreign places' and, a few lines later, 'diverse nations' (in fact, the word 'diverse' is used four times in this scene). Urraca's description of how the burghers grew rich and prosperous also relates back directly to the chronicle's account surrounding the *fuero* where directly following its granting the narrative looks forward to the burghers' future economic success. Both tell this rags to riches story of how the burghers arrived poor but rose to 'shine with all riches'⁴⁴⁰ (as above), or to become 'very rich with abundant luxuries';⁴⁴¹ both also use the phrase 'with gold and silver in describing this wealth.'⁴⁴² These echoes suggest the way that Urraca's speech is meant to refer back to this earlier moment in the chronicle: the way that Urraca's speech is meant to fulfil a function within the text itself. In one sense, the queen (her character in the *Crónica*, that is) plays spokeswoman for the *fuero*, but her invocation focuses, instead of on the terms of the charter, on the social and political significance implicit in the act of concession itself.

The queen's speech works by eliciting audience sympathy and by directing audience condemnation against the burghers. It also works by associating itself with her father, the strong and pious king, whom the chronicle nostalgically idolises as a demi-saint. His memory both adds to our pity for Urraca, and strengthens our condemnation of the burghers. But, there is a further strategy that begins to work in the speech quoted above, and which evolves in later speeches which we can consider here together. In the last line of her speech, Urraca reproves by accusing "you brought into my father's land the man who cast me, homeless and despised, out of my father's house". The queen refers without-name to Alfonso I. She takes up a theme dominant in this section of the chronicle, the culpability of the burghers for the crimes Alfonso I and his Aragonese men. The Aragonese came (chapter twenty) and went (chapter twenty-two) but the burghers invited them back again (chapter twenty-six): therefore,

⁴⁴⁰ '*resplandeçer en todas las riqueças*' CAS, ch. 34, p. 64.

⁴⁴¹ '*mucho ricos e de muchos deleites abastados*' CAS, ch. 15, p. 24.

⁴⁴² '*de oro e de plata*' (ch. 34, p. 64), and '*así de oro como de plata*' CAS, ch. 15, p. 24.

the damage caused after this is on the hands of the burghers. In chapter thirty-two, two chapters previous to Urraca's speech, the chronicler identifies with the queen's perspective; in a paragraph that begins 'Then the queen, seeing that the burghers had ...',⁴⁴³ the chronicle lists the causes for lament (the burghers and Aragonese had chased Domingo out of the town; the burghers were preventing the queen from visiting the sepulchres of her parents at the monastery; and the burghers and the Aragonese had taken control of all the monastery's lands). Finally, the chronicle sums up: 'anyone who looks on all this with open eyes will see that this was all the fault of the burghers'.⁴⁴⁴

The chronicle identifies a perspective on the local situation in Sahagún with the queen while Abbot Domingo is in exile. It is an interesting narrative technique, and it allows the chronicle to suggest the queen's condemnation of the burghers at a stage of the conflict. But, there is also another strategy that emerges from the queen's accusation. This strategy will appear as we consider subsequent speeches made by the queen, so we can briefly introduce this argument here before proceeding to back it up with examples. The queen's accusation introduces the contention that the burghers had broken the terms of the *libertas Romana*. She (or more correctly the chronicle) is arguing that the burghers' stand in violation of the terms of the *fuero* for their part in inviting royal power to Sahagún. The *libertas*, we know, exempted the monastery from the interference of royal power. The clearest rendering of this argument is to be found in the interior scene of Abbot Diego's resignation and Abbot Domingo's election. We saw how Archbishop Bernard specifically reminded the monks of their freedom from royal intervention.

As with parallel themes and arguments made in the course of the chronicle, this one is not made explicitly in any one place. Rather it unfolds according to the contours of the narrative. This raises questions about the purpose and recognition of these strains of meaning in the text, but we address these more generally elsewhere. This is an argument which we can show is made in a number of ways, Urraca's speeches being one. The presence of this argument in the speeches of Urraca

⁴⁴³ 'Entonces la reina, beyendo que los burgeses de Sant Fagum avían ...' CAS, ch. 32, p. 60.

⁴⁴⁴ 'lo qual si con el ojo belable de alguno fuere considerado, todo aquesto ynputara e echara a la culpa de los burgeses' CAS, ch. 32, p. 60.

demonstrates how the chronicle uses both the personality and position of representatives of either secular or religious authority to make connections between the distinct legal terms of two privileges which originate in the chronicle in documents. Indeed, Urraca's first reference to the burghers' dealings with Alfonso I serves as the example of the burghers' betrayal of her and her father's memory. It is an emotional rebuke, both personal and political.

The meaning of land

In both examples it is specifically moments when the monastery's lands are under attack that the burghers turn their speeches to the questions of the authority under which the monastery possesses that land. According to its particular terms and narrative patterns the monastery shows its understanding of the relationship between the burghers' violence—especially according to its details, as how the burghers targeted the young shoots of the trees and the plants, but which we have otherwise not gone into here—and its implications for who controls the land. We know nothing outside the chronicle of the burghers' actions or how they understood those actions. However, at least for the chronicle, the association between violence and legal implications is immediate. Whether the chronicle is putting these words in the mouths of the burghers, or strategically reordering and aligning the burghers' actions with something the burghers (or at least one of the burghers) once said, the chronicle is turning action into meaning. It is as if the chronicle is telling us what the burghers meant to say by their actions.

Thinking about the narrative in more comprehensive terms, the device used in the scenes discussed above tips us off to the way that the chronicle turns the violent action of the conflict into legal argument in a more pervasive way. It is not surprising that the chronicle should channel the violence of its story in this way. It is itself a text. It must give words to its meaning. But, more than this, in a text which conveys other legal texts, there is a logical motive to interpret action in the terms of these legal texts. Such scenes as we have looked at above, reveal this tendency in the *Crónica*. In the next chapter, we will consider how and where this chronicle moves in the opposite direction, from the verbal to the non-verbal; we are not arguing, therefore, that this is

the only narrative strategy of this text, but rather one of two dominant narrative trends which we will consider.

The burghers' provocations that turn violence into legal challenge also serve a rhetorical function. The chronicle interprets the burghers' actions in terms of the battle that the chronicle wants to fight. The chronicle is ready to answer the burghers' question. The chronicle has already answered this question in its deliberate account of the monastery's history; it would seem that the reader has been well-prepared for such questions. We know that the question of authority for the monastery's lands leads all the way back to Alfonso III, who upon founding the monastery in 905 'granted and gave [the church of Sahagún] by the authority of his royal privilege all the lands, worked and un-worked, with vineyards and all other things pertaining'.⁴⁴⁵ The land described here is not delineated, merely the idea that the monastery had a claim to some surrounding land at this early date is established. Ramiro II also granted lands to the monastery (at least according to the chronicle's recollection), the *coto* that is the same preserve of land which the burghers attack. The chronicle had described Ramiro II's grant in the following way:

And furthermore he assigned to the same monastery the *coto*, in which no person could possess or take for themselves even a palm's width of land; he wished to make it for the exclusive use of the monks and the monastery.

And he also ordained that if any guilty person or evildoer who was fleeing should take refuge within the *coto* he would in this way be made free without punishment. And he furthermore ordained that whoever, noble or not, should dare to take anything from the *coto*, however small of value, he should be forced for this to pay to the

⁴⁴⁵ *'le otorgó e dio por autoridad de su privilegio real todas las tierras, así labradas como por labrar, con viñas y las otras cosas çircunstantes'* CAS, ch. 4, p. 11. The monastery's charter collection preserves records of three grants made by Alfonso III: 22 Oct. 904, 30 Nov. 904, and, 30 Nov. 905 (*Colección diplomática*, pp. 27-32: ns. 6-8). Document 8 of 30 Nov. 905 includes the grant of a *coto*, a preserve of land, which might be that mentioned in the line quoted above, though, confusingly, the chronicle says specifically that Ramiro II granted a *coto* for which it describes more elaborated and specific terms.

king five hundred *sueldos* of silver and another five hundred to the abbot.⁴⁴⁶

Again the land is not delineated; the chronicle instead gives details which are not to any direct purpose in the *Crónica*, such as the amount of the fine to be paid by trespassers. The indirect point, at least, seems to be the underlying notion of the monastery's strong claim to exclusive possession and use of the land.

The *coto* is again up for legal confirmation in the reign of Alfonso VI. The terms of the *fuero* of 1085 not only strengthen the notion of exclusive control of the monastery's lands in various ways,⁴⁴⁷ but, of greater implication, it revisits the notion of land control in the context of the burghers' arrival. It is this charter which gives the abbot of Sahagún control of the burghers' houses. This appears in the first section of the *fuero* which the chronicle quotes:

And then the king made such a decree that no one that lived in the town might possess, inherit, or bestow any field, vineyard, orchard, land, or mill, but that they should have it only as a lease from the abbot. One might have a house within the town, but for this each one should pay to the abbot one *sueldo* for census and lordship.

