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Abstract

At the death of his superior in 1207, Dominic of Osma was just another canon from a cathedral in the Kingdom of Castile. He had served in his cathedral chapter for a little less than a decade, but already had traveled to Denmark on official royal missions and been part of a major reform of his home diocese of Osma. At his own death in 1221, Dominic had changed Latin Christendom forever. His Order of Preachers would in time be populated by men like Thomas Aquinas, Albertus Magnus, and the (in)famous inquisitors Bernard Gui and Tomas de Torquemada; his Order would change the world. For all of the hagiographies of Dominic, little is definitively known about his early life. For all of the modern scholarship dedicated to the Dominicans, little is definitively known about the founder of that Order. This MA thesis aims to fill those gaps. The study will be a reconstruction of St. Dominic’s pre-missionizing days (that is, before 1207). To achieve this task, the study will employ modern scholarship to reconstruct those parts of Dominic’s life which the sources only suggest and reference in passing. The reconstruction of Dominic’s life is a crucial task and will aid considerably in reappraisals of the early Order of Preachers and especially in estimations of the orthodox catholic presence in the Languedoc before and during the Albigensian Crusade.
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Chapter I: Introduction: Questions, Sources, and Methods

Thanks to the deep friendship he had for us when we were fulfilling a more modest office, we had proof of his sanctity in the admirable testimony of his life; and now competent witnesses have given us a full certification about the real character of the miracles about which many have spoken. Moreover, in union with the Lord’s flock given to our care, we are confident that, by God’s mercy, we can be aided by his suffrages, and that we who merited to enjoy the consolation of his very gracious friendship here on earth, may now have the benefit of his powerful patronage in heaven.¹

This study will examine the early life of St. Dominic of Osma. Its goal will be to determine what can be definitively known about the early life of a single, albeit exceptional, canon from the kingdom of Castile. The study begins with Dominic’s birth, circa 1170/4, and ends with the death of Dominic’s mentor Diego d’Acebo in 1207. Dominic’s identity is the focus of this study of his early life. It will be demonstrated that three words tersely summarize Dominic’s identity: Castilian canon regular. His vocation was that of a reforming canon; his cultural background was that of a Castilian in an age of major expansion and reformation.

Many modern biographies of St. Dominic exist. Pierre Madonnet attempted to chart Dominic’s “life and work” in the early part of the twentieth century; M-H. Vicaire did so from the 1950’s until his death in late 1993. William Hinnebusch included a strong section on Dominic and the early order in his History of the Dominican Order in the 1950’s. Simon Tugwell currently publishes nearly-annual articles in the Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum dedicated to the same cause, supplementing them with other papers and editions of source materials.

texts in the *Monumenta Ordinis Praedicatorum Historica*. All of the twentieth century
masters of early Dominican history were themselves Dominicans.\(^2\) A secular approach has
never been attempted and this study therefore represents a unique attempt to reappraise
Dominic’s early life.

Scholarship unfortunately seems content to leave the study of Dominic for
Dominicans and prefers instead to ponder other Dominican topics: be it the Inquisition or
the theology of St. Thomas Aquinas. This study aims at a new appraisal of St. Dominic’s
early life and work. The study will be a biographical and hagiographical analysis and will
attempt to provide an updated version of Dominic’s story, based on the excellent sources
from the period. So, while this task is not a new one, it is in drastic need of revision and
reconstruction.

Problematically, the sources from Dominic himself are few: despite Dominic’s
affinity for an Augustinian lifestyle, he left us no *Confessions*. We do have three letters from
Dominic and considerable sources from the early Order itself. Jordan of Saxony’s *Libellus*,
letters written in Dominic’s hand, and the *Acta Canonizationis* serve as vital early sources
for the life of Dominic. That said, the sources that survive from Dominic demonstrate *ex
silentio* that his concerns were practical and not literary. The sources from the early
brethren demonstrate a similar tendency. As Leonard Boyle observed: “When Dominic of
Osma died at Bologna on 6 August 1221, his brethren at Bologna and elsewhere saw no
particular reason to make a fuss over him, but got on instead with the job he had given

\(^2\) Although in need of an update, an excellent bibliographical reference for Dominican studies is available and
contains entries on all three scholars mentioned above; v., Charles R. Auth, *A Dominican Bibliography and
them.” In fact, it was only at the insistence of those who had not known Dominic that Jordan of Saxony, Dominic’s successor as magister ordinis, composed a “little book on the beginning of the Order of Friars Preachers”.

After Dominic’s canonization in 1233, the Order’s hagiography explodes: the vitae fratrum of Gerard of Frachet; the Legenda Sancti Dominici penned by Peter of Ferrand, Constantine of Orvieto, Jean de Mailly, and Humbert of Romans; the life of Peter of Verona, also styled “Peter the Martyr”; the life of Albertus Magnus; the life of St. Raymond de Peñafort. It is clear that after Dominic’s canonization, the role of sanctity within the literature of the Preachers increases dramatically. No study has been made of the influence of Dominic’s hagiography on the hagiography of later Preachers. Because Dominic’s biography touches so many different topics, the importance of this project becomes self-evident. A new reconstruction of Dominic’s early life is clearly necessary before any future examinations of Dominican hagiography can be truly understood.

Themes and Questions

Dominic was born in the early 1170’s in a village called Caleruega, in Castile. In the diocese of Osma and in the ecclesiastical province of Toledo, Dominic’s little village was at the heart of Castile’s ecclesiastical culture, as will be shown definitively below. During most of Dominic’s lifetime, Castile was an independent kingdom.

---

5 The specific date of Dominic’s birth is handled in detail below, on p. 70.
6 Vicaire makes special note this in an appendix to his St. Dominic and his times, but focuses more on Castile’s relations with other major kingdoms in the period and neglects Castile itself. (Marie-Humbert Vicaire, St. Dominic and his times, trans. Kathleen Pond, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964), 408-10.) More helpful on this situation are a few paragraphs from Linehan’s Spain, 1157-1300, a Partible Inheritance, (Malden, MA:
was part of Castile-Leon governed by the emperor Alfonso VII; after Dominic died, Castile and Leon reunited under Ferdinand III.\(^7\) Dominic's life and times were marked by his geography—both spiritual and political. We might speculate that, as a Castilian, concepts of oppositional identity—Christians vs. Muslims; Catholic vs. Heterodox—would have meant a great deal to Dominic and likely defined his religious vocation. As a reform-minded Catholic, Dominic would definitely have embraced the care of souls as a fundamental formula for both his own salvation and that of his co-religionists.

The thematic nature of Dominic's apostolate colors any reading of his life and the tone adopted by his hagiographers bears this out explicitly. Even modern biographies and histories report that Dominic had a single cause: “His one quest was for the salvation of souls.”\(^8\) The most obvious objection raised against any modern and secular study inevitably remains this: how can any biography of a reformer be written without engaging in some degree of polemic, however incidental it may be? From that objection follows this one: how can a history of St. Dominic account for events which lack any contemporary historical source? A new approach is clearly required.

This study will attempt to recreate a history. The hagiography of the order presents a great beginning to the story, but it is not a complete story. Of vital importance for the study of Dominic's early life is the context of his upbringing in Castile. Given that no study of the reign of Alfonso VIII and the Church in Castile exists, Chapter II of this work will

---

\(^7\)For an introductory overview of the recombination of Castile and Leon under Ferdinand III circa 1230, see: Malcolm Barber, *The Two Cities, Medieval Europe 1050-1320*, (New York: Routledge, 1992), 351-4.

\(^8\) Pierre Mandonnet, *St. Dominic and His Work*, trans. Mary Benedicta Larkin, (St. Louis, MO: 1944), 63.
examine important themes and trends which inform a proper understanding of Dominic’s early life. In order to understand what most likely happened in Dominic’s early life, Chapter II argues for what was happening around Dominic during that period of his life. By situating Dominic’s life into its historical context we can infer what course his early life took.

**The Sources for the Life of Dominic**

The sources for the life of Dominic are similar in quantity and quality to the sources for many of his contemporaries. Although the documentation for Dominic (and many other important figures) is dwarfed by the corpus concerning Thomas Becket, it is nevertheless considerable. In the extant sources, we have as much (if not qualitatively more) about Dominic’s early life as we do about that of Francis of Assisi. Further still, we know much about Dominic’s early patrons and followers and about the events which surrounded his earliest preaching missions. We know that Dominic directly served at least three bishops, and perhaps even a fourth: Martin Bazán of Osma, Diego d’Acebo of Osma, Fulk of Toulouse, and perhaps even Raimundo II of Palencia. He received the direct patronage of Simon De Montfort. He most likely knew personally three papal legates; Martin Bazán likewise figures largely in similar status as papal judge-delegate. Clearly there is much material from which the study can draw.

---

9 Dominic’s involvement in the dioceses of Palencia, Osma, and Toulouse will be handled individually in Chapter III.
11 It is clear that Peter de Castelnau, Arnaud Amery, and Master Ralph were all present at the Council of Twelve Abbots, which is dealt with in more detail below, in Chapter III. Martin Bazan’s role as a papal judge-delegate for the Huesca-Lerida dispute is handled more below, in Chapter II.
“In spite of our excellent sources, the historical image of Dominic was distorted soon after his death and adapted, especially by Dominicans, to suit current trends of fashion.”\textsuperscript{12} Within twenty-five years of his canonization, there were at least four full *Legenda Sancti Dominici* and an early history of the Order of Preachers; add to that a considerable body of cartulary and epistolographical evidence and we have good material to start with. The sources each possess their own challenges but, for the most part, those challenges are typical for other sources from the same genres. A discussion of the major contemporary sources about Dominic is crucial and they need to be examined before a deeper inquiry about Dominic’s life can take place.

The earliest known notation of Dominic of Osma is his signature on a charter from the chapter at Osma from 1199 confirming the possession of capital previously given by the chapter.\textsuperscript{13} Similarly, his name appears on a number of other charters and letters of similar type. Of these, the greatest window into Dominic’s mentality is offered by the three letters which can be definitively attributed to Dominic himself. Two of these letters are letters of reconciliation, written on behalf of their bearers (i.e. reformed heretics); the third letter is an exhortation to the nuns of Madrid toward greater perfection in Christ.\textsuperscript{14} The letters demonstrate how deeply inculcated into reform Dominic was: the penances imposed in the first two letters are strict and severe; the exhortations of the third demonstrate Dominic’s deep concern for the apostolicity of his subordinates’ lives. These letters and other charters


\textsuperscript{13} MDSD, 4-5.

\textsuperscript{14} MDSD, 16-8, 52-3, 126-7.
are recorded in the *Monumenta Diplomatica Sancti Dominici*, which comprises volume twenty-five of the *MOPH*.\(^{15}\)

The earliest literary description of his life and work is from his successor as *magister ordinis*, Jordan of Saxony; Jordan’s *Libellus de Principiis Ordinis Praedicatorum* is the earliest historical text produced by the order.\(^{16}\) Jordan most likely composed either early in his magistracy after 1221 or during his stewardship of Dominic’s canonization investigations. The text was most likely composed in 1221/2 and was revised and published to coincide with Dominic’s canonization in 1232/3.\(^{17}\) The text seems considerably more in tune with modern scholarly writing than the later tradition, due to the absence of an abundance of miracles and supernatural happenings in the text. Where miracles do play a role, they are described tersely and occur in appropriate chronological situation. Jordan does append a number of miracles to the end of the text, which suggests that these miracle stories were added in response to the canonization drive and were not part of the original text. Further still, Jordan’s text concerns not only Dominic, but several of the earliest Preachers and also Dominic’s mentor Diego d’Acebo, and it further documents much of the Order’s early history.\(^{18}\)

---

\(^{15}\) It should be noted that an earlier collection also appears in the *MOPH*, but that text was superseded by the later collection edited by Koudelka and Loenertz.


\(^{17}\) Tugwell revises his earlier dating scheme and seems to concur that Jordan’s text was published/finished and copying begun in 1233, but that a majority of the text’s composition took place in 1221/2. Simon Tugwell, “Schéma Chronologique de la vie de Saint Dominique,” in *Domenico di Caleruega e la nascita dell’ordine dei frati predicatori: atti del XLI Convegno storico internazionale*, ed. Enrico Menesto, (Spoletto: Fondazione Centro Italiano di Studi sull’Alto Medioevo, 2005), 23. It should be noted for the sake of disclosure that Tugwell premiered this “Schéma Chronologique” for Jordan of Saxony in his “Notes” for the *AFP* in 1998. See now, Simon Tugwell, “Notes on the Life of Dominic V: The Dating of Jordan’s *Libellus*”, *AFP*, 68, (1998), 5-33.

At the behest of Pope Gregory IX, two inquiries into Dominic’s life and work were held in Bologna and Toulouse. Both inquiries were mandated in order to document the memories of those who knew Dominic personally. They date to the summer of 1233, at Bologna from circa July 13 to before August 19 and at Toulouse from August 19 to sometime before July 4, 1234 when Gregory IX issued his bull of canonization. Of those brought before the commission, several were Preachers but many were private citizens whose only connection to the Preachers was in the early Dominicans’ ecclesiastical work.

We can add Gregory IX’s canonization bull, Fons sapientiae, to this corpus of important texts.

There are several texts which can be dated, with varying degrees of certainty, to the thirty-five years or so after Dominic’s death. These texts predate or circumdate Humbert of Romans’ programmatic imposition of liturgical uniformity and thus serve as iterations of the earliest recorded memories of St. Dominic’s life. There are three Legenda of St. Dominic: the Gesta et Miracula Sancti of Jean de Mailly; the Vitae Fratrum of Gerard de Frachet and the Liber de epilogorum of Bartholomew of Trent. Of the three Legenda Sancti Dominici

---

19 The locations of Toulouse and Bologna are much more important for Dominic’s later biography. Suffice it here to say that Toulouse was Dominic’s home from 1207-1217, during the formative years of his apostolate. Likewise, Bologna was the scene of much of Dominic’s later life, from 1218-1221. On Dominic’s time at Toulouse, see: Simon Tugwell, “Notes on the Life of Dominic VII”, Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum, (2003), 5-69; Simon Tugwell, “Notes on the Life of Dominic VIII”, Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum, (2003), 70-109. On Dominic’s time at Bologna, see: Simon Tugwell, “Notes on the Life of Dominic III”, Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum, (1996), 5-154.

20 The dates for the canonization processes are given in the text of the processes themselves and antedated by Gregory IX’s bull. The letter of mandate for the Bologna process is dated July 13; the letter which commanded the Toulouse process is dated August 19; Gregory’s bull is dated to July 4 of the following year. These dates are readily found in both the Latin and English-translated versions of each of the texts. The Latin can be found here: Acta Canonizationis Sancti Dominici, ed. R.P. Angeli Walz, in MOPH, 16, (Rome: Institutum Historicum Fratrum Praedicatorum, 1935), 89-194 [Hereafter, ACD], the individual dates are found on pages 117, 172, and 194. See also: Francis Lehner, St. Dominic, biographical documents, (Washington, DC: The Thomist Press, 1964), 95-146.

21 While the text was edited for the MDS, a new critical edition is provided by Tugwell in: Humbert of Romans, Humberti de Romanis Legendae Sancti Dominici, ed. Tugwell, (Rome: Institutum Historicum Fratrum Praedicatorum, 2008), 563-75.
composed within 25 years of Dominic’s canonization, two were written by famous
Preachers and the question of the third’s identity has only recently been settled.\textsuperscript{22} The
other three are hagiographical collections and are excellent sources for the study of
thirteenth century hagiography, but leave much to be desired concerning the life of
Dominic. The \textit{Legenda} composed within that span are varied. Peter of Ferrand's \textit{Legenda} is
the earliest, followed a decade later by that of Constantine of Orvieto, the noted canonist,
and finally one (in two redactions) by Humbert of Romans in the late 1240’s and 1250’s.

The earliest legend is attributed to an otherwise unknown “Peter of Ferrand”, and is
a close redaction of Jordan of Saxony’s text with a few additions and minor clarifications. It
can be reasonably dated between 1233 and 1241, but this is better narrowed down to
1238-1241, after Jordan of Saxony had died in a shipwreck.\textsuperscript{23} It is likely that Peter of
Ferrand was a Spaniard, like Dominic, but this cannot be confirmed.\textsuperscript{24} He was probably also
a Dominican, but this too cannot be definitively known. Peter’s narrative is more “folkloric"
than that of Jordan of Saxony—the number of miracles and supernatural occurrences is far
greater in Peter’s text and these are inserted into the text, rather than appended as in
Jordan’s text. Unfortunately, much of the miraculous material infused into the \textit{Legenda}
which Peter composed is directly excerpted from the \textit{Acta Canonizationis}.\textsuperscript{25} The literary
qualities of Ferrand’s narrative are consistent with the earlier tradition, and he is a
relatively reliable source. In perpetuating the hagiographical tradition, it is likely that
Ferrand’s legend was used as the first liturgical source for the Order. This is demonstrated

\textsuperscript{22} Simon Tugwell, “Petrus Ferrandi and his Legenda of St. Dominic”, \textit{AFP}, (2007), 20-100.
\textsuperscript{23} Tugwell, “Petrus Ferrandi”, 98-99.
\textsuperscript{24} Tugwell, “Petrus Ferrandi”, 60.
\textsuperscript{25} A comparative analysis has yet to be performed, but cursory analyses demonstrate the influence of the \textit{Acta}
on Peter Ferrand’s \textit{Legenda}. The interstices between the early Dominican legends and their sources will be
pursued in future studies.
by the coincidence between the composition of the *Legenda* and Dominic’s canonization. The lack of any other extent hagiographical texts from the period further suggests the importance of Peter’s *Legenda* for the early Order. Effectively, the survival of the legend may well indicate that the *Legenda* was important to the early Order and was considered authoritative enough to be preserved and used as a source for later narratives.

The later liturgical use of Constantine of Orvieto and Humbert of Romans’ texts suggests that Peter of Ferrand’s was similarly liturgical. The dating of Peter’s text coincides neatly with Dominic’s canonization and suggests that Peter’s was a quick composition designed to be used for the early Order’s liturgical celebrations of Dominic. That Peter’s text was superseded, first by Constantine’s and then by Humbert’s, makes sense if we consider Peter’s text to be something of an *ad hoc* composition for the early cult.

Sometime around 1245, Bartholomew of Trent composed his *Liber epilogorum in gesta Sanctorum*, a text primarily concerned with presenting edifying material about a number of saints. The function of the text seems relatively apparent from the stories collected by Bartholomew: by collecting stories connected to liturgical celebrations, Bartholomew was presenting “preachable materials” for use in sermons and for the edification of clerics and literate laity. Compared even to Peter of Ferrand’s text, Bartholomew’s employment of miracle-stories is overwhelming: the first 60 lines are a biography, 150 are what might be called “miracle chronicles”; even in the 60 lines of

---


27 Here, I mean the lists of miracle-stories inserted into or appended to hagiographies. Their semi-chronological ordering and their intent to catalog miracle-stories performed by the saints being described makes them appear to be chronicles of sorts, only they describe the miraculous rather than the mundane.
biography, nearly one-third still describe miracles from Dominic's early life and career. Included among these stories are the story of the miracle of the book, the baptism miracle, and the miraculous vision granted to Dominic’s mother. Each of these episodes will be dealt with below in Chapter II. Still, we can positively assert that Bartholomew’s collection is a crucial moment in the sources, not least because of its importance for Gerard de Frachet’s *Vitae Fratrum*, de Voragine’s *Legenda Aurea* and possibly even Jean de Mailly’s *Gesta et Miracula Sanctorum*.²⁸

Jean de Mailly’s *Vita de Sancti Dominici*, like the selection from the *Liber Epilogorum* from Bartholomew of Trent, comes from a collection of hagiographical vignettes.²⁹ The account of Dominic which is presented represents yet another early hagiographical collection from Dominicans. It is most likely that the text originally existed in two recensions. The latest additions to the chronicle in the autographed manuscript of the chronicle [in which the *Gesta* is found] stops at 1254; the *Gesta et Miracula Sancti*, was first published shortly after 1225, a second edition appeared a few years later, in 1243. “The earlier autographe dadditions in the manuscript of the chronicle stop before 1254; the *Deeds and Miracles of the Saints*, published for the first time after 1225, saw a second

---

²⁸ BTLE, xxxiii-xliv.
²⁹ In the larger, complete text, Dominic appears in the text on his traditional feast day: August 4.
edition some years after, perhaps in 1243.\textsuperscript{30} The details added by Jean de Mailly are not extraordinary: mostly his changes are those of style and not substance.\textsuperscript{31}

Constantine of Orvieto probably composed his \textit{Legenda} “during the winter of 1246/1247 and it was approved by the General Chapter in 1248”.\textsuperscript{32} His text also seems liturgically-oriented, like Peter of Ferrand’s, and also lacks \textit{lectio} markings in its only critical edition. Although the use of Constantine’s \textit{Legenda} is probably not wholly liturgical, it nevertheless represents a key refinement of much of the traditional narrative. It is clear that Constantine drew on Jordan’s \textit{Libellus} and on the \textit{Acta Canonizationis}, as well as partially on the \textit{Legenda} of Peter Ferrand.\textsuperscript{33} It is also worth noting that Constantine’s text is considerably longer than Jordan or Peter’s texts and includes much of their material reprinted verbatim.\textsuperscript{34} As a whole, Constantine is a relatively reliable collator and collector, but he offers little which is wholly original. For that, we must turn to Humbert of Romans.


\textsuperscript{31}The only published edition of his text is that found in the nineteenth century work by M-D. Chapotin entitled \textit{Les Dominicains de Auxerre}; the edition is usable but in need of revision: Jean de Mailly, “Vie de Saint Dominique par Jean de Mailly”, in M-D. Chapotin, \textit{Les Dominicains de Auxerre},(Paris: A. Picard, 1892). [Hereafter, JMV] John Cochrane is presently at work preparing editions of the medieval French versions of Jean de Mailly’s legend of Dominic, among others, but these works were not ready for even preliminary consultation before the submission date of this thesis.

\textsuperscript{32}H-C. Scheeben, “Einfuehrung”, \textit{MOPH}, XVI, 283-4.

\textsuperscript{33}H-C. Scheeben, “Einfuehrung”, \textit{MOPH}, XVI, 273-81.

\textsuperscript{34}In the printed editions of the \textit{MOPH}, Constantine’s \textit{Legenda} is fifteen pages longer than Peter’s and, even then, the edition does not reprint the excerpted pieces of the Peter’s \textit{Legenda} which are appended to the end of Constantine’s \textit{Legenda}—the edition reprints only the chapter headings! Even without those reprints, it is still several pages longer than Jordan’s \textit{Libellus}. While the length of the accounts themselves may not be indicative of their importance, their length certainly would have made their accounts seem more authoritative because of their inclusion of previously unwritten material. In doing so, it is likely that Constantine’s was the preferred text in many communities until it was superseded by Humbert of Romans’ texts.
The fourth free-standing *Legenda* was written by Humbert of Romans, fifth Dominican *magister ordinis*. The earliest redaction dates to sometime after 1246,\(^35\) with the final version dating to after 1255-56.\(^36\) The two redactions have recently been edited by Simon Tugwell in an authoritative volume of the *MOPH*. His division between the two redactions permits much closer scrutiny of the evolution of the source materials and allows us to glimpse the nature of Humbert’s quest for an authoritative and comprehensive *Legenda Sancti Dominici*. As mentioned above, the *Legenda prima* (i.e. “the earliest redaction”) is significantly shorter than the *Legenda maior* (“the final version”) and dates, by Tugwell’s estimation, to nearly a decade earlier. Humbert’s composition of two redactions and his inclusion of multiple sources fits with our understanding of the man himself and Tugwell rightly observed: “Humbert [of Romans] was an unusually scrupulous editor”.\(^37\) The division of the *Legenda maior* into *lectiones* demonstrates the growing maturity of Dominic's cult in the latter half of the thirteenth century.\(^38\)

The final member of what we might call this ‘first generation’ of hagiographical sources is the *Vitae Fratrum* of Gerard de Frachet.\(^39\) Gerard wrote as the result of Humbert

\(^36\) Ibid, 102-3.
\(^37\) Tugwell, “Petrus Ferrandi”, 60.
\(^39\) This distinction between ‘first’ and ‘second’ generation hagiographical sources is mostly for convenience but shows that a significant gap exists within the era of Dominican history under Humbert of Romans’ considerable influence (Humbert died in 1277). This seems to demonstrate that a degree of imposed uniformity in the legend of Dominic was possible under the sway of a strong Master General. Later sources demonstrate that in dredging up so much material on the life of Dominic in the process of researching the hagiography of Dominic, Humbert had caused considerable material to surface which was to be used by later authors. Dietrich, Cecilia, the Pseudo-Dietrich anonymous author of the *Nine Ways of Prayer* and Bernard Gui would be able to tap into the wealth of refreshed memories in their respective communities. Thus, I believe that the intellectual largesse summoned but kept dormant by Humbert might very well be in evidence in the second generation sources. Therefore, it seems foolish to exclude them *a priori*; rather, the later texts may be
of Romans’ open request for “any miracle or edifying occurrence happening in the Order, or concerning it”\textsuperscript{40} and produced it for the edification of the Order. “Every detail helps [the historian] to piece out his information, and without the \textit{Vitae Fratrum} our knowledge of early Dominican history, early difficulties, early divisions and reconciliations, would be meagre [sic] indeed.”\textsuperscript{41} Gerard’s text contains many miracles but also provides biographical entries for many of the early Preachers. As such, it is helpful but not authoritative. Thus, in the earliest texts, we can see a desire to preserve the memory of Dominic and the early community of Preachers which he gathered around him. A critical edition of Gerard’s text is available in volume I/II of the \textit{MOPH}.\textsuperscript{42}

Taken together, these “three” \textit{Legenda} offer a window into the progression of interpretations of the biography of Dominic. The \textit{Liber epilogorum} of Bartholomew of Trent and the \textit{Vitae Fratrum} offer a few reworded notions about Dominic, but add little to the tradition other than contributing to our understanding of the minds of their authors. Gerard de Frachet is redeemed a little because of his short hagiographical entries about the other brothers who were part of the early Preachers’ community. The \textit{Acta Canonizationis} provide considerable witness to the development of Dominic’s postmortem reputation in those two locations where his activities appear to have had so much staying power. The focus of each of the \textit{Legenda} shifts, if only a little, in each edition and the texts offer some

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{42} Gerard de Frachet, \textit{Vitae Fratrum}, ed. \textit{, MOPH, I/II}, (Rome: Institutum Historicum Fratrum Praedicatorum, 1897), 65-98. [Herafter, \textit{GFVF}]
\end{footnotesize}
insight into the ways in which the early Dominicans wrote and thought about Dominic. The early sources on Dominic are certainly our most reliable, if only because the memories of the Preachers around Dominic during his life were least likely to corrode through oral transfer, but there are others which merit our consideration.

