
THE INVENTION OF TOLEDO

PETER LINEHAN

(St. John's College & University of Cambridge)

*In Memory of Leonard Boyle, O.P.,
sometime Prefect of the Vatican Library
(† 1999)*

IT NEVER WAS my intention to be thought fashionable. It was only after I had surrendered to Asmodeo's blandishments and suggested entitling this meditation «The Invention of Toledo», and was beginning to regret doing so, that I was asked to look at a Hollywood script for a programme on the ever-interesting subject of «Convivencia», one of the propositions of which I found to be that Europe was only «invented» some time after 1085, that is to say some three and a half centuries after Charles Martel's victory at Tours in 732, which the Mozarabic chronicler of 754 had not hesitated to describe as a victory of the *europenses* over the *arabes*¹.

This was disorientating and rather put me off the whole «invention» idea. We are being asked to envisage Europeans without a Europe for them to inhabit, just as in the 1860s Italians were being encouraged to invent a place called Italy for them to live in. This evening I shall not be attempting to conjure a Toledo out of pre-existing *toledanos*. Nor shall I be speculating on the Herculean or Babylonian or Hebrew origins of the imperial

1. *Cron. Muzarabica*, § 65, edited by Iohannes Gil, *Corpus Scriptorum Muzarabicorum*, I, Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1973, p. 43.

city or on any of the other nineteen pre-Roman possibilities that so preoccupied Toledo's early modern historians², or on the interest in the place that the excavation of the Visigothic city has recently prompted. However, it *is* in the Visigothic period that I start. For whereas the Mozarabic chronicler of 754 reported the battle of Tours, but not the battle of Covadonga, with Toledo's first historian, Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada, it is the opposite. It is not Tours he remembers but Covadonga, because Covadonga was the symbolic link with the great days of Toledo and, in particular, with a Visigothic Spain governed by its Toledo councils³. Note how the chronicler's next chapter concerns the transfer of Toledo's sacred relics, Toledo's ark of the covenant, to the Asturias for safe keeping⁴.

The Visigothic regime was the template to which every modern system of government had to conform and the model to which it needed to aspire. Such was D. Rodrigo's message at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, which he had dominated as he ridiculed belief in the mission of Santiago and dismissed the pretensions of Toledo's competitors for peninsular primacy –or at least as he dominated it in Toledo tradition and iconography, to the extent indeed that the illustration of that scene contained in the Toledo *Notule de primatu* manuscript of 1253 gives the impression that it was he rather than the pope who had presided over the occasion⁵. For here it is D. Rodrigo who orchestrates the whole event as its central and its largest figure, with the pontiff just another of a surrounding group of attendant metropolitans: an iconographical arrangement plainly intended

2. See Pedro de Alcocer, *Hystoria, o descripcion dela Imperial cibdad de Toledo*, Toledo: J. Ferrer, 1554 [repr. Madrid: Instituto Provincial de Investigaciones y Estudios Toledanos, 1973], fols. 5v-9r; Francisco de Pisa, *Descripcion de la imperial ciudad de Toledo e historia de sus antigüedades*, I, Toledo: Diego Rodríguez, 1617, fols. 11vb-14ra.

3. *Historia de rebus Hispanie* [henceforth *DrH*], IV.1-2, edited by J. Fernández Valverde, [Corpus] C[hristianorum] C[ollectio] M[ediaevalis], vol. LXXII. I, Tvrnholti: Brepols, 1987, pp. 114-117.

4. *DrH*, IV. 3 (ed. pp. 118-119). See Peter Linehan, *History and the Historians of Medieval Spain*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993, chap. 12.

5. Patrick Henriët, «Political struggle and the legitimation of the Toledan primacy: the *Pars Concilii Laterani*», in *Building Legitimacy. Political discourses and forms of legitimacy in medieval societies*, edited by I. Alonso *et al.*, Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2004, pp. 293-316 (at pp. 299-300). For the date of the *Notule* MS. (Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, Vitr. 15-5; *olim* Biblioteca del Cabildo, Toledo, MS. 15-22) and description, see H. Flórez, *España Sagrada*, Madrid: Antonio Marín, 1767, XXIII, pp. 360-361; Ramón González *apud* Francisco Javier Hernández, *Los cartularios de Toledo. Catálogo documental*, Madrid: Fundación Ramón Areces, 1985, pp. xviii-xix.

to echo that of the Visigothic councils in the same manuscript where archbishop and king preside co-equally over those assemblies⁶.

So much for 1215, as remembered in 1253. Let me now turn to the intervening period, between 1217 and 1239, and to the treatment of them in the second chapter of the recent, splendid, enormous, often intricate and sometimes questionable book of Diego Catalán and Enrique Jerez, wherein the reader is treated to a minute analysis of a bundle of facts («un haz de hechos») and their interconnectednesses⁷. Catalán and Jerez remind us of the vain attempt of the *sayyid* of Valencia, Ab-Zayd, to surrender his kingdom in 1229 to the ruler of Castile rather than to the ruler of Aragon; also of the archbishop of Toledo's invocation of Visigothic provincial arrangements ten years later in order to secure the ecclesiastical equivalent of this initiative.

Now the project of bringing the church of Valencia under Toledo's authority was a doomed venture if ever there was one, and for all his rummaging for precedents in Castile's ecclesiastical libraries and archives, the archbishop failed to carry the day (as would anyway have been the case even if he had managed to persuade the papal court, since then the king of Aragon would have intervened, in accordance with the familiar precept recorded in D. Rodrigo's own History: «Quo uolunt reges uadunt leges»⁸). Such was the burden of Aragonese opinion as voiced by Vidal de Canellas, the Bologna-trained bishop of Huesca. Where had the archbishop of Toledo been during the siege of Valencia in the previous year?, he asked. With whose blood and money had the place been conquered in 1238? In the event of a Mudéjar uprising there, what could the archbishop of Toledo at eight days' distance do? Castilians would not come to the assistance of Catalans and Aragonese, even if the king of Castile allowed them to (which of course he wouldn't)⁹. Pragmatism ruled.

By juxtaposing these two developments, the secular and the ecclesiastical, Catalán and Jerez treat them as somehow related, with the one the corollary of the other, and with the implication that king and archbishop were working in concert, ploughing the same furrow. This is questionable.

6. P. Linehan, *History and the Historians*, ills. II (a) and (b) (after p. 366).

7. «*Rodericus*» *romanizado en los reinos de Aragón, Castilla y Navarra*, Madrid: Fundación Ramón Menéndez Pidal: 2005, pp. 71, 78.

8. *DrH*, VI. 25 (ed. p. 208).

