

Cambridge University Press

0521023351 - The Spanish Church and the Papacy in the Thirteenth Century

Peter Linehan

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Chapter 1*THE SPANISH CHURCH  
AND HONORIUS III

Of necessity historians of medieval Spain subscribe to the Pirenne thesis, for it fits that country's history as it does no other.<sup>1</sup> In the mid-twelfth century the abbot of Cluny, Peter the Venerable, did, foreshadowing the Belgian scholar by ignoring the Visigoths and arguing that it was not they but the Romans who were overrun by the Moors in 711.<sup>2</sup> And that view still holds. The Visigothic period of Spanish history may be described as no more than 'an appendix' to the Late Empire, and the Middle Ages be defined by the Moorish occupation.<sup>3</sup> Without Muhammad, Spanish historical scholarship down to and including the most recent article by Professor Sánchez-Albornoz would have been inconceivable.

So it is perfectly understandable that the history of medieval Spain should have become the history of the *Reconquista*; that the period of reconquest should be thought of as having left an indelible mark on the Spanish collective personality;<sup>4</sup> and, in particular, that historians should have paid special attention to the points of contact, both military and cultural, between Islam and Christendom.

One consequence of this, though, has been that the presumably less spectacular developments behind the front line have attracted the attention of considerably fewer scholars. The history of the Church,

<sup>1</sup> 'Probablemente... a ningún otro país como al nuestro... se puede aplicar la tesis de Pirenne... La idea es especialmente aplicable a España': Maravall, 'La idea de Reconquista', 177–8.

<sup>2</sup> 'Nam statim Romano languescere immo pene deficiente imperio... Arabum vel Sarracenorū hac peste infectorum surrexit principatus, atque vi armata maximas Asiae partes cum tota Africa ac parte Hispaniae paulatim occupans, in subiectos sicut imperium sic et errorem transfudit': *Summa Totius Haeresis Saracenorū*, in J. Kritzeck, *Peter the Venerable and Islam* (Princeton, 1964), 140, n. 111.

<sup>3</sup> Vicens Vives, *Manual de historia económica*, 81; Font y Rius, *Rec. Soc. Jean Bodin*, vi, 264: 'Chez nous le moyen âge commence avec cette invasion et finit avec l'expulsion des maures.'

<sup>4</sup> Vicens Vives, *Aproximación*, 192.

Cambridge University Press

0521023351 - The Spanish Church and the Papacy in the Thirteenth Century

Peter Linehan

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The Spanish Church and the Papacy*

for example, has been almost entirely neglected. Though there are hardly fewer ecclesiastical archives than there are tales – and many of them very good tales – about the impossibility of gaining access to them, their contents have still to be sorted and analysed. Since Gams and Lafuente in the middle of the last century, no one has attempted a general survey. Only two names, those of Fita and Mansilla, even deserve mention in a review of the study of the subject since then; and neither the penetrating research of the one nor the patient industry of the other has provided any general perspective of the possibly humdrum history of the thirteenth-century Spanish Church. For while Fita dispersed his energies over a vast field, leaving not what would surely have been an incomparable volume but instead a remarkable series of short papers and articles, Mansilla, intent upon continuing Kehr's *Papsturkunden*, has confined himself almost exclusively to the Vatican archives, which provided the material for his very valuable book published in 1945.<sup>1</sup> The history of that substantial part of the Spanish Church which is not illuminated by the glare of the *Reconquista* has yet to be written.