Dominican hagiographical sources from the latter half of the thirteenth and early decades of the fourteenth century are also important. These ‘second generation’ Dominican sources allow us to access latent community memories. Some sources are necessarily of more value than others. The most difficult problem posed by the later sources is that they add little which is not legendary or miraculous. The result of later traditions involved some new material but the occurrence of additions of any importance is infrequent at best. The true importance of these later sources is to demonstrate the continuity of Dominic’s hagiography and the consistency of his character.

James de Voragine’s *Legenda Aurea*, while certainly of great importance for medieval studies as a whole, does not aid the investigation of Dominic’s life by adding any detail. Much of the work is derivative and most of its content on Dominic is of little further value, save as a confirmation of earlier trends’ status as part of the hagiographical canon concerning Dominic’s life. The text was most likely composed circa 1267, and some have argued for its place as quasi-populist literature. “By the time the first printing presses were established in Europe, the *Legenda* had already been something of a best-seller for 175 years. There is doubtless some exaggeration in the old claim that late-medieval scribes produced more copies of the *Legenda* than of any other book except the Bible, but the

---

manuscripts which have survived until our own time leave no doubt about its dominant position in a very popular genre." As a source for medieval hagiography, the text is constantly ripe for study; as a source for the life of Dominic, the information is not particularly helpful.

Rodrigo de Cerrato’s entry on Dominic—in his larger compilation, *Vitae Sanctorum*—adds details which seem to have circulated around Caleruega and Osma in the early/middle thirteenth century. Further, the text’s translation into vernacular Castilian might suggest that it enjoyed more lay-popularity than the clerically-oriented Humbertine texts. Pedro Venancio Diego Carro correctly dates the text to the period between 1270-6, based on an autographed manuscript from within that period. De Cerrato’s text therefore seems to contain more valuable information than some of its predecessors, but most of it appears legendary with the exception of a few highly-localized details. The qualities and details of the Castilian Spanish seem to correspond mostly with the Latin, although a thorough analysis by a qualified linguist has yet to be undertaken and would require more space than can be allowed here.

---

47 “Firmando Fray Rodrigo, en Caleruega, en 1272, estaban en lo cierto quienes suponían que el Códice de Segovia era posterior a los otros dos conocidos, y señalaban el año de 1270, según Mamachi, o algunos años después, como fecha de su composición. Por lo escrito, debemos conceder que lo termino en 1276. Lo que añade y cambia es lo que le diferencia de los otros, después de 1272 o en ese mismo año.” Carro, *Domingo de Osma, Historia Documentada*, 770.
48 The most noteworthy examples are the mention of Dominic’s brother Mames’ preaching at Dominic’s newly-founded shrine and the construction of the Church at Dominic’s birthplace.
49 Carro’s book has prints of the MSS from which he was editing (the same as Mamachi) and provides a considerable, if dated introduction to the work. Additionally, his parallel edition of the Castilian translation and the Latin text itself make the text readily usable for further comparison between the Latin and the vernacular, lending an additional aid to interpreting the precise meaning of the text.
Dietrich von Apolda wrote a text about Dominic and his deeds —entitled *Libellus de vita et obitu et miraculis Sancti Dominici et de Ordine Praedicatorum quem instituit* in some manuscripts— and seems to have tapped into some of the remaining oral tradition about Dominic. As a whole, his *Libellus* is consistent with much of the tradition from the Dominicans and Dietrich’s narrative does not display considerable difference, either in his choice of words or in his sequencing of the narrative. Dietrich’s major contribution to the study of Dominic’s life is his curiously specific notation of the year (1170) in which Dominic’s parents were married.\(^5^0\) The text was most likely composed in the 1290’s.\(^5^1\)

A nun of Saint Agnes in Bologna called Cecilia composed a text of additional importance for our understanding of the first century of Dominic’s memory called the *Miracula Sancti Dominici*. The miracles themselves are a complicated text to employ in a biographical project concerning Dominic. Despite the fact that the text dates from 1288-1290, Cecilia’s memory of Dominic makes clear that the communal memory of Dominicans was still potent near the turn of the fourteenth century. In his edition, Walz never overtly states that the importance of the text is that it allows access to the communal memory of the Bologna community, yet there is a clear connection between Cecilia as a senior sister within the convent of St. Agnes at Bologna and the community memory of the Dominicans at Bologna as a whole. Nevertheless, it is not a stretch to say that Cecilia would have possessed some degree of memory which was valuable within that community: her


seniority alone would have made her memories an important resource for the Bologna Dominicans; further, because it was composed nearly a half-century after Humbert of Romans’ call for stories of Dominic’s miracles, the preservation of Cecilia’s memories may well have been considered an update of previous texts, which may or may not have survived. Of particular importance is Cecilia’s description of Dominic’s appearance, which seems to correspond with the depictions which date to the period of the early Order. Unfortunately, save for the details of the activities around Dominic’s cult site and her description of Dominic’s appearance, Cecilia’s account does not contribute substantially more than earlier accounts.

The Nine Ways of Prayer of St. Dominic, an anonymous text from circa 1290, further demonstrates that Bologna’s Dominican community has contributed much to our knowledge of Dominic and the early Order. As a source for the life of Dominic, the text is interesting, if only because it suggests the nature of spirituality of the early Order. The text’s history has only recently been clarified by Simon Tugwell. Further aiding in the understanding of the text is the survival of multiple illustrated manuscripts, all of which Tugwell suggests “seem to be independent of one another, the similarities being due to the fact that they are all illustrating an identical text.” The text itself is helpful only in

53 Tugwell, “The Nine Ways of Prayer of St. Dominic”, 79-80. Although any postulation of a lost source for the Nine Ways of Prayer is problematic, that other sources for the text are connected to Bologna. This makes it probable that the direct source may have been the community itself (or some type of archival document not preserved). In any case, Bologna seems to be the best locus scribendi for the Nine Ways.
55 Simon Tugwell, “The Nine Ways of Prayer of St. Dominic”, 56. I myself have consulted micro-film images and digital reproductions of several of the manuscripts at the Vatican Film Library from which Tugwell collected his edition. While the illustrations are quite similar, Tugwell is correct in suggesting that the illustrations do not bear enough resemblances to each other, beyond the description contained in the text, to merit the positing of a single source for the illustrations themselves.
reconstructing Dominic’s spirituality, but this would still be a valuable task for future studies.

Bernard Gui provides us with what are perhaps the last two major Dominican texts about Dominic. The earlier is the entry on Dominic from the *Catalogue of Masters [General] (Catalogus Magistrorum)* and was completed in 1304, but revised continuously until 1314. The latter entry is found in Gui’s *Speculum Santorale*, from sometime in the 1320’s. Both texts were clearly intended to reinforce the institutional memory of the Order: the former by demonstrating the qualities of holiness to be exhibited by Preachers; the latter by chronicling the Masters General as Preachers-in-chief. Gui’s importance for reconstructing Dominic’s early life is two-fold. First, as has been often noted, Gui was an excellent scholar in his own right. Second, Gui’s addition of a few key details which are otherwise unmentioned in much of the corpus suggests that Gui was keenly interested in collecting material about Dominic. For example, it is by Gui that we are told that Dominic and Diego travel to Denmark, a detail which is rather important for reconstructing Dominic’s biography in the period spanning 1203-1206.

These second generation texts round out the hagiographical sources concerning Dominic and are represented by Table 1, below, but must generally remain in a secondary position with respect to the earlier first-generation hagiographical corpus.

---

58 Both the *Catalogus Magistrorum* and the *Speculum Santorale* have been edited in a single volume by Tugwell for volume XXVII MOPH: Bernard Guidonis, *Scripta Sancti Dominici*, ed. Simon Tugwell, MOPH, XXVII, (Rome: Institutum Historicum Fratrum Praedicatorum, 1998). [Hereafter, the *Catalogus Magistrorum* is cited as GSSDCM and the *Speculum Santorale* is cited as GSSDLD.]
### Table 1: Major Dominican Accounts concerning Dominic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Composition Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libellus de Principiis Ordinis Praedicatorum</td>
<td>Jordan of Saxony</td>
<td>before 1221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vita de Sancti Dominici</td>
<td>Jean de Mailly</td>
<td>c. 1225/1243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legenda Sancti Dominici</td>
<td>Peter of Ferrand</td>
<td>c. 1238-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legenda Sancti Dominici</td>
<td>Constantine of Orvieto</td>
<td>1247-1248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liber epilogorum in gesta sanctorum</td>
<td>Bartholomew of Trent</td>
<td>c. 1245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legenda Sancti Dominici</td>
<td>Humbert of Romans</td>
<td>...prima: 1246-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>...maior: 1255/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitae Fratrum</td>
<td>Gerard de Frachet</td>
<td>1256-60, last recension c. 1271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legenda Aurea/ Legenda Sanctorum</td>
<td>James de Voragine</td>
<td>c. 1260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitae sanctorum</td>
<td>Rodrigo de Cerrato</td>
<td>c. 1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miracula Sancti Dominici</td>
<td>Cecilia of St. Agnes-Bologna</td>
<td>c. 1288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine Ways of Praying of St. Dominic</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>1274-1288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legenda Sancti Dominici</td>
<td>Dietrich von Apolda</td>
<td>1288/1297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogus Magistrorum</td>
<td>Bernard Gui</td>
<td>1304-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speculum Sanctorale</td>
<td>Bernard Gui</td>
<td>1324-1329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beyond the Dominican hagiographical texts, there are still other sources which deal with the early history of Dominic, without being directly affiliated with the Preachers. The other narrative sources for Dominic’s early life are primarily concerned with the Albigensian Crusade. Guillermo de Tudela, Pierre de Vaux-de-Cernay, and Guillaume de Puylarens discuss the history of the Albigensian Crusade, the process of which informs the context of Dominic’s work. “The Chronicle [of Guillaume de Puylarens] is one of the three main contemporary sources for the Albigensian Crusade. The other two such sources, the
Historia Albigensis of Peter of les Vaux-de-Cernay and the Chanson de la Croisade Albigeoise, are both much more detailed than the Chronicle but their accounts come to an end shortly after the death of Simon de Montfort in 1218.”

The troubadour Guillermo de Tudela’s Song of the Cathar Wars survives in only one manuscript. As a text, it describes the climate of the period before and during the Albigensian Crusade; his work dates to 1214 and an anonymous continuator added details which stop short of any certain dating past 1228. The Chanson “tells the story of events in Languedoc between the years 1204 and 1218”. The text itself is invaluable for the history of the Albigensian Crusade. The two texts themselves are unique in that two disparate viewpoints are presented in the same manuscript. “Both authors were concerned to present a true picture. William of Tudela used eye-witness testimony when he could, and quoted his sources...The anonymous author who wrote the large part of the Canso proves equally reliable.”

Pierre de Vaux-de-Cernay’s Historia Albigenses provides a history of the conflict in Provence up to the winter of 1218, when de Vaux-de-Cernay likely died. The text is an

---


60 A number of proposed identifications for the anonymous continuator of the Song of the Cathar Wars have been advanced; Saverio Guida has proposed that the continuator may have been a man of minor nobility and sometime-troubadour. While his argument is relatively convincing, Guida’s identification is necessarily uncertain but nevertheless re-highlights the internal bias of the second-half of the text. For Guida’s identification, see: Saverio Guida, “L’autore della seconda parte della Canso de la crotzada”, Cultura Neolatina, LXIII, (2003), 255-82.


62 William de Tudela and Anonymous, Song of the Cathar Wars, trans. Shirley, 4-5.

excellent source for the history of the Albigensian Crusade and de Vaux-de-Cernay is a reliable narrator. “Peter’s presence with the crusaders during these periods is attested by frequent use of the verb in the first person singular or plural.”65 Making Peter an even more valuable witness is his “access to official documents, some of which he inserts in his text.”66 Peter is a very reliable source for the orthodox perspective on the Albigensian Crusade.

William de Puylaurens’ Chronicle also details the progress of the Albigensian campaign, but from a much wider historical angle; his chronicle follows the dramatis personae from the Albigensian crusade until the County of Foix became a possession of the French crown in 1275, effectively ending the affair.67 “[The text’s] principle subject is the origins, course, and aftermath of the Albigensian Crusade...Its particular focus is Toulouse, its bishops, and the Counts of Toulouse, reflecting the fact that William of Puylaurens was a native of the city, who served two successive bishops and later Count Raymond VII. Much of the Chronicle is based on a close knowledge of the people and events being described, which adds greatly to its importance.”68

Taken together, these four sources present greater context for Dominic’s activities in greater Provence during the decade of his preaching mission; further, they allow certain gaps to be filled within the chronology, particularly with regard to other activities in the region. Each of the sources presents themselves as histories and each is reliable and usually

---

65 Peter of les Vaux-de-Cernay, The History of the Albigensian Crusade, trans. Sibly and Sibly, xxv.
67 William of Puylaurens, The Chronicle of William of Puylarens, trans. W. A. and M.D. Sibly, , 125, n.102. The last event which can be dated from William’s Chronicle is the capture of the Count of Foix by Phillip III of France. The chapter detailing this terminal event in the Siblys’ translation spans pages 123-5. The dating is firmly established, and, as is noted by the Siblys in n. 102 (p. 125) as the terminus ad quem for the text. (This is confirmed by other scholarship also mentioned in n. 102)
proceeds in direct chronological order. The different narratives help to elaborate the complicated events of the entire period. As a whole, they do not discuss Dominic with the sort of detail we might prefer, but they do discuss a few other consistent details. For example, the texts do mention the council of 1206 at which Diego and Dominic were present and describe it in similar fashion to the Dominican sources. However, some details, such as the number of prelates present at the 1206 council, are missing from the corpus. Nevertheless the sources are excellent and help us to place Diego and Dominic in the events of the first decade of the thirteenth century.

Table 2: Non-Dominican Narrative Sources concerning the Albigensian Crusade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Composition Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historia Albigensis</td>
<td>Peter de Vaux-de-Cernay</td>
<td>1212-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chansons de la Croisade Albigeoise</td>
<td>Guillermo de Tudela/Anonymous Continuator</td>
<td>Before 1214/After 1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronica magistris Guillelmi de Podio Laurentii</td>
<td>Guillaume de Puylaurens</td>
<td>After 1275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diplomatic evidence suggests that Dominic’s reputation among the Catholics in Provence was considerable. There are some 60 donations recorded in the Monumenta Diplomatica Sancti Dominici alone, and this is surely just the documentation which survives. The epistolary evidence from the same period suggests that the surviving diplomatics are accurate and that his fledgling order had a potent network of supporters.

---

69 MDSD, 20-85.
The diplomatic evidence has been edited twice for the *MOPH* and important papal letters were included in those same editions. Most of the diplomatic evidence comes from either Dominic’s Toulousain period or papal confirmations of privileges or letters of recommendation made by the pontiffs. As a whole, they record a trend of increasing popularity. Put briefly: Dominic’s popularity (and endowments granted to him and his party) corresponded directly with the length of the war and the success of the *crucesignati*.

As the Albigensian Crusade wore on, Dominic’s movement gained momentum, until a rogue boulder killed Dominic’s patron and forced him and the friars to take their apostolate elsewhere.\(^{70}\)

Similar to the diplomatic sources concerning Dominic’s life directly are those sources which concern Castile and the Castilian Church. The letters of pontiffs and the charters of Alfonso VIII allow us to reconstruct the scene of Dominic’s activity. From Celestine III and Innocent III, we have several letters which help us understand the complicated Spanish-Papal politics of the period. The *documentación pontificia hasta Inocencio III* edited by Demetrio Mansilla contains a majority of the major papal letters from the period in question.\(^{71}\) They demonstrate the reality of the reform movement in Spain, a movement in which Dominic will be shown to be a big player. Alfonso VIII made the Church a powerful and close ally: this is amply demonstrated by his charters. A large portion of Alfonso’s charters were edited by Julio González for his *El Reino de Castilla en la*

\(^{70}\) Dominic dispersed the brothers as a result of a vision in which he reportedly saw a great treat falling. We are told that he interpreted this to mean that Simon de Montfort, the leader of the Crusader forces in Provence, was soon to die. After the brothers had left the region, Simon was killed when an artillery boulder crushed his head while under siege at Toulouse in 1218. *JSLA*47-8.

RdC. Royal and pontifical sources are very useful for understanding the workings of power at the highest levels in the medieval period. Royal charters were major boons for institutions; pontifical exemption could found monastic empires. As a result, these sources are critical for understanding the important actions of medieval potentates. The letters which contained detailed recitations of the facts, as reported to the Curia, collectively called the narratio are an important source of information. Likewise, the argument of the letters, called the arenga, present the thesis of the letter and underscore the Curia’s intent in sending the letter. Taken together, the documents in Mansilla and González’ collections paint a complicated but realistic picture of the Castilian Church in the twelfth century.

The sources for Spanish history are fairly rich for the twelfth and thirteenth century. The Crown of Aragon has rich archives; Castile’s archives are also considerable, but still more work needs to be done. There are three major narrative sources for the period, and the records of Alfonso VIII’s reign are also accessible. Each and every chapter of the De Rebus Hispaniae by Archbishop Don Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada of Toledo describes a task involved in advancing the cause of the Toledan church, and the Castilian regnum writ large. Lucas of Tuy’s Chronicon Mundi is similarly helpful for sorting out the dynamic of early thirteenth century Castile. The anonymous Chronicle of the Kings of Castile presents a vivid if brief picture of the actions of the kings of Castile in the twelfth century and is similarly quite reliable.

Don Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada was many things: an experienced fighter; one-time bishop-elect of Osma; archbishop of Toledo; primate of Spain; and Navarrese by birth. Unfortunately, Don Rodrigo's account does not address the Dominicans and so is helpful only as an auxiliary source. His *De Rebus Hispaniae* can provide admirable, if biased, accounts of matters relating to the period. Unfortunately, it seems, the actions of the bishops of Osma and Palencia, although suffragans of Toledo, were apparently not especially important to Don Rodrigo. Rodrigo composed his text sometime in the 1240’s, and it is likely that his information came from sources closely connected to the events he describes. As a source for the life of Dominic, then, Rodrigo’s *De Rebus* is good for the “big picture” and for a few details about the studium of Palencia in the early thirteenth century but not for the all-important details.

Lucas of Tuy’s *Chronicon Mundi* is a problematic text for two reasons. First, we have only very few confirmable details about Lucas’ life—what we do have concerns his later life and career—and can pin him to only a handful of dates and locations. Second, the text itself is mostly a continuation of Isidorian historical texts and only the latter part of the text contains contemporaneous material which was likely of Lucas’ own composition. Thus, the text can be employed to fill in certain backgrounds and settings for the period but

---

73 Don Rodrigo’s presence as the bishop-elect of Osma, as archbishop of Toledo, and his general roles as a key vassal of the Alfonso VIII will be dealt with in great detail below.
its contribution for the study of the life of Dominic is minimal. Lucas’s narrative about the
early days of Palencia’s status as a university and the reign of Alfonso VIII is generally
reliable. The text can be definitively dated to 1236, by Lucas’ own admission.  

The Anonymous Chronicle of the Kings of Castile was probably composed by Juan,
bishop of Osma. A variety of dates have been proposed for the text: from 1211 to 1223;
after 1226 and after 1236; and, most likely, from 1224 to 1226 and from 1236 to 1239. The
text itself clearly betrays the author’s familiarity with the workings of the court of
Castile and the author's sympathies are clearly in favor of Castile. The author also clearly
admired Alfonso VIII and portrays him in the most positive light possible, except where the
issue of incestuous marriages among the nobility is concerned. The narrative of the
Chronicle allows us to fill in certain details about the royal court in the late twelfth and
early thirteenth century. The author was very likely an eye-witness of a good number of the
events which he describes.  

---

78 Emma Falque, "Introduccion", in Lucae Tudensis, Chronicon Mundi, ed. Emma Falque, CCCM, LXXIV, vol. 1 of Lucae Tudensis, Opera Omnia, xx-xxi.
81 There are four modern editions of the text, of which only a single manuscript survives, and the text has been translated by Joseph O’Callaghan. O’Callaghan himself surveys the editions and the manuscript tradition in his introduction to his translation: Joseph O’Callaghan, “Introduction”, in: Anonymous [Juan of Osma], The Latin Chronicle of the Kings of Castile, ed. and trans. Joseph O’Callaghan, Medieval and Renaissance Texts, and Studies, vol. 236, (Tempe, Arizona: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002), xxviii-xxx., xxvi-xxviii. But, a reliable edition of the Latin Chronicle is available from the Corpus Christianorum: L. Charlo Brea, J.A. Estévez Sola, R. Carande Herrero, eds, Chronica Hispana saeculi XIII, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 73, (Turnhout:Brepols, 1997). [Hereafter, only the Latin version will be cited, and those citations are abbreviated as LCKC.]
Table 3: Non-Dominican Narrative Sources concerning Spain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Composition Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronicon Mundi</td>
<td>Lucas of Tuy</td>
<td>1236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Rebus Hispania</td>
<td>Don Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada</td>
<td>c. 1240's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronicle of the Kings of Castile</td>
<td>Juan of Osma</td>
<td>1224/6 &amp; After 1236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, we have a considerable body of sources with which to work. The narrative sources are at times misleading and at other times simply parrot previous works. These sources help us to reconstruct the known facts of Dominic’s life when coupled with modern scholarship. With an approximation of the context of his life, we can begin to assemble a measured biography of Dominic; we cannot be quite as idealistic as to pretend objectivity but a study of Dominic’s early life is clearly plausible, after the text is stripped of those hagiographical elements which cannot be substantiated. Reconstructing the biography allows us to better understand the hagiographical additions to Dominican and orthodox memories of Dominic. We can, thus, better estimate how memories of Dominic changed in the first several generations of Friars Preachers.

There are three words to summarize the core of Dominic’s “Dominicanitas”: Castilian regular canon. Fundamentally, the context of Dominic’s biography helps to fill in the holes in Dominic’s biography. A close reading of the sources allows us to order the pertinent facts in a way which brings Dominic’s life out of the shadows. While the sources can be at times misleading, the confluence of the sources cannot be. By collating the reports
of the sources to one another, we can determine the elements common to them and thereby determine which elements are verifiable facts.

Towards a Reconstructive Biography: A Pre-Conclusion

Each of the authors of the sources had their own individual agenda. The sources require a degree of skepticism which is common for medieval scholarship, but nevertheless problematic. We can sort the sources generally into three categories: hagiography, diplomatic, and chronicle. Each has its unique difficulties and the assumptions implicit in dealing with each category of source material vary accordingly.

One of the fundamental arguments of this study is that Dominic’s biography must be read in its complete context. Without a reappraisal of the history of Catholic life in the latter half of the twelfth century in Castile, Dominic’s life stands alone as a hagiographical narrative distinct from human activities. Separating Dominic from his earthly context renders his biography inescapably unhelpful. Because saints were the representations of the pinnacle of human piety, their lot in the world was to be role models and conduits of divine instruction. Understanding the relationship between a saint and the people with whom he interacted helps to reconstruct the lives of the masses of unnamed Catholics in Castile. A careful reconstruction of religious life in late-twelfth-century Castile is clearly necessary.

For this study the context concerns only Dominic’s Castile. Because the study covers around the first seventy percent of Dominic’s life and because that span places Dominic mostly in Castile, the majority of the background context will concern the pertinent
Castilian context for Dominic’s biography. The study of the Church in Castile demonstrates that Dominic was clearly a product of his time.

Quantitative analysis, as that in Tables 4-7 and Appendices A and B demonstrate, has a considerable stake in this study of Dominic’s early life. It serves an important role in elucidating the nature of Alfonso VIII’s relationship to the bishops of Castile. The data collected comes from the over 900 charters pertaining to the reign of Alfonso VIII. These were collected by González for the second and third volumes of his El Reino de Castilla en la época de Alfonso VIII and represent a quality sample from which to draw a quantitative analysis. The aggregate data collected for the quantitative analysis presented below is listed in the Appendices. The analysis is presented in the appropriate sections on Castile.