9. V. Castell Maiques, *Proceso sobre la ordenación de la Iglesia valentina entre los arzobispos de Toledo, Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada, y de Tarragona, Pedro de Albalat (1238-1246)*, Valencia: Corts Valencianes, 1996, I, p. 479.

It is questionable for a reason which these authors do not consider, namely that it was in precisely these years that the ways of king and archbishop may be said to have diverged, and to have diverged decisively. A clue to what that reason was is contained in the report they themselves provide of the archbishop's return from Rome at the beginning of 1218 endowed with the title of «legate of the apostolic see» and armed with a papal grant of primatial jurisdiction in the as yet unreconquered province of Seville. The archbishop will have felt «satisfecho», the writers surmise –and as in 1617 Francisco de Pisa had surmised¹⁰.

But, if so, his rapture will have been modified, by a keen sense of loss. As recently as July 1206 Alfonso VIII had confirmed the archbishop of Toledo's possession of the *cancillería* of Castile in perpetuity –that is, in Roman law terms not only *ususfructus* of the office but also *dominium* of it, with the entitlement to concede it to another. During the brief reign of the boy king, Enrique, don Rodrigo was well placed to profit from that office. But the (perhaps accidental) death of the young Enrique in June 1217¹¹ had set in train a process which would soon invalidate that privilege, with the first stage of that process the appointment, later that year, of the abbot of Santander, Juan de Soria, as chancellor to Fernando III, and after the conjunction of the two kingdoms in 1230 in the person of Fernando its culmination in the replacement of the archbishop as *ex officio* chancellor of Castile¹². So the primatial grant and the legation should be seen less as a cause for satisfaction to D. Rodrigo than as a token of consolation for his recent loss of both profit and prestige and for the initiation of a process which in the event was to prove irreversible. In short, at the very moment when the archbishop was contemplating the apotheosis of his church in both script and stone, he was deprived of his traditional role as the king's right hand man and the conduit of royal favour, and so were his successors¹³.

10. D. Catalán & E. Jerez, «Rodericus» romanizado, p. 67; F. de Pisa, *Descripcion*, fol. 184ra («con otras muchas gracias que el pontifice le concedio, con las cuales boluio muy alegre a España»).

11. Cf. Simon R. Doubleday, *The Lara Family. Crown and nobility in medieval Spain*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001, pp. 55-56.

12. Julio González, *Reinado y diplomas de Fernando III*, Córdoba: Publicaciones del Monte de Piedad y Caja de Ahorros de Córdoba, 1980-86, II, num. 2; Peter Linehan, «Don Rodrigo and the government of the kingdom», *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*, 26 (2003), pp. 87-99.

13. P. Linehan, *History and the Historians*, pp. 338-345.

Previous writers, sustained perhaps by the unspoken conviction that the bishops of a canonised king could never have been in discord with one another, have gone so far as to suggest that in both 1217 and 1231 the transfer was made on the archbishop's own recommendation¹⁴. It has even been suggested that the pair were cousins. If so, blood was evidently thinner than water¹⁵. No, the case was probably otherwise¹⁶. And it was a case that did not go by default. In 1231-2, at the very moment at which the chancery was being conveyed to him, Juan de Soria found his promotion to the see of Osma delayed by a year and a half or more. And by whom if not by his Toledo metropolitan?¹⁷ Juan de Soria was currently acknowledging that the chancery was the archbishop's by right («ad vos de iure spectantem») and promising to surrender the chancellorship of Castile to the archbishop when he died or if, before that, he were promoted to a see outside the province of Toledo. The king had already admitted that the transfer was being made at his instigation («ad preces meas») and undertaken to ensure that the office reverted eventually to the archbishop or his successor, and the archbishop had a royal privilege guaranteeing as much. Nevertheless, neither in 1240, when don Juan was translated from Osma to the exempt see of Burgos, nor on his death in 1246 was his promise honoured and the chancery restored to the archbishop. Almost a century later the issue still remained a live one. Because the original instrument containing the chancellor's promise «era meester de mostrar en muchos logares» and was therefore worn by constant use, as late as August 1329 the treasurer of the church of Toledo was concerned to secure an authenticated copy of it¹⁸.

The salient point though, the point to be seized here, is the compensatory nature of the papal privileges of January 1218. Deprived of the secular ascendancy that possession of the *royal* chancery provided, the archbishop was seeking ghostly confirmation from the *papal* chancery of, firstly, his ecclesiastical primacy and, second, his entitlement to the church of Zuqueca,

14. Luciano Serrano, «El canciller de Fernando III de Castilla», *Hispania*, 1 (1941), pp. 3-40 (6); J. González, *Fernando III*, I, p. 506.

15. Thus Roger Wright, *Late Latin and Early Romance in Spain and Carolingian France*, Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1982, p. 257.

16. P. Linehan, «Don Rodrigo».

17. *Idem*, «D. Juan de Soria: unas apostillas», in *Fernando III y su tiempo (1201-1252)*, VIII Congreso de Estudios Medievales, León: Fundación Sánchez-Albornoz, 2003, pp. 377-393 (381).

18. «la qual mostrada el dicho thesorero dixo quela dicha carta era me[n]ester de mostrar en muchos logares et por periglos que podrían acaesçer en terminos e en otros logares»: [Madrid,] A[rchivo] H[istorico] N[acional], Clero, carp. 3019/8.

which the archbishop had persuaded the pontiff was identical with the Visigothic see of Oretó¹⁹. (There was also a third privilege, to which I will come in a minute.) It was no coincidence that in 1231, in the very month of the transfer of the archbishop's *ex officio* chancellorship to D. Juan, D. Rodrigo had these privileges confirmed by Gregory IX²⁰.

The chancellor don Juan had replaced the archbishop as the intimate of infantes, with his will recalling the visits he had made with them to Paris and Murcia²¹. More than that, the history of Castile he was author of began with the counts of Castile and had nothing to say about the history of the Visigoths, which was what gave D. Rodrigo's History its teleology and purpose. Now here was a *fractura historiográfica* if ever there was one²². So the spectacle of the chancellor celebrating the first mass in the purified mosque of reconquered Córdoba in 1236 may well have seemed a threat to that primatial jurisdiction regarding which D. Rodrigo had recently been so exercised. At any rate, his description of the scene seems to be the only occasion in his chronicle on which he describes himself as primate²³. Moreover, with the capture of Córdoba Fernando III appears to have liberated himself too –from the tutelage of his mother²⁴ and from what remained of the tutelage of D. Rodrigo. When, in April 1237, Gregory IX was concerned to encourage Fernando III to make peace with the king of Navarre, it was

19. Demetrio Mansilla, *La documentación pontificia de Honorio III (1216-1227)*, Rome: Instituto Español de Historia Eclesiástica, 1965, nums. 153, 144. For further implications of this exercise, see P. Linehan, *History and the Historians*, pp. 340-344.