The subject to be studied, however, does not present anything like the contrast which is suggested by the preoccupation of historians with the frontier area. Wherever they were, all Spanish churchmen were frontiersmen, to some extent. They differed in degree, not in kind. In matters of ecclesiastical discipline they expressed the frontier-spirit by their contempt for distant authority – papal authority included – and their rejection of any reforms which threatened their peculiar institutions, the most ineffectively threatened if not the most peculiar of which was clerical concubinage. The way in which the Spanish clergy as a whole survived and, within a generation, neutralised the fulminations of the Fourth Lateran Council on that topic deserves fuller treatment.<sup>2</sup> Here it is sufficient to observe the working of that frontier-spirit in the diocese of Segovia, and especially at Sepúlveda, in and after 1203 when the combined attempt of Bishop Gonzalo and Archbishop Martín of Toledo to separate the clergy from their women produced not a reformation of clerical morals but

<sup>1</sup> *Iglesia castellano-leonesa*, which deals with the period up to 1254. The *Papsturkunden* project has so far only reached the year 1227, and does not incorporate original, unregistered letters, for details of some seventy of which from Honorius III's pontificate, see Linehan, *AA*, xvi, 385 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Below, pp. 51 ff.

Cambridge University Press

0521023351 - The Spanish Church and the Papacy in the Thirteenth Century

Peter Linehan

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The Spanish Church and Honorius III*

widespread clerical revolt.<sup>1</sup> In 1203 Segovia was not, physically, the frontier see that it had been a century before. Yet from the reactions of the clergy there to reforming notions, it is clear that there had been no decay of that sense of aggressive exclusiveness which characterised settlements all along the frontier and had been enshrined in Alfonso VI's confirmation of the celebrated *fuero* of Sepúlveda in 1076.<sup>2</sup>

By then, the year 1203, sanctions against concubinage had a long prehistory, but there is special justification for recalling in particular one earlier occasion on which clerical philandering had been condemned: the national council over which the legate, Cardinal Boso, had presided in February 1117.<sup>3</sup> For the political circumstances of that council illustrate the important point that the truculence of individual clerics or of the clergy in general was far from being the sole obstruction to reform. During the first three and a half centuries of the *Reconquista*, the Christian kings had frequently solved their dynastic difficulties by marriages which took no account whatsoever of the canonical rules of consanguinity. Not until 1023, when Sancho III consulted Bishop Oliva of Vich on the question of the proposed union of his sister, Urraca, and her second cousin, Alfonso V of Leon, is there any sign that they felt themselves bound by the current disciplinary norms; and even then Sancho chose to ignore the inconvenient reply which he received.<sup>4</sup> Now when, in 1117, some thirty years after the death of Gregory VII, the prelates assembled at Burgos, they met beneath the shadow of a similar union of second cousins, Alfonso I of Aragon and Urraca, the daughter and heiress of Alfonso VI of Castile. Canon xiv of the rather laconic review of canonical discipline issued by them, prohibiting marriages within the seventh degree, amounted therefore to a direct challenge to Alfonso VI's political testament. That the attack was led by Archbishop Bernardo

<sup>1</sup> In the course of an inquiry into the affair, the abbot of San Tomé, Sepúlveda, stated 'quod ipse scit quod clerici Septempublicenses de villa et de aldeis pro maiori parte tenebant concubinas ante incium istius cause et multi eorum adhuc tenent': AC Segovia, doc. 16. See also Colmenares, *Historia*, 168–9; González Davila, *Teatro*, III, 538–9. The clergy of Sepúlveda helped to drive the next bishop, Giraldo, into premature retirement over this and other issues: González, *Alfonso VIII*, I, 425–7.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Sáez, *et al.*, *Fueros de Sepúlveda*, 45–9; González, *Hispania*, III, 243–5; Lacarra, *Moyen Âge*, LXIX, 218.

<sup>3</sup> Fita, *BRAB*, XLVIII, 396.

<sup>4</sup> Pérez de Urbel, *Sancho el Mayor*, 109–14; Abadal, *L'Abat Oliba*, 246–7.

Cambridge University Press

0521023351 - The Spanish Church and the Papacy in the Thirteenth Century

Peter Linehan

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The Spanish Church and the Papacy*

of Toledo, one of the Cluniacs whom Alfonso had invited to Castile to assist him with the *Reconquista*, provided a further element of poignancy. For though Bernardo may have been a reformer (an excellent thing in primates), he happened also to be the champion of the Burgundian candidate to the Castilian throne, the young Alfonso VII.<sup>1</sup> Reform had its political uses and carried with it its political dangers.