Charter evidence is a valuable source of study for three reasons. First, the formulaic language helps to make clear those elements which change in each charter and thereby indicate the intent of the charter. Second, charters were often preserved because of their legal and economic value as testaments to property or capital of some kind. Third, this preservation means that many charters survive and that a broad sample of them can be used as a sampling for quantitative analysis. Taken together, these three reasons demonstrate that charters can be a valuable source, even when only cursorily involved in studies.

Before beginning the survey, a quick summary of the project’s goal and thesis will serve as a helpful reminder. The sections of context fill in the lacuna in Dominic’s biography. The sources employed are reliable and most contribute at least a little new information about Dominic’s life. The biographical section of the study (“Chapter III”) will
focus only on the earlier two-thirds of Dominic's life, from his birth in Caleruega to the
death of his mentor Don Diego d'Acebo in 1207. Dominic's life should not be read as a
timeless narrative, bound up in the sacred time defined by hagiography. Instead, it was
tangibly a product of its context and was very much the life of a man “in the world”. A
reinterpretation of the biography of St. Dominic helps us to understand Dominic in terms
beyond, but not stripped of, his sanctity.
Chapter II: The Kingdom of Castile and the Church during the Reign of Alfonso VIII (1158-1214)

This second section will explain the historical context of Dominic’s biography. There is still no full study dedicated to the relationship between Alfonso VIII and the church during his reign, but a detailed sketch of the diocese and province in which Dominic lived and worked is vital. For example, the state of relations between Alfonso VIII and the Church is a major focus because it is clear that Dominic’s vocation was suffused within that larger topic. Summary topics and case studies will have to supplant a more comprehensive and deeper study of the individual sections of context. For these same sections, this study will focus on topics which directly inform the context of Dominic’s biography.

Dominic was a Castilian and for most of his life Alfonso VIII was his king. Theodoric of Apolda tells us that “in the parts of Spain in a village, which is called Caleruega, in the diocese of Osma, in 1170 AD there was a man, who was called Felix and he took a wife, Joanna by name”.82 Dominic’s parents, then, were married in the year of Alfonso’s knighthood and majority. It is clearly necessary, then, to describe in detail Alfonso’s activities within the framework of royal control and influence over the church. The narrative will have to concern itself with the particular dioceses in which Dominic lived and worked: Osma, Palencia, and their metropolitan Toledo. Alfonso VIII employed a variety of means to underscore his authority: he used clerics as diplomats; employed Church officials as his own potentates; and practically used cathedrals as his own courthouses. The nature

82DAL, 566C.
of the twelfth century *reformatio* needs analysis in the Castilian context and comparison against the larger Northern European context: Spanish clerics were reproached for keeping concubines; were manipulated for the royal cause while serving as legates; and religious orders were farmed for their influence over the king’s subjects.

Alfonso VIII emerged from a vulnerable minority toward a dominance which saw him attain the position of being, as Joseph O’Callaghan called him, “the most influential and powerful of the Christian rulers”.\(^3\) Unfortunately, during the early years of Dominic’s life that destiny was as uncertain as possible. From the dynastic squabbling with Leon; the advent of Alfonso II of Aragon’s greater hegemony in the east of the peninsula; and the crushing defeat handed to the Christians at Alarcos in 1195; the fortunes of Castile seemed ever in doubt. Teófilo Ruiz has rightly noted: “When Alfonso VIII came of age and assumed the rule of Castile in 1170, he found a kingdom deeply divided by noble antagonism and diminished by foreign occupation.”\(^4\) The kingdom of Castile was a dynamic and vibrant place during Dominic’s youth under the rule of a young king and the church of Castile was in the throes of revival.

*Alfonso VIII and His Castilian Church*

Alfonso VIII was not the papacy’s ideal monarch, although he may have come close after Las Navas. Neither was he the papacy’s most reviled foe. The progress which Alfonso made against the Islamic kingdoms to the south brought him considerable credit prior to the defeat at Alarcos in 1195, and a sterling reputation after Las Navas de Tolosa in 1212. To achieve victory on his campaigns he required much support, not the least of which were

the resources of the church. We can witness the importance of the Church to Alfonso’s conquest of the southern portions of the peninsula by examining his use of the Church in support of his royal program. First, it is clear that Alfonso valued high-ranking clergymen as key advisors in many of his endeavors: in marriages, judgments, and treaties the importance of the clergy will become clear. Second, the use of the cathedral as a nexus of learning and administration demonstrates Alfonso’s keen understanding of the importance of the Church as a source for the development of his government. Third, the manipulation and employment of cathedral chapters as recruiting grounds for future royal officials will demonstrate Alfonso’s intent to cultivate homegrown talent to staff his government. As a whole, the progress of Alfonso’s reign demonstrates that the Church was an important player in his reign, but that the relationship was consistently that of lord and vassal.

Alfonso VIII understood the value of a cleric fulfilling the role of a royal official. The archbishop of Toledo was an especially close ally of the King and was clearly one of his most trusted advisors (see below, Table 5). Bishops subscribe a considerable majority of Alfonso’s charters, and more than a few of his treaties bear the names of high-ranking ecclesiastics. Bernard Reilly rightly commented: “With few exceptions, bishops were the king’s men and the episcopate was the key institutional element.” Of the many roles which ecclesiastics served in Alfonso’s administration, three serve as excellent case studies and demonstrate the importance of clerics to Alfonso’s government. First, the role of Diego d’Acebo as a marriage ambassador in the early 1200’s shows the importance of clerics in ensuring the perpetuation of the royal line. Second, the role of clerics in the controversy

---

caused by the marriage of Alfonso IX to Berenguela of Castile, under Alfonso’s VIII aegis, demonstrates that, even when faced with the inescapable conclusion of Alfonso’s wrongdoing, the bishops of Castile were still Alfonso’s men. Third, the subscription of important treaties by ecclesiastics demonstrates that bishops were important guarantors of both prosperity and peace. The confluence of these three observations evinces the importance of ecclesiastical officials as members of the royal administration and shows how tightly bound were the clerics and laymen in Alfonso’s court.

Diego d’Acebo was Navarrese and a career ecclesiastic. He first appears in the documentary record as a prior in the cathedral chapter of Osma under Martin Bazán in 1199. It is likely that his enrollment occurred after 22 February 1195, as he does not appear among the signatories of a document from that year. (It is possible that he enrolled before this point, but there are no surviving documents from the 1190’s which might demonstrate his presence at the canonry of Osma.) Likewise, the reform of the chapter under Bazán occurred recently before Innocent’s letter (dated 11 May 1199) confirming those same reforms. Diego progressed through the ranks of the chapter of Osma and appears as prior in 1199. Two years later he replaced Martin Bazán as bishop and appears to have picked up where Martin had left off. Diego was tasked by Alfonso VIII to fetch a bride for Prince Ferdinand: “It happened at that time that Alfonso, king of Castile, 

87 MDSD, 4-5.
88 It is all too curious that none of the names which appear on the 1195 charter appear on the 1199 charter. The reform of the chapter would have had to happen between these two endpoints. Innocent’s confirmation of reform notes that secular canons were no longer being accepted at Osma. It is possible that Diego was one such canon that accepted regular religious life and appeared was a member of the canonry after 1195 despite being a canon previously. Loperraex, Descripción histórica del obispado de Osma, 3:44-5.
89 MDSD,4-5; Loperraex, Descripción histórica del obispado de Osma, 3:44-5.
90 For more on the career of Martín Bazán, see below, p. 60-1. The two men were attendant at Alfonso’s court with similar frequency: see Table 6 below, p. 61.
desired a marriage between his son Ferdinand and a certain noble girl from the Marches. He came for that purpose to the Osman bishop, requiring him to be made his agent for the work."\textsuperscript{91} The most likely date spans for the mission are: for the first journey: 18 February 1205 to 26 May 1205; for the second journey, 28 May 1205 to 18 August 1205.\textsuperscript{92} The marriage with the young girl from “the Marches” was a lost cause—when Diego and his entourage returned to bring her to Castile, she had already died.\textsuperscript{93} Nevertheless, that Diego was tasked with potentially finding the future queen of Castile speaks volumes about the trust Alfonso VIII placed in leading ecclesiastics.

The marriage of the Castilian Infanta Berenguela, daughter of Alfonso VIII, to Alfonso IX of Leon, Alfonso’s cousin, caused the King of Castile no shortage of

\textsuperscript{91} “accidit itaque tunc temporis Alphonsum, regem Castelle, inter filiolum suum Ferdinandum et quondam nobilem de Marchis desiderare connubium. Quam ob causam adidit prefatum episcopum Oxomensem, postulans fieri eum procuratorem negotii.” \textit{JSL}, 33.

\textsuperscript{92} The documents published by González in his \textit{El reino de Castilla} demonstrate that Diego was in Castile for continuous spans and the gaps in the chronology of the documents, which would indicate the time which Diego had to potentially travel to the Marches, are too small to facilitate travel to Denmark or even to a neutral site, such as Phillip II Augustus’ court in the Ile-de-France. Jarl Gallén’s schema requires Diego and his party to have moved quickly and to have likely had previous contact with the Danish court (probably by letter, but possibly by representatives). His well-reasoned dating schema has great potential, but the evidence for Diego’s absences (and therefore the likely spans for his mission) bears repeating because the itinerary cannot be proven. The mission must have taken place between 11 December 1201, when Diego had become bishop, and June of 1206, when Diego and Dominic had met the Twelve Abbots at Montpellier. We can further narrow the span to 1203 to 1206, based on Ferdinand’s birthday (29 November 1189), as Ferdinand would need to be nearing 13 or 14 before he would likely be ready to marry. The gaps in the documentary evidence which record Diego’s absence from court (and therefore may be the dates during which he was travelling to the Marches) are: 4 November 1203 to 26 February 1204; 18 February to 26 May 1205; 28 May 1205 to 18 August 1205. The first date-span occurs in the winter, and thus would require Diego’s party to traverse the Pyrenees in the winter and to travel during the height of the liturgical season. The latter two spans are long enough to sustain the journey and coincide with Jordan’s narrative concerning the situation. However, even this span is problematic because it requires the royal retinue (prepared to retrieve the young woman) to have been ready to travel immediately upon Diego’s return. Jarl Gallén, “Les voyages de S. Dominique au Danemark. Essai de datation”, in \textit{Xenia mediæ ævi historiam illustrantia oblatæ Thomæ Kaepelli}, ed. R. Creytens and P. Künzle, vol. 1, (Rome: Edizioni du storia e letteratura, 1978), 73-84; \textit{JSL}, 33-5; \textit{RdC}, 3:321-4, 3:349-54, 3:356-8; \textit{HALb}, 20-7, 41-7; \textit{Anales Toledanos}, ed. H. Flórez, in \textit{España Sagrada}, vol. XXIII, ed. idem, 393.

\textsuperscript{93} \textit{JSL}, 35. The issue of the girl’s identity is dealt with more below, on p. 94-8.
consternation. The loyalty of Castile’s bishops surely comforted him. The illegalities of the marriage aside, the problems created for Alfonso VIII were clear: if his bishops enforced the sentences handed down by Celestine and Innocent, his kingdom could be thrown into turmoil. The excommunications of officials supporting Alfonso could have invalidated a large portion of government by invalidating his theocratic right to rule and the rights of ecclesiastics to use their office on his behalf. There were several threats of interdict and excommunication. Alfonso used Fabian tactics until a legitimate heir was produced; even then, Ferdinand III was frequently reminded by pontiffs that he was the product of gravely sinful acts. That Innocent sent nine letters over the course of little more than six years—an average of one every eight or so months—demonstrates how concerned the pontiff was about that particular marriage. We know from the frequency of the letters that the Castilian clergy were committed to the royal cause, at least until the birth of the future Ferdinand III.

The marriage also demonstrates that the need for peace between Leon and Castile was of grave concern for the magnates of both realms. That the archbishops of Compostela, Toledo, Burgos and Oviedo blessed the marriage implicitly testifies to the need for a peace

---

94 See Tables 5-7, below, on p. 58, 61, and 66.
95 Alfonso VIII seems to be one of the few monarchs to have assumed theocratic themes for the legitimacy of his reign. Ruiz comments: “Mais l’exemple castillan se distingue par l’accent qui est mis sur la Reconquête et sur la latitude autorisée en ce qui concerne la sexualité (par exemple, sur le choix des concubines de bonnes familles et le fait de n’avoir de bâtards que de femmes nobles). Il va sans dire qu’à l’exception d’Alphonse VIII et, dans une moindre mesure, de Ferdinand III et d’Isabelle la Catholique, tous les souverains castillans entre 1157 et 1504,— tout comme leurs homologues du Nord — étaient loin de correspondre à cet idéal. De leur côté, le peuple, les seigneurs, les prélats et les conseils municipaux se montrèrent aussi peu fides à leurs serments que leurs rois. Aux faiblesses de la monarchie castillane répondent les rébellions, les conspirations, la violence de la noblesse dévergondée, les mouvements de résistance urbaine contre les empiètements royaux.” Teófilo F. Ruiz, “Une royauté sans sacre: la monarchie castillane du Bas Moyen Âge”, Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales, 39, no. 3 (May - Jun., 1984), 441
96 These documents were edited by Mansilla, see above, n. 95.
between Leon and Castile. Moreover, as mentioned above, the frequency of letters sent from Rome to Leon and Castile's prelates demonstrates concretely that the ecclesiastical population of Leon and Castile—or its leadership at the very least—understood the importance of concord between Leon and Castile. Furthermore, Alfonso's previous attempt to marry Berenguela to Conrad II of Swabia, a son of Barbarossa, indicates that Alfonso was in need of allies and resources to fuel future victories. Thus, it is fair to conclude that Alfonso had the support of his ecclesiastical vassals in pursuing the marriage of Alfonso IX and Berenguela. There are no records of criticism from within Castile of the marriage, except in records from after the fact.

We can further notice the importance of clerics in pivotal moments in the progress of Alfonso's reign. Of the nineteen treaties signed by Alfonso VIII, seven were witnessed by leading ecclesiastics. The witnesses of the treaties were mostly counts and barons but the inclusion of the ecclesiastics demonstrates the ecclesiastical presence at the treaty negotiations. Alfonso was supported by the lay and ecclesiastical magnates of the realm; ecclesiastics witnessed seven of Alfonso's treaties and certainly consulted on others. We can extrapolate from the extant documents, as well as the evidence of episcopal support

98 We can infer that these bishops were involved in rendering the match legitimate based on their presence among those bishops to whom Innocent sent letters
100 The LCKC comments in numerous places about incestual marriages among royalty, but the composition date of the text places it long after Alfonso VIII had died. Brea comments to this effect in: L. Charlo Brea, “Introduccion”, in LCKC, 11-8. R.A. Fletcher does note that one Leonese bishop spoke out against the union, Juan González of Oviedo, but this is a Leonese criticism and therefore does not concern Alfonso VIII’s role in the marriage. R.A. Fletcher, The Episcopate in the Kingdom of León in the Twelfth Century, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 76.
102 For the presence of ecclesiastics at Alfonso’s court, see Tables 5-7, below, on p. 58, 61, and 66.
discussed more fully below, that ecclesiastical figures were important counselors in his foreign policy.

The importance of ecclesiastical figures as royal officials is further supported by the extant documentation from the reign of Alfonso VIII. Diego d'Acebo was an important member of Alfonso’s court; he was chosen to find a potential future “queen of Castile”. This suggests that the bishop of Osma was an important supporter of Alfonso and that Alfonso trusted the bishop. That trust evinces clearly the state of affairs between the bishops of Castile and Alfonso. The support given to Alfonso VIII during the aftermath of the Infanta Bereguela’s marriage to Alfonso IX of Leon also clearly demonstrates the loyalty of Castile’s bishops to Alfonso VIII. More broadly, the importance of bishops as guarantors of treaties, and generally as counselors, demonstrates the importance of clerics as Castilian officials. Taken together, these three topics show that the clerics of Castile were important royal vassals and key members of the royal administration.

That the Church was vital to Alfonso’s reign was demonstrated in other ways as well. The importance of cathedrals and episcopal sees to the royal program speaks volumes about Alfonso’s reliance on the Church. Cathedrals were powerful places for Alfonso. At Palencia, it was the cathedral school that would become the first proto-university under the royal aegis. Alfonso’s charters betray the employment of episcopal sees for royal bureaucracy. Alfonso’s donations to cathedral chapters further demonstrate the use of those same chapters for Alfonso’s own program. Taken together, Alfonso’s employment of ecclesiastical centers demonstrates that it was not only the clerics, as argued above, that
were utilized to the benefit of Alfonso’s administration but also the places in which the clerics lived and worked.

The emergence of the cathedral school of Palencia in the 1150’s will be treated at greater length below, but it is necessary here to discuss the patronage and chartering of the school by Alfonso VIII circa 1212. “King Alfonso VIII granted the cathedral school the status of university in 1212, bringing professors from France and Italy and offering excellent salaries.” Although the university faded after the death of its royal patron, the school itself had previously developed organically from the precursory cathedral school. Although his analysis is flawed concerning the origins of the school at Palencia, Linehan does rightly summarize the cause of Alfonso’s later patronage of the school: “The husband of an Angevin queen did not need his wife to inform him of the value of the staple education provided at Paris, Oxford and Northamton”. Despite the presence of other schools, “[the] school of Palencia was the most important of Castile.” Alfonso’s patronage of the school demonstrates his concern to enhance existing ecclesiastical endeavors to benefit his own royal program and nevertheless shows his keen understanding that what begins in cathedrals quickly reaches the royal court. His influence over the school may well have

---

105 Linehan argues incorrectly: “For though other studia—Bologna and Paris in particular—were ahead of Palencia, these had been organic developments thrusting up from below, not acts of state imposed from above. It was Palencia sometime before 1214, not Naples in 1224, that was ‘the first university of all to be erected by a definite act’.” Linehan is incorrect in assuming that Alfonso’s patronage established the school. While it greatly increased the resources of the studium of Palencia, Alfonso’s patronage of the school did not found the school. Contrary to what Linehan says, the school did develop organically from a cathedral school, as did Paris and Bologna before it. Further information can be found below, on p. 62-4. Peter Linehan, *Spain, 1157-1300, a partible inheritance*, 48.  
106 Linehan, *Spain, 1157-1300, a partible inheritance*, 49.  
caused the *studium* to grow beyond the need for its teaching, but the patronage of the school itself shows Alfonso's keen understanding of the power of a cathedral city.

Tables 5-7, below, demonstrate clearly that the bishops of Toledo, Palencia and Osma were, in Dominic's lifetime, Alfonso's men. Yet the importance of bishops for Alfonso's program is only part of the equation. The episcopal sees themselves became important nexuses of power for Alfonso. A quantitative analysis of Alfonso's charters demonstrates this fact clearly. Of the 1031 charters edited by González for his *El reino de Castilla en la época de Alfonso VIII*, 832 can be fixed to a particular location. Nearly one-fifth of these 832 charters can be fixed to Burgos; almost another fourteen percent originate from Toledo. Two episcopal sees produced more than one-third of these charters. (Table 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Charters from <em>RdC</em></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burgos</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>19.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>13.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palencia</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuenca</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valladolid</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segovia</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plasencia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ávila</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calahorra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siguenza</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>429</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 4 demonstrates, more than 50% of the sample derives from episcopal sees. The addition of important abbeys and monastic centers would likely drive the number even higher, although an analysis of these has not been performed here. Sahagún, for example, is

---

108 The figure for Cuenca includes documents emanating from both Cuenca and the Sitio de Cuenca.
indicative of this particular potential: 1.2% of Alfonso’s charters emanate from that abbey.\(^{109}\) Although the sample taken from González’ edition of Alfonsine charters is limited, it is very informative. It is clear that Alfonso understood the importance of the episcopal see as a center for administration.

The importance of cathedral chapters to the royal program makes sense within the context of Alfonso VIII’s larger programs. Alfonso was tapping into earlier traditions of governing that his grandfather Alfonso VII had practiced: bishops were crucial in this style of government, but their time at court “promoted the rise of the practical authority of the cathedral chapter and its dean or prior.”\(^{110}\) Powerful cathedral chapters were common in the major dioceses of Castile.\(^{111}\) Alfonso’s recognition of the importance of the cathedrals is clearly seen in the frequency of his donations to cathedrals and their chapters, and in his concessions to the same.\(^{112}\) Future studies will certainly bear out the importance of the cathedral chapter as a recruitment ground for Alfonso’s government,\(^{113}\) but a few examples will suffice. Both Don Raimundo II (1124-52)\(^{114}\) and Gonzalo Perez (1183-91) were elected to the archiepiscopacy of Toledo from the cathedral chapter there.\(^{115}\) At Osma, two bishops

\(^{109}\) For more of these other points of data, see Appendix A.
\(^{110}\) Reilly, *The Kingdom of Leon-Castile under Alfonso VII*, 268.
\(^{111}\) Bernabé Bartolomé Martínez, “El cabildo catedralico, colaborador de su Obispo”, in *Historia de las diócesis españolas*, ed. *idem*, v. 20, 342. Bartolomé notes that the chapter of Osma suggests the importance of the chapter was “igual que diócesis como Toledo, Salamanca, Ávila, Orense y otras.”
\(^{112}\) Even a brief survey of the *Indice de Documentos* compiled by González suggests this: *RdC*, 3:786-887.
\(^{113}\) Although the connection above is obvious, my internal logic deserves secondary emphasis: if, as I have argued, Castilian bishops were naturally the king’s men, and if, as I am about to demonstrate, the cathedral chapters were recruiting grounds for future bishops, then two conclusions follow: the cathedral canons were already the king’s men because they were the king’s men’s men, and that Alfonso’s patronage of those chapters were investments in the royal bureaucracy.
\(^{115}\) Rivera Recio, *La Iglesia de Toledo en el siglo XII*, vol. 1, 202.
were elected from the cathedral chapter in less than 30 years: Garcia, elected in 1174,\textsuperscript{116} and Diego d’Acebo in 1201.\textsuperscript{117} These four examples demonstrate that the cathedral chapter was a potential breeding-ground for future bishops. Although bishops were drawn from many different sources, the patronage of cathedral chapters was clearly meant to supplement other sources of episcopal talent to serve among the ecclesiarchy of Castile in the king’s court.

The importance of episcopal cities to the government of Alfonso VIII demonstrates two facts: first, that the Castilian government understood the inherent power structures accessible in episcopal sees; second, that royal influence in those cities would engender a considerable degree of familiarity with royal power and patronage among the members of the ecclesiastical \textit{familia} in those same cities. We can conclude, then, that St. Dominic would have been familiar with the networks of royal power as they interacted with ecclesiastical spaces. Dominic would likely have been familiar with royal officials, governmental protocol and the relationship of the royal patron to the ecclesiastical client.

\textbf{The Twelfth Century Reformation and the Castilian Church}

The twelfth century reformation, as described by Giles Constable, was not absent from Spain. In fact, it seems that Spain was just as much a battleground for the \textit{reformatio} as any northern kingdom. Three issues of reform deserve considerable attention for this survey of the Castilian church in the twelfth century. First, the development of many religious orders and their subsequent patronage-networks brought diverse forms of

\textsuperscript{116} Loperraez, \textit{Descripción Histórica}, 1:146-7.
\textsuperscript{117} Loperraez, \textit{Descripción Histórica}, 1:187.
religious life and important influences on the Castilian church, furthering its growth and power. Second, papal use of legates in the region demonstrates the emphasis placed on the Castilian church as an emerging front for the defense of the faith and the liberty of the church. Third, as a case study, the issue of clerical concubines as a front in the reformation of the Castilian church demonstrates that papal ideals and realities “on the ground” were quite disparate. Taken together, the reformatio of the Castilian church suggests that the context for Dominic’s early life and career were situated thoroughly in a setting which was changing slowly but dramatically.

The development of religious orders in Castile under Alfonso VIII deserves a much more intensive study than has hitherto appeared in English. Despite that fact, their development in Castile can be summarized thus: where the interests of the religious orders served the interests of Alfonso, they were granted privilege and patronage. First, Alfonso VIII inherited a long-standing tradition of granting patronage and privileges to Cluniacs. Second, the multiple military orders in Castile suggests that, like the crusader states in Outremer, Castilian laymen may have wanted to see their organized campaigns against the Muslim states to the south as being in line with the larger crusade movement. Third, the growth of the Premonstratensian and Cistercian Orders in the latter half of the twelfth century demonstrates that, at least on the level of monasticization, Constable’s reformation seems to have taken hold in Castile. When “heresy” is added to this mixture, it becomes very clear that the spirituality of Castile is a vibrant and complex subject. Taken together, these three summative surveys demonstrate the importance of religious life to the spirituality of many Castilians, the young Dominic included.
Alfonso VI, Alfonso VII, and Alfonso VIII showed considerable favor to the abbey of Cluny. “The profound and lasting involvement of Cluny and León-Castilla was to blossom during the reign of Alfonso VI and would influence everything from dynastic marriages to monastic liturgical practice.” Peter the Venerable was a personal guest of Alfonso VII in 1142 and the two men traveled and acted in concert for much of the summer of that year. A charter dated 20 April 1165, given by the order of Alfonso VIII, recalls that his ancestors “loved with a special devotion the Cluniac church.” Similar language of ancestral devotion is found in other donations to Cluniac monasteries. Taken together, the special relationship between Castile and Cluny demonstrates the affinity which the Castilian monarchy must have had for reform-minded churchmen and monastics.