⁴⁴⁶ 'E otrosí él primeramente asignó e aseñaló al dicho monasterio el coto, dentro del qual ninguna persona puede tener ni a sí apropiar aun tan solamente un palmo de heredad. Mas quiso que esentamente fuese de los monjes e monasterio. / E quiso otrosí e ordenó que si algún culpado o malhechor fuyendo, al dicho coto se acogiese, tal como éste fuese libre e sin pena alguna. E aún ordenó más: que qualquiera que sea, o noble o non noble, que osase sacar e tomar del dicho coto prenda alguna, aun quanto quier pequeña, luego por ese mesmo fecho fuese obligado a pagar al rey quinientos sueldos de plata e otros quinientos sueldos al abbad. / E muchos otros beneficijos e nobles donaciones a este monasterio con muy larga mano dio e otorgó' CAS, ch. 5, p. 11-2. Sahagún's charter collection preserves seven grants made by Ramiro II to the monastery, of local churches and territories; none of these mention a *coto*, though charter 8 records that Alfonso III granted a *coto* in 905 (see note 3 above) (*Colección diplomática*, pp. 92-3, 115, 123-4, 129-34, 166-7: ns. 61, 84, 93, 97, 98, 99, 129).

⁴⁴⁷ For example the exemption from royal tax collectors: "Furthermore, the king demanded that if any tax collector or official minister of the king should attempt to assert with the use of force his royal right within the boundaries or the town of Sahagún he should be killed. And the killer would be free from any penalty". / "Otrosí, si algún recaudador, o ministro oficial del rei dentro del coto o villa de Sant Fagum por fuerza presumiere de usar algún derecho real, manda que le maten. E el matador que quede sin pena" CAS, ch. 15, pp. 23-4. Alfonso VI had confirmed the monastery's privileges in a charter of 8 May 1080 which includes the stipulation that no royal agent might enter the monastery's lands under a 500 *sueldo* penalty (Escalona, n. 114, p. 477-78). The penalty of death clause seems to be the chronicle's own elaboration; if so, it is noticeable that it draconises this clause which treats of exemption from royal power—a theme which echoes the terms of the *libertas Romana*.

And if any of them should cut anything pertaining to the monastery, even a branch, from the woodland, he should be imprisoned and redeemed only at the will and pleasure of the abbot.⁴⁴⁸

The monastery's case for possession of its lands is elaborated in each of the reigns it covers; in this it gives the impression that its claim is both very old and constant up to the last king (before Urraca). All documents are in order. What is more, as we read in the section of the *fuero* quoted above, the chronicle specifically knits together the new terms for the burghers' residence in the town and the terms of the monastery's control of its land, once again terms of exclusive use and possession stipulated to the smallest detail ('even a palm's width of land' / 'however small of value' / 'even a branch') that are now familiar in their second formulation, but which we know stretch back in essence to the first land grant of Alfonso III in 905. This, of course, anticipates the burghers' later attacks on the monastery's lands, as well as their challenge on the authority of the possession of those lands. But, if the chronicle has a rhetorical purpose in linking the burghers' violent actions with the monastery's case for possession of its lands, for channelling the dramatic energy of descriptions of the burghers' violent attacks into a dispute over documentation and authority, then this particular question is in its way too obviously ordered.

The burghers' 'cursed' charter

The *Crónica* describes in chapter twenty-seven how the burghers presented a charter that they had produced to the king and queen for confirmation. The chronicle does not say whether they did sign it, but we can infer that they did not as on two further occasions in the chronicle the burghers bring out their charter, pressing on the first occasion the monks, and on the second Queen Urraca, Abbot Domingo, and the monks to sign their charter. About this charter the chronicle gives us very little information. No indication is given on which of the burghers drafted the charter or when. In the

⁴⁴⁸ *'E luego el rei fiço tal decreto e ordenó que ninguno de los que morasen en la villa, dentro del coto del monasterio toviese por respeto hereditario o raçón de heredad, canpo, nin vinna, nin huerto, nin molino, salvo si el abbad, por manera de enprestido, diese alguna cosa a alguno d'ellos, pero pudiere aber casa dentro de la villa. E por causa e respecto d'ella, por todos los annos pagase cada uno d'ellos al abbad un sueldo por censo e conosçimiento de señorío.*

E si alguno d'ellos tajase o cortase del monte que pertenesçe al monasterio aún tan solamente una rama, que sea puesto en la cárcel e sea redimido a boluntad e beneplaçito del abbad' CAS, ch. 15, p. 22.

description of the charter's introduction to the story, which takes place in the course of a list of other acts of violence and treachery on the part of the burghers, the chronicle makes clear that the burghers meant to amend the terms of the *fuero*. The chronicle says they broke 'the laws and customs given to them by King Alfonso of blessed memory and made new ones'.⁴⁴⁹ Here the further details are also added that this charter 'established new customs and rents for the millers' use of the mills, leaving out the customary toll for the oven'.⁴⁵⁰ Regulations for the use of the mills are not mentioned in the terms of the *fuero* as the chronicle listed them previously; the oven toll was explained, however.

As with the other charters described by the chronicle, the terms of the burghers' charter are only part of its significance to the story. Of course, the chronicle has a defensive interest in how these terms are presented; its strategy looks to be to give as little information as possible about these terms. The phrases quoted above make it clear enough what the effect of the charter would have been, if not in specific legal detail, then for the monastery's hegemony over the burghers. It is enough to know that there were specific terms on the table: that is, that the burghers had a legal strategy that involved itself with such things as the use of the mills and the oven toll. But beyond this, the function of the burghers' charter is physical and social. We can already look ahead to see that the burghers' charter will be destroyed by Abbot Domingo. In effect, this frees the chronicle's history from a direct engagement with the legal specifics of the burghers' charter; and we can add from the monastery's own charter's as well. At the end of the conflict there is no wrangling over messy legal details; the burgher's charter is destroyed and the terms of the *fuero* are reasserted. This observation of the function of the *fuero* in the chronicle, in fact, suggests an interesting comparison with the *libertas*. The chronicle's description of this event is telling. The admission that the burghers had drafted their own charter is given among a rapid last of acts of violence and rebellion. The next mention of the burghers' charter is found in chapter fifty-four.

⁴⁴⁹ 'quebrantando las leyes e costumbres puestas a ellos de la buena memoria rei don Alfonso e otras nuevas faziendo' CAS, ch. 27, p. 50.

⁴⁵⁰ 'a los molinos eso mesmo posieron nuevas costumbres e rentas por el uso del moler, negando el sueldo por el forno acostunbrado' CAS, ch. 27, p. 50.

Without a doubt, I abhor to tell what happened one day, for the burghers, having entered the chapterhouse of Sahagún, showed the monks a charter in which new laws and customs were written, which they themselves had decided on and ordained, denying the customs which the king Alfonso of good memory had established. And when they presented the same charter, they began to pressure the monks to sign their laws with [the monk's] own hands. But when the monks refused to do it, saying "we cannot sign this thing without our abbot", they harassed the monks with many insults and abusive words until they were satisfied; and, leaving the chapter, they threatened the monks, saying that for as long as they lived they would continue their efforts to force all of the monks out of the cloister.⁴⁵¹

Finally the burghers present their charter to the monks and abbot in chapter seventy-three. The burghers promise to burn their charter:

Furthermore they promised that the new laws and customs that they had made and ordained, that they would cast them into the fire; and swearing this, they promised that they would renounce the power of mortals and agree to live under the laws and customs that they had live under in the time of Don Alfonso, of blessed memory.⁴⁵²

But the accord breaks down when Urraca shows up and the burghers try again to force her to confirm their charter.

"Oh queen, we will never confirm this oath with you unless you confirm a charter which we have written and ordained, agreeing that

⁴⁵¹ *'Sin duda ya mucho aborrezco recontar lo que acaesçió un día, ca todos los burgeses, entrados en el capítulo de Sant Fagún, demostraron a los monjes una carta en la qual eran escriptas nuevas leyes e costumbres, las quales ellos mismos para sí escogieron e ordenaron, quitando las costumbres que el de buena memoria rei don Alfonso avía estableçido. E, demostrando la dicha carta, començaron a apremiar a los monjes que las dichas sus leyes firmasen con sus propias manos; mas como los monjes rehusasen fazerlo, diçiendo "non pertenesçer a nos firmar las semejantes cosas sin nuestro abbad"; e luego con muchos denuestos e vituperios de palabras fatigaron a los monjes fasta tanto que les fue satisfecho; e saliendo del capítulo, amenaçávanles diçiendo que si ellos obiesen bida, que ellos farían por manera que ninguno de los monjes quedase en el claustro'* CAS, ch. 54, p. 83.

⁴⁵² *'Otrosí prometieron que las nuevas leyes e costumbres que ellos avían fecho e ordenado, que las echarían e quemarían en el fuego; e, jurando, deliveraron de se quitar de todo señorío, nin se dar a señorío de ninguno de los mortales, contentos de vibir según las leyes y costumbres que en los tiempos del rei don Alfonso de buena memoria acostumbraron a bevir'* CAS, ch. 73, p. 110.

the things we have of the monastery's we have bought from Sanchiáñez, Guillelmo Falcón, from Ramiro, the brother of the king of Aragón, or of Giraldo, the son of the devil, in turn; we want you to confirm these customs that we have written after the death of your father that say that the lands of the monastery which we possess today are ours. Otherwise, we will not make peace with you".⁴⁵³

The queen skirts the question; the chronicle says she confirmed the charter as far as it was in her power to do so, she says to the burghers:

"You well know that in this town, my father did not appropriate anything for himself, forgoing the royal power, for all the things are given and consecrated to God and to his martyrs. And no mortal might hold as his possession or inheritance deed or title to this land; but, whatever in that charter might pertain to me, I confirm it".⁴⁵⁴

Seeing that the queen has outmanoeuvred them, the burghers then pressure her to force Abbot Domingo to sign the charter. At this he complains to them:

"Forcing me to sign your charter, you ask me to do something unjust, for this is not what the Holy Father admonished you to do in his letter, nor is this what you agreed to in your oath. Where is that oath now? With God as a witness you swore to me on the four evangelists and you promised to return all the things which you had stolen from us".⁴⁵⁵

Abbot Domingo then attempts to follow the queen's strategy and confirm the charter ("*E yo vos confirmo aquesta carta, salva sienpre mi orden e salva la justícia*

⁴⁵³ "Por çierto, nosotros en ninguna manera jo reina! firmaremos contigo juramento si no confirmares a nosotros una carta que nosotros escrivimos e ordenamos, consentiendo en todas las cosas que por preçio compramos, agora Sanchiáñez, o de Guillelmo Falcón, o de Ramiro, hermano del rei de Aragón, o de Giraldo, fijo del demonio; queremos aún que confirmes las costumbres que después de la muerte de tu padre ordenamos, porque las heredades de el monasterio que oy poseemos sean nuestras. En otra manera, non abremos concordia contigo, nin paz" CAS, ch. 73, p. 112.