This remained true a century after the Burgos Council, at a time when the Spanish Church was in crying need of reform in head and members. Far afield, as far afield as Flanders, tales were told of the incontinence of the Spanish clergy.<sup>2</sup> But the legislation of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, 'the most important single body of disciplinary and reform legislation of the medieval church',<sup>3</sup> made no immediate impression upon Castile, Leon or Aragon. For the twenty-three peninsular prelates who, according to the 'official communiqué', were there,<sup>4</sup> the Council's highlight was not so much its solemn decrees as the preliminary slanging match over the primacy issue during which Archbishop Rodrigo of Toledo dismissed the rival claim of Compostela as being founded on an old wives' tale and brought blushes to the cheeks of the archbishop of Braga by recounting in loving detail the unedifying history of Estevão's predecessor, the anti-pope Gregory VIII.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Fita, *BRAH*, XLVIII, 398; Defourneaux, *Les Français en Espagne*, 32–7, 201–3; Rivera, *Iglesia de Toledo*, 125 ff.

<sup>2</sup> For the cautionary tale of *quidam presbyter* of 'Hyspania' who had slept with a woman, see *Balduini Ninovensensis Chronicon*, 539 (s.a. 1211). Cf. the view of González: 'La moralidad del clero ofrece reducida... documentación, indicio de que no era de nivel bajo': *Alfonso VIII*, I, 419.

<sup>3</sup> Kuttner and García, *Traditio*, xx, 163.

<sup>4</sup> Luchaire, *Journal des Savants*, III, 562, whence Hefele–Leclercq, v, ii, 1730. There are two Toledo MSS., BN, vit. 15–5 (*olim* BC Toledo, MS. 15–22) and BC Toledo, MS. 42–21, which give different lists of Spanish prelates from that of the Zurich MS. used by Luchaire. The former (fo. 22r) notes 'quod XIII fuerunt episcopi in isto concilio de regno Castelle, Legionis et Portugalie' and mentions the bishop of Oviedo but not those of Astorga, Salamanca or Mondoñedo, while in the other (publ. Rivera, *HS*, IV, 337) the bishop of Astorga's presence is noted, but not that of the others or of the bishop of Segorbe.

<sup>5</sup> BN, vit. 15–5, fos. 22r–3v (Fita, *Razón y Fe*, II, 178 ff.); Foreville, *Mélanges... Crozet*, 1125–7; Kuttner and García, *Traditio*, xx, 136–8; Hefele–Leclercq, v, ii, 1319–20. There is a briefer version of Rodrigo's speech in BC Toledo, MS. 42–21, fo. 1 (Rivera, *HS*, IV, 336–7). For a more balanced account of the career of Mauricio Burdino, the anti-pope, see David, *Études historiques*, 441 ff.

Cambridge University Press

0521023351 - The Spanish Church and the Papacy in the Thirteenth Century

Peter Linehan

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The Spanish Church and Honorius III*

The primacy issue was only one of the items which interested them more than reform. There was also, of course, the *Reconquista*. Three years before, the Almohads had been defeated at Las Navas de Tolosa, and the credit for saving ‘non solum Yspaniam, set et Romam, immo Europam universam’ was due to *Yspania* ‘et precipue regno Castelle’, as the Castilians were quick to remind the Europeans and some Europeans had the grace to acknowledge.<sup>1</sup> More important, there was the bill for the *Reconquista*. The Castilian victory cost Castilian money, for, though the Moorish account of the 1212 campaign describes the Christians begging pitifully for assistance ‘from Portugal to Constantinople’, the truth is that that year marked the closing of the period of foreign aid. The few Frenchmen who did come caught dysentery and abandoned Alfonso VIII before the battle. And they had come as mercenaries. Even the king of Aragon was Castile’s pensioner and received from Alfonso *stipendia necessaria* for his troops.<sup>2</sup> Regardless of the crusading indulgences which it offered them, foreigners had always made profitability their criterion for assisting in the *Reconquista*, and by 1212 better opportunities for booty were available nearer home. This break with the past was completed in the following year when Pedro II of Aragon died at Muret, with his back to the south, defending his French vassals against the crusading hordes of Simon de Montfort.<sup>3</sup> In 1147 Bishop Pedro of Porto had cajoled the English into abandoning their journey to the Holy Land and joining the siege of Lisbon by promising them booty and quoting the old Spanish proverb that the road is better than the inn.<sup>4</sup> Sixty-five years later these arguments had lost their force; sixty-six years later they were turned against Aragon. The thirteenth-century *Reconquista* would have to be a Spanish enterprise.