Military orders held a special place in the Iberian Peninsula—that much is certain. The Order of Santiago, Alcántara and Calatrava were all founded specifically for the defense of the Iberian Christian kingdoms against their southern Muslim neighbors. The importance of the Orders of Alcántara, Calatrava and Santiago de Compostela to the Spanish understanding of crusade and the religious life of the laity cannot be overstated. The emphasis of these orders in Spanish scholarship attests to the continued impression left on the documentary record by these orders. In the diplomatics of Alfonso VIII,

---

120 *RdC*, 2:117.
122 Carlos Ayala Martínez, *Las órdenes militares hispánicas en la Edad Media*, (Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2007), makes this point so abundantly clear that other treatments of the military orders in Spain can only serve to nuance Ayala Martínez’ deeply impactful survey.
123 For two such examples, see the following: Javier Fernández Conde and Antonio Linage Conde, “La Renovación Religiosa”, in *Historia de la Iglesia en España*, II-1, 376-405; *RdC*, I.556-601.
Santiago is mentioned in fourteen charters;\textsuperscript{124} Calatrava is found in fifty-six.\textsuperscript{125} It is, thus, rather clear that the military orders were an important part of Spanish spirituality and had a considerable impact on the Castilian \textit{mentalité} in the twelfth century.

Of the new forms of religious life nurtured in the twelfth century, Cîteaux was perhaps the most successful. Although the rate of that success was, perhaps, less rapid than was once thought,\textsuperscript{126} the impact of the Cistercian movement is nevertheless unparalleled in the twelfth century. Cistercians were archbishops of Toledo,\textsuperscript{127} bishops of Osma,\textsuperscript{128} and leaders of the kingdom.\textsuperscript{129} The importance of the Cistercian movement to Castilian religious culture suggests that the patronage of the Order by Alfonso VIII was part of a consistent program of employing the Cistercians in the spiritual work of Castile. Cistercians are mentioned in twenty-three of the charters collected by González.\textsuperscript{130} The strength of the Cistercian presence in Castile evinces the very likely existence of Constable’s twelfth century reformation in Castile.


\textsuperscript{127} Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada is yet again an excellent example.

\textsuperscript{128} Diego d’Acebo is reported to have accepted the \textit{habitus} of Cîteaux from the mother abbey herself. \textit{JSL}, 35.

\textsuperscript{129} Don Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada serves as a prime example of the power wielded by Cistercians in the kingdom of Castile. He was also both bishop-elect of Osma and archbishop of Toledo and primate of Spain.

The Premonstratensian movement is less well-studied than the Cistercians, but nevertheless demonstrates the vibrancy of the twelfth century reformation in Castile. Backmund observed it is very difficult to write the history of the Premonstratensians.131 Yet, we know of at least fifteen houses in Spain which predate Alfonso’s majority.132 These communities seem to have likewise tapped into a need for pastoral care in Iberia and likely were responding to the same tensions received and reacted to by the Cistercians.133 Thus, it seems likely that similar conclusions about the Premonstratensians can be drawn as were drawn about the Cistercians. Put differently: having tied the success of the Premonstratensians to the later success of the Cistercians, we can infer that similar causes compelled the creation of Premonstratensian houses as would later cause Cistercian foundations. This is made more relevant given that, as Constable reminds us, “houses of canons were often cheaper to found than houses of monks and they tended to be more amenable to the wishes of the founders and more submissive to the authority of bishops.”134 The Premonstratensians possess, in the words of one scholar, “[u]n historial glorioso de siglos, bien mercería los honores de una historia crítica y documentada.”135 An awareness of the popularity of the Premonstratensians as reform-minded clerics in Spain demonstrates the traction gained by the “Twelfth Century Reformation” in Castile.

---

132 Backmund, “La Orden Premonstratense en España”, 75-82
134 Constable, The Twelfth Century Reformation, 57.
The parallel movement to the religious orders in Castile was the influx of heresies in the late twelfth century. These heresies, both organized and local, frequently centered on the same ideals of the orthodox church. At their core, most heretical movements in the twelfth century desired to imitate the life of the apostles. We do not have the same reports of heretical activities in Castile that we do for Toulouse, and the results of those activities were markedly different. Nevertheless, there is scholarly consensus that heresy must have existed in Castile, although likely not in as virulent a form as in the Languedoc. A letter from Gregory IX attests to the presence of heretics in Castile (specifically at Palencia) in 1236, and seems to connect the heresies in Languedoc directly to Castile; a second letter follows suit for Burgos two years later. Likewise, Smith has amply demonstrated that heresy was alive and well even earlier than Gregory’s letter.


138 Fernández Conde edits and transcribes these letters as an appendix to his article. The article itself presents traditional assertions about “Cathars” and “their beliefs”, but marshals little new evidence, save the edited letters. Most troubling, however, about Fernández Conde’s conclusions is that he completely relies on Lucas of Tuy’s polemic against “Cathars” to prove the existence of “Cathars”. There is no real evidence for the condemnation or persecution of “Cathars” or any other major heretical movement in Castile in the period before the pontificate of Innocent III. However, the existence of “Albigenses” seems assured given the proximity of many Castilian towns to the Road to Santiago. Fernández Conde, “Albigenses”, 113-4.

139 Damian J. Smith, Crusade, heresy and inquisition in the lands of the Crown of Aragon (c. 1167-1276), (Boston: Brill, 2010),130-6. While Smith notes reports of heresy in Palencia, Burgos, and Toledo, the question of whether accusations of heretical activity were political tactics is not overtly discussed. The first mention of Castilian heresy noted by Smith from the period in question comes from the pontificate of Innocent III and is all too neatly coincidental with the dispute over the marriage of Berenguela and Alfonso IX. However, even if this notice is downgraded to “doubtful”, many more notices are still “likely” to have regarded actual heretics
The presence of heresy in Castile demonstrates the diversity and complexity of spirituality and religious life in Castile in the long twelfth century.

Surveying the presence of the reformed houses and heresy in Spain suggests that the twelfth century was a period of religious reform and a revival in Castile in similar fashion as that in Northern Europe. Rather than stifle it, Alfonso VIII and his ancestors encouraged the *renovatio* of religious life. The importance of this fact for the study of St. Dominic’s early life cannot be oversold: Dominic was a reformer who was certainly raised in an environment of religious reform and revival. If we accept Constable’s overarching thesis about the nature of religious reform in the twelfth century—the “monasticization” thesis—and apply it to the life of Dominic, the only conclusion can be that the influence of the “Twelfth Century Reformation” inspired Dominic’s reform-minded spirituality.

Legates had a special role in Castile. The aims of the papacy in Spain were manifestly based on asserting pontifical supremacy and the pope’s responsibility for the souls of the faithful. The legates sent to Spain during the twelfth century, by and large, were tasked with ensuring that the Iberian Church was in line with Roman orthopraxy. As reformers, legates sent to Spain had a full plate. Of the many legates sent to Spain, three deserve some attention here: first, Cardinal Boso, Cardinal-Priest of St. Anastasia; second, Cardinal Guido, Cardinal-Deacon of Sts. Cosmas and Damian; and third, Cardinal Hyacinth Bobone (later Pope Celestine III), Cardinal-Deacon of St. Cosmedin. These three Cardinal-Legates represent major papal attempts to control the growth of the Iberian church and

(as opposed to those accused of heresy due to political concerns). Inevitably, it seems clear that a heretical presence in Castile was demonstrable, even if kept under close supervision by close episcopal allies of Alfonso VIII.
demonstrate the intricacies of Papal-Hispanic politics during the progress of the twelfth century.

Cardinal Boso, the Cardinal-Priest of St. Anastasia, went on two separate legations; both to Iberia. The first, from November 1116 to November 1117, took him from Turin to Burgos to Gerona to Barcelona. “Las crónicas anónimas‘ speak of [Cardinal Boso’s] purpose to effect peace between Urraca and Alfonso of Aragon and of his itinerary from Burgos through Palencia and Leon, then on to Compostela and Braga, and, finally, of his return to Burgos and the council held there.” That same council of Burgos is “concerned almost exclusively with ecclesiastical discipline but [does] forbid consanguineous marriages.” The second, from February 1121 to August 1121, seems only to have left records covering his activities in Toulouse and Sahagún. During his second legation, the work of the Cardinal concentrated much more on the emergent kingdom of Portugal and the ecclesiastical relationships which were in flux under Doña Teresa. Taken together, the aims of the papacy point to a desire for the return to relative normalcy in the Iberian kingdoms and to ensure the resumption of the southward conquests.

---

140 Summaries of the evidence for his legations can be found in: Stefan Weiss, *Die Urkunden der päpstlichen Legaten von Leo IX. bis Coelestin III. (1049-1198)*, (Cologne: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, 1995), 70-81.
141 Weiss, *Die Urkunden der päpstlichen Legaten*, 70-73.
142 Reilly, *The Kingdom of León-Castilla under Queen Urraca*, 120.
143 Reilly, *The Kingdom of León-Castilla under Queen Urraca*, 120.
145 The surviving records of the legation mostly involve the bishops of Coimbra, Porto, and Compostela. Nearly half of the records which survive from the legation concern these men, who had previously been summoned to a council held at Sahagún under Queen Urraca’s aegis. We can probably assume that other records from the long distance between have simply been lost. Weiss, *Die Urkunden der päpstlichen Legaten*, 73-4;
During the pontificate of Pope Innocent II, Cardinal Guido went on four legations, two of which took him to Iberian territories. The evidence for his legations is scarcer than for Cardinal Boso’s legations. His first Iberian legation occurred circa September 1136 and centered on Burgos. The agenda for the whole legation does not survive in enough detail to demonstrate any specific goals which might be extracted from more complete records, but we do know for certain that the council itself was of major importance; nearly every Christian bishop in the peninsula attended the Council at Burgos. The second Iberian legation appears to have occurred in late 1143. Reilly suggests that “Alfonso VII had requested the appointment of a papal legate for Iberia with the authority to settle all outstanding matters.” The records from Cardinal Guido’s second legation (his fourth overall) are relatively scant, although again a council was celebrated at Valladolid: “The best idea of its dimensions is revealed by the decree of the papal legate, Cardinal Guido, who there published the canons of the Second Lateran Council of 1139.” Although the records of Guido’s legation do not survive sufficiently to suggest a larger program, the span of his decade of legatine activities suggests that he was certainly no empty shirt—his journeys to the peninsula coincide too neatly with the ascendance of Alfonso VII for that—he likely was a skilled papal diplomat. The most likely scenario is that his task was to

---

146 These legations were in fact the Cardinal’s second and fourth legations. The evidence which demonstrates the progress of his legatine activities can be found in: Weiss, Die Urkunden der päpstlichen Legaten, 118-123.
147 Weiss, Die Urkunden der päpstlichen Legaten, 118-9.
148 Bernard Reilly discusses the Council thus: “At Burgos in the fall [of 1136], a great council of the realm was held under the presidency of the cardinal-legate Guido (D263-64). The archbishops of Toledo and of Santiago de Compostela attended as did all fifteen living bishops of the realm proper. In addition, the newly reclaimed Ebro Valley was represented by the prelates of Calahorra and Tarazona and the bishop-elect of Zaragoza...The problems of the far west were discussed, for the archbishop of Braga and the bishop of Coimbra attended, while a new bishop of Oporto...was elected there.” Reilly, The Kingdom of León-Castilla under Alfonso VII, 55.
149 Weiss, Die Urkunden der päpstlichen Legaten, 119-20.
150 Reilly, The Kingdom of León-Castilla under Alfonso VII, 79.
151 Reilly, The Kingdom of León-Castilla under Alfonso VII, 79.
ensure the stability of the détente between the Iberian Christian kingdoms in order to facilitate renewed hostilities against the Muslim principalities to the south.

Cardinal Hyacinth Bobone was a frequent legate from the Holy See and eventually the Roman Pontiff himself. The pontificate of Celestine III has only recently begun to receive the attention which it deserves.\textsuperscript{152} From his Iberian legations, we have considerably more documentary evidence than from Cardinals Boso or Guido.\textsuperscript{153} The role of the Cardinal Bobone in Spain was to reform the church in Iberia and also to ensure that the ordering of the peninsula served the cause of reconquest by ensuring infra-Hispanic détente.\textsuperscript{154} As Damian Smith rightly notes: “Only through peace could the Christian rulers of Spain successfully defeat the Moors. Hyacinth as legate sought co-operation and an end to conflict between the various Christian rulers, and, when pope, one of the major tasks of his legate Cardinal Gregory was to establish peace between the Christian kingdoms.”\textsuperscript{155} Cardinal Bobone’s skill in handling Iberian affairs translated directly to an increase in Iberian business at his curia as Celestine III: “there was a marked respect for the pope’s knowledge...”

\textsuperscript{152} The only book which covers his pontificate with any great detail in English appeared in 2007. V., John Doran and Damian J. Smith eds., \textit{Pope Celestine III (1191-1198), Diplomat and Pastor}, Church, Faith and Culture in the Medieval West, (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2007). Previous volumes appeared near the turn of the twentieth century in German. Beyond the 2007 volume, modern scholarship seems to only concern itself with codicological, epistolary, and canon-legal studies concerning topics which approach Celestine, but these have only begun to broach the important topics which took shape in Celestine’s pontificate.

\textsuperscript{153} Comparing the four combined legations of Boso and Guido with only Cardinal Bobone’s first demonstrates this fact. From Boso and Guido, we have 19 extant documents. From Hyacinth Bobone, we have 28. Weiss, \textit{Die Urkunden der päpstlichen Legaten}, 70-3,118-120,173-182.


\textsuperscript{155} Smith, “The Iberian Legations of Cardinal Hyacinth Bobone”, 100. One wonders whether Celestine III knew (or had heard) about Alfonso VIII’s plans to marry Berenguela of Castile to Alfonso IX of Leon. I suspect that the marriage, had it occurred during the early part of Celestine’s pontificate, would have drawn only lukewarm condemnations from Celestine III. It seems likely that, while he would have formally condemned the match, he would not have pressed the matter, given its potential for ensuring lasting peace between Castile and Leon and for the furthering of the offensive against the Moors.
of the peninsula and ability to deal with its affairs."\textsuperscript{156} The reform of the Iberian Peninsula was a crucial objective, "this reform was intimately connected with the battle against the infidel."\textsuperscript{157} The legations of Cardinal Hyacinth demonstrate the papacy’s concern with pragmatic reform for the benefit of Christianity.

Taken together, these three cardinal-legates demonstrate that Iberia was an important theatre for papally-sponsored reform. Boso, Guido and Hyacinth were stalwart supporters of the pontifical agenda, achieving ecclesiastical victories—large and small—in the Iberian kingdoms. The roles of the cardinal-legates were as pontifical muscle and to ensure that the Iberian monarchs were able to continue their progress against their southern Muslim enemy. The reform of the Iberian church was a means for the Iberian monarchs to ensure all of the resources of the realm were directed toward their victory. For the cardinals, the reform of the church meant that God would ensure that victory. Reform \textit{qua} reform meant that the souls of the Christian inhabitants of the north were better prepared for crusades against the moors. Peace \textit{pro bono pacis} meant that those same inhabitants were more likely to participate in the crusades against the Almoravids and Almohads. Thus, Dominic was injected into a context of controversy which the cardinals of the Curia clearly intended to resolve; the intended result was no less than the subjugation of the Muslim south by a united Christian north.

Spanish secular clergy were—rightly or wrongly—accused of any number of vices, but among the most common was incontinence. The problems of Spanish clergy keeping concubines is a complex problem, but one acute expression of the tensions of clerical

\textsuperscript{156} Smith, "The Iberian Legations of Cardinal Hyacinth Bobone", 96.
\textsuperscript{157} Smith, "The Iberian Legations of Cardinal Hyacinth Bobone", 102.
concubinage can be found in one particularly important letter to Martin Bazán, bishop of Osma, from the papal curia under Innocent III. The letter contains within it all of the usual features of an epistle of its type, but has the added bonus of being potentially concerned with the reform of a house of canons regular (the same one in which Dominic would enroll)—the reform movement, clerical celibacy, and episcopal control.

Martin Bazán’s role as a close vassal of Alfonso VIII and pontifical judge-delegate will be examined more below, but his episcopate was clearly that of a royal reformist bishop.158 His letter to Innocent III concerning clerics who kept concubines became a standard reference for canon law collections.159 The text of the letter provides multiple methods for accusing and removing clerics who kept concubines.

If their crime is public in such a way that it deserves to be called notorious, in that case neither an accuser or witness are necessary, since such a crime cannot be concealed by evasion. If indeed it is public, not from evidence but from fama, in that case proof alone will not suffice for their condemnation, since they cannot be judged according to proof but rather by witnesses; but if concerning these clerics are held in so great a suspicion that it causes a scandal among the people, even though an accuser does not appear against them, you can impose canonical purgation against them; if they refuse to carry it out, or if they fail to carry it out, you will be able to punish them rightfully with canonical punishment.160

The notation that “such a crime cannot be concealed by evasion” suggests that evasion was a common enough tactic to merit its position in the letter. Given Martin Bazán’s role as a

---

158 For Martin’s role as a royal vassal and judge-delegate, see below, p. 65-8.
159 As Mansilla notes, the text of this letter found its way into the collections of Innocent’s Decretals, the Collection in Tres Partes, and the Decretal Collections of Gregory IX. DPHI3, 206.
160 DPHI3, 206: “si crimine eorum ita publicum est, ut merito debeat appellari notorium, in eo casu nec accusator nec testis est necessarius, cum huiusmodi crimen nulla possit tergiversatione celari. Si vero publicum est, non ex evidentia, set ex fama, in eo casu ad condemnationem eorum sola testimonia non sufficiunt, cum non sit testimoniiis set testibus iudicandum; sed si de clericis illis talis habeatur suspicio, ut ex ea scandalum in populo generetur, licet contra ipsos non apparaverit accusator, tu tamen eis canonica potes purgationem indicere; quam si prestare noluerint, vel defecerint in prestanda, eos canonica poteris animadversione punire.”
close vassal of Alfonso VIII and important papal ally, it is possible that the rescript was meant precisely to set precedent for the reform of secular priests Spanish—or at least the Castilian—Church. This suggests that Spanish clerics frequently ignored their colleagues’ keeping of concubines and that the papacy desired the reform strongly enough to provide one of their judges-delegate with such a clear and concise wording of official policy regarding clerical concubines. For the papacy, priestly keeping of concubines made the conquest of the Muslim south less likely—no less than the fate of Christendom was stake in the beds of Castilian clerics.

The reform of the Iberian church was a tricky business. Churchmen, both regular and secular, had to balance their solutions to the delicate problems of a rapidly expanding church with the legal realities of the Church. Their solutions had to support the Spanish monarchs and placate the Roman pontiff. That three cardinals held seven legations demonstrates that the reform of the Iberian church required something of a specialist. Further, the demonstrable influence of regular religious in the peninsula suggests that the reformation, as iterated by Constable, was a powerful influence on Spanish spirituality. The case study presented for the nature of clerical celibacy further suggests that Spanish clerics were reluctant to fight the inertia of tradition and required high-ranking clerical condemnation to make such changes tenable. Dominic’s life spans the height of the twelfth century reformation in Castile and we can strongly link Dominic’s background and his vocation because of this.
The Province of Toledo: Topic-surveys of Toledo, Palencia, and Osma

The inner workings of the Toledan province provide a glimpse into the workings of the internal hierarchy of Castile’s most important ecclesiastical network. The history of the archdiocese of Toledo needs to be understood in order to demonstrate its importance as a metropolitan and a regional power. The dioceses of Palencia and Osma must also be described in detail because they were two important dioceses for the study of the life of Dominic and two important suffragans of Toledo. The examination of these three dioceses provides an excellent microcosm of the larger twelfth century Castilian church. We must begin with Toledo itself, before proceeding to Palencia and Osma.

There are several issues which require some examination in order to understand the role of the archbishop of Toledo. First, the supremacy of Toledo as the primate of Spain requires summation and analysis. Second, the role of the archbishop of Toledo as Alfonso’s closest episcopal ally and as a member of the royal court is important. Third and finally, the role of the bishops of Toledo in internal canonical matters requires close scrutiny to better explain the role played by Toledo in Papal-Royal politics. Taken together, these three factors will demonstrate the importance of Toledo as the spiritual and political leader in Castile.

The position of primate is difficult to define accurately out of its context. Toledo’s primacy began as a royal privilege in the Visigothic period, but was first granted papally-

---

sponsored primacy by Urban II in his bull *Cunctis Sanctorum*. From the pontificate of Urban II to Innocent III, all but five pontiffs, most of those being short-lived, affirmed Toledo's primacy. Primates had, theoretically, the power to call synods, impose excommunications of all the prelates in their territory, and affect major policy shifts in their territories as well. The importance of Toledo's primacy cannot be overstated: Toledo was certainly the leader of the Castilian church and was the theoretical head of the whole Iberian church. The confluence of Toledo's ecclesiastical predominance coupled with the archbishop's incredibly close relationship with Alfonso VIII made Toledo very powerful in Castile and similarly powerful in Christendom in general.

Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada was, without doubt, one of Alfonso's VIII men but he was not the first archbishop of Toledo to cooperate closely with the Castilian monarch. Toledo’s cooperation underscores its importance for the kingdom of Castile. It is worth noting here that many of the kings of Castile also included the title of “King of Toledo” in their official title. Alfonso VIII styled himself as king of Castile, Toledo, and Extremadura as early as his second charter, dated to 11 July 1160. A survey of the extant royal diplomas of Alfonso VIII demonstrates how closely affiliated were the bishop of Toledo and the King of Castile (Table 5).

---

162 Rivera Recio, *La Iglesia de Toledo en el siglo XII*, 324-5.
163 Rivera Recio lists the epistles which confirmed Toledo’s primacy. His list is clearly accurate. The only pontiffs from which no such affirmations survive are Celestine II, Anastasius II, Lucius III, Gregory VIII, and Clement III. Only Lucius III and Clement III served more than two years each. I would suggest that, had any of them lived long enough the confirmation of Toledo’s primacy would certainly have come up. Rivera Recio, *La Iglesia de Toledo en el siglo XII*, 327.
164 RdC, 2:95. It should, of course, be noted that these titles would probably not have occurred to a seven-year-old and were likely the product of court stylings at the time. Nevertheless, major power-brokers in Castile thought Toledo important enough to include it in the royal titulus.
Table 5: The King's men I: The Archbishops of Toledo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Doc.’s witnessed by bishop</th>
<th>Total Doc.’s</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1153-1166</td>
<td>Juan</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1166-1180</td>
<td>Cerebruno</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1180-1182/3</td>
<td>Pedro de Cardona</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1183-1191</td>
<td>Gonzalo Pérez</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1192-1208</td>
<td>Martín López de Pisuerga</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1209-1247</td>
<td>Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>835</strong></td>
<td><strong>665</strong></td>
<td><strong>80%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding Rodrigo, the data would seem to be misleading: 59% is not an impressive statistic, when compared to his predecessors.\(^{165}\) However, the historical narrative betrays the reality: Rodrigo was an important diplomat within the royal court and was responsible for helping to drum up support for the campaign which ultimately fought at Las Navas.\(^{166}\)

The overarching presence of Toledan archbishops at Alfonso’s court—they witnessed 80% of his charters—suggests that Toledo’s absence would surely have been noticed and noteworthy. Table 5 demonstrates the importance of the archbishops of Toledo to the administration of Alfonso VIII. It is thus quite clear that the archbishops of Toledo were close allies of the royal administration.

The history of *reformatio* in Toledo may seem to clash with the picture presented for primatial sees in the rest of Europe. The archbishops of Toledo were, despite this disparity, present at many of the major reform councils which took place in the Iberian peninsulas.

The archbishops of Toledo were present at the councils called by cardinal-legates during

---

\(^{165}\) A caveat must be included here regarding Don Rodrigo: the charters surveyed for this analysis are limited to those of Alfonso VIII. Rodrigo lived on to serve Alfonso’s son, Enrique I, and grandson, St. Ferdinand III, and his frequency would almost certainly approached the same level of occurrence which his predecessors maintained, although I have only briefly surveyed those later documents

\(^{166}\) *LCKC*, 56-8
the twelfth century. Further still, the archbishops of Toledo attended all four of the
general councils at the Lateran. It was under the aegis of Toledo that the Roman rite was
imported to replace the old Hispanic rite. It is likely that the function of Toledo’s
presence ensured orthopraxy. Further still, it is extremely likely that the marriage between
the Castilian Infanta Berenguela and Alfonso IX of Leon took place with the support of
Toledo: Toledo was part of the party who pled the necessity of the marriage before
Innosc’s court. In fact, the letters condemning the marriage of Berenguela and Alfonso
IX were frequently addressed to Toledo, among others. These facts confirm that Toledo’s
role was one of leadership within the Castilian church.