⁴⁵⁴ "Bosotros bien sabedes que mi padre en aquesta villa non quiso nin apropió a sí alguna cosa, sacando el real señorío, ca todas las cosas son dados e consagradas a Dios e a los sus mártires. E ninguno de los mortales, por raçón e respeto de heredad e posesión, puede aver firmes nin seguras; mas que quier que ello sea, quanto lo que a mi pertenesçe, aquesta carta yo confirmo." CAS, ch. 73, p. 113.

⁴⁵⁵ "Cosa ynjusta façedes queriéndome forçar a la confirmar, ca el Santo Padre por sus escritos non bos obo así amonestado, nin vuestro ayuntamiento, façiéndome juramento, prometiera. Pues ¿dónde es agora el juramento que, testigo Dios, sobre sus ebangelios a mí feçistes, prometiéndome que me restituírades enteramente todas las cosas que aviades tomado e robado?" CAS, ch. 73, p. 113.

d'este monasterio")⁴⁵⁶ but insist that the question ultimately lies with the monks of the house. The chronicle says that Domingo was sure that the monks would never agree when the question was put to them, but they do ("*Nos confirmamos, así como el abbad confirmó*").⁴⁵⁷ The chronicle immediately cuts away to explain the monk's motives and why their confirmation was not binding:

Now then, consider for yourself clever reader how the burghers had committed the crime of perjury, and how the abbot and monks did not confirm the same cursed charter, for their purpose was to justly see the return of all the things that unjustly had been taken from the monastery and belonged to it by right: to have all the things that had been removed from its power restored to its power.⁴⁵⁸

Once again the matter is brought back to the monastery's property. Subtle lines of argument are pursued. It is potentially a disastrous turning point in the monastery's conflict with the burghers over rights. It shows why the charter and the terms of the charter are so essential in the chronicle.

But the story of the burghers' charter, as we know, reaches its own sudden conclusion. This is in chapter seventy-five. With the burghers expelled from the town, Abbot Domingo searches their house for their charter and finding it burns it:

Furthermore, with great difficulty he searched out that charter and cursed document; and when he found it he cast it in the fire to burn. And he reinstated the customs established by Alfonso, that prince of blessed memory.⁴⁵⁹

The argument over specific rights and privileges largely falls away after this. The granting of the *fuero*, the other of the two documents which are made relevant to the conflict, stands in contrast to the *libertas* in several significant ways. The *fuero* is given in specific circumstances which give the document an immediate social, political, and

⁴⁵⁶ CAS, ch. 73, p. 114.

⁴⁵⁷ CAS, ch. 73, p. 114.

⁴⁵⁸ '*Pues agora tú, savio leedor, considera que los burgeses cometieron crimen de perjurio. E el abbad e monjes non feçieron confirmación alguna a la dicha maldita carta, ca la orden del abbad e monjes era demandar e a sí apropiar justamente todas las cosas que ynjustamente les eran tomadas e la justia del monasterio pertenesçian, todas la cosas perdida a todo su poder restaurar e cobrar*' CAS, ch. 73, p. 114.

⁴⁵⁹ '*Otrosí buscó con gran diligencia la carta e escritura de las malditas costunbres. E, fallada, echóla e quemóla en el fuego. E las costunbres estableçidas de don Alfonso, príncipe de santa memoria, renobó*' CAS, ch. 75, p. 121.

even spiritual significance. We have quoted the first two paragraphs of the chronicle's version of the *fuero* above. These defined the abbot of Sahagún's control of the burghers' residences and land. Already apparent is the way that the *fuero* will be relevant to the coming conflict.

The narrative of the chronicle serves to collate the terms of the two charters, which we have seen were granted in different circumstances and for different purposes, into a unified version of the monastery's authority over the burghers. This does not appear all in one place, but rather in fragmentary formulations throughout the chronicle—in documents, in speeches, in the contours of the narrative and its presentation of the conflict. This would seem a factor of the way the conflict was decided and specifically on the lack of a single document for the monastery encapsulating its victory. The monastery was tasked with defending its privileges—this task, however, lead the monastery to return to its past privileges, to seek confirmation of these, to reinterpret these in the experience of the conflict, and ultimately to capitalise on its victory by asserting a novel version of its authority, to show how this version was effective in the present conflict, and could be in a future conflict, to turn an exposed weakness into a strength.

Conclusion

This chapter has intended to show the complex ways that documents are worked into the narrative of the *Crónica*. The monastery's documents can tell their own story. They allow a story to be told about the nature of the monastery's hegemony over the burghers which is not the chronicle(r)'s own voice. But, this story is also given its meaning according to the position of these documents in the narrative. Traditional documents are updated with new meanings in the specific events and words of the conflict, and new documents are given meaning according to how they look back to the past. We have been especially interested in how the chronicle creates arguments which bring together the distinct terms and purposes of the *libertas Romana* and the *fuero* of Alfonso VI through the themes and personalities of the narrative.

The burghers' charter, however, is not permitted to tell its own story. In this case, the chronicle's purposes are to neutralise the lingering threat that the public memory of the confirmation of the charter still (we can imagine) possessed. According

to our reading of the chronicle's strategy, recording the burghers' charter and the confirmation of it by Queen Urraca and the monastic community was not without risk. The chronicle literally brings the very documents which Abbot Domingo had destroyed back into being. The effectiveness of this strategy depends on the perspective of those who sought to make use of the chronicle; the question is outside of our purpose here. However, we can show how the chronicle uses the burghers' charter as a prop against which it can direct the force of its own narrative and documentary arguments for the monastery local hegemony and eventual victory over the burghers in that struggle. Larger findings here can also be made as regards disciplinary conversations about cartulary-chronicles, their strategies as documents and narratives for defending privileges and/or responding to often unknown future needs. Documents were produced in order to hedge bets against unknown future exigencies. In this case, the anonymous chronicler might be said to aim not so much at an uncertain future, but to have found in the genre the appropriate form for interpreting an uncertain past.

Conclusion

This thesis has explored by way of five chapters the narrative design and historiographical purpose of the first *Crónica anónima*. We have seen the complex strategies the text employs to turn a closely avoided disaster into a triumphant victory, and to build upon this victory a new more flexible and dynamic version of the monastery's lordship over the burghers. This is achieved by a strategy in which narrative order reflects political, religious, and social order. This convergence is demonstrated in part one of the chronicle. Here the intentions and actions of generosity by the kings of León towards the monastery of Sahagún collapse distinctions between local and regional and between religious and secular and drive all history forward in the story of the growth and enrichment of the monastery. Though the chronicle's introduction projects a direct confrontation between this history of monastic foundations and 'generous kings' and the burghers' revolt, a more complex narrative pattern unfolds after the death of Alfonso VI. The monarchy remains the focus of the narrative. The struggles and intrigues between Urraca and Alfonso I are made the centre of a story of the breakdown of political, social, and religious order in which a number of individuals and groups at the local and regional levels compete for power in the story and agency in the narrative.

It is in this world turned upside-down that the burghers are shown to emerge as challengers to the monastery's authority. Any sense of a coherent strategy of social, legal, or violent means is obscured by the part they are made to play in the chronicle: opportunistic strivers against the monastery's power and peace, by turns treacherous, scheming, cruel, wild, and mindless. With this model of conflict, danger, and drama carefully arranged the chronicle transitions into the final part of its narrative: the resolution of the conflict. We saw how the chronicle uses the eight chapters of the burghers' tortures of local peasants to refocus the narrative from the story of the political disaster of Queen Urraca's marriage to Alfonso I to the burgher problem.

This leads to Abbot Domingo's new strategy of seeking ecclesiastical censures against the burghers, with the chronicle careful to show how this was a necessary defensive response to the burghers' cruelty and moral corruption and their threat against the religious order of the monastery and the kingdom. The chronicle also uses

terms of rhetorical persuasion and spiritual corruption to dramatise the abbot's confrontations with the burghers as a benevolent ecclesiastical lord against wild and unruly brutes. It is in the course of this strategy that the chronicle shows how Abbot Domingo has the *libertas Romana* read to the burghers, and how they accept it as a legal and spiritual subjection to St Peter, the Holy See, and Abbot Domingo. Finally, the chronicle looks forward to the resolution of the chronicle. In the dramatised confrontations between monastery and burghers the issues of property and land begin to receive emphasis. In chapter seventy-three, the chronicle shows how Abbot Domingo arrives back in Sahagún with new spiritual powers over the burghers, and how the burghers once again accept him as their ecclesiastical lord and agree to return all property stolen from the monastery and to burn their charter.