20. A[rchivo de la] C[atedral de] Toledo, X.7.A.3.6, X.1.A.1.3a [Zucheta] (4, 8 Apr. 1231; printed Santiago Dóminguez Sánchez, *Documentos de Gregorio IX (1227-1241) referentes a España*, León: Universidad de León, Secretariado de Publicaciones, 2004, nums. 176, 179 [«Zucheta» in Archivo Segreto Vaticano, Reg. Vat. 15, fol. 77r]; Peter Linehan, «Juan de Soria: the chancellor as chronicler», *e-Spania*, 2 (2007), <http://www.e-spania.paris-sorbonne.fr> [net visited at 2007-03-30].

21. L. Serrano, «El canceller», pp. 39-40.

22. Francisco Bautista, «Escritura cronística e ideología histórica: la *Chronica latina regum Castellae*», *e-Spania*, 2 (2007), <http://www.e-spania.paris-sorbonne.fr> [net visited at 2007-06-30]; Cf. *idem*, «Hacia una nueva 'versión' de la *Estoria de España*: texto y forma de la *Versión de Sancho IV*», *Incipit*, 23 (2003), pp. 1-59 (at p. 48).

23. *DRH*, IX.17₈ (ed. p. 299).

24. Whom he informed from afar of his «firmum propositum» (to proceed to Córdoba) «quod nulla ratione poterat inmutari»: *Chronica latina regum Castellae*, c. 70, edited by Luis Charlo Brea, CCCM, vol. LXXIII (1997), 112₂₄₋₅. See Peter Linehan, «On further thought: Lucas of Tuy, Rodrigo of Toledo and the Alfonsine histories», *Anuario de Estudios Medievales*, 27:1 (1998) [repr. P. Linehan, *The Processes of Politics and the Rule of Law: Studies on the Iberian kingdoms and papal Rome in the Middle Ages*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002], p. 421.

not to the queen-mother and the archbishop that he wrote for support but to the queen-mother and the chancellor²⁵.

Now Fernando III's action in divesting himself of the services of his *ex officio* chancellors (the archbishop of Compostela was another casualty of the process) was in accordance with developments within other monarchies at this time (France and Portugal for example) and also reflected a domestic power struggle in which the queen-mother was involved²⁶. But if, as Mr Donald Rumsfeld has acutely observed, «Stuff happens», it is also the case that «consequences follow». The consequences of the *coup* of 1217 were far-reaching. Until then, with a boy king on the throne, D. Rodrigo had held the reins of power. By March 1243, the date of the first redaction of his chronicle, he had care of the clerical education of two of Fernando III's younger sons at Toledo. But now the effect of the relationship was the opposite. Now, the Infantes Felipe and Sancho were being groomed to succeed to the government of the churches of Toledo and Seville: a novel manner of securing a state-dominated church in the post-Hildebrandine age²⁷.

I mentioned a third papal privilege of January 1218. This was the one appointing the archbishop of Toledo papal legate. But since 1218 D. Rodrigo had fallen from papal favour by colluding with a nefarious papal agent, and in January 1222 the papal registers describe him as papal legate for the last time²⁸. In Roman circles his reputation seems never to have recovered. At any rate, on the death in 1246 of the chancellor D. Juan the canon law regarding broken oaths was not invoked against Fernando III²⁹. Not that the king ran much of a risk of incurring a papal rebuke at this date, even if the archbishop of Toledo had not been in the shadows. With Fernando

25. Léon Cadier, «Bulles originales du XIII^e siècle conservées dans les Archives de Navarre», *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire*, 7 (1887), pp. 268-338 (nums. 23-24).

26. P. Linehan, «D. Rodrigo», p. 95; Georges Martin, «Régner sans régner. Bérengère de Castille (1214-1246) au miroir de l'historiographie de son temps», *e-Spania*, 1 (2006), <http://www.e-spania.paris-sorbonne.fr> [net visited at 2007-03-30].

27. See Francisco Javier Hernández & Peter Linehan, *The Mozarabic Cardinal. The life and times of Gonzalo Pérez Gudiel*, Florence: SISMEL & Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2004, pp. 30-32.

28. D. Mansilla, *Honorio III*, nums. 148, 390; Peter Linehan, *Spanish Church and the Papacy in the Thirteenth Century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971, pp. 8-9. Undeterred, he was still describing himself as such three years later: AHN, Órdenes Militares, Uclés, carp. 58, num. 23.

29. X 2.24 *de iureiurando*.

poised to attack Seville, the pontiff was prepared to grant him the resources of the Castilian Church for the purpose; and perhaps even more³⁰.

When D. Rodrigo died in 1247 the prospect of Seville's recovery, which had haunted him for at least thirty years, was imminent. With it were awakened Toledo's fears for the ecclesiastical primacy which the southern city had enjoyed when Leander and Isidore had been its bishops. There is no need here to recount the battle fought by the chroniclers over this rocky terrain. Suffice it to say that the recent publication of Dr Emma Falque's eagerly awaited edition of the *Chronicon Mundi* and the attentions of a new generation of codicologically literate scholars, notably Enrique Jerez, have left the reputation of Lucas of Tuy further enhanced³¹. Moreover, his versatility in other areas will soon be demonstrated when, in a paper still in press, he is revealed in a new guise, as the author of an eschatological work concerning SS. Francis and Dominic dated by its editor to 1234³².

In his recent distinguished thesis on the subject of don Lucas, Dr Jerez has observed that «frente a tan brillante origen para la ciudad de Guadalquivir, la fundación de Toledo a cargo de dos cónsules romanos, tardía y desabrida, queda en inferioridad»³³. He has in mind, on the one hand, Isidore of Seville's connexion of «Yspanus» and «Yspalis»: the first king of *Yspania* and the «famous city» he built (CM, 124₁₆); on the other, the altogether more modest origins of Toledo (and of its name) in its foundation by the Roman consuls Tolemo and Brutus (CM, 73₂₋₄)³⁴. Don

30. As to more, see P. Linehan, *Spanish Church and the Papacy*, p. 123. Manuel González Jiménez states the sum in question (4000 marks sterling) to have been a loan connected with the conquest of Seville (*Fernando III el Santo*, Seville: Fundación José Manuel Lara, 2006, p. 230). It is more likely to have comprised payments of *census* withheld by the king. See *Les registres d'Urbain IV*, edited by Jean Guiraud, Paris: Thoron & Fils/Albert Fontemoing, 1899, I, cameral num. 478.