Toledo’s role as the ecclesiastical head of Castile and primate of Spain in general
makes the history of the Toledan province important for the study of Iberian history and
the life of St. Dominic. Yet, despite the importance of Toledo, Dominic was not a canon of
the cathedral chapter of Toledo but of Osma; he did not study at the cathedral school of
Toledo, but at that of Palencia. Fortunately, Palencia and Osma were direct suffragans of

167 These legations are discussed more above, see above p. 47-51. The best summary of Toledo’s interactions
in this period with pontifical figures is found in: Rivera Recio, La Iglesia de Toledo en el siglo XII, 125-242.
168 The concern for Spanish crusading from the First Lateran’s decrees suggests that Spanish prelates
attended. Toledo’s attendance, in light of that fact, seems likely, especially given Calixtus’ previous
confirmations of Toledan primacy. Purkis notes the importance of I Lateran to the Spanish holy wars in:
William Purkis, Crusading Spirituality in the Holy Land and Iberia, c. 1095-1187, (Rochester, NY: Boydell and
Brewer, 2008) 129-30. The Cardinal Guido’s recitation of those prelates who attended II Lateran at the
council of Valladolid, and published the canons of II Lateran to remind the prelates of their obligations: Reilly,
The Kingdom of León-Castilla under King Alfonso VII, 79. Linehan notes Toledo’s presence at III Lateran as a
major event in the political life of the long-lived archbishop Cerebruno in: Linehan, History and Historians,
287. Rivera Recio concluded that a considerable presence at the IV Lateran Council was likely and that the
Toledan presence (as attested by the size of the familia of Don Rodrigo) was considerable: J. F. Rivera Recio,
“Personajes hispanos asistentes en 1215 al IV Concilio de Leetrán”, Hispania Sacra, 4:8 (1951), 347-50.
169 Juan Francisco Rivera Recio, “La Supresión del Rito Mozárabe y la Introducción del Romano”, in Historia de
la Iglesia en España, ed. Javier Fernández Conde, II.1, 275-85.
170 DPHI3, 211.
171 Compostela, Oviedo and Leon were also included in these letters, suggesting that they were intended for
the most important readers. Toledo’s place among such company is assuredly one of pontifically-sponsored
primacy. DPHI3, 276, 332, 336-8.
Toledo’s metropolitanate and not indirect suffragans under Toledo’s larger peninsular primacy. The dioceses of Palencia and Osma, therefore, require significant exposition in order to better fill out the picture of the province in which Dominic was raised.

Palencia was an important see within Toledo’s metropolitan province and was certainly one of Alfonso’s favored cities. The longevity of the bishops’ tenure in their office, the importance of Palencia as the site of key synods, the role of the cathedral school of Palencia as one of the earliest and most important of Castile, and the demonstrable presence of the Palencian bishops in the King’s innermost circle clearly demonstrates the important role played by the bishops of Palencia. Palencia provides the backdrop for nearly a decade of Dominic’s life.\textsuperscript{172} It is clear that the bishops of Palencia, perhaps the entire ecclesiastical population of Palencia, were motivated for the furthering of the Castilian royal administration.

The longevity of the bishops of Palencia is a briefly-made point, but deserves stating because it demonstrates the length and continuity of their influences during Alfonso VIII’s term. Each of the bishops during the reign of Alfonso VIII served for more than twenty years, two served thirty-five or more: Raimundo II was bishop from sometime in 1148 until his death after 20 May 1183; Arderico was bishop from sometime in 1184 until his death on 11 August 1207; Tello Téllez was bishop from 1208 until his death in 1247.\textsuperscript{173} The strength of Palencia’s bishops, made more impactful by the steadiness of the episcopal program, brought major opportunities for growth.

\textsuperscript{172} For more on the exact dating of Dominic’s time at Palencia, see below, p. 91-5.
It is clear that the bishops of Palencia were some of Alfonso’s closest advisors. Don Raimundo II was Alfonso’s great-uncle. Likewise, he was a forceful diplomat on behalf of his grand-nephew, a major power-broker in Castile, and an important expander of Palencia’s influence in the region. Yet what is even more impressive on this point is the frequency with which the bishops of Palencia appear in the documentary record as witnesses to royal charters. (Table 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Doc.’s witnessed by bishop</th>
<th>Total Doc.’s</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1148-83</td>
<td>Raimundo II</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1184-1208</td>
<td>Arderico</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1208-46</td>
<td>Tello Téllez</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>586</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was much more likely that Palencia would be in attendance at the royal court than that Palencia would be absent. This attendance brought considerable privileges and must have contributed handsomely to the growth of the diocese. We can conclude that these three bishops made Palencia into a powerful diocese and that it was likely because of their influence that the royal court and the national councils met there so frequently.

The growth of the episcopacy of Palencia is further seen in the frequency with which important synods and meetings of the royal court were held at Palencia. “Of the 16 national councils celebrated in the twelfth century only six took place outside the diocese of

---

175 Derek W. Lomax, “Don Ramón, Bishop of Palencia (1148-84)” in *Homenaje a Jaime Vicente Vivens*, vol. 1, ed. Juan Maluquer de Motes y Nicolau, (Barcelona: Facultad de Filosofía y Letras 1965), 280-91.
Palencia. The remaining ten gathered inside [the diocese of Palencia]." Further still, Alfonso VIII visited Palencia in nearly every year of his majority. The incredible frequency with which the magnates of the realm gathered in the diocese of Palencia suggests how truly powerful it was, and how likely it was for something remarkable to happen in Palencia.

We know little about the beginnings of the cathedral school in Palencia, save that it seems to be one of the few to emerge with great prominence from Castile. The confluence of long-lived bishops with close ties to the king and frequent councils being held at Palencia led to the enrichment of the diocese. Further, the development of a long-standing and successful cathedral chapter suggests that the chapter’s members were independently wealthy and that they were well-educated in their cathedral school. The likeliness of the clerics of the chapter of Palencia being well-educated is further enhanced by Peter of Ferrand’s comment that “the liberal arts flourished there in those days”. This comment is made more prudent by a chance mention in a papal epistle dated 11 May 1207 of a certain “I.” holding the position of “magister scholarum”, which demonstrates that a school existed.

177 A survey of the index of González’ charter volumes demonstrates this fact. Also, Table 4, above, demonstrates that ~5% of the charters issued by the chancery of Alfonso VIII emanated from Palencia.
178 However, we should not wholly discount the likelihood of a wealthy chapter. Spanish clerics frequently maintained their own nest-eggs, but lacking any evidence of overly-opulent clerics at Palencia, the most likely inference is that the clerics were capable and well-educated.
179 “Ibi enim tunc temporis generale florebat studium”. PFLSD, 212.
at Palencia. Modern scholarship has also identified that the position of *magister* appears as early as 1160, under Don Raimundo II.

It is very likely that the early cathedral school was responding to the same social tensions indicated by the call for greater clerical education in the Third Lateran in 1179. Thus, there was already a successful cathedral school during the episcopacy of Don Raimundo II and that it was greatly expanded in the 1180’s. Modern scholarship has argued that the cathedral school may be detected as early as the 1150’s, but it certainly dates to the reign of the bishop Don Raimundo II (r. 1148-83). We know that, when he chartered the school at Palencia, Alfonso VIII intended it to continue the work which had been undertaken there since perhaps the middle of the twelfth century. Adeline Rucquoi has further argued that the school “specialized in the study of law with the Italians” and has reconstructed a provisional list of scholars (many with Italian names) who appear in Palencian documents. We can thus conclude that, while the university in its royal form

---

180 DPHI3, 387-8.
185 Rucquoi, "Las Dos Vidas de la Universidad de Palencia (c.1180-1250)", 99. Rucquoi’s notation of the masters at the school is as follows: "Además, la prosperidad del cabildo catedralicio bajo los episcopados de Raimundo II y Arderico proveyó a un cierto número de maestros con los recursos necesarios para su estancia en Palencia. Se explica así la aparente brevedad de la presencia de estos *magistri*: Garsias Fornelle sólo se menciona una vez, en 1160, Martin en 1166, Odón en 1183, Parenns en 1190, Guillermo de Peñafiel figura en 63
dates to the thirteenth century, there was certainly a flourishing school at Palencia in Dominic’s time.

Effectively, the actual origins of the cathedral school of Palencia evade any degree of minute accuracy, but we can safely say that the school was running well during the episcopate of Don Raimundo II. The brief scraps of information from Raimundo’s episcopate are enhanced by the notations of Alfonso VIII’s patronage of the school during the period of Tello Téllez’ episcopate, found in both Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada’s *De Rebus Hispaniae* and Lucas of Tuy’s *Chronicon Mundi*. Further, this informs our understanding of Dominic: it was likely during the episcopate of Raimundo’s successor Arderico that Dominic joined the chapter. The school would have grown considerably in the intervening years, especially in the wake of Third Lateran. When coupled with Peter of Ferrand’s comment about the flourishing faculty of arts during Dominic’s time there, we can safely accept the suppositions above and conclude that the school was strong since at least the 1170’s.

Taken together, it is clear that Palencia was an ecclesiastically-vibrant place which would have had a considerable impact on young Dominic. The steady hand of a long-serving bishop, the continuing prosperity brought by royal privilege, the frequent contacts with the magnates of the realm, and a burgeoning cathedral school made Palencia one of Castile’s flagship cities. The Dominican narratives about Dominic’s time in Palencia reflect this reality but the survey presented here demonstrates how important a city like Palencia would certainly have been.

las listas de canónigos solo entre 1183 y 1190, Pons entre 1184 y 1190, Girardo y Lanfranco entre 1200 y 1213.”

186 *LTCM*, 324-5; *DrH*, 256.
Dominic served in the cathedral chapter of Osma; he was recruited to serve there from Palencia. Osma was as important as any diocese in the Toledan province, and seems to have played an active role in the larger program advancing Toledan peninsular ecclesiastical supremacy. Relations between Palencia and Osma were clearly amicable: “Don Raimundo[II, bishop of Palencia] sought good relations with other churches, and signed a letter of fellowship between the cathedral chapters of Palencia and Osma.”\(^{187}\) To better analyze the situation of the diocese of Osma up to and including Dominic’s time there, three points need to be discussed here. Firstly, Osma’s bishops were valued members of the royal court and the diocese received royal patronage accordingly. Secondly, the reform of the chapter of Osma occurred only during the tenure of a powerful episcopal ally of the king (and likely at the king’s pleasure). Third and finally, the role of Martin Bazán as a papal judge-delegate reinforced his position as a trusted papal lieutenant and royal vassal.

Martin Bazán was little different from his predecessor; like Garcia I, the bishop of Osma was one of the king’s men. The infrequency of earlier bishops in the diplomatic record (1148-85) demonstrates that only after the episcopate of Garcia I did the bishops of Osma begin more actively to cultivate the patronage of Alfonso VIII. (Table 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Docs.’ witnessed by bishop</th>
<th>Total Docs.’</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1148) 1158-73</td>
<td>Juan II</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{187}\) “Buscó don Raimundo buenas relaciones con otras Iglesias, y firmó carta de hermandad entre los cabildos de Palencia y Osma.”González, “Siglos de Reconquista”, in Historia de Palencia, ed. idem, 1:196.
Tenure | Name                     | Doc.'s witnessed by bishop | Total Doc.'s | Percentage |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1174-6</td>
<td>Bernardo I</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1177-1185</td>
<td>Miguel I</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1186-88</td>
<td>García I</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1189-1201</td>
<td>Martin Bazán</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201-1207</td>
<td>Diego d’Acebo</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1208-10, el.</td>
<td>Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210-1214 (1225)</td>
<td>Mendo/Melendo</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>424</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We might further note that García I, Martin Bazán, and Diego d’Acebo demonstrate a considerable up swell in the number of their appearances. Much more than their predecessors, these three were certainly the king’s men. Although his presence in the documentary record represents a numerical drop-off, Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada’s tenure as the bishop-elect of Osma can be included into this same schema because of his later service to the king. Further, although Don Rodrigo ostensibly retained his title as bishop-elect of Osma, his propensity for title-collecting is infamous and the use of the title of elect until Melendo’s confirmation in 1210 is likely of function of his love of titles. The period, then, from 1186-1225 saw the bishops of Osma become close and vital allies of the kings, suggesting that their activities were likely undertaken with the consent or sponsorship of the royal curia.

The reform of the chapter of Osma seems to have occurred sometime between the early 1170’s and middle 1190’s. This reform certainly occurred by 1199 given that Innocent III had confirmed the reformist constitutions of the chapter in the spring of that year.

---

188 For Rodrigo’s presence among the king’s inner circle, see above, p. 58.
189 An epistle of Alexander III is the first to demand the reformation of the chapter, but it was not until Innocent III’s letter that reform seems to actually have been completed. Rivera Recio notes this letter from Alexander III, but unfortunately misreads Innocent III’s letter of 1199 which suggests that the reform was still incomplete during the tenure of Lucius III. Cf., Rivero Recio, La Iglesia de Toledo, 265-7; DPHI3, 205.
This coincides with the period directly after the disastrous defeat of Alfonso’s coalition at Alarcos in 1195 and may well coincide with Alfonso’s concern to ensure his future victories. While we cannot know for certain when Dominic was active in the chapter at Osma, it was in the process of reform and revival while he was a member. While Dominic certainly learned much as a sacristan and sub-prior, it is much more likely that he learned just as much in his extra-ecclesiastical duties: his role had political significance, economic significance, and a considerable impact on his understanding of leadership and bureaucratic structure as well.

During his episcopate, Martin Bazán was the deserved subject of significant papal correspondence: there are eight extant letters addressed to him. When this fact is observed in tandem with Don Martin’s attendance at Alfonso’s court, it becomes clear that Martin Bazán was clearly a power-broker in Castile in the last decade or so of the twelfth century. Further still, Martin’s testimony to the curia is attested by several other letters, all of which concern the Huesca-Lérida dispute for which Martin served as a papal judge-delegate. These facts in confluence suggest that Martin Bazán was a close ally of both the pope and the king. That all of these letters date to the first few years of the pontificate of Innocent III suggests that Innocent placed considerable trust in Martin’s allegiance. We cannot reliably reconstruct his experience with Spanish politics during the span of Innocent’s cardinalate. However, it can be supposed that Innocent had considerable contact

190 *MDSD*, 4-5.
191 The personnel shift evident in the chapter at Osma alone, between 1195 and 1201, demonstrates that cultivating the relationship with the divine was an important support mechanism for the Castilian reconquest. Not a single subscribing member from the chapter at Osma in 1195 appears in the charters from 1201. Loperraez, *Descripción Histórica del Obisbado del Osma*, 2:41-5; *MDSD*, 4-5.
192 *DPHI* 176, 205, 206, 251-2, 270-1, 272-3, 273, & 274.
193 For Martin’s attendance at Alfonso’s VIII court, see Table 6 above, p. 66
194 *DPHI* 256, 271, 283-5, 292-300.
with Iberian classmates from his university days in Paris and Bologna and that, later on, talk at the Papal Curia made certain names well-known in Rome. Martin Bazán must have been either a frequent correspondent with the Papal Curia or must have been present on multiple occasions at the Curia for councils, appeals and/or other official business.

The diocese of Osma was a complex place. When Dominic was born, the bishops were not yet closely-tied vassals of Alfonso VIII. When Dominic enrolled at the cathedral chapter, they were some of Alfonso’s closest vassals. The reform of the chapter was recent and likely was still very vigorous by the time Dominic arrived. Martin Bazán was the archetypical Castilian bishop: he was a close ally of both the king and the pope. If we take that connection and cross-apply it to Dominic’s time in Toulouse the similarities are striking: Martin cultivated good relationships with the King, Dominic was one of Simon de Montfort’s favorite churchmen; Martin was a close ally of Innocent III and was rewarded for his service. Fulk of Toulouse lavished praises and gifts on Dominic. The similarities are striking.

The province of Toledo was clearly a vibrant place, counter-balancing royal and papal interests. The bishops of Toledo, Palencia, and Osma were all closely-tied vassals of Alfonso VIII. The bishop of Toledo was the primate of Spain. A bishop of Osma served as a papal judge-delegate. The bishops of Palencia guided their bishopric with steady and long-lived leadership, developing perhaps Castile’s first university and certainly one of Castile’s strongest cathedral schools. Palencia, too, was a frequent site for major gatherings of the realm’s prelates and potentates. Taken together, it is clear that the province of Toledo was a major center of ecclesiastical and royal activities. We can safely say that Dominic was
born and raised in the heart of Old Castile and benefited greatly from her ecclesiastical culture.

**Conclusions**

Dominic of Osma was a Castilian by birth and by experience. The kingdom of Alfonso VIII was his home for more than half of his life. His returns to Castile during his later life may well indicate the affection he felt for his homeland. We can conclude that the nature of Alfonso VIII and his realm likely had a considerable impact on Dominic's life, spirituality, and *mentalité*. The role of Alfonso's royal patronage, the Castilian reception of the twelfth century reformation and the nature of the province of Toledo paint a vivid picture of what Dominic's early life must have been like. The impact of his upbringing is demonstrable in Dominic's later life—Dominic styled himself “brother Dominic, canon of Osma, least of the preachers”.\(^ {195} \) This Castilian context for Dominic's early life surveyed three major topics: first, the role of the influence of Alfonso's patronage and attempts to harness the church for the benefit of Castile; second, the attempts at reforming the church of Castile and the nature of *reformatio* in the Castilian clerical culture; and, finally, the section surveyed the nature of the province of Toledo in order to understand more closely some of the tensions which Dominic would have experienced.

\(^ {195} \) *MDSD*, 16-7.
Chapter III: Dominic of Caleruega

Dominic’s Family and Early Life

Medieval “biographies” of saints, their “hagiography”, demonstrate the sanctity of the individual being portrayed in the text. The life of the holy person is necessarily the product of their character. Saint Dominic’s life was interpreted as the product of his upbringing, as is demonstrated by the hagiography crafted by his order. Effectively, Dominic’s early life was read forward into his later sanctity; more than literary foreshadowing, his mores as a young man influenced his growth into his later sanctity. His education was the backbone of his later endeavor and his early career developed the skills required of him as the founder and first Master of the Order of Preachers. Therefore, we must examine the following items to understand their later thematic importance for Dominic’s hagiographers: first, his family history and hometown; second, his early life and education; third, his “character” in the medieval sense of revealed nature, his *ingenium*. Fundamentally, the thematic underpinnings of Dominic’s early biography explained his later sanctity, because, to the medieval reader, his sanctity was the product of his early life.

The traditional date for Dominic’s birth is given as *circa* 1170. Simon Tugwell has successfully argued that 1174 makes a better tether-date, and that Dominic was potentially born a little before this date, but certainly not much later than it. Effectively, the

---


197 The meat of Tugwell’s argument is located in: Simon Tugwell, “Notes on the Life of Dominic IV: Dominic’s Date of Birth”, *AFP*, LXVII, (1997), 46-50. Tugwell himself summarizes his final chronology for the important benchmarks of this schema, on page 56 of the same article, thus: “We may conjecture, then, that Dominic was born c.1174, went to Palencia c.1187, and became a canon of Osma c.1198.”
argument over Dominic's date of birth becomes academic, but this span does interestingly coincide with Alfonso VIII's marriage to Eleanor of Aquitaine after 1169 and the buildup to the conquest of Cuenca in 1177. Contextually, then, Dominic's birth took place during the beginning of Alfonso's VIII assertion of his regnal rights and the expansion of his kingdom.

The earliest mention of the family of Dominic is found in Jordan of Saxony's *Libellus*, in a section which echoes a passage from the life of St. Bernard, and describes a dream attributed to Dominic's mother. In it, Dominic's mother sees a puppy (*catulus*) in her womb which emerges, torch in mouth, to illuminate the world barking (*baiulantam*) sacred erudition (*sacre eruditionis*). In two of the *vitae* of Bernard, his mother also sees a puppy (*catulus*) and Bernard is described as an extraordinary preacher (*egregius praedicator*). In both versions, the future saints were described as puppies, remarkable preachers, and gifted intellectuals. The textual parallels stop there. Jordan's textual description becomes the standard and later legends merely tinker with vocabulary and the poetry of the description.

Peter of Ferrand would add both of the saint’s parent’s names (*Iohanna and Felix*). Rodrigo de Cerrato may have added that Dominic’s father belonged to Castile’s class of *ricos hombres* calling Felix “a venerable man and rich within his own”, *vir venerabilis et*

---

199 *JSL*, 27.
200 *JSL*, 28.
202 Cf., *PFLSD*, 210-1; *BTLE*, 209; *COLSD*, 288-9; *HRLP*, A29; *HRLM*, A53-4; *JVLA*, A66; *JMV*, 317; *RCVSD*, 776; *DAL*, 566D-E; *GSSDLD*, 238.

71
dives in proprio suo. Unfortunately, Rodrigo’s diction is rather imprecise. Peter of Ferrand was perhaps well-informed about Dominic, but Rodrigo composed nearly half a century after Dominic’s death. As a result, while Felix’ status as a member of the nobility cannot be definitively proven, the attribution of “de Guzman” as Felix’ surname has been proven to be a fifteenth century invention and incorrect. Anthony Lappin therefore rightly asserts that “Dominic’s father was then...a successful member of the middle class, perhaps a merchant”, an assertion with which Tugwell clearly concurs.

The sources claim that Dominic had two siblings: both were brothers and there is no mention of any sisters. Unfortunately, little is known about either of these two brothers. Gerard de Frachet (writing in the 1250’s) declares that Dominic’s brother Mames became a Preacher and was buried with the Cistercians at Caleruega. Rodrigo de Cerrato

---

203 {RCVSD, 777.}
204 The dating of Rodrigo’s text does not invalidate him (see my analysis, above, p. 25-6) but does call into question the precision of his account rather than its accuracy. Rodrigo may well have known about Felix’s social status and may have attempted to preserve some memory thereof in his text. Unfortunately, the (im)precision of Rodrigo’s text only allows us to exclude certain social categories (namely, slaves and peasants) rather than to include the upper ranks of the kingdom (namely, nobility or membership in high-ranking clerical families).
207 “To conclude, the sum of documentary evidence supporting the derivation of Dominic from the Guzman and the Aza is precisely nil. All there is a Guzman family tradition which can be traced back to the early years of the fifteenth century. Since authentic sources furnish no family name for Dominic, it is to be hoped that scholars will henceforth follow the policy of current official Dominican documents, such as the Proprium Officiorum, and maintain a discreet silence on the subject of Dominic’s genealogical affiliations.” Tugwell, “Notes on the Life of Dominic IV”, 57-9. The above quote is found on page 59.
208 When we read this further forward into Dominic’s relationship with the house at Prouille and his work with women, it suggests that we would certainly have known if Dominic had had sisters.
209 The whole passage, as translated by Jarret, reads: “The other, whose name was Marines [sic], a holy man of contemplative mind, served God during many years in the Order of Preachers, and after a happy passage entered into his rest. He died in Spain, where he shone with the lustre of virtues and miracles, and there, in the Cistercian abbey at Calaroga, his blessed remains rest, and his venerated tomb may yet be seen beside the high altar.” Gerard de Frachet, Vitae Fratrum, trans. Bede Jarret, II.1. It should be pointed out that much of the text as translated by Jarret does not appear in the critical edition of Gerard de Frachet’s text as given in the MOPH, but rather is given as an addition in the apparatus criticus. The Latin reads as follows, with the addition from the apparatus given in braces: “Alter vero frater, Manes dictus, vir contemplativus et sanctus, Deo diu in ordine serviens, bono fine quievit (Hic obit et quiescit in monasterio quodam monachorum
supplies a brief description of Mames, saying: “that brother Mames was a fervid preacher, honest in his ways, mild, humble, joyful and kind” \(^{210}\) and Gerard de Frachet further acclaims him as “a contemplative and saintly man”, *vir contemplativus et sanctus*.\(^{211}\) Mames’ reputation for leading a holy life seems to have resulted directly from the tradition of the Dominicans in Spain and is reported by Bernard Gui early in the fourteenth century.\(^{212}\) Frachet further adds: “One of [Dominic’s brothers] became a priest, and gave himself up entirely to the service of the poor by works of mercy in a hospital, thereby earning for himself the reverence of all his countrymen as a man truly beloved of God.”\(^{213}\) Vicaire rightly notes that the other brother, save being mentioned in anonymity by Gerard de Frachet, remains something of an unknown.\(^{214}\) We have no other facts about this brother, and references to him are absent from the other early texts. But on this issue, Vicaire adds: “The Dominican historiographers of the sixteenth century call this brother Anthony, without its being known on whose authority.”\(^{215}\) Unfortunately, the confluence of the reputations of Dominic’s brothers adds little to our understanding of the saint’s biography. That either brother was a member of the Spanish clergy only makes clear that they would have had a steady income and were involved in community life; concerning the conduct of the Spanish clergy in the thirteenth century (and thus probably also the twelfth), Linehan

\(^{210}\) “Erat autem ille frater Mames predicator fervidus, honestus moribus, mittis [sic], humilis, ylaris [sic], et benignus.” Clearly, “mittis” should read “mitis”; Mames is obviously not of a group of nouns which were sent.” \(RCVSD, 798-9.\)

\(^{211}\) *GFVF*, 67.


\(^{213}\) Gerard de Frachet, *Vitae Fratrum*, II.1.

\(^{214}\) Vicaire, *St. Dominic and His Times*, 20.

\(^{215}\) Vicaire, *St. Dominic and His Times*, 20.
has commented that: “Many treated the parish as an economic unit rather than as a social or religious entity.”

The stereotypical state of the Spanish Church in the period makes the stories told by the sources about Mames and Anthony remarkable just as much because of what they didn’t do as because of what they did. More optimistically, although the sources assume that Dominic’s brothers shared in what is ostensibly the family *ingenium*, we cannot know this for certain.