The 1212 campaign had cost the Castilian clergy half their year’s income.<sup>5</sup> There are no means of knowing quite what this sacrifice meant for them. It was probably not the first such burden that they

<sup>1</sup> CLI: *B. Hisp.*, xiv, 357–8; *Sicardi Episcopi Cremonensis Chronica*, 180.

<sup>2</sup> *Anónimo de Madrid y Copenhagen*, 122; Defourneaux, 185 ff.; CLI: *B. Hisp.*, xiv, 355.

<sup>3</sup> Defourneaux, 125 ff.; Renouard, *Annales de l’Université de Paris*, xxviii, 16–17.

<sup>4</sup> ‘Non Iherosolimis fuisse sed bene interim invixisse laudabile est’: *De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi*, 76. Afonso Henriques’ expectation that they might assist him for reasons of religion – *pietas* – and not for loot was soon disappointed: *ibid.* 98, 110.

<sup>5</sup> CLI: *B. Hisp.*, xiv, 355.

Cambridge University Press

0521023351 - The Spanish Church and the Papacy in the Thirteenth Century

Peter Linehan

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The Spanish Church and the Papacy*

had been made to bear. It was certainly not the last. But it can at least be safely assumed that they were not immune to the effects of the nation-wide crisis which dispersed the euphoria of victory and brought the Christian advance to a temporary halt two years later.<sup>1</sup> Economic relief, in the shape of a papal grant of crusading indulgences for warriors on the Spanish front, was requested by the entire Spanish contingent at the 1215 Council *cum quanta potuerunt instantia*. In that, if in nothing else, Rodrigo of Toledo had the support of the archbishop of Compostela.<sup>2</sup> At least two Castilian prelates, García of Cuenca and Giraldo of Segovia, had been reduced to borrowing their fare to Rome;<sup>3</sup> and if, furthermore, they made their stay there last two full years, as did Bishop Martinho of Porto,<sup>4</sup> then the economic consequences of the Council for them may well have been similar to those which forced Bishop Juan Pérez of Calahorra to sell property on his return in order to clear the debts that he had contracted at the Curia.<sup>5</sup>

In these circumstances, it is hardly surprising that the one issue raised at the Council which riveted the attention of Spanish prelates was the fiscal issue: the tax of a twentieth of the income from ecclesiastical benefices to be used for the launching of another crusade.<sup>6</sup> The levying of the tax was given pride of place in the perfunctory passage which Lucas of Túy, writing twenty years later, devoted to the Council;<sup>7</sup> and this emphasis probably reflects pretty faithfully the attitude of the bishops themselves in and after 1215. To them it seemed inequitable that they should be expected to contribute to a foreign War, however Holy it might be, when they were already bearing the heat and burden of the day on their own national front. In this spirit – a spirit which was to endure throughout the century – they devoted their energies not to the business of summoning councils and synods and reforming the Spanish Church, but, instead, to the task of sabotaging the collection of the tax: a task for

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* 368; *Primera Crónica General*, para. 1023.

<sup>2</sup> Bishop Soeiro of Lisbon and others to Honorius III, autumn 1217, in *Reg. Hon. III*, appendix I, 7 (MDH, 95).

<sup>3</sup> Rivera, *HS*, IV, 340–1.