31. *Chronicon mundi* [henceforth *CM*], edited by Emma Falque, CCCM, vol. LXXIV (2003); P. Linehan, *History and the Historians*, pp. 357-379, with the additions provided by Enrique Jerez, «El Tudense en su siglo: transmisión y recepción del *Chronicon mundi* en el Doscientos», in *El relato historiográfico: textos y tradiciones en la España medieval*, edited by Francisco Bautista, [papers of the] M[edieval] H[ispanic] R[esearch] S[eminar] 48, Department of Hispanic Studies, Queen Mary, University of London, 2006, pp. 19-57, esp. pp. 28-29, 32-35.

32. Robert Lerner, «The Vision of John, Hermit of the Asturias': Lucas of Tuy, apostolic religion, and eschatological expectation», *Traditio*, 61 (2006), pp. 195-225.

33. Enrique Jerez, «El *Chronicon mundi* de Lucas de Tuy (c. 1238): técnicas compositivas y motivaciones ideológicas», Ph.D. diss. [Tesis doctoral], Universidad Autónoma Madrid, Dpto. Filología Española (Fac. Filosofía y Letras), 2006, p. 143, num. 425.

34. The story seems to have originated with Pelayo of Oviedo: Cruz Montero Garrido, *La Historia, creación literaria. El ejemplo de Quatrocientos*, Madrid: Fundación Ramón Menéndez Pidal & Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 1994-1995, pp. 217-218.

Rodrigo, following on, had suggested something less grand for Seville (with «Hispalis» derived from *pali*: the planks or pales on which the earliest habitations of the place rested; DrH, 16₉₋₁₂), but, though false etymologies, even those derived from St Isidore³⁵, combined happily enough with creative antiquarianism, he was unable to propose anything more elevated for his own city: either that or he lacked the nerve to do so (DrH, 14₄₆₋₅₀).

Toledo's riposte, when it came, was based on neither of these devices. Eventually it would rest on the practice of promoting Toledo's reputation and prestige by injecting alien material into the historiographical mainstream. The process was already underway in D. Rodrigo's History, in the author's account of his own role at Las Navas, his presence in the rear-guard shoulder to shoulder with Alfonso VIII, and the king's conversations with him, and with him alone, both before and at the height of battle (VIII.8₁₃₋₁₄: «in ultima acie»; VIII.10_{12-18, 21-25, 48-52}). True or not –and, according to the Latin chronicler, only kings occupied the rearguard (24₁₇₋₁₈) while D. Lucas fails to mention the archbishop's presence at Las Navas at all (IV.91) –the tendency to conjoin archbishop and king in close association can thus be dated to the year 1243, a date at which, at least in theory, the archbishop's historic cancellerial proximity to the king might still have been salvaged.

Ten years later, after the death of D. Rodrigo and two brief pontificates, it was apparent, even to Toledo patriots (indeed, especially to Toledo patriots) that no such restoration was to happen. In granting Seville the *fuero* of Toledo, Fernando III had described the southern city as «mayor [...] et mas noble [...] de las otras ciudades de Espanna»³⁶. In Toledo itself it seems to have been at this point that wishful thinking began to take hold. Thus, in the *Estoria de los godos*, the earliest romance version of D. Rodrigo's History, to which Catalán and Jerez have recently drawn attention, dating it to 1252/3, the role of D. Rodrigo before Las Navas is recorded in terms which improved on D. Rodrigo himself. Whereas the archbishop had reported how the danger to the city of Toledo that the muster of foreigners of so many discrepant 'nations, customs, *tongues* and cults' represented had been neutralised by the king's evacuation of them to the Huerta del Rey, now it was «por conseio del arçobispo» that the king was said to have

35. *Etymologiarum*, XV.1.71, edited by W. M. Lindsay, Oxonii: E typographeo Clarendoniano, 1911, whence also «G. Petri de Calciata Rithmi de Iulia Romula seu Ispalensi urbe», edited by R. Carande Herrero, *Chronica Hispana saeculi XIII*, CCCM, vol. LXXIII (1997), lin. 17-20.

36. J. González, *Fernando III*, III, num. 825.

done so³⁷. And more. As Aengus Ward has observed, according to the *Estoria* in the battle itself the king was a broken reed. It was the bishops who showed the way –and especially the archbishop of Toledo³⁸.

What Catalán and Jerez do not mention is that 1253 is also the date of the *Notule de primatu* manuscript: that is, of the manuscript to which I referred earlier in which the archbishop of Toledo is shown lording it over the Visigothic councils and D. Rodrigo is reported to have addressed the Lateran Council in all manner of languages. And it is not only the recurrence of that linguistic theme that invites closer investigation. Although down the ages both the authenticity of the *Notule's* account of 1215 and its ostensible date have been regularly rejected³⁹, there was plainly something astir in Toledo in May 1253 –or, as the manuscript calculates, 6629 years after Adam and 2640 after the foundation of the city, making Toledo more than six hundred years older than Rome. Here, along with the various papal licences allegedly authorising D. Rodrigo to disregard recent Lateran legislation, is the earliest claim that his legation was to continue for ten years⁴⁰.

I suspect that whether or not the contents of the *Notule* be credible⁴¹, the date of them is, that 1253 was the year in which history and reality diverged and fiction intervened, and that this was a development not unconnected with the arrival on the Toledo scene in 1252 of the king's brother the Infante Sancho, as procurator and then archbishop. By April 1255 Sancho de Castilla was subscribing royal privileges as... «chancellor del rey» and in the safety of his church describing himself as «regie maiestatis

37. D. Catalán & E. Jerez, «*Rodericus*» romanizado, p. 54.

38. A. Ward, «Rodrigo Ximénez de Rada: auteur et acteur en Castille à la fin du XIII^e siècle», *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*, 26 (2003), pp. 283-294 (287-289). Ward favours a date nearer 1280 for the *Estoria*.

39. El Marqués de Mondéjar and P. Fita, both dismissing its content as spurious, proposed dates of 1432 and 1320 respectively: Fidel Fita, «Santiago de Galicia. Nuevas impugnaciones y nueva defensa», V-VI, *Razón y Fe*, 2 (1902), pp. 178-195 (180), 3 (1902), pp. 49-61 (61).