We can further infer the status of Dominic’s immediate family by examining his later career. Given that houses of canons regular were often smaller, easier to maintain, and did not require the sophisticated or extensive endowments of traditional monastic institutions, it is likely that Dominic’s family could have afforded to give (only?) a small sum to the chapter at Osma, if any such gift was even necessary. Given that the chapter’s reform was recent (probably little more than a decade before Dominic’s arrival), the need for a substantial endowment was further decreased. Effectively, the chapter could afford to recruit based on talent alone, rather than on the basis of potential offerings by canon’s relatives. It is likely that the chapter of Osma *circa* 1200 was small, funded by gifts tied to recent reform-minded bishops with histories of fealty to the king, and populated with educated and pious young canons of diverse economic background. Royal involvement made it all the more likely that Castilian cathedral chapters would have been able to survive financial, or even military, strains. Further, the fact that Felix was able to send Dominic to school, first with his uncle and then later at Palencia, suggests that Felix was at

---


least a shrewd enough businessman to meet the demands of late twelfth century Castilian markets and provide ably for his family. Further still, that Dominic's brothers were likely also educated suggests that Felix and Johanna were able to generate a noteworthy household income.\textsuperscript{218} Taken together, this seems to confirm Lappin's speculation that Felix was likely a merchant or non-noble knight living in or very near Caleruega.

About Dominic's extended family, little can be definitively determined. We hear from Jordan that Dominic was given to his archpriest uncle for his early education,\textsuperscript{219} presumably for the most basic clerical skills: Latin, some grammar, some logic, and learning to write. The identity of this uncle is otherwise unknown. We can reasonably assume from the text that he must have been, himself, educated, but other facts are lost. It would make considerable sense for that uncle to have been attached to a church and/or to have been enrolled at a nearby cathedral, perhaps as a teacher in either place. This makes Dominic's later religious path self-evident: if he was educated and socialized to be a pious cleric, Dominic's later actions of charity at Palencia and his enrollment in the chapter at Osma make considerable sense. Thus, it seems likely that this otherwise unknown uncle should be a priest at one of the nearby towns or cities. My speculation would be that the dioceses of Burgos, Osma, Palencia, or Valladolid fit for this uncle's location. I base this on three observations. First, all four of these locations are not very far from Caleruega and would be

\textsuperscript{218}This suggests the possibility of Felix and Johanna belonging to the non-noble knightly class. Although Spanish clergy were not always (as the Popes and Councils had commanded them to be) well-educated, we might safely assume, given Dominic's education, that his older brothers were as well. This suggests a certain degree of familial wealth. Effectively, I see Dominic's family fitting into the sort of class described in detail by Ruiz in his \textit{Crisis and Continuity}: Teófilo F. Ruiz, \textit{Crisis and Continuity: Land and Town in Late Medieval Castile}, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994), 235-61. Ruiz further develops these ideas in a study which surveys those tendencies' evolutions: Teófilo F. Ruiz, \textit{From Heaven to Earth}, passim. On Dominic being not the oldest of the three brothers and potentially the youngest of the three, see: Tugwell, "Notes on the Life of St. Dominic IV", 56.

\textsuperscript{219} JSL, 28.
near enough for money to be sent to Dominic and for his family networks to maintain him. Second, each of these cities possessed their own cathedrals in the period, and would thus have likely had cathedral schools and well-developed parochial networks. Third, Jordan remarks that Dominic was sent to this uncle and then sent to Palencia, meaning that he did not stay in Caleruega and likely was not resident with the uncle in Palencia. Fourth, it seems most likely that the uncle was a parish priest somewhere in the dioceses of Burgos, Osma, or Valladolid because Jordan does not list the exact city. Had the location been memorable enough (as Burgos or Valladolid would have been), it would have been listed. Therefore, it is likely that the uncle would have lived near enough to have some access to the academic climate of the cathedrals and near enough to Felix’ domus, so as to facilitate further support as became necessary. We should suppose that the archipresbyterium to which the uncle was assigned was likely part of one of these same dioceses and he likely lived in one of the villages there within. This uncle’s role as an educator is hard to pin down, but the chronology itself is not greatly in question; it is most likely that Dominic was with this uncle from circa 1182-87.220

I would argue that the uncle most likely served in the dioceses of Osma or Burgos (and therefore not too far from his family). Together, there were, at most, three dozen

---

220 Tugwell suggests (see above, n. 198) that Dominic was in Palencia from after circa 1187 and that he was born circa 1174. Therefore, if we surmise that Dominic was still a boy of eight or so when he was sent to his uncle, this puts the year at around 1182, giving Dominic five years or so to learn Latin, writing, etc. Further, I would be comfortable pushing the date forward to 1184/5, which would suggest that the primary purpose of Dominic’s time with his uncle was to learn proper church-service and basic language and academic skills. Beyond even that dating, it would seem likely that if Tugwell’s dating is accurate (and is corroborated by the evidence) then Dominic could not have had much time to learn before Palencia. Dominic was likely destined for the priesthood from birth.
archpriestly positions in these dioceses which suggest the uncle’s importance.\textsuperscript{221} This suggests that Juana’s social position was similar to Felix’s and confirms the above-noted speculations regarding Dominic’s family’s social background.

“Furthermore,” Gerard de Frachet notes, “two of St Dominic’s nephews led holy and praiseworthy lives in the Order.”\textsuperscript{222} What makes the existence of these two nephews especially problematic is that they present a problem for reconstructing Dominic’s family tree [Figure 1]: if they were sons of Anthony, this would mean that Anthony either had a concubine or a wife, which would suggest that Anthony was the eldest and stood to inherit the most, which would explain Dominic and Mames’ clerical vocations; this is made further likely by the observation that Mames was still alive by the time of Dominic’s canonization.\textsuperscript{223} I would thus propose that the two nephews were likely the younger sons of Anthony and that Anthony’s work with the poor took place after he had already fathered those two sons. However, given that there is no mention in the early texts about Dominic not having sisters, it is also possible that these nephews were actually the sons of one of

\textsuperscript{221} There are reports of no more than 14 such positions in the diocese of Osma and no more than 20 in Burgos. Even these estimates are from later documents and the actual number for the latter half of the twelfth century is likely smaller. Bernabé Bartolomé Martínez et al., \textit{Historia de las diócesis españolas}, vol. 20, 72-3 & 358-61.

\textsuperscript{222} Gerard de Frachet, \textit{Vitae Fratrum}, trans. Jarret, II.1. Strangely, there are no extant mentions which allow us to further identify these two nephews. It seems odd that no reference to them survives in other sources or legendaries, given the larger success of Dominic. (It is, of course, still quite possible that mention of them exists in some, as yet, unknown manuscript.)

\textsuperscript{223} Rodrigo de Cerrato notes that Mames was still alive when news of Dominic’s canonization had reached Spain. Rodrigo writes: “When it had been heard in Spain that blessed Dominic had been canonized, brother Mames, his very own brother, came to Caleruega, and preaching about his own [brother] he induced those [gathered to hear him] so that in that place where blessed Dominic had been born they should build a church, and he added: ‘make now a little church, because it will become enlarged when it shall be pleasing to my brother [to enlarge it].’” “Cum auditum esset in Hyspania quod canonizatus esset beatus Dominicus, frater Mames, germanius ipsius, venit Calerogam, et predicans proprio induxit eos ut in loco illo ubi natus fuerat beatus Dominicus ecclesiam hedificarent, addiditque: ‘facite nunc ecclesiam peruulam [sic], quia ampliabitur cum placuerit fratris meo.’” Obviously, “peruulam” is a misprint in Carro’s edition; it should read “paruulam” as “peruulam” makes grammatical sense only if Mames was attempting to express that he would thoroughly want that church to be built, but this does not fit with the second half of the clause that declares that the church would be later enlarged by God, should worship at the Church merit such an increase. \textit{RCVSD}, 798.
Dominic’s sisters. If Anthony were in fact the father of these two nephews, we can clarify the structure of Dominic’s family life somewhat.

Figure 1: Proposed Family Tree for St. Dominic

About the character of this group, we can add one last interesting fact. Legends of Dominic’s mother tell of her giving to the poor, having prophetic dreams and otherwise living like an upright Spanish lady.\(^{224}\) This suggests that the family, even after presumably paying for Dominic’s education (and perhaps that of his brothers), possessed a disposable

---

\(^{224}\) Rodrigo de Cerrato calls her “honesta, pudica, prudens, miseris et afflicitis valde campasiens, et inter omnes mulieres terre illius bone fama prorogativa rufulgens.” \textit{RCVSD}, 777. We must be aware that Rodrigo wrote much later in the thirteenth century than we might like and his information must be suspected. However, his earlier comments seem to reflect a Castilian tradition with regard to Dominic and can be tentatively relied upon for such “local” background, but he cannot be our sole evidence. Every text, excepting Jordan of Saxony’s, note that Dominic came “from pious parents”, which suggests that Johanna’s reputation was secure, but that Rodrigo was either adding a bit of flourish (which is more likely) or reflecting the Castilian understanding of that reputation (which is a little less likely).
income. Even if these reports smack of being hagiographical trope, the mention occurs in Rodrigo de Cerrato’s text which suggests a lasting local Spanish memory of Dominic’s mother; this is perhaps further evidence of the social status of Dominic’s family.

In summary, we can reconstruct only some of Dominic’s family history: he was one of at least three surviving siblings. His mother had at least one brother who had become a priest and who was later to be Dominic’s teacher. His father was probably a man of good reputation and was at least of the emergent mercantile class which is attested throughout Europe in the twelfth century. He had two brothers, at least one of whom was a professed religious, and no sisters are ever mentioned. He is reported to have had two nephews, neither of whose names is given in any of the sources.

Of Dominic’s early life we have surprisingly little information of any substance. First to appear in the traditions are stories about an incident at Dominic’s baptism and a description of his character as a little boy. Early on, descriptions of his study habits, love of charity, and his ascetic sleeping practices also surface. In both cases, these are hagiographical and can be considered less as verifiable facts but rather as contributions to our understanding of Dominic’s character. Additionally, we have a description of his education and his recruitment into regular life. Each of these descriptions contribute to our understanding of the kind of man Dominic would grow up to become and therefore merit deeper analysis in order to parse which memories of Dominic are legitimate, which are elaborations or expansions of fragmentary memories, and which are purely hagiographical. Thus, we must at least attempt to distill the important and potentially-authentic details found in the corpus.
The story of Dominic’s baptism occurs very frequently in the hagiography. Naturally, the first mention is found in Jordan of Saxony and his report echoes considerably in the later tradition: “his mother was shown a vision just as though [Dominic had] a moon on his forehead, in which it surely was prefigured that he would be given into the lights of his people, to illuminate those people, who sit in the shadows and shades of death.” The story about Dominic’s baptism loses something in translation from its medieval context. Fortunately, the appreciable repetition found in the tradition makes plain the story’s importance to the Dominican tradition. The baptism story likely happened, in the sense that something occurred and was reported, but what happened exactly is irrelevant. The importance for the medieval Dominican mind was that the story matched what they already knew to be true about Dominic’s holiness.

Dominic’s boyhood conduct appears in the earliest texts and is augmented in the later tradition. Problematically, we have little which does not smack of hagiographical trope. Of course, the accounts quality does not invalidate the testimony of the texts, but must call them into question because of the quasi-mythological hagiographical tendency. We hear three of Dominic’s boyhood character traits extolled consistently in the hagiographical corpus: we hear that he frequently refused to sleep in his bed; that he abstained from boyish shenanigans; and that he frequently modeled holiness beyond his years. The composite of these three qualities demonstrates the manifestations of his

---

225 PFLSD, 212; COLSD, 289; HRLp,429; JMV,317; JVLA,466; BTLE,209; HRLM,455; RCVSD, 776; DAL, 566D; GSSDLD, 238.
226 “Iam autem in illa sua iuvenili etate futurorum prescius Deus aliquatenus est dignatus ostendere, quod insigne aliquid proventurum ex pueru speraretur. Denique matri sue visio monstratus est velhabens lunam in fronte, quo profecto prefigurabatur dari eum aliquando in lucem gentium, illuminare his, qui in tenebris et in mortis umbra sederent, ut rei postmodum probavit eventus.” JSL, 30.
227 See above, n. 226.
ingenium and follow traditional hagiographical trends: Dominic was a saint as an adult because he was pious as a boy and learned the lessons which his parents, his teachers, and his ecclesiastical superiors taught him.

The reports of Dominic’s sleeping habits as a boy are traceable to Peter of Ferrand’s narrative, but that Dominic maintained this habit well into his adult life is attested by the “Canonization Acts” in both their Bolognese and Toulousain incarnations. We hear the consistent affirmation from the period after Peter of Ferrand that Dominic, while still a little boy, left his bed and was found frequently sleeping on the floor: “For when he was still a little boy and not long separated from his wet-nurse, he was often found to have left his bed and as if shrinking back from the delights of the flesh he chose to lie on the ground rather than to stretch out upon the solid bed.” The same attributions were used by the later hagiography, nearly verbatim. The repetition of the same facts demonstrates the continuity of the tradition, but cannot be marshaled to demonstrate that that tradition was founded on facts. Whether the account is factually accurate is irrelevant, the testimony of Dominic’s later sleeping habits would have convinced the early Dominicans that the stories about his juvenile behavior were true, if only because they were themselves consistent with Dominic’s adult habits. The point, for the Dominican authors, was that Dominic’s later behavior was part of his ingenium and was manifest during his childhood—he was a saint from his earliest days and that early behavior did not change.

228 PFLSD, 211-2.
229 ACD, 137, 139, 146, 156, 180, 184.
231 BTLE, 209; COLSD, 290; BTLE, 209; HRLM, 455; JVLA, 466; RCVSD, 776-7; GSSDL, 238.
Dominic’s other behavior is described in the corpus in terms of agelessness. Jordan of Saxony’s *Libellus* remarks: “He did not mingle in games, and he was not with those, who wander in their levity supplying themselves with a share [of the game]”. While mentions of the same qualities are infrequent in the Dominican corpus, its presence in three of the sources makes clear that it was an important characteristic for the early Preachers. Yet, any further analysis runs into the same problem which corrupted the analysis of Dominic’s juvenile sleeping habits: Dominic’s later *habitus* was read back to infer his behavior as a child. Effectively, this means that, like Dominic’s sleeping habits, we may suspect that the stories contain some truth; perhaps Dominic disliked some games; perhaps he was more severe than other boys his age; perhaps he slept on the ground some nights. Unfortunately, none of Jordan’s sources could have been actual eye-witnesses for Dominic’s childhood, and we have no evidence of any of the earliest brothers being Dominic’s classmates at Palencia and therefore a reliable witness. While it may be possible that Dominic abstained from the pleasures of youth, we cannot know for certain and the nature of the evidence and of the tendencies of hagiographical accounts make it likely that Jordan was projecting, conflating, or reporting rumor.

In similar fashions, Jordan reports Dominic’s character in trope fashion, calling him *senex puer*. Jordan of Saxony, again as the source of the later tradition, reports: “You would think him to be both juvenile and old, because the fewness of his days called him a boy, and because both the maturity of his conversion to religious life and the firmness of his ways

---

232 “Non se cum ludentibus miscuit, neque cum his, qui in levitate ambulant participem se prebuit”. *JSL*, 29-30.
233 *BTLE*, 209; *DAL*, 567C.
declared him an old man.” The later tradition has a few scattered echoes of Jordan’s phrase, but they occur later and are relatively infrequent. (More frequent are mentions of the odor of sanctity which was likewise meant to indicate the nature of his virtue.) At the risk of redundancy, the same provisos must be repeated with regard to the senex puer trope. Dominic’s mores and habits were likely reflected back onto his childhood and thus the attributions made by Jordan must be brought under scrutiny. Descriptions of Dominic’s behavior make clear that early Preachers were willing to project his adult mannerisms back onto his childhood.

Functionally, the importance of Dominic’s early life and behaviors was to provide a model on which later Preachers would build. Although they were not expected to have been senes pueri like Dominic, they were expected to take his adult example to heart; that example was built on the foundations of his childhood and so the narrative of his childhood reinforced his later example as the prototypical Preacher. The story of Dominic’s childhood was perhaps more important from a literary angle, but nevertheless the fragments help us recreate the picture of his early life. After his education at the hands of his uncle the archpresbyter, Dominic was sent to Palencia and from there, to Osma, where his career began. The next section will describe these events in detail, but it is nevertheless important to keep the connection between Dominic’s early life and those latter days in full view.

234 “Iuvenem simul ac senem aspiceres, quoniam et paucitas dierum loquebatur infantiam, et senem iam ipsa conversationis maturitas et morum Constantia predicabat.” JSL, 30.
235 HRLM, 456; DAL, 567A; GSSDLD, 239.
236 JSL, 28; PFLSD, 211; HRLM, 454-5; RCVSD, 778; DAL, 567A; GSSDLD 238. It is worth noting as an afterward to the early-life mentions of the odor sanctitatis, that the Acta Canonizationis apud Bononia contain similar notes from five separate witnesses. In every case, the witnesses testify that the odor was postmortem and related to the translation of Dominic’s remains. ACD, 131-2, 135-6, 141-2, 152-3, 163-4.
Early Life and Service: The studium of Palencia and cathedral days at Osma

Parish priests, it seems, did not often engage in higher learning after completing the rudiments of their vocational education—Dominic, and many other successful churchmen we should add, studied further. These same schools, usually growing out of previous successful cathedral schools, were the recruiting grounds for burgeoning mercantile associations, royal bureaucracies, the courts, and the Church. The Church itself installed university graduates and masters in advisory and leadership positions. Dominic’s education would certainly have influenced his later development as an adult and it is entirely unsurprising to the modern reader that so early in Jordan of Saxony’s text is a “college story” about Dominic. Furthermore, Dominic’s early practice of his ecclesiastical duties at Osma would have immersed him fully in his work. Effectively, both periods—of formal education and “on the job training”—help to rectify the lacuna present in the early-adult phase of the hagiography of Dominic. Even further, the connections made by Dominic to two episcopal cities in northern Castile and along the road to Santiago help to explain why so much of Dominic’s career was dedicated to the task of preaching and the defeat of heresy: it is possible that we can glimpse in Dominic’s reconstructed past the origin of his understanding of his priestly vocation, making this period of Dominic’s life quite crucial.

First, we have to sift out the date of Dominic’s time at Palencia. After studying for an unspecified period of time with his uncle the archpresbyter, Dominic was sent to Palencia. Jordan narrates the scene thus: “And afterward he was sent to Palencia, in order to be

---

237 Papal complaints of clerics being under-educated become more and more frequent as heretics began to achieve increasing levels of erudition, as canons 18 and 11 from III and IV Lateran, respectively, demonstrate. Cf., J.D. Mansi ed., *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova Amplissima Collectio*, vol. 22, cols. 227-8 & 999-1000.
taught in the liberal sciences there, the study of which was vigorous there in those days”. It is worth noting two points in this, the earliest mention of Dominic’s study at Palencia. Palencia, of course, was not a *studium generale* at this point in its history, and Jordan does not give a date for this period of study which inhibits any attempt to determine the school’s actual status. We are not even told how old Dominic was when he went to Palencia. Equally frustrating is the fact that later Dominican sources do not mention the question of when Dominic was there, nor do they discuss his age at the time. The only information which might allow us to pin down Dominic’s time in Palencia are the mention of a famine and by working backward from later events, but even this has its problems. All of the relevant sources confirm that there was a famine at Palencia while Dominic was there. The most likely scenario, and one that unfortunately seems to hold little sway with present scholarly trend, is that the famine was the result of the Castilian defeat at Alarcos, in 1195 and part of a large series of famines which struck southern Europe in the same year. Also plausible.

---

238*Postmodum autem missus Palentiam, ut ibi liberalibus informaretur scientiis, quam stadium ea tempestate vigebat ibidem*. JSL, 28.
239 JSL, MOPH I, 30; PFLSD, 214; COLSD, 291; BTLE, 209; HRLM, 458-9; JVLA, 466; JMV, 318; RCVSD, 777-8; GSSDL, 240.
240 Tugwell, in his “Notes IV”, argues that earlier estimations of the importance of Alarcos are perhaps overzealous. Yet, in other points in the same article, Tugwell notes the equally plausible date of 1192. Tugwell’s flaw is in arguing that the *eleemosina* was limited to the relative closeness of the royal courts as the point at which Martin Bazan (and ostensibly Diego d’Acebo) would have taken notice of Dominic and recruited him. This method is flawed because it ignores the implication of the sentence which follows the original account in Jordan. The whole passage, reads: “Vendens itaque libros, quos sibi oppido necessaries possidebat cum omni supellicili sua eleemosinam quondam instituens dispersit dedit pauperibus. Cuius pietatis exemplo sic aliorum theologorum ac magistrorum animos provocavit, ut ex iuvenis liberalitate suam parcam segnitiem estimantes eleemosinis extunc largiorbus abundarent.” The second sentence may suggest that the masters and students with means began to give to similar almonries or, (as I would argue is more likely to have been an enduring institution and attracted the attention of Don Martin and Don Diego,) to give to Dominic’s almonry. While this is speculation on my part, it refocuses the debate on the most likely famines: in 1192 and autumn 1195. Furthermore, a necessary caveat must be appended to this particular discussion: the absence of a Histórica I record of a famine (or even very high food prices from which the poor would suffer most) does not necessarily indicate the absence of a famine; especially given the tumult of the later 1190′s.
is the persistence of a localized famine from earlier (1192) in that same decade.\textsuperscript{241} What we
do know is that Dominic reportedly attempted to alleviate that famine by establishing an
almonry. As usual, Jordan of Saxony’s narrative is the first:

In that same time, while he persisted in studying at Palencia, a great famine
arose through nearly the whole of Spain; then that same man [Dominic], moved by
the neediness of the poor and suffering in them [and] being affected with
compassion, he grew in works of the lord and at the same time he followed the
counsels [of the Lord] and [decided] to restore the dying so far as he was able, who
were destitute in their poverty. And selling the books along with his furniture, which
were exceedingly necessary for him to possess, and establishing a certain almonry
he dispersed [the profits of the sale] and gave to the poor. So, by the example of his
piety he provoked the spirits of the other theologians and of the masters, so that
from generousness of the youth they saw their own small sluggishness and from
then on the alms were more greatly overflowing.\textsuperscript{242}

The later sources echo Jordan’s account and repeat the story, with no further details
(temporal or functional) added.\textsuperscript{243} Because we do not know to which parish (if any)
Dominic gave the proceeds of his possessions, we cannot recover any diplomatic evidence
to pin down the date of Dominic’s time at Palencia. Furthermore, we cannot pin down
exactly Dominic’s date of birth,\textsuperscript{244} which makes determining exactly when his time at
Palencia may have been all the more troublesome.

\\textsuperscript{241}On the localized famine, see the transcription of the \textit{Anales Toledanos} in: H. Florez, \textit{España Sagrada}, vol.
XXIII, (Madrid, 1767), 393.
\textsuperscript{242}\textit{Eodem tempore, cum Palentie studens persistet, oborta est fames valida fere per universam Hispaniam ;
tunc ipse pauperum necessitate permotus et estuans in se compassionis affecti, uno decrevit opera dominicis
simul obseundere consiliiis et resarcire pro posse morientium egenorum inopiam. Vendens itaque libros,
quos sibi oppido necessarios possidebat cum omni supellectili sua eleemosinam quandam instituens dispersit
dedit pauperibus. Cuius pietatis exemplo sic aliorum theologourm ac magistrorum animos provocavit, ut ex
iuvenis liberalitate suam parcam segniem estimantes eleemosinis extunc abundarent.” JSL, 30-1.
\textsuperscript{243}PFLSD, 214-5; BTLE,209; COLSD, 291-2; JMV,317-8; JVLA,466; HRLp,430; HRLM,458-9; RCVSD, 777-8;
DAL,567D-E; GSSDL,240.
\textsuperscript{244}See above, p. 70-2.
Dominic’s time at Palencia is difficult to pin down with any specificity: we do not
know which famine it was that Dominic tried to sate with his little almonry, and we do not
know under whom he studied. The important part, however, is the testimony of the
earliest sources which all note that Dominic began with general studies and, soon after,
began advanced studies in theology. The phraseology is consistent in each account, with
only modifications—style, not substance—of the vocabulary: Dominic began working “in
the liberal arts which flourished [at Palencia] in those days”, and after completing began
“keeping diligent vigil for four years in these sacred studies”. Problematically, the
qualification, which appears first in Peter of Ferrand’s Legenda, that the faculty and student
body were large while Dominic was there is attested to only by the hagiography: “[the
school] having as great a numerous multitude of scholars, as [it did] the devoted perfection
of the masters.” Neither the date nor the actual scholarly composition of the university is
betrayed by the reports of Peter of Ferrand or the later accounts which derive their
substance from him. Only modern historiography has begun to reconstruct the list of

245 Guessing is difficult because the specialty of the masters at Palencia appears to have been law, although
whether Roman or Canon law is not easily discernible. Theologians do not appear in the record. It seems
likely that, if theologians were actually absent, as they appear to be, that Dominic studied with the bishop
Arderico’s household. However, if the presence of canon lawyers is accepted, it seems likely that theologians
too would also have been present, but this is only speculation.
246 JSL, 28; PFLSD, 213; BTLE,209; COLSD, 290; JMV,317-8; JVLA,466; HRLp,A29; idem, Legenda maior, ed.
Tugwell, 456; RCVSD, 777; DAL, 567A; GSSDLD,240.
247 Nearly every one of the accounts recounts the fact that Dominic spent nearly every night studying late,
*quod noctes pene imnones ducebat*, and that this was what made his study remarkable. This attribution will be
dealt with more below. JSL, 28; PFLSD, 213; HRLM,457; RCVSD, 777; DAL, 567C.
248 PFLSD, 213. Modern scholarship has determined that the cathedral school (as it existed in Dominic’s time
there) certainly grew into a rather large institution, but we simply cannot know how large the faculty was.
Essentially, we must resign ourselves to trusting Peter of Ferrand’s attribution of a large faculty to Palencia as
tentative fact. The cathedral school had existed since the time of Don Raimundo II, uncle of king Alfonso VIII,
but we are only able to grasp at certain small mentions of the school itself. Gonzalo Martínez Diez, S.J., “La
Universidad de Palencia. Revisión Crítica”, in *Actas del II Congreso de Historia de Palencia*, t. IV, ed. María
Valentina Calleja González, (Palencia: Departamento de Culturo, 1990), 155-178; Santiago Franca Lorenzo,
“Palencia en la época de Santo Domingo de Guzmán: Instituciones Eclesiástica’s”, in *Santo Domingo de
Caleruega Contexto Cultural: III Jornadas de Estudios medievales Caleruega 1994*, ed. Cándido Aniz Iriarte and
Luis V. Díaz Martin, 167; Adeline Rucquoi, “Las Dos Vidas de la Universidad de Palencia (c.1180-1250)” in
masters present at Palencia. Further still, the history of the school at Palencia was being repurposed to foreshadow the form of the *studium generale* already ubiquitous in thirteenth century Dominican life. The medieval logic inherent in the text is clear: because Dominic had a liberal arts degree and studied theology, Dominicans should have a similar training; because there were *studii generalia* created with the thirteenth century’s Dominicans, there was one at Palencia for Dominic. Thus, while we can, as Tugwell has admirably done, extrapolate back and reconstruct the date of Dominic’s time at Palencia, we cannot know for certain and must resign ourselves to providing an 1188-1199 dating for Dominic’s time and speculating that 1188-1196 is most likely.