<sup>4</sup> The fact was mentioned in the early 1250s, in the course of a lawsuit between the churches of Braga and Porto: ADB, Gav. dos Arcebispos, 24.

<sup>5</sup> AC Calahorra, doc. 251, 255: publ. Menéndez Pidal, *Documentos lingüísticos*, I, 126–7.

<sup>6</sup> Hefele–Leclercq, v, ii, 1390–95.

<sup>7</sup> *Chronicon Mundi*, 113. Similarly Gil de Zamora, ed. Fita, *BRAH*, v, 312.

Cambridge University Press

0521023351 - The Spanish Church and the Papacy in the Thirteenth Century

Peter Linehan

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The Spanish Church and Honorius III*

which their spiritual leader, Archbishop Rodrigo, by diverting the funds into his own coffers, proved himself to be admirably equipped. Thus, speculation preceded reform, and because the affair provided the post-Lateran papacy with its first experience of the shortcomings of the Spanish episcopate it is appropriate that some account of it should stand at the beginning of this study.

Throughout Christendom the collection of the triennial twentieth was entrusted by Innocent III to the regional Masters of the Hospital and Temple. In the provinces of Toledo, Braga and Compostela, and the exempt sees of León, Burgos and Oviedo, they were assisted by the cantor and archdeacon of Zamora. Three months after Innocent's deadline for payment, November 1216, nothing had been achieved, and Honorius III sent the Spanish provinces a stiff reprimand. The bishops' ingenuity in interpreting Innocent's mandate had made the collectors' task impossible. Some had alleged that they were not obliged to pay in cash; and others that they were not responsible for summoning diocesan synods for this purpose, although the pope had been quite explicit on this point. In consequence, the collectors had been made to wander the length and breadth of the country, gathering the dues in dribs and drabs of wheat, wine and barley; and at that rate fifty of them, let alone four, Honorius observed, could hardly hope to deal with a province the size of Toledo, which spread over two entire kingdoms. The bishops were reminded that time was short and that the cash was needed immediately. They were to interpret his predecessor's instructions *sano et simplici intellectu* and to centralise and expedite the business of collection.<sup>1</sup> Their Fabian tactics irritated Honorius, as he had already made clear in his reply of December 1216 to a series of questions which the chapter of Compostela had asked concerning the scope of the tax<sup>2</sup>. Yet while the pope fumed, the game continued.

To some Spaniards the capture of the Portuguese stronghold of Alcacer do Sal in the autumn of 1217 seemed to herald the arrival of that moment, the recommencement of military operations, when, in accordance with Innocent III's promise at the Council, crusading indulgences might be granted to the *reconquistadores*. Their argument did budge the pope, but only to the extent of granting favours to the

<sup>1</sup> *Reg. Hon. III*, 337 (MDH, 35). Cf. Lunt, *Financial Relations*, 242 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Reg. Hon. III*, 132 (MDH, 16).

Cambridge University Press

0521023351 - The Spanish Church and the Papacy in the Thirteenth Century

Peter Linehan

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The Spanish Church and the Papacy*

victors of that particular engagement. He was not prepared to release them from the oaths which they had taken to join the Fifth Crusade.<sup>1</sup> Nor would he assign to Spanish purposes the profits of the twentieth; and in February–March 1218 he made a further effort to chivvy the province of Toledo and the rest of the Spanish Church into taking positive action.<sup>2</sup>

When this new approach failed, Honorius tried other methods: the appointment in October 1218 of two papal collectors, Master Cintius, and his chaplain Huguicio, two canons of St Peter's.<sup>3</sup> But, if anything, the cure proved worse than the disease, for Honorius had made no allowance for the villainy of Archbishop Rodrigo. In January 1218 Rodrigo had been invested with legatine authority of a martial character throughout the kingdoms of Leon, Castile and Aragon, in connexion with the fresh Christian offensive;<sup>4</sup> and now, combining his new status with his native wit, he teamed up with Huguicio, to their own shameless advantage and the Church's considerable loss. In February of the year 1219 – a year of disastrous harvests throughout Europe, Spain included<sup>5</sup> – Honorius demonstrated his affection for the archbishop by granting him half of the income of the twentieth in the dioceses of Toledo and Segovia, adding airily (and in the light of later developments, most inadvisably) that there was no need for Rodrigo to tax his conscience overmuch about calculating his share of the takings *ad unguem*.<sup>6</sup> And the recipient was evidently still held in high regard twelve months after, for then the entire uncollected