This anticipates what follows. At the end of the same chapter the burghers force the abbot and monks to sign their charter. The chronicler hastily explains away the confirmation of the charter by the abbot and monks and move quickly on to how an ambush by Aragonese and burgher conspirators was discovered and foiled by Abbot Domingo and by divine fortune. Queen Urraca returns to the town, expels the burghers, and Abbot Domingo takes back the monastery's lands and burns the burghers' charter. The burghers' temporary triumph in having their charter confirmed is undone completely. However, the chronicle is already looking forward to the burghers' complaint over their expulsion and the hearing of the case at the Council of Burgos. The chronicle is vague about the dynamics of the case especially that Domingo is put on the defence against the burghers' charges against him. But, the burghers' case falls apart in the run-up to the trial and they find themselves on defence for perjury. By this point, then, the monastery's victory is ensured. Domingo insists the trial go forward as a show trial and the burghers finish the performance with public penance. Abbot Domingo is confirmed as their lord.

In chapter four of this study we looked at the role of the author in the chronicle. We saw how the role of the author conforms in significant ways to the chronicle's three-part narrative structure. In the account of the monastery's history the author plays a negligible part. In the section on the outbreak of conflict the author participates in the common suffering and fear of his fellow monks. This role involves a series of scenes which take us inside the monastery. In chapter twenty-six, Archbishop

Bernard of Toledo comes to the rescue of the monks, helping them to elect a new abbot before Alfonso I can instal one of his own deputies. This fear becomes a reality in chapter thirty when Alfonso I instals his brother Ramiro to replace Abbot Domingo who has gone into exile.

In the third narrative section of the chronicle the author is increasingly associated with Abbot Domingo's strategy of ecclesiastical censure against the burghers. Thus, in chapters sixty-two and sixty-nine, the author accompanies Abbot Domingo on trips outside of the monastery. On an excursion to the nearby nunnery of San Pedro the abbot and author are attacked by Giraldo Diablo and a group of burghers. But, a more triumphant note is struck when Domingo, accompanied by the author, travels to Rome to solicit the aid of Pope Paschal II against the burghers. They return with letters giving Domingo powers of excommunication and absolution over the burghers. This leads to the scene in which the abbot and monks sign the burghers' charter, and here the author distances himself from the monks' decision to sign in order to explain their motives and invalidate their confirmation.

We suggested the way that the author's role as eyewitness and dramatic narrator adds a subjective dimension to the text. The author imagines or calls upon the reader to experience the burghers' violence and the monastery's suffering through his first-hand account. At critical moments in the text, as in the burghers' tortures of the peasants, the author also interjects to express his responsibility to his fellow monks to render a true account of the sufferings of the peasants and the monks.

In the final chapter of this study we took a closer look at the chronicle's use of documents. Here we saw the way that these documents are fit into the dramatic contours of the narrative. In the chronicle's account of the monastery's past two documents are introduced which together will come to define the monastery's relationships to specific royal and ecclesiastical power structures, as well as to the burghers. Thus, specific figures from among these hierarchies serve in the chronicle to show the social, historical, and personal relationships that are reflected in the terms of these documents. Finally, we suggested the complex relationship between the way in which the conflict comes to its conclusion and the purposes of the chronicle itself. The burghers' temporary victory in chapter seventy-three involved the production and

confirmation of a document. That document, then, contained and recorded their victory. In turn, the monastery's eventual victory happened with the destruction of the burghers' charter. In recording that destruction the chronicle is, in effect, bringing the burghers' charter back into written history. Thus, the chronicle exists in an antithetical relationship to the validity and existence of that document. The chronicle partly effaces the burghers' charter by limiting what it says about its contents. It also neutralises the charter by controlling its place within the dramatic, religious, and historical strategies of the chronicle. Finally, it confronts the burghers' charter with the *libertas Romana* under the terms and authority of which (as the chronicle shows us) the burghers had previously agreed to live in Sahagún and accept Abbot Domingo as their ecclesiastical lord.

The close reading of the narrative of the *Crónica* of this study is also of wider significance for theories on the cartulary-chronicle. The *Crónica* participates in a broad historiographical tradition. Very generally this tradition is that of the medieval chronicle. The chronicle endured as part of the inheritance of the classical cultures of Greece and Rome, and as such became common practice in a relatively uniform way across the wide geographical area and through the long era of the medieval world. The uniformity of the rhetorical gestures, metaphors, symbols, and descriptions of medieval literature through its common union with the classical past was the subject of Ernst Robert Curtius' momentous survey, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. Chris Given-Wilson has made this point on the uniformity of medieval historiography across Western Europe – despite the differences that existed between traditions that took root in specific parts of Europe, in England, France, and Italy, for example.⁴⁶⁰ The historiographical features and strategies of the *Crónica* must be read as part of this tradition.

Yet, the *Crónica* employs these common historiographical and literary features in a case specific way. The chronicle of Sahagún belongs more specifically to a type of twelfth-century chronicle which is local and monastic. These have been studied as a subset of the chronicle tradition by such scholars as Elisabeth van Houts in *Local and Regional Chronicles*, Steven Vanderputten in 'Monastic Literate Practices in Eleventh-

⁴⁶⁰ Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, p. ix.

and Twelfth-Century Northern France', and Jennifer Paxton in 'Monks and Bishops: The Purpose of the *Liber Eliensis*'. These have been distinguished by both their historiographical and literary formation as well as by the specific social and legal purposes that underpin them. As the term 'cartulary-chronicle' suggests, these chronicles can be classified according to their use of charters inserted directly into the narrative. Beyond this their firm place in the larger medieval chronicle tradition makes it difficult to identify specific historiographical or literary characteristics that set them apart.

The use of charters in these chronicles is, of course, also a function of the local, monastic interests which motivated their production. Here we can set this genre against histories of royal lines, noble families, nations, the church, or, more ambitiously, histories of the world. Though, as Arnaldo Momigliano has noted, an essential link persisted between local histories and larger-scale ecclesiastical or world histories that stemmed from 'the ever present problem of relating events of local churches to the mystical body of the Universal Church'.⁴⁶¹ Indeed, as a miniature indication of the way that local chronicles often strayed beyond their own provincial boundaries, the *Crónica* itself, in chapter twelve, invokes Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica* to tell the story of Saint Helena's search for the true cross in Jerusalem (though the story in fact comes from a tradition of later additions to Eusebius' *Vita Constantini*)⁴⁶².

A tension between the local and the general can be seen running beneath many of our attempts to define and understand the chronicle. The chronicle draws from the very general pool of medieval historiographical and literary devices, but it combines these into a unique text. Often this leaves us unable to fully disentangle the universal and the specific. For example, the uncertainty between the general and the local emerges in a pressing way in questions surrounding the nature of the author's interjection of his own voice and character into the narrative: are such manifestations of the author simply rhetorical convention, or are they the unique and spontaneous traces of the individual behind the text? The same applies to the historical context of

⁴⁶¹ A. Momigliano, *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley, 1990), p. 138.

⁴⁶² See introductory essay in A. Cameron & S. Hall (eds.), *Eusebius: Life of Constantine* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 49-50.

the chronicle. The factors behind the social and political circumstances that led to the conflict between the monastery and the burghers of Sahagún must be understood according to developments that were at the same time local, regional (in the civil war between Queen Urraca and King Alfonso I burgher revolts broke out throughout the Northern Kingdoms), and still more widespread across Western Europe (the involvement of the papacy through travelling legates as well as French ecclesiastics in these events is immediately suggestive of the larger forces at work).

The specifically cultural context of the production of the chronicle must also be explained in large part in general terms. Michael Clanchy, in *From Memory to Written Record*, has described a transitional period between a predominantly oral culture and the emergence of a document-based bureaucracy between the eleventh and fourteenth centuries. Cartulary-chronicles belong to this history of bureaucracy according to their practical legal and social application (Clanchy makes clear that he does not mean to account for texts of all kinds: 'The development of literacy from and for practical purposes of day-to-day business, rather than creative literature, is the theme of *From Memory to Written Record*').⁴⁶³ Steven Vanderputten has expanded upon Clanchy's transitional period to suggest that cartulary-chronicle emerged as a response to uncertainty over the exact use and usefulness of documents as applied to courts or the workings of state or church administration. In the words of Jennifer Paxton, the chronicler 'hedges his bets' between whatever forms of document and narrative might possibly persuade or prove useful in a future conflict.⁴⁶⁴

The ubiquitous nature of medieval culture as well as the place of Sahagún in the larger political and social developments requires us to stress the general nature of the chronicle. But it is the unique and case-specific way that the *Crónica* deploys the generic historiographical methods of the medieval chronicle, and the literary elements that underpin them, that most interest us in this study. Vanderputten's notion (followed by Paxton for the *Liber Eliensis*) of the open relationship to the audience does not fully apply to the chronicle of Sahagún. The generic aspects of the chronicle's construction open the text up, at least in theory, to an audience far beyond the monastery's walls. We explored in the introduction the complex nature of what we

⁴⁶³ Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, p. 3.

⁴⁶⁴ Paxton, 'Monks and Bishops', p. 20.

called the 'audience-function' in the text, which points to a rhetorical 'reader' and 'attentive listener'. This literary device frames the text as an address to an open, unspecified audience in a very explicit way. The jumbled, 'everything in' approach of the cartulary-chronicle – the difficulty that Vanderputten's theory attempts to address – also characterises the *Crónica*. Vanderputten's argument for the cartulary-chronicle's open relationship to the audience suggests the rationale behind the generic narrative structure assumed by the chronicle, as well as the way that the chronicle might have been open to multiple uses within the local monastic community in its long life in the monastery's library. We saw how the second *Crónica anónima* appropriated the first chronicle according to its own purposes a century later.