40. Although the legatine privilege (in any case granted not by Innocent III but by Honorius III) contained no such provision (ACT, I.4.N.1.20: D. Mansilla, *Honorio III*, num. 148), Toledo historiography succeeded in foisting the ten-year term onto posterity: F. de Pisa, *Descripción*, fol. 184ra; P. Linehan, *Spanish Church*, p. 8 num. 4. The archbishop is reported to have been allowed to promote upto three hundred illegitimate clergy to ecclesiastical dignities and to dispense «excommunicati, sacrilegi, irregulares et concubinari»: F. Fita, «Santiago de Galicia», 2 (1902), p. 184.

41. As P. Henriet appears to think: «Political struggle», pp. 295-296.

cancellarius⁴². But this was honorific only, as was the resumption of the same title at the same time by the archbishop of Compostela⁴³. The reality was that Alfonso X's chancery had been overhauled and that its operations were now in the hands of notaries⁴⁴.

A new component was provided between 1272 and 1275 when, as well as «chancellor de Castilla» (or «del rey») Archbishop Sancho de Aragón was listed as «capellán mayor del rey»⁴⁵. Now, this *did* distinguish him from the archbishop of Compostela (who was anyway out of favour with the king)⁴⁶ as well as placing him in both the first and second offices of trust in the royal household and, according to the *Siete Partidas*, situating him between the Almighty and the king on the one hand and between the king and his subjects on the other⁴⁷.

All the elements of the rest of what I have to say to you this evening were now assembled. When an «official history» became available in the Alfonsoine *Estoria de España* Toledo's friends were ready to adjust the historical record in Toledo's favour by breaking the Isidorian claim to a connexion between Seville and Spain and so bringing Seville down a peg or two (*EE* 9a₂₆)⁴⁸. But because the *Estoria's* account of Visigothic Toledo had taken final form in the lifetime of *el rey Sabio*, it was to the more recent past that the fabricators looked to make their mark, and to the figure of Alfonso VII in particular, whose remains were the cathedral's most substantial royal

42. *Diplomatario andaluz de Alfonso X*, edited by Manuel González Jiménez, Seville: El Monte. Caja de Huelva y Sevilla, 1991, num. 146; AC Toledo, E.8.D.1.18 (F. J. Hernández & P. Linehan, *Mozarabic Cardinal*, p. 76).

43. D. Sancho of Castile's use of the title continued until his death in October 1261, with D. Juan of Compostela similarly described after October 1255: M. González Jiménez, *Diplomatario andaluz*, nums. 162 & 246.

44. F. J. Hernández & P. Linehan, *Mozarabic Cardinal*, pp. 70-71.

45. M. González Jiménez, *Diplomatario andaluz*, nums. 397, 399, 404-405, 412.

46. Because Gonzalo Gómez García had been imposed on Alfonso by Gregory X in preference for the king's candidate for the see: F. J. Hernández & P. Linehan, *Mozarabic Cardinal*, p. 150. By contrast with his predecessor, Archbishop Gonzalo Gómez is never accorded the title of chancellor: M. González Jiménez, *Diplomatario andaluz*, nums. 404 & 458 (July 1273-December 1279).

47. «Chanciller es el segundo oficial de casa del rey de aquellos que tienen oficios de poridat; ca bien asi como el capellan es medianero entre Dios et el rey espiritualmente en fecho de su alma, otrosi lo es el chanciller entre él et los homes quanto en las cosas temporales»: *Part. 2.9.3-4* (*Las Siete Partidas del rey don Alfonso el Sabio*, edited by Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid 1807: La Imprenta Real [repr. Madrid: Ediciones Atlas, 1972], II, pp. 59-61).

48. Whereas the report of Toledo's origins in *EE*, 7a₅₃, repeats that of *De rebus Hispanie*.

trophy. The reburial of those remains during the reign of Sancho IV constituted a red letter day for the imperial city and it is in what Francisco Bautista tells us we have again to call its «Versión amplificada»⁴⁹ that we find the history of the Emperor's reign being put to the service and the greater glory of Toledo's archbishops. *That* was the «Emperor Alfonso» he chose to be buried next to; not, as Dr Bizzarri unaccountably states, his father Alfonso X⁵⁰. In the «Versión amplificada» two particularly egregious examples of the wishful thinking already referred to occur, both concerning the reign of Alfonso VII. The first is its treatment of the imperial coronation of 1135. Precisely what had happened at León that Pentecost, whether or not the king had crowned himself for example, the *Cronica Adefonsi Imperatoris* had failed to explain. Nor had it so much as mentioned the archbishop of Toledo⁵¹. But in the «Versión amplificada» it is Archbishop Raimundo who is the centre of attention. All the archbishops, bishops and abbots present, with «ell primas de Toledo» at their head, «bendixieron la corona, et bendixieron a el, et consagraronlo todo; et tomaron [...] la corona, diciendo sus bendiciones, et pusieronla en la cabeça, et allí fue emperador coronado»⁵². Accordingly it comes as no surprise to learn that at the emperor's death-bed in 1157 «llego a el don Johan, arçobispo de Toledo et primas de las Espannas, que era y con ell et siempre con ell andaua, ca nunca se partie dell nin en la frontera nin en la tierra». As chief mourner and the kingdom's spokesman, the archbishop launches into a lengthy speech of farewell to the moribund monarch running to twenty-nine lines in Menéndez Pidal's edition, before leaving him to die in peace⁵³. Thus was confirmed the archbishop's special relationship with the king and his ascendancy over him, liturgical, political and spiritual. It will not have been forgotten that one of the main functions, or privileges, of the king's *capellán mayor* was to hear the king's confession⁵⁴.

Affecting stories such as these became part of Toledo's history, and for them Menéndez Pidal sought credible sources, «fuentes fidedignas». But he

49. «La Estoria de España en época de Sancho IV: sobre los reyes de Asturias», *PMHRS*, 50 (2006), pp. 8-9; cf. *idem*, «Hacia una nueva 'versión' de la *Estoria de España*».

50. Hugo O. Bizzarri, «Castigos del rey D. Sancho IV': una reinterpretación», *PMHRS*, 37 (2004), p. 70.

51. P. Linehan, *History and the Historians*, pp. 235ff.

52. *Primera Crónica General de España*, edited by Ramón Menéndez Pidal, Madrid: Gredos, 1955, c. 974 (p. 654a₃₄₋₄₅); P. Linehan, *History and the Historians*, pp. 463ff.

53. *Primera Crónica General*, c. 982 (p. 662a₈-b₄₇).