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* appendix I, 7; 997 (MDH, 95, 134); Herculano, *História de Portugal*, iv, 80 ff. For the papal attitude, cf. Goñi Gaztambide, *Historia de la Bula de la Cruzada*, 133 ff., except that Goñi refers to a tax of 20% rather than 5% (p. 135).

<sup>2</sup> *Reg. Hon.* III, 1116, 1547 (MDH, 162, 182).

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 1634 (MDH, 187).

<sup>4</sup> AC Toledo, I.4.N.1.20 = *Reg. Hon.* III, 1042 (MDH, 148). Cf. Goñi, *Historia*, 141 ff., according to whom Rodrigo had obtained 'el oficio de legado ordinario en España durante diez años' in 1215 (p. 143): an allegation for which the earliest authority dates from the year 1253: BN, vit. 15–5, fos. 22v, 33r. Rodrigo does not figure as legate in the Papal Registers before Jan. 1218: cf. Zimmermann, *Die päpstliche Legation*, 100, 244. The legatine status accorded to Archbishop Estevão of Braga in Jan. 1219 probably had the same quasi-military quality: ADB, Gav. II das Igrejas, 194; *Rerum Memorabilium* I, 66; Cunha, *História ecclesiástica dos arcebispos de Braga*, II, 96.

<sup>5</sup> 'Per totam Teutonium, Allemanniam, Frantiam et usque Ispaniam excussa fuerunt grana': *Aegidii Aureavallensis Gesta Episcoporum Leodiensium*, 119.

<sup>6</sup> *Reg. Hon.* III, 1864 (MDH, 207) = AC Toledo, A.6.H.1.10a; 11b; 11c (three copies).



Cambridge University Press

0521023351 - The Spanish Church and the Papacy in the Thirteenth Century

Peter Linehan

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The Spanish Church and Honorius III*

balance of the tax from the whole area subject to his legatine jurisdiction was made over to him:<sup>1</sup> an act of papal liberality which was doubtless prompted by favourable reports on the archbishop submitted by Huguicio.

Huguicio had every reason for giving the archbishop a good press. In March 1218 he had been appointed to the Toledo canonry which Rodrigo had conferred eight years before upon another Roman clerk;<sup>2</sup> and between then and July 1220, when the scales at last fell from the pope's eyes, the *simplex nuntius* passed himself off as a full-blown legate, committed *multa enormia et abusiva*, and received various grants from the see of Segovia, of which Rodrigo had recently been given charge.<sup>3</sup> When, eventually, all this came to light, Honorius acted purposefully, for once. Rodrigo was administered a stinging rebuke and informed that his stock at the Curia had fallen sharply.<sup>4</sup> The archbishop of Tarragona was instructed to investigate and, on the very same day, 1 July, the pope called Rodrigo's fellow countryman, Cardinal Pelayo of Albano, to render account of his receipts from the Hospitallers of Paris. Honorius suspected, perhaps, that the archbishop's chicanery had even wider ramifications.<sup>5</sup> Retribution was swift. On 4 July Rodrigo was deprived of his income from the twentieth on the grounds that his proposed campaign against the Moors – which, as the pope now remembered it, had provided the justification for the grant<sup>6</sup> – had never materialised.