The exactness of the chronicle's argument about the nature of the monastery's authority over the burghers of Sahagún, and the definite shape of its narrative structure, both highlighted in this thesis, suggest a more deliberate and precise purpose than Vanderputten's notion of the typically uncertain relationship of the cartulary-chronicle towards its audience would allow. The *Crónica* provides an example of the exploitation of this genre that evolved as a scattershot of various medieval historiographical, legal, and literary forms and their diverse narrative strategies and rhetorical devices for a highly crafted and case-specific end. But more than this, the jumbled, chaotic nature of the genre is even put to its own narrative effect in the chronicle's progression from the strict narrative order of the monastery's past of royal patronage to the narrative confusion of the outbreak of the civil war. At the juncture following chapter seventeen the shift in narrative strategies and rhetorical figures is palpable, yet we do not need to overdo this reading. The chronicle does not lapse into an incoherent pastiche here; the storyline remains in place. What we can suggest is the way that the author is able to exploit certain narrative possibilities to his own purpose within the very loose constraints of the cartulary-chronicle genre. In this way we can still affirm the model offered by Vanderputten as a useful explanation of the larger social and cultural logic governing the development and structure of the cartulary-chronicle while, at the same time, putting forward the *Crónica anónima* as an example of how the genre could also be made use of for highly tailored ends – to make a specific argument to a specific audience.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Anonymous, *Breve Historia del Monasterio de Sahagún, de los siglos IX al XI*, Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid, MS 18659-35
- Falque Rey, E., ed., *Historia Compostella* (Turnhout, 1988) [Spanish trans. *Historia Compostelana*, (ed.) E. Falque Rey (Madrid, 1994)]
- Fernández Flórez, J.A., *Colección diplomática del monasterio de Sahagún (857-1300)*. IV. 1110-119. V. 1200-1300, 2 vols. (León, 1991-1994)
- Galbert of Bruges, *The murder of Charles the Good*, (ed. and trans.) J. B. Ross (New York, 2005)
- Gil Fernández, J., ed. *Crónicas asturianas* (Oviedo, 1985) [English trans. *Medieval Iberia: Readings from Christian, Muslim, and Jewish Sources*, (ed.) O. R. Constable (Pennsylvania, 1997)]
- Herrero de la Fuente, M., *Colección diplomática del Monasterio de Sahagún I (857-1230)*. II (1000-1073). III (1074-1109) (León, 1988)
- Hugh of Poitiers, *The Vézelay Chronicle and Other Documents from MS. Auxerre 227 and Elsewhere*, (eds. and trans.) J. Scott & J. O. Ward (New York, 1992)
- Mínguez Fernández, J.M., *Colección diplomática del Monasterio de Sahagún (Siglos IX y X)* (León, 1976)
- Muñoz y Romero, T., *Colección de fueros municipales y cartas pueblas* (Madrid, 1972)
- Pérez de Urbel, J., ed., *Historia Silense* (Madrid, 1959)
- Puyol y Alonso, J., 'Las crónicas anónimas de Sahagún', *Boletín de la real academia de la historia*, (Madrid, 1920), tomo LXXVI, pp. 7-26, 111-122, 242-257, 339-356, 395-419, and tomo LXXVII, 51-59 and 151-192 [reprinted as: *Las crónicas anónimas de Sahagún: nueva edición conforme a un manuscrito del siglo XVI* (Madrid, 1920)]
- Ubieto Arteta, A., *Crónicas anónimas de Sahagún* (Zaragoza, 1987)
- Ubieto Arteta, A., ed., *Crónica de Alfonso III* (Valencia, 1971)
- Ubieto Arteta, A., ed., *Crónica Najerense* (Valencia, 1966)

Secondary Sources

- Agúndez San Miguel, L., 'Memoria, escritura y control social: la construcción de la memoria histórica en el monasterio de Sahagún (siglos X a XIII)' (unpublished thesis, Santander, 2008)
- Ángel Álvarez Palenzuela, V., 'Jurisdicción episcopal y monástica. Su delimitación entre el obispado de León y el monasterio de Sahagún', in *Escritos dedicados a José María Catón*, (ed.) M.C. Díaz y Díaz (León, 2004), 65-85
- Antonio, N., *Bibliotheca Hispana Vetus* (Rome, 1696)
- Bádeas Población, M.J., 'Manu mea roboravi: ¿Representaciones medievales del yo? Monasterio de Sahagún, 1000-1100', in *El legado de Mnemosyne: las escrituras del yo a través del tiempo*, (eds.) A. Castillo Gómez & V. Sierra Blas (Gijón, 2007), 335-354
- Barrero García, A.M., 'Los Fueros de Sahagún', *Anuario de historia del derecho español*, 42 (1972), 385-597
- Barthélemy, D., 'Devils in the Sanctuary: Violence in the *Miracles of Saint Benedict*', in *Feud, Violence, and Practice*, (eds.) B.S. Tuten & T.L. Billado (Farnham, 2010), 71-94
- Bartlett, R., *Trial by Fire and Water: The Medieval Judicial Ordeal* (Oxford, 1986)
- Barton, R.E., 'Making a Clamor to the Lord: Noise, Justice and Power in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century France', in *Feud, Violence, and Practice*, (eds.) B.S. Tuten & T.L. Billado (Farnham, 2010), 213-235
- Barton, S., *The Aristocracy in Twelfth-Century León and Castile* (Cambridge, 1997)
- Bishko, C.J., 'Fernando I and the Origins of the Leonese-Castilian Alliance with Cluny', in *Studies in Medieval Spanish Frontier History* (London, 1980) II, 1-136 [orig., *Cuadernos de Historia de España*, 47 (1968), 31-135 and 48 (1969), 30-116]
- Bishko, C.J., 'Liturgical Intercession at Cluny for the king-emperors of León', *Studia monastica*, 7 (1961), 53-76
- Bisson, T., *The Crisis of the Twelfth Century: Power, Lordship, and the Origins of European Government* (Princeton, 2009), 251-58
- Black-Michaud, J., *Cohesive Force: Feud in the Mediterranean and the Middle East* (Oxford, 1975)
- Blumenthal, U., 'The Papacy, 1024-1122', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History 4: c.1024-1198*, II (eds.) D. Luscombe & J. Riley-Smith (Cambridge, 2004), 8-37
- Boynton, S., *Shaping a Monastic Identity: Liturgy and History at the Imperial Abbey of Farfa, 1000-1125* (Cornell, 2006)

- Brown, P., *The Cult of Saints* (Chicago, 1981)
- Brown, W., *Unjust Seizure: Conflict, Interest, and Authority in an Early Medieval Society* (Cornell, 2001)
- Brown, W.C. & P. Górecki, *Conflict in Medieval Europe: Changing Perspectives on Society and Culture* (Aldershot, 2003)
- Brown, W.C., *Violence in Medieval Europe* (Harlow, 2011)
- Brundage, J.A., 'The Advocate's Dilemma: What Can You Tell the Client? A Problem in Legal Ethics' in, *Medieval Church Law and the Origins of the Western Legal Tradition*, (eds.) W.P. Müller & M.E. Sommar (Washington D.C., 2006), 201-210
- Brundage, J.A., "'My Learned Friend": Professional Etiquette in Medieval Courtrooms', in *Readers, Texts and Compilers in the Earlier Middle Ages*, (eds.) M. Brett & K.G. Cushing (Woodbridge, 2009), 183-196
- Brundage, J.A., *The Medieval Origins of the Legal Profession: Canonists, Civilians, and Courts* (Chicago, 2008)
- Bührer-Thierry, G., "Just Anger" or "Vengeful Anger"? The Punishment of Blinding in the Early Medieval West', in *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, (ed.) B.H. Rosenwein (Cornell, 1998), 73-91
- Cameron, A. & S. Hall, eds., *Eusebius: Life of Constantine* (Oxford, 1999)
- Carmen Pallares, M. & E. Portela, *La Reina Urraca* (San Sebastián, 2006)
- Carrera de la Red, M.F., 'Arabes y judíos en la documentación del monasterio de Sahagún', *Proyección histórica de España en sus tres culturas. Castilla y León, América y el Mediterráneo*, I (Valladolid, 1993), 45-51
- Carrera de la Red, M.F., 'Notas de toponomástica leonesa: estudio del coto de Sahagún', *Archivos Leoneses*, 79-80 (1986), 347-363
- Carriedo Tejado, M., 'En torno a los orígenes del monasterio de Sahagún', *Tierras de León*, 43 (2005), 65-87
- Cerquiglini, B., *Eloge de la variante: Histoire critique de la philologie* (Paris, 1989)
- Clanchy, M., *From Memory to Written Record, England 1066-1307*, 2nd ed. (Oxford 1993), 1st ed. (London, 1979)
- Clarke, P.D., *The Interdict in the Thirteenth Century: A Question of Collective Guilt* (Oxford, 2007)