54. *Part.* 2.9.3 («et quel sepa apercebir de las cosas de que se debe guardar: ca á él es tenuto de se confesar mas que á otrí»: ed. cit., II, 59).

sought in vain⁵⁵. Their origins have rather to be looked for in the author's wistful, semi-autobiographical description of Archbishop Juan in 1157: «siempre con ell andaua, ca nunca se partie dell nin en la frontera nin en la tierra», reminiscent as it is of D. Rodrigo's account of his inseparable relationship with the king at Las Navas. And who *was* the author? One possibility would be someone who enjoyed a similar intimate relationship with his own king, namely Sancho IV's real-life archbishop of Toledo, or otherwise someone close to him. As a mitred manifestation of his king, Archbishop Gonzalo Pérez of Toledo (the mis-named Gudiel) played Aaron to Sancho's Moses, which was how the *Castigos* attributed to Sancho characterized the ecclesiastical and the secular powers, as twin vicars of God, with each bearing his symbol of office, the crozier and the sceptre respectively, and each having its own independent sphere but also a capacity for bringing its resources to the assistance of the other⁵⁶.

As a product of the royal chancery himself, he was so acutely aware of the importance, both real and symbolic, of control of that department that, when appointed to the see of Toledo in May 1280, he had adopted the belt-and-braces policy of describing himself as *both* chancellor of Castile *and* royal notary⁵⁷. Accordingly, amongst the jottings long known as *Anales Toledanos Terceros*, we find a description of negotiations with the French at Bayona in 1290 and, at the head of the Castilian delegation... don Gonzalo Pérez: «Et los que tractauan esta paç por el rei de [Ca]stiella era el arcobispo don Goncaluo de Toledo» etc. –as became the effective head of the king's chancery⁵⁸. For more than a century these *anales* have been associated with Jofré de Loaisa⁵⁹, and Jofré de Loaisa, as well as being the

55. F. de Pisa, *Descripcion*, fols. 167rb-va, 170ra; P. Linehan, *History and the Historians*, p. 463n.

56. *Castigos del rey don Sancho IV*, edited by Hugo O. Bizzarri, Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert & Madrid: Iberoamericana, 2001, p. 172. Cf. the strikingly different exegesis of the contemporary Augustinus Triumphus, cit. Michael J. Wilks, *The Problem of Sovereignty in the Later Middle Ages. The papal monarchy with Augustinus Triumphus and the publicists*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964, p. 395: «Moyses repraesentabat Christum cuius vicem papa gerit in terris [...] Similiter Aaron Christum repraesentabat [...] Aliter tamen Moyses et aliter Aaron Christum significabant, quia Moyses significabat Christum ut legislator, Aaron vero ut summus sacerdos».

57. F. J. Hernández & P. Linehan, *Mozarabic Cardinal*, pp. 185-186.

58. Enrique Jerez, «El *oficio* historiográfico: los Anales Toledanos Terceros en su entorno», *La Corónica*, 32.3 (2004), pp. 109-161 (150-153); D. Catalán & E. Jerez, «*Rodericus* romanizado», pp. 597-598.

59. A relationship first noticed by Antonio Paz y Mélia in his review of Alfred Morel-Fatio's edition of Jofré's chronicle: *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos*, 3 (1899), p. 729.

author of a continuation of D. Rodrigo's History, was a member of Gonzalo Pérez's circle⁶⁰. By that year the royal chancery was styling the former protégé of Archbishop Sancho of Castile as «chancellor mayor en los regnos de Castiella e de Leon e de Andalucia» and by 1294 as «chancellor mayor en todos nuestros regnos»⁶¹. True, for a man who was the product of Alfonso's chancery, at one level the prostitution of his historiographical activity, and the recourse to fiction, would have represented a sad decline from the scrupulous standards of Alfonso's glory days –especially if, as Dr Hernández and I have suggested, it was he who, as archdeacon of Toledo and notary for Castile in the early 1270s, was responsible for the collection of the documentary material which seventy years later was to find its way into the *Crónica de Alfonso X*⁶². But, in that capacity he would have been familiar with and would have had free access to the historical materials assembled by Alfonso X.

I have said more than enough elsewhere about «Gudiel» and about the tantalising but never quite conclusive indications of his responsibility for the elaborations of Toledo's past in the «Versión amplificada». Here suffice it to remark that, for him as well as don Rodrigo, cathedral building and the creation of historical fiction were complementary activities. Though one looked forward and the other back, the same ethos informed both, and consonant with that ethos were Sancho IV's privilege, as alleged by Jofré, promising that all future kings of Castile would be crowned in Toledo cathedral, and the adaptation of a coronation *ordo* from a German imperial model for that purpose⁶³. The illustration to the privilege in which Sancho promises to be buried in Toledo cathedral shows king and archbishop seated in exact horizontal equivalence, exactly as in the representations of kings and archbishops presiding over Visigothic councils in the

60. Francisco Javier Hernández, «Noticias sobre Jofré de Loaisa y Ferrán Martínez», *Revista Canadiense de Estudios Hispánicos*, 4 (1980), pp. 281-309.

61. F. J. Hernández & P. Linehan, *Mozarabic Cardinal*, p. 266, *q. v.* for criticism of this interpretation.

62. *Idem*, pp. 129-131. For reasons not stated, Manuel González Jiménez contends that this section of the *Crónica* was compiled in the years 1282-1284: *Crónica de Alfonso X según el MS. 2777 de la Biblioteca del Palacio Real (Madrid)*, Murcia: Real Academia Alfonso X el Sabio, 2000, p. xxxii.

63. Peter Linehan, «The Toledo forgeries c. 1150 - c. 1300», *Fälschungen im Mittelalter. Internationaler Kongreß der Monumenta Germaniae Historica, München, 16-19. September 1986*, I, MGH Schriften 33.1; Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1988 [repr. P. Linehan, *Past and Present in Medieval Spain*, Aldershot: Variorum, 1992], pp. 643-674 (666-667).

Notule de primatu manuscript⁶⁴. How appropriate therefore is Dr Bautista's conjecture that the completion of this version of the Alfonsine History was timed to coincide with Sancho IV's accomplishment of the royal pantheon within the cathedral⁶⁵.

This is not to suggest that Jofré de Loaisa and a Toledo lobby, or mafia, were responsible for all the amplifications of the «Versión amplificada». For example, although on the awkward matter of Seville's ancient primacy the subversive D. Lucas had been muted⁶⁶, it would be difficult to ascribe to a Toledan sympathiser the passage celebrating the miracles and preaching of Santiago⁶⁷ –unless its inclusion is to be regarded as an oversight attributable to the scramble to meet that 1289 deadline⁶⁸. Be that as it may, the practice of inferring authorship from apparent motivation may be thought a questionable procedure anyway, as also may be the tendency to regard a writer's apparent failure to quote from or even acknowledge the existence of another work as automatically disqualifying him from the authorship of it. Is it not a fallacy, one perhaps based on modern experience, to assume that historians are incapable of original thought and of original ways of expressing it and that anything they may say must have been adapted from someone else? We have already seen how that assumption underestimates

64. *Idem*, *History and the Historians*, pp. 482-485. Cf. Fernando Gutiérrez Baños, *Las empresas artísticas de Sancho IV el Bravo*, Valladolid: Junta de Castilla y León, Consejería de Educación y Cultura, 1997, pp. 186-190.