In fact, Honorius's memory played him false. The grant of six months before had been made on account of Rodrigo's past achievements and not in expectation of future action.<sup>7</sup> But inconsistency – the mark of all of Honorius's dealings with the Spanish Church – was

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* 2488 (MDH, 269) = AC Toledo, A.6.H.1.10c. On the previous day, 4 Feb. 1220, an identical mandate had been sent to the archbishop: AC Toledo, A.6.H.1.8d; 10 (two copies); and Sparago of Tarragona and other prelates within Rodrigo's legatine jurisdiction were ordered to render him *auxilium personarum et rerum*: AC Toledo, A.6.H.1.8b; 9 (MDH, 268); AHA, *Index dels Indices*, fo. 567v. On 5 Feb. they were directed to pay Rodrigo the balance of the tax: AC Toledo, A.6.H.1.8c.

<sup>2</sup> *Reg. Hon. III*, 1181 (MDH, 167); Potthast, 3921 (MDhI, 420).

<sup>3</sup> *Reg. Hon. III*, 2516, 2716, 414, 2700 (MDH, 300, 326, 43, 323); Colmenares, 185 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Reg. Hon. III*, 2516 (MDH, 300).

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* 2515 (MDH, 299); 2517.

<sup>6</sup> 'Non tamen pro eo quod processeras sed quia procedere intendebas': *ibid.* 2525 (MDH, 301).

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* 2488: 'Attendentes expensas et discrimina et labores quos... archiepiscopus... aggressus est Mauros viriliter impugnando' (MDH, 269).

Cambridge University Press

0521023351 - The Spanish Church and the Papacy in the Thirteenth Century

Peter Linehan

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The Spanish Church and the Papacy*

of less consequence than the fact that the discovery of the scandal dispelled whatever illusions he may still have entertained regarding Rodrigo's integrity. For, though he managed to escape the graver consequences of his actions,<sup>1</sup> Rodrigo would have to wait for Honorius's death for his stock at the Curia to rise again. His legatine status lapsed,<sup>2</sup> and once again Spain was required to contribute to the Fifth Crusade.<sup>3</sup>

Historians have not paid due attention to this archiepiscopal fall from grace.<sup>4</sup> Yet by July 1220 the pope already had other good grounds for despairing of Rodrigo. An earlier incident had shown that the archbishop's zeal for *libertas ecclesiastica*, which Innocent III had entrusted to his care in 1208,<sup>5</sup> was considerably less fervent than his determination not to fall out with the civil power. This incident arose out of Fernando III's refusal to surrender certain property which his grandfather, Alfonso VIII, had bequeathed to the church of Osma. In the autumn of 1217 the bishop of Osma, Melendo, complained in person to the pope and caused Bishop Sancho of Zaragoza and two archdeacons of that church to be commissioned to investigate the affair. The delegates, domiciled in Aragon, found for Melendo, but the very freedom from Castilian pressure which enabled them to reach a decision unfavourable to Fernando prevented its implementation. On-the-spot assistance was needed, and so, in April 1218, they engaged the archbishop of Toledo to act for them. To be required to read his king a lecture was a nightmare for any medieval prelate, and that duty had now devolved upon Rodrigo. He failed the acid test. After some delay he sent the judges a plaintive reply. He had urged the king and queen 'often and diligently' to accept the decision, he said. But he had been unable to bring himself to impose sanctions when the royal couple ignored his admonitions, 'on account of the scandal and not inconsiderable diffi-

<sup>1</sup> In Sept. 1220 the allegation of the chapter of Toledo that Rodrigo's grant of the canonry to Huguicio had been made *extra numerum* was referred for a decision to Bishop Domingo of Plasencia, an old friend of the archbishop: AHN, cod. 996B, fo. 44v (MDH, 319); Rodericus Toletanus, *De Rebus Hispaniae*, 202.

<sup>2</sup> The last occasion on which the pope addressed him as legate seems to have been in Nov. 1221. By Sept. 1225, at the latest, he had ceased to use the title: AHN, 3019/1 (MDH, 381); AC Ávila, perg. 12.

<sup>3</sup> AHN, 2129/15; Linehan, *HS*, xx, 180 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Mansilla mentions the papal reprimand, but not its consequences: *Iglesia*, 54.

<sup>5</sup> Potthast, 3680 (MDhI, 398).