- Coffey, T. F., L.K. Davidson, *et. al.*, *The Miracles of Saint James: Translations from the Liber sancti Jacobi* (New York, 1996)
- Collins, R., *Early Medieval Spain: Unity in Diversity, 400-1000* (London, 1983)
- Collins, R., *España en la Alta Edad Media* (Barcelona, 1986)
- Constable, G., 'Cluny and Rome', in *The Abbey of Cluny*, (ed.) G. Constable (Berlin, 2010), 19-41
- Cosmen Alonso, M.C., M.V. Herráez Ortega & M. Valdés Fernández, "Alfonso VI y el monasterio de Sahagún: nuevos testimonios sobre la construcción del templo monástico", *De arte: revista de historia del arte*, 5 (2006), 29-41
- Cowdrey, H.E.J., *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085* (Oxford, 1998)
- Cowdrey, H.E.J., *The Cluniacs and the Georgian Reform* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970)
- Cuenca Coloma, J.M., *Sahagún Monasterio y Villa (1085-1985)* (Valladolid, 1985)
- Curtius, E.R., *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (Bern, 1948) [English trans. W.R. Trask (London, 1953)]
- Chibnall, M., 'Charter and Chronicle: The Use of Archive Sources by Norman Historians', in *Church and Government in the Middle Ages*, (eds.) C.N.L. Brooke, *et. al.* (Cambridge, 1976), 1-17 [republished: *Piety, Power and History in Medieval England and Normandy*, 19 (Aldershot, 2000)]
- Davies, W. & P. Fouracre, *Property and Power in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1995)
- Díaz y Díaz, M.C., *El Códice Calixtino de la catedral de Santiago: estudio codicologico y de contenido* (Santiago de Compostela, 1988), 77-81
- Dupont, F., 'Comment devenir à Rome un poète bucolique? Corydon, Tityre, Virgile et Pollion', in *Identités d'auteur dans L'Antiquité et la tradition européenne*, (eds.) C. Calame & R. Chartier (Grenoble, 2004), 171-74
- Dutton, B., *La 'Vida de San Millán de la Cogolla' de Gonzalo de Berceo* (London, 1967)
- Escalona, R., *Historia del real monasterio de Sahagún* (León, 1782)
- Estepa Díez, C., 'Sobre las revueltas burguesas en el siglo XII en el reino de León', *Archivos Leoneses*, 55-56 (1974), 291-307
- Fernández Caton, J.M., 'Datos para la historia del martirio y del culto de las reliquias de los santos mártires leoneses Facundo y Primitivo', *Bivium* (León, 1983), 67-80

- Fernández Flórez, J.A., 'El fondo documental del monasterio de Sahagún y sus scriptores (siglos IX-X)', in *El monacato en los reinos de León y Castilla (siglos VII-XIII)*, (ed.) F. Sánchez-Albornoz (Ávila, 2007), 125-146
- Fernández González, E. & J. Pérez Gil, *Alfonso VI y su época II: los horizontes de Europa (1065-1109)* (León, 2008)
- Fernández González, E., *Alfonso VI y su época, los precedentes del reinado (966-1065)* (León, 2007)
- Fernández Luna, W., *Monografía histórica de Sahagún y breve noticia de sus hijos ilustres* (Sahagún, 1921)
- Fernández Martín, L., 'Ruinas del ex-monasterio de Sahagún', *Boletín de la Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando*, 78 (1981)
- Fernández Rojo, R., 'Acercamiento a la historia medieval de Sahagún', *Tierras de León* 36, 102 (1997), 17-34
- Fernández, L., 'Colección diplomática del monasterio de Villanueva de San Mancio, filial de la abadía de Sahagún', *Archivos Leoneses*, 51 (1972), 9-60
- Firey, A., 'Blushing Before the Judge and Physician: Moral Arbitration in the Carolingian Empire', in *A New History of Penance* (ed.) A. Firey (Leiden, 2008), 173-200
- Fita, F., 'Concilio nacional de Burgos (18 feb. 1117)', *Boletín de la real academia de la historia*, 49 (1906), 394-98
- Fleischman, S., 'Philology, Linguistics, and the Discourse of the Medieval', *Speculum* 65.1 (1990), 19-37
- Fletcher, R., *St. James Catapult: The Life and Times of Diego Gelmírez of Santiago de Compostela* (Oxford, 1984)
- Fletcher, R., *The Episcopate in the Kingdom of León in the Twelfth Century* (Oxford, 1978)
- Fontaine, J., 'King Sisebut's *Vita Desiderii* and the Political Function of Visigothic Hagiography', in *Visigothic Spain: New Approaches*, (ed.) E. James (Oxford, 1980), 93-129
- Freedman, P., 'Peasant Anger in the Later Middle Ages', in *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, (ed.) B.H. Rosenwein (Cornell, 1998), 171-188
- Gaffard, L., 'Los monjes de Sahagún a la luz de su escritura. Imagen de una comunidad y construcción memorial (León-Castilla, siglos XII-XIII)', *Actas*

del XI Congreso de la Asociación Hispánica de Literatura Medieval (León, 2008), 551-560

- Gaffard, L., 'Martirio y taumaturgia: la construcción de una memoria original de los santos Facundo y Primitivo en la primera *Crónica anónima de Sahagún*', *Pratiques hagiographiques II*, (eds.) A. Arizaleta, *et. al.* (Toulouse, 2007), 33-54
- Gaffard, L., 'Poesis de la chronique dans la collection diplomatique du monastère de Sahagún', *Poétique de la chronique. L'écriture des textes historiographiques au Moyen Âge (péninsule Ibérique et France)* (Toulouse, 2008) 89-105
- Gambra, A., *Alfonso VI: Cancillería, Curia e Imperio* (León, 1997)
- García, C., 'L'anonymat individuel au service d'une identité collective: l'exemple des Chroniques Anonymes de Sahagún (XIIe siècle)' in *Identités méditerranéennes. Reflets littéraires*, (ed.) M. Michaud (Paris, 2007), 97-110
- García, C., 'La minorité "franque" de Sahagún dans les Chroniques anonymes (XIIe siècle)', in *Minorités et régulations sociales en Méditerranée médiévale*, (eds.) S. Boisselier, *et. al.* (Rennes, 2007), 283-298
- García, C., 'Le pouvoir d'une reine. L'image d'Urraque 1re (1109-1126) dans les Crónicas anónimas de Sahagún', *e-Spania*, 1 (2006) <<http://e-spania.revues.org/319?lang=en&&id=319>>
- García, C., 'Révoltes populaires ou lectures du Moyen Âge? Léon-Castille (XIIe S.): Féodalisme et mouvements sociaux dans l'historiographie du XXe siècle', in *Images du Moyen Âge* (Rennes, 2006), 45-56
- García, C., 'Une histoire (presque) sans mort. Le dépassement de la mort dans les Cronique anonymes (XIIe siècle)', in *Entre ciel et terre: La mort et son dépassement dans le monde hispanique*, (eds.) D. Lecler & P. Rochwert-Zuili (Paris, 2008), 21-32
- Geary, P., *Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages* (Cornell, 1994)
- Given-Wilson, C., *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England* (London, 2004)
- Glick, T.F., *Islamic and Christian Spain in the Early Middle Ages* (Brill, 2005)
- Gluckman, M., 'The Peace in the Feud', *Past and Present* 7 (1955), 1-14
- Gluckman, M., *Custom and Conflict in Africa* (Oxford, 1959)

- Goetz, H., 'Protection of the Church, Defense of the Law, and Reform: On the Purposes and Character of the Peace of God, 989-1038', in *The Peace of God*, (ed.) T.F. Head & R.A. Landes (Cornell, 1992), 259-279
- González Fraile, E., 'Metodología para el estudio de las arquitecturas del monasterio de San Benito de Sahagún', in *Alfonso VI y su época, los precedentes del reinado (966-1065)*, (eds.) E. Fernández González & J. Pérez Gil (León, 2007), 189-207
- González García, M., 'Aspectos de la vida del Monasterio de Sahagún hasta el 1100', in *Archivos Leoneses*, 21 (1967), 249-251
- González Mínguez, C., 'Privilegios mercantiles en la familia de los fueros de Sahagún: el portazgo', in *El fuero de Santander y su época*, (ed.) Diputación Regional de Cantabria (Santander, 1989), 207-220
- Gordo Molina, A. & C. I. Jiménez Acuña, 'Trasfondo de las revueltas burguesas en la villa de Sahagún a la luz de las Crónicas anónimas en los reinados de Alfonso VI y Urraca I', *Journal of Medieval Iberian Studies*, 5.1 (2011), 21-38
- Greene, V., 'What Happened to Medievalists after the Death of the Author', in *The Medieval Author in Medieval French Literature*, (ed.) V. Greene (New York, 2006), 205-227
- Guardiola, J.B., *Historia del monasterio de San Benito de Sahagún*, Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid, MS 1519 (2007)
- Guibert of Nogent, *A Monk's Confession: The Memoirs of Guibert of Nogent*, (ed. and trans.) P.J. Archambault (Penn State, 2006)
- Gumbrecht, H.U., "Strangeness as a Requirement for Topicality: Medieval Literature and Reception Theory," *L'Esprit Createur* 21 (1981), 5-12
- Halsall, G., ed., *Violence and Society in the Early Medieval West* (Woodbridge, 1998)
- Hamilton, S., *The Practice of Penance, 900-1050* (Woodbridge, 2001), 184-5
- Head, T., 'Introduction: The Book of Ely', in *Medieval Hagiography: an Anthology*, (ed.) T. Head (New York, 2000), 459-494
- Head, T., *Hagiography and the Cult of Saints: the Diocese of Orleans, 800-1200* (Cambridge, 1990)
- Henriet, P., 'Sanctoral clunisien et sanctoral hispanique au XII siècle, ou de l'ignorance réciproque au syncrétisme: à propos d'un lectionnaire de l'office originaire de Sahagún', in *"Scribere sanctorum gesta": recueil d'études d'hagiographie médiévale offert à Guy Philippart*, (ed.) E. Renard (Turnhout, 2005), 209-259