65. F. Bautista, *La Estoria de España*, pp. 51-54.

66. But not altogether silenced. According to Lucas's fifteenth-century translator, Fernando III incorporated Seville to León and made it subject to the Fuero juzgo: *Crónica de España por Lucas, obispo de Túy*, edited by Julio Puyol, Madrid: Rev. de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos, 1926, p. 445. Seville had been granted the *fuero* of Toledo in 1251: F. J. Hernández & P. Linehan, *Mozarabic Cardinal*, p. 68. At one level therefore the Leonese mafia remained alive and well. But the influence is not unidirectional. Despite its promotion of St. Isidore, the extended Lucas omits the notice of the *Estoria de España* that Fernando III entered Seville «dia [...] de la traslación de sant Esidro de Leon [22 December], arçobispo que fue de Seuilla» in favour of that of S. Clemente: the day prearranged for the surrender of the *alcázar* [23 November: a Monday in 1248], misreporting it as a Sunday: Puyol, pp. 443-4. Cf. *Primera Crónica General*, cc. 1123, 1125 (p. 767a₂₀, b₁₀).

67. F. Bautista, *La Estoria de España*, pp. 26, 83-84, 97-98. Cf. the downbeat D. Rodrigo at Las Navas, as described in the *Sumario Analístico de la Historia Gothica*, edited by Aengus Ward, PMHRS, 56 (2007), pp. 26, 97-98.

68. Was this the reason why, in the words of J. B. Crespo Arce, «el texto que presenta E₂ está plagado de imperfecciones, tanto estructurales como puntuales», failing even to verify the year of the reconquest of Toledo?: «La complejidad textual de la historiografía alfonsí», *Actas del XIV Congreso de la Asociación Internacional de Hispanistas*, New York, 16-21 de Julio de 2001, Newark, Del.: Juan de la Cuesta, 2004, I, pp. 55-65 (56).

practitioners of the calibre of Bishop Pelayo of Oviedo⁶⁹. For the affecting account in the «Versión amplificada» of the death of Alfonso VII Menéndez Pidal cited «[una] fuente desconocida, quizá poética»⁷⁰. But why not «una invención, quizá insólita»? Why should *inventio* not be counted amongst the historiographer's resources, along with *auctoritas* and *memoria*?⁷¹ –always provided we do not expect the *Cui bono?* test mechanistically applied to identify the author. In the present case, for example, to treat the «toledanisation» of the historical record as an expression of Sancho IV's political philosophy *tout court* and king and archbishop as in intimate collaboration would appear highly questionable⁷². The fit is not that exact. The absence from Toledo cathedral's title deeds of Sancho's coronation privilege described by Master Jofré's speaks for itself.

Many loose ends remain. In the masterly analysis of Catalán and Jerez I find no mention of the item listed amongst the contents of Archbishop Sancho of Aragón's chapel, the «quaderno de fechos de Toledo que comienza 'En guarda del arçidiagno de Toledo'»⁷³. Yet here is an item –un quaderno de fechos de Toledo– which sounds as if it might deserve discussion in relation to the *Anales Toledanos Terceros* (the bifolio enclosing

69. Above, n. 34.

70. *Primera Crónica General*, II, p. cxciv.

71. Cf. Inés Fernández-Ordóñez, «La composición por etapas de la *Chronica latina regum Castellae* (1223-1237) de Juan de Osma», *e-Spania*, 2 (2007), pp. 1-35 (32-35), <http://www.e-spania.paris-sorbonne.fr> [net visited at 2007-06-30].

72. Cf. Georges Martin, «L'escarboucle de Saint-Denis, le roi de France et l'empereur des Espagnes», in *Saint-Denis et la royauté. Études offertes à Bernard Guenée*, edited by F. Autrand, C. Gauvard & J.-M. Moeglin, Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1999, pp. 439-462 (458). C. L. Chamberlin regards the king as the manipulator-in-chief («undoubtedly with the intimate collaboration of Archbishop Gonzalo»): «Unless the Pen Writes as it Should': the proto-cult of Saint Fernando III in Seville in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries», in *Sevilla 1248. Congreso Internacional conmemorativo del 750 aniversario de la conquista de la ciudad de Sevilla por Fernando III, rey de Castilla y León. Sevilla, Real Alcázar, 23-27 de noviembre de 1998*, edited by M. González Jiménez, Madrid: Ayuntamiento de Sevilla & Fundación Ramón Areces, 2000, pp. 389-417 (406), while F. Gutiérrez Baños, *Empresas artísticas*, p. 189, speaks of «una confluencia de intereses». Regarding the *Lucidario*, F. Gómez-Redondo discerns «una orientación religiosa, impulsada en la corte de Sancho posiblemente por clérigos cercanos al cardenal Gudiel»: *Historia de la prosa medieval castellana*, I, *La creación del discurso prosístico: el entramado cortesano*, Madrid: Cátedra, 1998, p. 912. As to the differing nuances observable in historical compilations of the period, A. Ward observes: «it is hard to imagine separate teams beavering away in the 1280s at differentiated histories of Iberia in the cathedral without knowledge of each other»: *Sumario Analítico*, p. 29. Hard yes, but also intriguing.

73. F. J. Hernández & P. Linehan, *Mozarabic Cardinal*, p. 142, n. 149.

what used to be called the *Anales Toledanos Quartos*: now the *Sumario analítico de la Historia Gothica*), the work penned, according to Catalán and Jerez, by Archdeacon Jofré of Toledo in the spring of 1280⁷⁴. If there is a connexion, though, there is also a problem. For in the spring of 1280 this *quaderno* was nowhere near the archdeacon. It was in the possession of Archbishop Sancho's creditors, and was not released by them until 1284⁷⁵.

That is not the only problem. Another concerns Archdeacon Jofré of Toledo himself and in particular the question whether in 1280 Jofré de Loaisa was an archdeacon at all. Of course, Catalán and Jerez insist that he was, stating that the dispute regarding succession to that office had been decided in Jofré's favour by Pope Nicholas III in 1278. But this is wrong. It is wrong because it was Pope Nicholas IV who decided in Jofré's favour, and not until after 1288 that he did so⁷⁶. Only after that date was Jofré de Loaisa *de iure* archdeacon of Toledo.