Given that the date of Dominic’s studies place him in the days before Palencia was a royally-chartered university, we are presented with the further difficulty of identifying what Dominic might have studied while at Palencia. While classifying Palencia as a “cathedral school” presents a few problematic anachronisms, it is closer to what is the ostensible truth presented in the available records. The diocese itself had been reconstituted 155 years or so before Dominic arrived, and thus we must be careful about being informed by cathedral school-to-university parallels. We further know that, in those days, Palencia’s bishop, Don Arderico, was a close ally and vassal of Alfonso VIII. Julio González demonstrates the variety of the texts possessed by Castilian clergy in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. There, he notes the frequency of law and theology, as well as the presence of what appears to be a curious number of classical authors and

---

249 On the emergence and form of the *studium generale* along with the function and evolution of these same institutions, see: Hinnebusch, *History of the Dominican Order*, vol. 2, 37-98.
250 Reglero de la Fuente, “Palencia”, in *Historia de las diócesis españolas*, v. 19, 8-9
251 See above, Table 5, p. 61
texts. González further notes that Palencia was a major center for the study of “humane letters”. The names of a few scholars resident at Palencia are known but can only suggest that there was a strong presence of masters of law in Palencia during the period. It could be rightly supposed that a significant number of masters of canon law implies a significant number of masters of theology, although this cannot be confirmed.

Dominic certainly would have had a reputation for study to have merited a place in the reformist chapter of Osma. Dominic’s study habits were important influences on his development as a churchman. As such, Dominic’s intellectual abilities demonstrates his fitness for leading his Order, and therefore as an archetype for the Preachers themselves. Jordan of Saxony’s narrative becomes standard for Dominic’s study habits: “for the sake of learning he spent his sleepless nights nearly without defeat, and he held the stored-up truth, which was brought to his ears, in the great treasury of his mind with a firm-clasping memory.” Dominic is consistently declared to have spent entire nights in study. A cynical reading could suggest that reports of Dominic’s studying were intended to reinforce the programs set in place by the Preachers; a more sympathetic (and more reasonable) reading would suggest that those same programs were formed in order to replicate Dominic’s success. In either case, the consistency of the reports of Dominic’s study-habits, coupled with their omission from the more mytho-hagiographical sources, suggests that the reports were correct about his zeal for study.

---

253 “Indudablemente, el foco de mayor preocupación por el saber era el de Palencia y las poblaciones relacionadas con ella.” RdC, I, 631.
254 “ut pre discendi infatigabilitate noctes pene insomnes perageret, et veritatem, que auribus ingerebatur, profundo mentis repositam sinu tenci memoria retineret.” JSL, 28.
255 PFLSD, 213; HRLpA 430; HRLM, 457; DAL, 567C; GSSDLD, 239.
Coupling the *eleemosyna* which Dominic had established and his reputation as a burgeoning scholar, it is no surprise that he was recruited for a reform-minded cathedral chapter. We have only a little information concerning when Dominic was at the cathedral chapter: his signature appears on a settlement-charter dating to 1199, but he does not appear on a previous charter from 1195. That same signature (from 1199) employs the *titulus officii* of sacrista. This has lead Tugwell to conclude that Dominic “became a canon of Osma c.1198”; Vicaire too dates Dominic’s enrollment to this same intervening period, preferring that it was “in 1196 or 1197 when St. Dominic entered [the chapter] at the age of twenty-four or twenty-five”. While Vicaire’s argument is plausible and Tugwell’s is more convincing even than Vicaire’s, we simply cannot know exactly when Dominic entered the chapter at Osma. Tugwell claims that Dominic’s almonry would have necessarily come to the attention of Don Martin Bazán, then the bishop of Osma, while that bishop was attending the *cortes* when they were held at Palencia, sometime between 1191 and 1197. Unfortunately, Tugwell does not mention the fact that Martin Bazán was clearly closely tied to Alfonso VIII, as his virtual ubiquity in royal diplomas suggests. Further

256 The charter is a resolution of a dispute between the church of Osma and the Cistercian monastery of Veruela. The document is relatively unimportant, save for the fact that Dominic is listed as “sacrista” in the subscriptions. *MDSD*, 4-5.

257 Loperraez, *Descripción Histórica del Obisbado del Osma*, 3:44.

258 Vicaire, *St. Dominic and his times*, trans. Pond, 42.

259 See above, p. 84-5.

260 “The assertion that Dominic’s renown in Palencia came notice to the of the bishop of Osma and that the bishop, after taking advice, ‘sent for’ him is perfectly plausible. Martin was present on several occasions between 1191 and 1199 when the king’s council met at Palencia.” Tugwell, “Notes on the Life of Dominic IV”, 42.

261 From the time of Martin’s election in early 1189 to the period of Dominic’s first appearance (16 August 1199) in the diplomatic record, Martin is found in nearly 63% of the royal documents (101 of 161 to be exact). For reference, the document numbers (as they appear in González) are as follows: 519, 531, 533, 539, 530, 544, 545, 547, 551, 552, 559-61, 563, 565-69, 571, 573, 576-8, 580, 582-90, 592-4, 596-606, 608-613, 617-620, 623-631, 634, 638-43, 646, 647, 649-658, 661-666, 669-673, and 676-679. *RdC*, 2:890-97, 3:9-202. It is also worth noting here that Martin continues to appear regularly in the documents until his death sometime in the autumn or winter of 1201, see table 7, above, p. 66. Loperraez,
still, the instances in which the diplomas are given from Palencia and for which Martin was in attendance means that Martin was in Palencia almost every other year—add to that the fact that the other locations of the court were no more than one or two day’s ride from Palencia and the dating of Dominic’s time becomes rather circumspect. I would suggest that Dominic would have had to have had considerable experience or expertise in both astronomy and theology in order to be appointed to such an important position after only a year. This supposition calls Tugwell’s dating into question and suggests that Vicaire’s schema is closer to the truth of the matter. Unfortunately, we simply cannot know for certain when Dominic was recruited for the chapter at Osma.

While we cannot know when Dominic was recruited to serve in the chapter at Osma, we know precisely why Dominic is supposed to have been recruited for the cathedral chapter. Hinnebusch provides the traditional assessment of the climate at Osma in that period: “[Dominic’s] reputation had reached from Palencia back to his native diocese of Osma. The cathedral chapter was then in the course of reform, and Bishop Martin Bazán and Prior Diego d’Acebo were filling its vacancies by choosing men zealous for the cause of religion.”

Unfortunately, we have no evidence, either diplomatic or narrative, of when that reform occurred or which qualifications made Dominic most desirable.

Descripción Histórica del Obispado de Osma, 1:187. It is also worth noting that Martin was named a judge-delegate for Innocent in the Lérida-Huesca affair, as Innocent’s III letters attest. DPHI3, 282-3. 292-300. 262 Hinnebusch, History of the Dominican Order, vol. 1, 18. 263 We cannot determine whether the initiative to reform the chapter was Don Martin Bazan’s or whether it was Diego’s. Diego does not appear in diplomatic evidence in 1195, but does appear as prior in 1199. In fact, none of the names which appear in the 1195 document (save the bishop, Don Martin Bazan) remain in the 1199 charter; many of the names from the 1199 charter are also found in a reconfirmation of an 1191 charter which was re-upped in 1201. Given that Innocent III approved the reformed constitutions of the chapter in 1199, the reform itself must have occurred before then. This leads me to suspect that the reform happened after 1195, when Martin had gained enough support from his frequent attendance at the royal courts to force reform and when vulnerability after Alarcos may have been partially mitigated by the prospect of religious
Rivera concluded that the reform of the chapter at Osma was begun under the
tenure of Don Juan Téllez (1148-73). Unfortunately, Rivera Recio gives only a single
argument for this dating: Alexander had demanded that reform and mentions of a need for
reform do not appear later. His analysis makes no account of Innocent III’s letter which
seems to demonstrate that the reform was completed during Innocent’s tenure, but begun
much earlier and was a slow-burning process. That the chapter was at some point reformed
is not in question; a letter from Innocent demonstrates that the chapter adopted reformed
constitutions sometime before 1199: “We know indeed, through your authentic letter with
your seal and through the reinforcement of our venerable brother the archbishop of
Toledo, that you by the consent of the whole community of the chapter of Osma...have
decided that the other portion or ‘secular canons’ be no longer received into the chapter
henceforth.” Innocent’s additional notation of previous letters from both Alexander (the
same one mentioned by Rivera Recio) and from Lucius III (which does not survive)
suggests that the reform was ongoing and was completed only recently. Innocent would
additionally later point out in the letter that the reform was coupled with the adoption of
stricter constitutiones. A rescript to a contemporary letter ostensibly from Martin Bazán
also clarifies that the canons of the chapter were likewise, having adopted strict and

reform encouraging future victories. However, I do concede that it is also likely that the documentation
suggesting ongoing reform efforts are simply lost and that the only surviving documents represent
fragmentary evidence of the two ends of the story. For the documents in question, see: Loperaez, Descripción
Histórica, 3:46-7.

264 Rivera Recio, La Iglesia de Toledo en el siglo XII, 265-6.
265 Rivera Recio, La Iglesia de Toledo en el siglo XII, 266.
266 “Intelleximus equidem, per scriptum autenticum sigillo tuo et venerabilis fratri Toletani
archiepiscopi communitum, quod tu de communi consensus totius capitolii Oxomensis...in Oxomensi
ecclesia sint de cetero canonici regulares, nec aliquis in portionarium vel secularem canonicum recipiat
deinceps in eadem.” (=Potthast 697) MDSD, 3-4; DPHI3,188; Loperaez, Descripción del Obispado de Osma,
3:46.
267 Ibid.
orthodox constitutions, forbidden from keeping concubines.\textsuperscript{268} Dominic’s reputation for holiness\textsuperscript{269} and his training in theology\textsuperscript{270} made him a likely and qualified candidate for a post in a recently reformed cathedral chapter. Further, we can add the bishop of Palencia himself as a reason for Dominic’s recruitment: both Martin Bazán (bishop of Osma) and Arderico (bishop of Palencia) were clearly the king’s men\textsuperscript{271} and we can safely speculate that Bazán and Arderico, while at court, may well have discussed any noteworthy happenings in their diocese, including a certain young student.

We have determined why and roughly when Dominic was enrolled at the canonry, but for what purpose has yet to be recovered. It is safe to say that Dominic’s position in 1199, listed as sacristan in that charter,\textsuperscript{272} required extensive readings in theology and considerable facility with Latin. The supervision of the liturgy, even in a mildly-pious chapter, was a crucial role. While it is unlikely that Dominic would have been made sacristan without considerable experience in the chapter, Dominic could have been brought directly into the chapter to serve as sacristan immediately. This, too, is speculative, but raises important questions about the nature of religious reform in Spain.\textsuperscript{273} Dominic’s early years in the chapter were likely uneventful. Diego was the sub-prior, after 1199 prior, of the chapter and likely one of Martin Bazán’s close advisors.

\textsuperscript{268} DPHI3, 205-6.
\textsuperscript{269} See above, p. 90-2.
\textsuperscript{270} See above, p. 88-90.
\textsuperscript{271} For Martin Bazan’s status as an ally of Alfonso VIII, see Table 7, above, p. 66. For Arderico’s status as one of “the King’s men”, see Table 6, above, p. 61.
\textsuperscript{272} MDSD, 4-5.
\textsuperscript{273} For example, if Dominic was recruited directly from the cathedral schools, this would suggest a much more vibrant series of cathedral schools in the peninsula. Further, Dominic had been recruited from the cathedral schools, this would mean a greater connection between the schools and bishops. Further still, the nature of these connections would pose further questions into the autonomy and influence of Toledo’s episcopal suffragans. By understanding the nature of Dominic’s recruitment, we might very well be able to unlock a great number of clues about the nature of the late twelfth century’s religious reform movements and foster a newer and deeper series of subsequent inquiries.
Martin Bazán died sometime in mid-1201, and Diego d’Acebo assumed the role of bishop later in the same year. Unfortunately, there are no surviving documents which can fill Dominic’s agenda in the period between 1199 and 1201 (or until 1203 for that matter). The only thing that the documents do add about Dominic’s time there was that he was a role-model for the other canons and that he read the *Collationes Patrum* of John Cassian. It seems likely that Dominic (sacristan in 1201, and sub-prior in 1203) was one of Diego’s trusted allies. It is further likely that when Diego went somewhere Dominic went along. Because Diego was Martin’s prior and likely also a trusted ally, it makes good sense that Diego picked up where Martin left off: just as Martin Bazán had been, Diego d’Acebo was certainly one of “the king’s men”. Being one of the king’s men, however, did not simply require Diego to autograph diplomas; the bishop of Osma was tapped, in 1203 or 1205 to find a bride for one of Alfonso’s *infantes*. The importance of this fact cannot be

---

274 Martin’s last appearance in the royal diplomatics is on a document dating from 10 June 1201; Diego’s first appearance on a royal document dates to 11 December 1201. Thus, we can conclude that Martin Bazan died sometime in late summer or autumn and that, having finished with the necessary duties of ordination, Diego began to fill his role. v., RdC, 3:247-9, 3:255-7.
275 Diego appears as the bishop in a diploma from 11 December 1201, and the Dominican evidence notes that Diego was the bishop of Osma. While there is a discrepancy in the Dominican sources, it is clear that Jordan was unaware of Martin Bazán’s tenure as bishop; from the earliest, the Dominicans list Diego as the bishop without noting the importance of Bazán.
276 For lengthy descriptions of Dominic’s behavior at the canony and the issue of his reading the *Collationes* of Cassian, see the following: *JSL*, 32; *PFLSD*, 216; *HRLp*, 431; *HRLM*, 460; *DAL*, 568A; *GSSDLD*, 241.
277 *MDSD*, 4-5.
278 *MDSD*, 5-7; Loperaez, *Descripción Histórica*, 3:42.
279 It is worth noting that within the first year of his episcopate, Diego appears on 74% of the diplomas (14/19). For reference, the document numbers (as they appear in González) are as follows: 711, 715-18, 720-22, 724-28, & 730. RdC, 3:257-284.
280 Jordan of Saxony, despite not listing the year, offers the following description: “accidit itaque tunc temporis Alphonsum, regem Castelle, inter filium suum Ferdinandum et quondam nobilem de Marchiis desiderare connubium. Quam ob causam adiit prefatum episcopum Oxomensem, postulans fieri eum huius procuratorem negotii. Precibus regis acquevit episcopus, moxque adiuncta sibi iuxta sue sanctitatis exigentiam honesta societate, secum etiam virum Dei Dominicum ecclesie sue suppriorem, adduxit”. The only Fernando to which Jordan could possibly be referring is the one who first appears in charters in the 1190’s. The *Anales Toledanos* report that this same Fernando was born in 1189 and therefore, if the traditional dating schema holds, the journey would have taken place after Fernando had been knighted in 1203. The entry in the *Anales Toledanos* reads: “Nació el Infant D. Ferrando en Miercoles dia de S.
overstated: Prince Fernando was Alfonso’s only living son and was thus the presumptive heir to the throne. Further, Fernando was fourteen years old at that time—by the time Diego and Dominic had left, he had likely been knighted and was being groomed for rule.\textsuperscript{281} Thus, in 1203, the Bishop of Osma and his young sub-prior left to find the heir-apparent, and their future sovereign, a bride in Denmark.

Problematically, none of the earliest sources say that Dominic and Diego were bound for Denmark. The only clue given by the earliest sources is the notation that they went to the Marches This location is expanded by the problematic \textit{Chronica Prima} as being “Marchia Dacie”; the attribution is repeated by Bernard Gui as being “in Marchias sive Daciam”.\textsuperscript{282} Gui further adds, in his \textit{Catalogus Magistrorum}, that the mission took place in 1203.\textsuperscript{283} According to Gallén’s dating schema, the mission “must have taken place between mid-October 1203 and late February 1204, whilst the second visit must have been between late October 1205 and April 1206.”\textsuperscript{284} If his reconstruction of the dating of Dominic’s mission\textsuperscript{285} is correct, there is only one female member of the Danish royal family who may have been alive at the right time. Gallén himself suggests that the potential female member of the royal family would have been the daughter of one of Valdemar’s closest vassals: “the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item Saturnin amanecient, \textit{Era MCCXXVII.} The \textit{LCKC} similarly describes the importance of Fernando to the King and notes Fernando’s growing importance to the Kingdom before the fall of Salvatierra in 1211: \textit{LCKC}, 52-6. See also above, page 34-5, \textit{JSL}, 33; Flórez, \textit{España Sagrada}, vol. XXIII, 393.
\item González calls Fernando “la esperanza de los padres y del reino.” Further he notes that it was this Fernando, the second of Alfonso’s sons named Fernando that Diego and Dominic journeyed to the Marches in order to find a bride. \textit{RDIC}, 1:208-9, 1:209 n.237.
\item \textit{GSSDCM}, 94.
\item Fonnesberg-Schmidt, \textit{The Popes and the Baltic Crusades 1147-1235}, 157.
\item Gallén, “Les voyages de S. Dominique au Danemark”, 73-84.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
marriage concerned a daughter of his sister, the wife of Count Sifroid of Orlamund.”  

While this is certainly plausible, I would argue that the marriage would not have had the importance appropriate to the favorite son of Alfonso VIII. A royal daughter was needed for the Infante Fernando.

I would propose that a daughter of the recently (1202) deceased King Cnut VI would fit Fernando’s position. Cnut VI had a daughter named Ingred/Ingeborg who died sometime before 1236, when her older cousin by the same name was also reported to have died. Cnut VI himself was born sometime in 1162. The likely range for the birth of Ingred would thus span the late 1170’s to the early 1190’s. This puts Cnut in his late teens to early thirties and his wife would have been in the prime of her childbearing years. This would suggest that she could have been of a marriageable age at the same time as the Infante Fernando.

There are additional points of circumstantial evidence which support the hypothesis of a proposed marriage alliance between the kings of Denmark and Castile. First, Danish power was growing considerably under Cnut VI and Valdemar II, making both of them powerful allies of Castile. Further supporting this first cause is the observation that Valdemar II married his eldest son to a Portuguese princess (Eleanor of Portugal) and

---

287 Fernando’s status as Alfonso’s (and Spain’s) favorite is recounted by González: RdC, 1:208-9. González’ assessment is further supported by the great remorse at Fernando’s death reported by Juan of Osma in the LCKC: LCKC, 55-6.
289 Barber, The Two Cities, 385.
290 Barber, The Two Cities, 385-6.
he himself took a Portuguese royal for his second wife (Berengaria of Portugal).  

Although these marriages post-date Dominic and Diego’s mission by twenty years or so, they demonstrate the contact between the Iberian and Danish royal houses. Second, there is significant evidence of the Danish kings cultivating marriage alliances with foreign powers in order to ensure their political legitimacy. Three examples demonstrate this second point. First, Ingeborg, daughter of Valdemar I, married Phillip II Augustus. Second, Ingeborg’s (younger?) sister Helena married Henry the Fat, son of Henry the Lion of Saxony. Finally, the above-mentioned marriages to Portuguese heiresses can be added to this list. In sum, it seems very likely that Dominic and Diego were sent to Denmark to secure a marriage alliance with the King of the Danes. It is also likely that this marriage was to the otherwise unknown Ingred, daughter of Cnut VI.

The journey to the Marches chronicles a number of important episodes from Dominic’s early life. The importance of his time at Palencia made him a formidable churchman and potent intellectual. Dominic’s activities at Osma cultivated a relationship with the royal court and accustomed Dominic to the workings of larger diocesan and regnal organizations, as well as helping grow his seemingly inherent leadership skills. At this juncture of his life we could easily imagine Dominic reflecting back on his life to that point: he was around thirty, well-educated, and on a mission for the King himself. Dominic would journey through the Pyrenees and likely through Toulouse, until the journey cut north toward Denmark. Toulouse, in those days, was apparently a depressing place for a reform-

---


minded churchman. Dominic knew Latin, the pun was apparent; Dominic was headed for 
*Tolosa dolosa*, for deceitful Toulouse.

---

**Tolosa dolosa and the Birth of the Early Order**

Ingred was still an unknown quantity when Diego and Dominic left for Denmark. The two men, in fact, had to make two trips northward. On the first, Diego and Dominic were responsible for negotiating the terms of marriage between the Castilian and Danish courts. They then had to return to Castile to make sure that the terms suited Alfonso VIII and that Fernando himself approved of the match. Then, after the terms were accepted, Diego and Dominic had to return to Denmark to retrieve Ingred and bring her back to Castile and the court of Alfonso VIII. All told, the journeys were supposed to cover some 2500 miles. Ingred’s unforeseeable death should have meant that Diego and Dominic would return to Castile to inform Alfonso and Fernando and return to business as usual. Instead, Diego and Dominic took a pair of side-trips: first to Rome, second to Cîteaux. Both stops would dramatically alter the course of Dominic and Diego’s lives.

The route to Denmark took the Bishop Diego and his entourage through the city of Toulouse. In the twelfth century, Toulouse had already garnered more than its fair share of pejoratives and labels. The trip through Toulouse, in either 1203 or 1205, was Dominic’s first experience there, but it was very far from his last. It was at Toulouse that the second of the inquiries was made about Dominic’s candidacy for sainthood. It was at Toulouse that

---

293 Dominic receives custody of a property in a charter given at Toulouse by Simon de Montfort in late 1217, after he had ostensibly already dispersed his brothers to their new cities of residence. _MDSD_, 84-5.
he and Diego, with the cooperation and sponsorship of the abbot of Cîteaux and Toulouse’s bishop, would establish a preaching mission. It was at Toulouse that most Dominican historians begin to trace the formation of the Order of Preachers. Yet the early period of growth at Toulouse was suspended: it was not until 1207 that the mission centered on Toulouse would become something of an institution. Further, for all the formative roles Diego had played in Dominic’s life (as sub-prior, prior, bishop and, generically, as mentor), Diego was hardly present near Toulouse. The early Dominican narratives emphasize Diego’s importance, but as the story of Dominic’s life was refined, Diego was slowly distilled out of the plot. Dominic was, in hindsight, coming into his own.

The focus of this inquiry requires an awareness of the life of Dominic’s mentor. Diego d’Acebo was Dominic’s superior for at least 8 years, probably more. His death in 1207, thirteen months before Peter of Castelnau’s, certainly shook Dominic’s life, but it was also a turning point. Technically, Dominic would have still been bound to the chapter at Osma: he was only away from the see because he was accompanying the bishop on official royal business. Dominic would not have been able to function beyond the will of his bishop. Even the actions of Fulk of Toulouse, appointed bishop of Toulouse by Innocent III in 1206, only touch the ends of this early period of Dominic’s life. Fulk’s patronage of Dominic was intense and dedicated; so was the patronage of Simon de Montfort. The patronage of a bishop other than that of Osma could present a conflict of interest: Dominic was a canon of

---

294 MDSD, 13-5; WPC, 60.
296 MDSD, 15-86, passim.
Osma, working near Toulouse, and being paid by Osma and Toulouse. That situation must have been resolved, although the text of any such resolution does not survive.