- Heras García, F., 'Felipe Berrojo y la Portada de la Iglesia del Monasterio de Sahagún', *Boletín del Seminario de Arte y Arqueología de la Universidad de Valladolid*, 36 (1970), 503
- Hernandez-Canut, L. y Fernández-España, 'El abadengo de Sahagún: Vestigios de una manifestación monetaria feudal en los reinos de Castilla y León durante el siglo XII', *Gaceta numismática*, 137 (2002), 7-28
- Herrero de la Fuente, 'De Cluny a Sahagún: la escritura carolina en el monasterio de Sahagún (siglos XI-XII)', in *Le statut du scripteur au Moyen Age*, (eds.) M.C. Hubert, et. al. (Paris, 2000), 29-40
- Hillgarth, J.N., *The Visigoths in History and Legend* (Toronto, 2009)
- Hult, D., 'Author/narrator/speaker', in *Discourses of Authority in Medieval and Renaissance Literature*, (ed.) K. Brownlee & W. Stephens (Hanover, 1989) 76-96
- Jauss, H.R., 'Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory', inaugural lecture at University of Constance (First published in German, 1967; first English translation in *New Literary History* (1970), 7-37 [reprinted in *New Directions in Literary History* (ed.) R. Cohen (Baltimore, 1974)
- Jiménez Belmonte, J., 'Hagiografía y denuncia política en la primera Crónica anónima de Sahagún', *La Corónica*, 29 (2001), 213-232
- Jungmann, J.A., *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development* (trans.) F.A. Brunner (London, 1959), pp. 283ff., 389ff
- Kagay, D.J. & L.J. Andrew Villalon, eds., *The Final Argument: The Imprint of Violence on Society in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Woodbridge, 1998)
- Linage Conde, A., *Alfonso VI, el rey hispano y europeo de las tres religiones: 1065-1109* (Burgos, 1994)
- Linage Conde, A., *Los orígenes del monacato benedictino en la Península Ibérica* (León, 1973)
- Linehan, P., *History and the Historians of Medieval Spain* (Oxford, 1993)
- López Ferreiro, A., *Don Alfonso VII, rey de Galicia, y su ayo el conde de Traba* (Santiago de Compostela, 1885)
- Loscertales, R., 'La sucesión del rey Alfonso VI', *Anuario de Historia del derecho Español*, 13 (Madrid, 1936-41), 60

- Loud, G.A., 'Monastic chronicles in the twelfth-century Abruzzi', in *Anglo-Norman Studies 27*, (ed.) J. Gillingham (Woodbridge, 2005), 101-31
- Mansi, J.D., *Sacrorum Conciliorum 21*, (Venice, 1776), 145-52
- Marnette, S., 'The Experiencing Self and the Narrating Self in Medieval French Chronicles', in *The Medieval Author in Medieval French Literature*, (ed.) V. Greene (New York, 2006), 117-136
- Martin, G., 'Le pouvoir historiographique (l'historien, le roi, le royaume. Le tournant alphonsin)' *Histoires de l'Espagne: (historiographie, geste, romancero). Annexes des cahiers de linguistique hispanique médiévale*, 11 (1997), 123-136
- Martínez Liébana, E., 'Aportación al estudio de la crisis demográfica bajomedieval en el dominio del monasterio de Sahagún', *Archivos Leoneses*, 47 (1993), 277-310
- Martínez Liébana, E., 'Milagros y propaganda en el Sahagún medieval', *Tierras de León*, 35.95/96 (1994), 27-48
- Martínez Sopena, P., 'El comercio interregional: Sahagún, un ejemplo castellano', in *El comercio en la Edad Media*, (eds.) J.A. García de Cortázar y Ruiz de Aguirre, et. al. (Quintanilla, 2006), 345-374
- Martínez Sopena, P., 'El solar a fines del siglo XI: reflexiones sobre los documentos del Monasterio de Sahagún', in *Escritos dedicados a José María Fernández Catón*, (eds.) M. Domínguez García, et. al. (León, 2004), 995-1018
- Martínez Sopena, P., 'Por los santos mártires! Poder, devoción y sociedad en Sahagún durante la Edad Media', in *Alfonso VI y su época, los precedentes del reinado (966-1065)*, (ed.) E. Fernández González (León, 2007), 235-258
- Mehtonen, P.M., 'The Apophatic First-Person Speaker in Eckhart's Sermons', in *Modes of Authorship in the Middle Ages*, (ed.) S. Ranković (Toronto, 2012), 79-96
- Meyerson, M.D., et. al. (eds.) 'A Great Effusion of Blood?', *Interpreting Medieval Violence* (Toronto, 2004)
- Migne, J.P., *Patrologia Latina* 163 (Paris, 1854), no. 469: 406
- Miller, W.I., *Bloodtaking and Peacemaking: Feud, Law, and Society in Saga Iceland* (Chicago, 1990)
- Mínguez Fernández, J.M., *Alfonso VI: Poder, Expansión y Reorganización Interior* (Hondarribia, 2000)
- Mínguez Fernández, J.M., 'Excavaciones de la primitiva Iglesia del Monasterio de Sahagún', *Archivos Leoneses*, 67 (1980), 187-197

- Mínguez Fernández, J.M., *El Dominio del Monasterio de Sahagún en el siglo X* (Salamanca, 1980)
- Momigliano, A., *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley, 1990)
- Morse, R., *Truth and Convention in the Middle Ages: Rhetoric, Representation, and Reality* (Cambridge, 1991)
- Nelson, J.L., 'Dispute Settlement in Carolingian West Francia', in *The Settlement of Disputes in Early Medieval Europe*, (eds.) W. Davies & P. Fouracre (Cambridge, 1986), 283-307
- O'Callaghan, J.F., *A History of Medieval Spain* (Cornell, 1975)
- Otter, M., *Inventiones: Fiction and Referentiality in Twelfth-Century English Historical Writing* (North Carolina, 1996)
- Pascual Rodríguez, J.A. & R. Santiago Lacuesta, 'Evolución fonética y tradiciones gráficas: sobre la documentación del Monasterio de Sahagún en Orígenes del español', in *Lengua romance en textos latinos de la Edad Media: sobre los orígenes del castellano escrito*, (ed.) H. Perdiguero Villarreal (Burgos, 2003), 205-220
- Pastor De Togneri, R., *Conflictos sociales y estancamiento económico en la España Medieval*, (Barcelona, 1980)
- Pastor De Togneri, R., *Resistencias y luchas campesinas en la época del crecimiento y consolidación de la formación feudal: Castilla y León, siglos X- XIII* (Madrid, 1980)
- Paxton, J., 'Charter and chronicle in twelfth-century England: The house-histories of the Fenland Abbeys' (PhD thesis, Harvard University, 1999)
- Paxton, J., 'Lords and Monks: Creating an Ideal of Noble Power in Monastic Chronicles', in *The Experience of Power in Medieval Europe 950-1350*, (ed.) R. F. Berkhofer (Aldershot, 2005), 227-236
- Paxton, J., 'Monks and Bishops: The Purpose of the *Liber Eliensis*', *The Haskins Society Journal*, 11 (2003: for 1998), 17-30
- Peláez Albendea, M.J. & J. Banchs de Naya, 'La influencia de la Regla de San Benito en la redacción y contestura jurídica del fuero breve de Sahagún. Incidencia institucional', *Atti del 7° Congresso internazionale di studi sull'alto medioevo* (1982), 751-759
- Pennington, K., 'Feudal Oath of Fidelity and Homage', in *Law as Profession and Practice in Medieval Europe*, (eds.) K. Pennington & M.H. Eichbauer (Farnham, 2001), 93-115

- Pérez de Urbel, J., *Las grandes abadías benedictinas; su vida, su arte y su historia* (Madrid, 1940)
- Pérez Gil, J. & J. Rivera Blanco, 'Sahagún y Cluny: vidas paralelas', in *Los grandes monasterios benedictinos hispanos de época románica (1050-1200)*, (eds.) J. A. García de Cortázar y Ruiz de Aguirre & R. Teja Casuso (Aguilar de Campo, 2007), 87-120
- Pérez Gil, J. & J.J. Sánchez Badiola, *Monarquía y monacato en la Edad Media peninsular: Alfonso VI y Sahagún* (León, 2002)
- Pérez Gil, J. et. al., *El sueño de Gunzo. Sahagún y Cluny: historia y restauración arquitectónica* (Salamanca, 2010)
- Pérez, J., 'Prólogo de las Notas de la historia del Autor Anonymo', in *El abadengo de Sahagún*, (ed.) J. Puyol y Alonso (Madrid, 1915)
- Portela Silva, E. & M. Pallares Méndez, 'Revueltas feudales en el Camino de Santiago: Compostela y Sahagún', in *Las peregrinaciones a Santiago de Compostela y San Salvador de Oviedo* (Oviedo, 1993), 313-333
- Prada Villalobos, M., 'La asistencia hospitalaria a lo largo del Camino de Santiago: la villa de Sahagún y sus territorios dependientes', *Tierras de León*, 40 (2002), 67-94
- Procter, E.S., *Curia and Cortes in León and Castile, 1072-1295* (Cambridge, 1980)
- Purkis, W., *Crusading Spirituality in the Holy Land and Iberia: c.1095-c.1187* (Woodbridge, 2008), 140-1
- Puyol y Alonso, J., *El abadengo de Sahagún* (Madrid, 1915), 305-11
- Rankovic, S., ed., *Modes of Authorship in the Middle Ages* (Toronto, 2012)
- Ray, R.D., 'Medieval Historiography through the Twelfth Century: Problems and Progress of Research', *Viator*, 5 (1974), 32-59
- Reglero de la Fuente, C.M., 'Antroponimia de los monjes de Sahagún en el siglo XII: entre la costumbre clerical y la influencia laica', *Iacobus* 2 (1996), 53-68
- Reglero de la Fuente, C.M., 'La Querella entre el abad de Sahagún y el obispo de León: Recuerdos de un enfrentamiento', in *Escritos dedicados a José María Fernández Catón*, (eds.) M. Domínguez García, et. al. (León, 2004), 1149-1176
- Reilly, B. F., *The Kingdom of León-Castilla under Queen Urraca 1109-1126* (Princeton, 1982)