True, he may have been *de facto* archdeacon before that, and may not have let the difference worry him unduly. And, if so, as an accomplice of his archbishop that would have been wholly appropriate. For Gudiel was one of nature's survivors. The story of his political resurrection after King Sancho's succession is a remarkable one. But Catalán and Jerez are also wrong in claiming that he returned to the old king's side in the last months of Alfonso's reign⁷⁷. So too is Dr Bizzarri in reporting that it was he who

74. D. Catalán & E. Jerez, «*Rodericus*» *romanizado*, pp. 566-594.

75. New York, Hispanic Society of America, MS. B190 (printed F. J. Hernández & P. Linehan, *Mozarabic Cardinal*, p. 499).

76. D. Catalán & E. Jerez, «*Rodericus*» *romanizado*, p. 571. The error derives ultimately from Ramón González's attribution to the pontificate of Nicholas III (1277-1280) of a papal letter copied in ACT O.3.C.1.3 («El arcediano Jofre de Loaysa y el 'fecho de coronados'», in *Estudios en homenaje a D. Claudio Sánchez Albornoz en sus 90 años*, III, Buenos Aires: Instituto de Historia de España, 1985, pp. 241-262 (244). However, the date of this («Laterani non. martii pontificatus nostri anno primo») can only refer to that of Nicholas IV (1288-1292), as references in the text to letters on the subject issued by the pontiff's immediate predecessor, Honorius IV, confirm. The reader of González's article is likely to have been misled by what purports to be a quotation from the papal text referring to the abbot of Covarrubias «qui se gerit pro electo toletano» (p. 244), and therefore to a date before 1280. In fact, the letter's description of the abbot is of one «qui se tunc pro electo Toletano gerebat». See F. J. Hernández & P. Linehan, *Mozarabic Cardinal*, p. 171. It is to be noted that on diplomatic grounds the copy can be shown to have been made not from the papal register but from the original.

77. D. Catalán & E. Jerez, «*Rodericus*» *romanizado*, p. 594, in accordance with the further misdating by R. González Ruiz, *Hombres y libros de Toledo (1086-1300)*, Madrid: Fundación Ramón Areces, 1997, pp. 359-360. Cf. F. J. Hernández & P. Linehan, *Mozarabic Cardinal*, p. 240.

crowned Sancho in Toledo cathedral⁷⁸. It was precisely the fact that like Archbishop Gonzalo of Compostela he had *not* been the king's man for Toledo in the first place, that he had *not* returned while the old king was still alive, and that he had *not* been at Toledo at the start of the new reign that made the development of his relationship with the new king so notable. By a curious irony, most modern scholars have been deluded by purveyors of historical fiction into believing that no such special relationship can have existed because the archbishop was driven into exile by *ira regia* in 1286⁷⁹. This too is wrong. Gonzalo Pérez stayed, and develop the relationship did –though it did not survive the death of that king.

With the death of Sancho IV in 1295 the special relationship waned. The moment had passed. In 1311 Sancho's son would describe Gonzalo Pérez's successor but one as his «fechura». That was the word that, when writing to Alfonso X from Rome⁸⁰ at the time of his appointment in May 1280, Gonzalo Pérez had used to describe himself. The same word, but with very different connotations in the two places⁸¹. A sentence in another letter from the earlier date, and destined for the then Infante, shows what had been lost. It had been addressed «a uos, que siempre nos amastes e nos onrrastes de que erades moço pequenno a aca»⁸².

But in a sense the failure of that relationship hardly mattered since by then sufficient of the historical past had been toledanized for the archbishop to rest in peace. The placebo to which a Toledo deprived of

78. H. O. Bizzarri, «Castigos del rey D. Sancho IV», p. 17.

79. Misinformation originating with the anonymous author of certain «Vidas de los arzobispos de Toledo» written after 1588. Amongst those recently misled have been Manuel Alonso, «Bibliotecas medievales de los arzobispos de Toledo», *Razón y Fe*, 123 (1941), pp. 295-309 (at p. 302); *Johannis Aegidii Zamorensis. 'Historia Naturalis'*, edited by Avelino Domínguez García & Luis García Ballester, [Valladolid]: Junta de Castilla y León, Consejería de Cultura y Turismo, 1994, I, pp. 30-31; Germán Orduna, «La elite intelectual de la escuela catedralicia de Toledo y la literatura en época de Sancho IV», in *La literatura en la época de Sancho IV (Actas del Congreso Internacional «La literatura en la época de Sancho IV», Alcalá de Henares, 21-24 de febrero de 1994)*, edited by Carlos Alvar & Juan Manuel Lucía Megías, Alcalá de Henares: Servicio de Publicaciones, Universidad de Alcalá, 1996, pp. 53-62; G. Martín, «L'escarboucle de Saint-Denis», p. 460; and F. Gómez-Redondo, *Historia de la prosa*, I, p. 861. Cf. F. J. Hernández & P. Linehan, *Mozarabic Cardinal*, p. 423 n. 73.

80. And it was from Rome that he did so and not, as D. Catalán & E. Jerez variously contend, from Viterbo or Orvieto: «Rodericus» *romanizado*, pp. 549, 570, 602.

81. F. J. Hernández & P. Linehan, *Mozarabic Cardinal*, p. 442; Antonio Benavides, *Memorias de D. Fernando IV de Castilla*, Madrid: J. Rodríguez, 1860, II, num. 550 (cit. F. J. Hernández & P. Linehan, p. 405).

82. *Idem*, *Mozarabic Cardinal*, p. 446.

nourishment had turned was found to have therapeutic virtues of its own. To return to my point of departure, the process ensured that in death, as never in life, D. Rodrigo came to be identified with his king and, because his king was a saint, to be treated as immune from the criticism of historians⁸³. In the 1590s another member of the Loaisa clan, Archbishop García de Loaisa, attempted to improve on the record of 1253, and in 1902 Padre Fita brandishing a sword for Santiago denounced him and sought to tar D. García and everything back to 1253 with the brush of the False Chroniclers⁸⁴. Padre Fita was right about many things. He was probably wrong about that.

83. See the judgement of E. Estella, sometime archivist of Toledo cathedral, cit. P. Linehan, «D. Rodrigo», p. 87, n. 1.

84. F. Fita, «Santiago de Galicia», *Razón y Fe*, 4, 2 (1902), pp. 35-45 (36-38, 45).