So, the inquiry must restrict itself to the period before 1207, the period during which there would ostensibly be no episcopal conflict of interest; with Diego’s permission, Dominic could continue to preach against the Albigensian heterodoxy despite Diego’s absence. The topics which need to be addressed before the inquiry regarding Dominic’s early life can be concluded are as follows: first, the routes and stops which the Dominican sources attribute to the journey taken by Diego and Dominic; second, the so-called “council of the twelve abbots” which Diego and Dominic attended in 1206; third, and finally, the debate at Montreal during which Dominic may have performed his first miracle. Taken together, these three early episodes illustrate the pace of Dominic’s increasing involvement in the region.

Dominic and Diego stopped at five locations on their two trips. The itinerary looks like this: they stopped at Toulouse in 1203; at Denmark in 1203/4; in Castile in 1204-5; in Denmark in 1205; in Rome in 1205/6; at Cîteaux in 1206; at Montpellier and the Languedoc in 1206. Diego returned to Castile, after the debate at Montreal, sometime in late 1207, and died there in late December 1207. Although we cannot retrace their exact route, the frequent route used by the later Crusader forces during the Albigensian Crusade suggests that the route probably followed “the usual crusaders route down the Saône and the Rhône”.\textsuperscript{297}

\textsuperscript{297} Strayer, \textit{The Albigensian Crusade}, 117.
Dominic and Diego clearly stopped at Toulouse on their way to Denmark. It is during this first stop that Dominic allegedly stayed up all night debating with their hostel-keeper, who was himself an Albigensian heretic. After spending the entire night debating the heretical hostel-keeper, Dominic “with much disputation and persuasion” led the hostel-keeper back to the faith.\footnote{“multa disputatione et persuasione”. \emph{JSL}, 33-4.} The later tradition does not provide the identity of this heretic,\footnote{Cf., \emph{PFLSD}, 216-7; \emph{BTLE},209; \emph{COLSD}, 293; \emph{HRlp},431; \emph{HRLM},461; \emph{JVLA},467; \emph{JMV}, 318; \emph{RCVSD}, 779; \emph{DAL},569A; \emph{GSSDCM}, 94; \emph{GSSDLD}, 240.} and outside of the Dominican tradition, there are no mentions of the incident. None of the three letters which survive from Dominic mention a hostel-keeper. Further, we do not have any donations to Dominic’s later preaching mission which mention hostel-keepers. It seems that Dominic’s first recorded reconciled heretic fades into anonymity.

Diego and Dominic proceeded onward toward Denmark after their stop in Toulouse, although we are not told what other stops they must have made. We are told that the terms of the marriage were agreed upon in Denmark in 1203/4 but we are not told what they were. Thereafter, Diego and Dominic returned to Castile to inform Alfonso and to gain his approval of the terms. In early 1205, they returned to Denmark to retrieve Ingred, only to find that she had died in the intervening period.\footnote{\emph{JSL}, 34; \emph{PFLSD}, 217; \emph{COLSD}, 294; \emph{HRLM},461; \emph{JVLA},467; \emph{JMV}, 318; \emph{RCVSD}, 779; \emph{DAL},568B; \emph{GSSDLD},242.} While in Denmark, Diego and Dominic apparently heard tell of the Cumans and their remnant pagan-ness.\footnote{\emph{Fonnesburg-Schmidt, The Popes and the Baltic Crusades (1147-1254)}, 156-60; Tugwell, “Notes VI”, 30-57.} They traveled to Rome and Diego requested that Innocent relieve him of his episcopal office, so that Diego could return to Denmark to convert the Cumans. Innocent refused.\footnote{\emph{JSL}, 35; \emph{PFLSD}, 217; \emph{COLSD}, 294; \emph{HRLM},462; \emph{JVLA},467; \emph{JMV}, 318; Rodrigo \emph{DAL},568B; \emph{GSSDLD},242.} Although he could not have known it, Diego’s missionary plans were not lost entirely, but were simply to be redirected.
Diego's frustration with Innocent’s refusal likely made him consider making a change in his life. “And so, returning [to Castile, Diego] visited Cîteaux on the way, where he marveled at the conversatio of the many servants of God, and enticed by the height of religion he assumed then-and-there the habit of a monk”.303 As Tugwell rightly notes: “By no stretch of the imagination is Cîteaux ‘on the way’ from Rome to Osma; if Diego went there, he must have gone there of set purpose.”304 Diego’s assumption of the Cistercian habit makes sense: many of the leading prelates in Castile were Cistercians and the presence of Cîteaux’s monks in Castile was considerable. Along with the moment’s importance for Diego, it seems to have equal impact on Dominic. The wording of Jordan’s account needs to be examined closely here. Jordan does not say that Diego became a Cistercian; he says that he assumed the habitus kept by them. This likely indicates the rigorous asceticism for which the Cistercians became famous but not the habit itself, since there are no Cistercian indications of Diego being an actual Cistercian himself, as Tugwell notes.305 When Dominic selected a Rule for his new Order in 1215/6, he selected the Rule of St. Augustine and augmented it with more rigid customs.306 Reading this fact back on the earlier account, we can conclude that Dominic understood that an Order itself did not make its members holy; the holiness of their lifestyle did. The stopover at Cîteaux likely had a powerful impact on Dominic.

303 Revertens itaque in via Cistercium visitavit, ubi multorum servorum Dei conversationem intuitus, et altitudine religionis illecutus assumpto ibidem habitu monachali”. JSL, 35.
304 Tugwell, "Notes VI", 58.
305 Tugwell, "Notes VI", 58.
The next stop on the journey would have been the return to the Languedoc.

Somehow, Diego was invited to a Council being held at Montpellier in 1206. 307 Peter de Vaux-de-Cernay exalts Diego’s assistance in the region; to Peter, Diego was the spark that reenergized the preaching campaigns of the Cistercians. Peter narrates thus:

And so, the remembered bishop [of Osma] facing the perplexity [of the legates] soundly gave advice, reminding and counseling that, having left the rest behind, they should labor at preaching more fervently, so that they would be able to block up the mouth of the evildoers, proceeding in humility, they should do and teach by the example of the Pious Master, they should go by foot lacking silver and gold, imitating the apostolic way in all manners. 308

Diego’s advice seems to have resonated with Dominic; Dominican accounts report the council in nearly the same fashion: Diego shows up, the Cistercians are frustrated, Diego exhorts them to follow an Apostolic model, and leads that same reform push. 309 The major contribution of the Dominican accounts is the notation that twelve Cistercian abbots were present, suggesting a much larger preaching campaign. 310 The corollary to that addition is that the preaching mission was rather large and that Diego and Dominic had made a

---

307 I suspect that Diego had heard of the planned meeting while he was on the way back to Castile. The extant texts suggest that Diego seemed to have simply stumbled onto the meeting, which is relatively unhelpful in determining the progress of the missions in the Languedoc but nevertheless makes sense. The account of Diego happening upon a council is made quite likely by the fact that Citeaux is almost due north of Montpellier and that Montpellier is almost due east of Toulouse. Travelling south to Montpellier and then following the pilgrimage road west through Toulouse and onward to Castile is a very feasible route and this makes Diego’s chance encounter seem very plausible. The importance of Castile to regional politics would suggest that Master Ralph, Peter de Castelnau, and Arnaud Amaury might have sought him ought.

308 HALb, 23.

309 JSL, 35-6; PFLSD, 218-9; BTLE, 209-10; COLSD, 294-5; HRLM, 462-3; JMV, 318; RCVSD, 779; DAL, 568B-C; GSSDCM, 95; GSSDLD, 242.

310 The same citations of Dominican sources can be marshaled here, see the previous note. Now, see also Kienzle’s analysis of the mission during this period: Beverly Mayne Kienzle, Cistercians, Heresy and Crusade in Occitania, 1145-1229, 135-73.
powerful impact on the orthodox of the region...even from the beginning of their involvement in the preaching.

Dominic seems to have remained in the Languedoc for the rest of 1206 and 1207. "After this a number of debates were held with the heretics in various places; one of the more solemn was at Montreal, where our side was represented by our two champions [Diego and Dominic], joined by the venerable legate Peter of Castelnau and his colleague Master Ralph, and many other men of good will." Dominican accounts of the debate paint a very dramatic picture. Dominic it seems was one of the lead debaters for the Catholic side and was blessed with a miracle when the debating came to a stalemate. In a fashion reminiscent of the ordeal of fire, the books were tested in a large fire to determine which was most filled with true doctrine. When the books were thrown into the fire, the heretic's volume was incinerate immediately, while Dominic's tract was thrown from the fire. Dominic's work was thrown twice more into the fire and twice more leapt back out of the flames. Jordan of Saxony's account was remarkably important for the later tradition: nearly every Dominican source records the miracle of the jumping book. Remarkably,

---

311 *WPC*, 56.
312 "Plerique igitur fidelium suos interim conscripserent libellos, rationes atque auctoritates confirmationem fidei continent, inter quos omnibus inspectis beati viri Dominici libellus plus ceteris commendatus est et communiiter approbatus, quatenus tribus arbitris, de assensu partium ad sententie diffinitionem electis cum libello hereticorum, quem et ipsi pro se conscripserant, presentari deberet, et cuius partis libellum rationabiliteri arbitri iuicarent, eius firdes prestantior. Cumque multa verborum disceptatione ad alteram partem arbitri convenire non possent, tandem incidunt eis consilium, ut libellorum usque flammis inierent, et si quem illorum non combusti contungeret, ille veram fidem proculdubio contineret. Accensus est igitur ignis magnus, utrumque librorum incipit. Liber hereticorum confestim exuritur, alter vero, quem conscripserat vir Dei Dominicus, non solum permanisit illesus, sed et de flammis palam omnibus in longinquum egressus; iterumque reiectus et III totiensque resiliens monstravit aperte et fidei veritatem et eius, qui libellum conscripsisset, sanctitatem." *JSL*, 38.
313 *JSL*, 38; *PFLSD*, 219-20; *BTLE*, 209; *COLD*, 296; *HIRM*, 464-5; *IVLA*, 467; *JMIV*, 319; *RCVSD*, 780; *DAL*, 569E; *GSSDL*, 245.
the account of the jumping book is found in other, non-Dominican sources.\textsuperscript{314} As Jordan of Saxony himself comments, the importance of the miracle was to demonstrate Dominic’s erudition and his faith, “the truth of the faith and the holiness of the book’s author” in Tugwell’s translation.

Necessarily, the dating of this miracle is a neat transition point for the narratives. Sometime after the debate, Diego returns to Castile never to return to the Languedoc. Dominic was now without his superior, in a foreign land allegedly filled with heretics, under the supervision of a newly-appointed bishop—who had previously been a troubadour—and with the Albigensian Crusade only a year or so away. The transition between the early phase of Dominic’s life and his work in forming and fostering his new Order of Preachers occurs at this point in his life. We can confirm that the period of Dominic’s life spent in the Languedoc was formative, but perhaps only in confirming the tendencies brewing in his mind from his earliest memories.

\textsuperscript{314} HALB, 47-9. The dating of Peter’s text and his mentioning of the jumping book suggests that Peter was familiar with the Dominican sources and their account. William of Puylarens reports the occurrence of the debate, but does not note that anything unusual happened. WPC, 56.
Chapter IV: Conclusion

St. Dominic of Osma was born sometime in the early 1170’s. We do not know when exactly. We do know that the village was called Caleruega, in the diocese of Osma, in the Kingdom of Castile. When he was born, there was a young king on the throne battling the hegemony of the king of León. Dominic’s father was not a nobleman, but neither was he a pauper. It seems likely that he was part of the emergent bourgeoisie which becomes so noticeable in the twelfth century. His mother was likely of a similar background. There were other sons, at least, but we have no reports of daughters in the family.

Dominic was sent to his mother’s brother, an archpriest serving in a parish somewhere in the province of Toledo. He at least learned Latin and writing from this uncle. After a few years, he was sent to Palencia. The cathedral school of Palencia had a strong faculty of legalists then and probably a comparable number of other masters. Sometime during his studies—maybe in 1192 or 1195/6—a famine struck. Dominic sold his books to feed the hunger-stricken in Palencia. Despite selling his books, Dominic still did well enough in these studies to move on and study theology.

After four years of study in theology, he was recruited for the cathedral chapter in Osma. Under the guiding hand of Martin Bazán, the chapter of Osma had recently been reformed. A close ally of both the king of Castile and the Pope, Martin regularized the chapter, reduced its number and seems to have increased the power and prestige of the chapter. Dominic was enrolled sometime between 1195 and 1199. The reform likely was
completed sometime during that span, but had been ongoing since the 1170’s. Martin served as a papal judge-delegate and his importance is demonstrated by the career of his successor, and the prior of his cathedral chapter, Diego d’Acebo.

Diego d’Acebo was Dominic’s mentor. While Dominic was a canon, Diego was the sub-prior. When Dominic was sacristan, Diego was the prior. When Diego became bishop, Dominic became sub-prior of the chapter. The two of them, on royal initiative, traveled to Denmark and back; twice. They arranged the marriage of the King of Castile’s favorite son. Along the way, Dominic debated and converted an adherent of the Albigensian heresiarchs. When the Castilian prince’s betrothed died, Diego and Dominic sought a different mission, a preaching mission.

Diego and Dominic intended to preach in Denmark against the Cumans. Diego asked Innocent III to reassign him to Denmark in order to preach against the Cumans. Innocent denied his request and Diego began the long trip home to Castile. On the way he stopped at Cîteaux and continued through to Languedoc. In the Languedoc, Diego and Dominic began to preach against the Albigensian heretics. They were supported by Cistercians, pontifical legates, and local bishops. The two men, it seems, intended to make preaching in the Languedoc their special task. Diego returned to Castile, to set the diocese of Osma in order before his long absence, but he never returned to the Languedoc. He died in December 1207.

Dominic, in 1207, was without a bishop, far from home, and without a chapter to serve. Despite these long odds, he became a favorite preacher of Simon de Montfort, the future hero of the Albigensian Crusades. Fulk of Toulouse, longtime troubadour and bishop
of Toulouse from 1206 onward, also favored Dominic greatly. Years later, Fulk and Dominic would travel together to IV Lateran. The Order of Preachers would not truly experience rapid growth until later in the 1210’s. When he died in 1221, Dominic was not immediately canonized, that took another dozen years.

The study of the life of Dominic of Osma requires a considerable awareness of the historical context of Dominic’s background. The Church of Castile dramatically informed the way in which Dominic thought and worked. The unique closeness of the Castilian bishops and King Alfonso VIII deserves a full-length study, but several indications of that closeness were given here. Likewise, the importance of the twelfth century reformation for understanding the Castilian Church demonstrated that the traditional connotations of close royal-ecclesiastical relationships do not hold true for Castile. It seems clear that the state of the Castilian Church, at least under Alfonso VIII, was balanced between pontifical reformism and royal service.

Taken as a whole, the early life of St. Dominic of Osma demonstrates that close reconstructions of the lives of twelfth century saints are possible when reconstructions are paired with close readings of historical contexts. The context is particularly important when the record of the saint’s early life is fragmentary. St. Dominic’s biography is no exception. The little data about Dominic’s early life suggests that an infusion of the context of Dominic’s early life can help to approximate a clearer understanding of the life of the saint, and by extension the lives of innumerable unknown secular and regular clerics in Castile.
Approaches such as this, although limited in their scope, have great potential. A considerable body of hagiography remains to be analyzed and a close reading of the hagiographical sources and the context of the saint’s life brings the saint back to life. Reanimated, the saint’s biography becomes vibrant, useful and informative. By better understanding the lives of saints, we can begin to better understand the societies for whom they were role models. Using the saints as one pole, we can approximate the lifestyle of otherwise unknown clerics and can begin to fill in the history of the clergy in the middle ages. By filling in the history of the clergy, we can better understand the nature of the laity in the same period. A renewed interest in hagiographical constructions, such as this one, may well be the key to unlocking a new level of understanding for the middle ages.
Appendix A: Aggregate Data for Table 4

This is the collected data which shows the location given in the diplomatics of Alfonso VIII. These locations are listed individually, but the table is nevertheless macro-organized by diocese, as Table 4 was above. The importance here is the diocesan location. The document numbers listed are those ascribed to them by Julio González in the second and third volumes of his three-volume *El Reino de Castilla en la Época de Alfonso VIII* (abbreviated *RdC* in the tables’ headings.) The documents in the solely Alfonsine period begin with number 51 and end with number 1033. The analysis of the data can be found in its fully processed form above in Table 4. This table lists only the number of the document of the location and does not include speculative identifications of documents which lack a location in their edited form.

Table 8: Raw Data for Table 4: Charters Emanating from Episcopal Sees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Document #’s from RdC</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aceca</td>
<td>511-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreda</td>
<td>424, 425, 448, 449, &amp; 644</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguilar</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarcón</td>
<td>693, 793, &amp; 884-8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarcos</td>
<td>610 &amp; 627</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albelda</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberguería de Martín Quendul</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcalá</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcalía de Henares</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alconchel</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcubilla</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Document #’s from RdC</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almazan</td>
<td>129, 130, 174, 445, 559, 677, 699, &amp; 748</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Añover de Tajo</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcos</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arévalo</td>
<td>194-6, &amp; 312</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariza</td>
<td>153 &amp; 749</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atajona</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atienza</td>
<td>82, 173, 372-4, 606, 672, 742, 743, 798, 799, &amp; 928</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avía</td>
<td>108, 179 &amp; 180</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ávila</td>
<td>77, 159, 160, 222, 381, 382 &amp; 612</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayllon</td>
<td>155, 255, 348, 375, 376, 708 &amp; 716</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belorado</td>
<td>191, 207, 208, 227-9, 268, 303, 522-5, 684,800, &amp; 848</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belvis</td>
<td>421 &amp; 422</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berdejo</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlanga</td>
<td>560, 744 &amp; 783</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borcalfaro</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brihuega</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buelna</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buitrago</td>
<td>175, 461, 814 &amp; 817</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burgos</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51, 57, 79, 113, 114, 124-6, 132-6, 138, 144, 164, 181, 187,</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>19.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>190, 192, 209, 210, 240, 290, 295-7, 306, 333, 347, 364-9,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>395, 401, 403-5, 416-9, 427, 444, 472-84, 526-30, 539-55,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1027, 590, 591, 595-603, 616-8, 624, 650, 663, 664, 668, 674,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>675, 682, 685, 686, 688, 709-712, 715, 721-5, 747, 778, 1030,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>784-6, 803-7, 819, 820, 822, 824, 841, 843, 846, 847, 850,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>853, 854, 870-3, 894, 902-3, 910-3, 917, 1032 &amp; 919-26</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>19.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bujedo de Campajares</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabreros</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calabazanos</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calahorra</td>
<td>263, 429 &amp; 430</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calatañazor</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calatayud</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carabaña</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caraceña</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrión</td>
<td>304, 305, 331, 332, 370, 426, 505, 506, 531, 567, 568, 594,</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>619, 633-637, 734, 750, 751, 753-5, 802, 909 &amp; 918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castro Nuño</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castro Urdiales</td>
<td>823 &amp; 851</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castrogeriz</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castronuño</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castroverde</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Document #'s from RdC</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cazola</td>
<td>319 &amp; 320</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cea</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedillo</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerco de Vitoria</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cevico</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conosal de Fuentidueña</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coriel</td>
<td>556 &amp; 861</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corril</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covarrubias</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubillas</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuellar</td>
<td>224, 301, 400, 932 &amp; 933</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuenca</td>
<td>291, 300, 338, 351, 383, 410, 510, 521, 536-9, 640, 727, 728, 776, 831, 832, 868 &amp; 878</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deza</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eban</td>
<td>614 &amp; 861</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enciso</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrena-Navarrete</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalona</td>
<td>826, 881</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitero</td>
<td>99, 239</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresneda</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno-Lavandera</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frías</td>
<td>779, 787-789</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fromista</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuentidueña</td>
<td>212-4, 768, 769, 929</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaton de Campos</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
<td>131, 795, 796, 813, 905, 906</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hita</td>
<td>572, 573, 797</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huerta</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huete</td>
<td>167, 794, 879, 880</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagunillas</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langa</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lerma</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llantada</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logroño</td>
<td>689, 690</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maderuelo</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>178, 563, 883</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magaña</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Document #’s from RdC</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maqueda</td>
<td>83, 882</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masegoso</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>183, 223, 225, 231-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina de Rioseco</td>
<td>362, 396-8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina del Campo</td>
<td>310, 394</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medinaceli</td>
<td>154, 1020, 204</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molina</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monforte</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moñivas</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monsalud</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montealgre</td>
<td>161, 162</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montuenga</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monzón</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral de la Reina</td>
<td>488, 548</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortalaz</td>
<td>859, 860</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muño</td>
<td>97, 106, 186, 639</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nájera</td>
<td>80, 149-51, 163, 265, 266, 294, 343-5, 428</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nájera-Logroño</td>
<td>267, 321</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieva</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmedo</td>
<td>489, 578, 655</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oña</td>
<td>141-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osma</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovila</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palazuelo de Vedija</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palenzuela</td>
<td>137, 638</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancorbo</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcorbo</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pareja</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedraza</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peñafiel</td>
<td>487, 653, 654, 673, 703, 877</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinilla</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plasencia</td>
<td>454, 462, 463, 492-5, 520, 676</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramaga</td>
<td>377, 577</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riaza</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riba</td>
<td>774, 775</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Document #'s from RdC</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahagún</td>
<td>62, 63, 64, 76, 109, 127, 140, 340-2,</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Cristóbal de Ibeas</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Esteban de Gormaz</td>
<td>205, 459, 486</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Isidro de Dueña</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Miguel de Sortello</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Sebastián</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa María de Hanoveque</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa María de Husillos</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Olalla</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santo Domingo de la Calzada</td>
<td>226, 346</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santorcaz</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saquillo</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segovia</td>
<td>53, 78, 157, 184, 202, 238, 1021, 378-80, 687, 707, 757, 763, 764, 773, 828-30, 1031, 891, 899</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepúlveda</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigüenza</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silos</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simancas</td>
<td>65, 307</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitio de Cuenca</td>
<td>272-6, 280-9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solerana</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soria</td>
<td>81, 148, 216, 217, 259-61, 423, 450, 607, 671, 719, 816, 821</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soto Hermoso</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talamanca</td>
<td>251, 252</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talavera</td>
<td>182, 386, 387, 434-8, 1022, 519, 825, 834, 856</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tordesiliras</td>
<td>442, 592, 593</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tordesillas</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treviana</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Document #'s from RdC</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trujillo</td>
<td>451, 452</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudela</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudela de Duero</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ucles</td>
<td>388, 432, 465, 466, 535</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ureña</td>
<td>399, 441, 621</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valladolid</td>
<td>121, 123, 235-7, 302, 308, 328, 508, 575, 1028, 585-9, 613, 642, 657, 662, 697, 704-6, 758-61, 770-2, 838, 844, 845</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viana</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villacisla</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villafranca de Montes de Oca</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villamezquina</td>
<td>1024, 1025</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villanubla-Bamba</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villanueva de Arlanzon</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villanueva de Tozara</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitoria</td>
<td>683, 790, 849</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamora</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaragoza</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zorita</td>
<td>115-9, 415</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Aggregate Data for Tables 5-7

The data collected below represents only the charters which occurred during Alfonso’s lifetime (11 November 1155- 5 October 1214), after his father Sancho had died (31 August 1158). During this period, Alfonso was the legitimate king (albeit a minor, and therefore the subject of a protracted regency). The document numbers listed are those ascribed to them by Julio González in the second and third volumes of his three-volume El Reino de Castilla en la Época de Alfonso VIII (abbreviated RdC in the tables’ headings.) The documents in the solely Alfonsine period begin with number 51 and end with number 1033. The analysis of document ranges and the frequency of episcopal subscriptions is presented above, in Tables 4-6, as a composite. These three tables present only the aggregate data and list the document numbers in which the bishops appear and do not represent all possible documents in which they appear.

Table 9: The King’s men I: Raw Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bishops of Toledo</th>
<th>Document #’s from RdC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juan</td>
<td>51-60, 62, 64-75, &amp; 77-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro de Cardona</td>
<td>379-87, 389, 390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada</td>
<td>834, 841-4, 846-9, 851, 859-63, 865, 868-72, 874-6, 878-88, 891, 893, 894, 896, 899, 901-13, 915, 917-21, 923-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 10: The King’s men II: Raw Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bishops of Palencia</th>
<th>Document #’s from RdC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tello Téllez de Meneses</td>
<td>817-20, 824, 826, 828, 832, 834, 835, 837-9, 841-9, 851, 859-61, 863, 865, 868-72, 874-6, 878-80, 882, 884-8, 891, 893, 894, 896, 899, 901-13, 915, 917-21, 923-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11: The King’s men III: Raw Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bishops of Osma</th>
<th>Document #’s from RdC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bernardo I</td>
<td>197, 198, 209, 210, 213, 218, 221, 224, 227, 229, 235, 237, 248, 257-9, 261, 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>García I</td>
<td>431, 432, 434-447, 451-3, 456, 457, 459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego d’Acebo</td>
<td>711, 713, 715-8, 720-2, 724-8, 730-2, 734-8, 742, 743, 745-8, 750, 752, 753, 758-65, 767, 768, 770, 772, 774, 777-80, 783-90, 792-4, 797-9, 801-4, 807, 810, 812, 814 &amp; 815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada, elect.</td>
<td>824-6, 828, 835 &amp; 837-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendo/Melendo</td>
<td>865, 869, 871, 872, 874-6, 878-80, 882-8, 891, 893, 894, 899, 901-8, 910, 911, 913, 915, 917-21, 923-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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