- Reilly, B.F., 'The Chancery of Alfonso VII of León-Castilla: The Period 1116-1135 Reconsidered', *Speculum*, 51 (1976), 243-261
- Reilly, B.F., 'The Historia Compostelana: The Genesis and Composition of a Twelfth-Century Spanish Gesta', *Speculum*, 44.1 (1969), 78-85
- Reilly, B.F., *The Kingdom of León-Castilla under King Alfonso VI 1065-1109* (Princeton, 1992)
- Reilly, B.F., *The Kingdom of León-Castilla under King Alfonso VII 1126-1157* (Philadelphia, 1998)
- Robinson, I.S., 'The Institutions of the Church, 1073-1216', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History 4: c.1024-1198*, II, (eds.) D. Luscombe & J. Riley-Smith (Cambridge, 2004), 368-460
- Robinson, I.S., *The Papacy, 1073-1198: Continuity and Innovation* (Cambridge, 2004), 270
- Rodicio, M.C. & J. Rivera, 'Reparación de los restos de la antigua iglesia mudéjar de Santiago, de Sahagún de Campos', *Boletín del Seminario de Estudios de Arte y Arqueología*, 49 (1983), 460-464
- Rollason, D., 'Hagiography and Politics in Early Northumbria', in *Holy Men and Women: Old England Prose Saint's Lives and Their Context*, (ed.) P.E. Szarmach (Albany, 1996), 95-114
- Román de la Higuera, J., *Historia Eclesiástica de la Imperial Ciudad de Toledo* (unpublished: Biblioteca Nacional de España) mss. 1.639-1.641 y 1.285-1.293
- Romera Iruela, L.E., 'El Becerro Gótico de Sahagún: esbozo de estudio codicográfico', *Anuario de estudios medievales*, 18 (1988), 23-41
- Rosenwein, B.H., *Negotiating Space: Power, Restraint, and Privileges of Immunity in Early Medieval Europe* (Cornell, 1999)
- Salvador Martínez, H., *La rebelión de los burgos: crisis de estado y coyuntura social* (Madrid, 1992)
- Sánchez Albornoz, C., *Despoblación y repoblación del Valle del Duero* (Buenos Aires, 1966)
- Sánchez Belda, L., 'La cancillería castellana durante el reinado de Doña Urraca', *Estudios dedicados a Ramón Menéndez Pidal*, 4 (1953), 587-99
- Sánchez Pérez, M. P., *El Monasterio de Los Santos Facundo y Primitivo de Sahagún: Estudio de los aspectos artísticos* (Sahagún, 1993)

- Santiago Rodríguez, M., *Los manuscritos del Archivo General y Biblioteca del Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores* (Madrid, 1874), n° 57
- Santiago, R., 'Originales y copias en la documentación del monasterio de Sahagún', *Orígenes de las lenguas romances en el reino de León: siglos IX-XII*, vol. 1 (León, 2004), 533-564
- Santifaller, L., *Quellen und Forschungen zum Urkunden- und Kanzleiwesen Papst Gregors VII*, I, no. 209 (Vatican City, 1957), 243-6
- Scheibelreiter, G., 'Church Structure and Organisation', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History I, c.500-c.700*, (ed.) P. Fouracre (Cambridge, 2005), 675-709
- Schmutz, R.A., 'Medieval Papal Representatives: Legates, Nuncios and Judges-Delegate', *Studia Gratiana* 15 (Rome, 1972), 443-463
- Senra Gabriel y Galán, J.L., 'Sahagún: L'histoire et l'art clunisiens du royaume de Castille et León' *Cluny, à la découverte des sites clunisiens* (Dijon, 2002), 102-106
- Serna Serna, S., 'Munio y el becerro gótico de Sahagún: una muestra de su actividad como copista', *El monacato en los reinos de León y Castilla*, (ed.) F. Sánchez-Albornoz (Ávila, 2007), 425-436
- Shailor, B.A., 'The Scriptorium of San Sahagún: A Period of Transition', in *Santiago, Saint-Denis, and Saint Peter: The Reception of the Roman Liturgy in León-Castile in 1080*, (ed.) B. F. Reilly (New York, 1985)
- Solar, J., 'Algunos rasgos de la iglesia grande del Monasterio de Sahagún', *Boletín de la Institución Libre de Enseñanza*, 9 (1884), 84
- Solar, J., 'La antigua Iglesia del Monasterio de Sahagún y sus bóvedas botarles', *Boletín de la Institución Libre de Enseñanza*, 8 (1884)
- Sot, M., 'Local and Institutional History (300-1000)', in *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, (ed.) D.M. Deliyannis (Leiden, 2003), 89-114
- Spearing, A.C., *Textual Subjectivity: The Encoding of Subjectivity in Medieval Narratives and Lyrics* (Oxford, 2005)
- Spiegel, G., "History, Historicism, and the Social Logic of the Text in the Middle Ages", *Speculum*, 65 (1990), 59-86 [later reprinted in *The Past as Text: The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography*, (ed.) G. Spiegel (Baltimore, 1997), 3-28]
- Traggia, J., 'Anónimo de Sahagún', *Memorias de la real academia de la historia* III (1799), 526-541

- Tuten, B.S. & T.L. Billado, eds., *Feud, Violence, and Practice* (Farnham, 2010)
- Tyler, E.M. & R. Balzaretto, eds., *Narrative and History in the Early Medieval West* (Turnhout, 2006)
- van Houts, E., *Local and Regional Chronicles* (Turnhout, 1995)
- Vanderputten, S., 'Monastic literate practices in eleventh- and twelfth-century northern France', *Journal of Medieval History*, 32 (2006), 101-26
- Villacortes Rodríguez, T., 'Conflictos de jurisdicción entre el obispo de León y el abad del monasterio de Sahagún', in *Escritos dedicados a José María Fernández Catón*, (eds.) M. Domínguez García, et. al. (León, 2004), 1445-1496
- Vitz, E.B., *Medieval Narrative and Modern Narratology: Subjects and Objects of Desire* (New York, 1989)
- Vodola, E., *Excommunication in the Middle Ages* (Berkeley, 1986)
- Ward, J. 'Memorializing Dispute Resolution in the Twelfth Century: Annal, History and Chronicle at Vézelay', in *The Medieval Chronicle*, (ed.) E. Kooper (Amsterdam, 1999), 269-284
- Weiss, S., *Die Urkunden der päpstlichen Legaten von Leo IX. Bis Coelestin III. (1049-1198)* (Cologne, 1995)
- White, S.D. 'Pactum . . . Legem Vincit et Amor Judicium: The Settlement of Disputes by Compromise in Eleventh-Century Western France', *The American Journal of Legal History* 22.4 (1978), 281-308
- White, S.D., 'Feuding and Peace-Making in the Touraine around the Year 1100', *Traditio*, 42 (1986), 195-263
- White, S.D., 'From Peace to Power: The Study of Disputes in Medieval France', in *Medieval Transformations: Texts, Power, and Gifts in Context*, (eds.) E. Cohen & M. de Jong (Leiden, 2000), 203-18
- White, S.D., 'Proposing the Ordeal and Avoiding It: Strategy and Power in Western French Litigation, 1050-1110', in *Cultures of Power: Lordship, Status, and Process in Twelfth-Century Europe*, (ed.) T. N. Bisson (Pennsylvania, 1995), 89-123
- White, S.D., 'Tenth-Century Courts and the Perils of Structuralist History', in *Conflict in Medieval Europe: Changing Perspectives on Society and Culture*, (eds.) W. Brown & P. Górecki (London, 2003), 37-68
- White, S.D., *Feuding and Peace-Making in Eleventh-Century France*, (Aldershot, 2005)

- Williams, J., 'Cluny and Spain', *Gesta*, 27 (1988), 93-101
- Wood, S., *The Proprietary Church in the Medieval West* (Oxford, 2006)
- Young, K., *The Drama of the Medieval Church I* (Oxford, 1933), pp. 21ff
- Zaragoza Pascual, E. 'Un siglo y medio de tomas de hábito en el Monasterio de Sahagún', *Archivos Leoneses*, 59 & 60 (1979), 35-79
- Zaragoza Pascual, E., 'Abadologio del monasterio de San Benito de Sahagún (siglos X-XIX)', *Archivos Leoneses* 77 (1985), 97-132
- Zaragoza Pascual, E., 'Acta de visitas del Monasterio de Sahagún', *León y su historia*, 4 (1977), 101-211