

UM ARCEBISPO *IN ANGUSTIIS* (MAIO 1280)

PETER LINEHAN



Este estudo oferece um olhar privilegiado sobre um caso particularmente elucidativo de “engenharia epistolar”, saída das mãos de um carreirista eclesiástico do século XIII, o arcebispo de Toledo Gonzalo Peres Gudiel, num momento em que a sua carreira política como curialista estava particularmente ameaçada e no intento de tentar servir os interesses de Deus, do rei, do papa e, sobretudo os seus e os da sua própria família.

AN ARCHBISHOP *IN ANGUSTIIS* (MAY 1280)

PETER LINEHAN

This paper offers a privileged view of the epistolary gymnastics of thirteenth-century ecclesiastical careerist intent on serving the interests of God, king, pope and family.



## AN ARCHBISHOP *IN ANGUSTIIS* (MAY 1280)

PETER LINEHAN\*

I make no apology for descending from the macro to the micro, not to say to a single letter, and even to a draft of it. Nor do I do so for referring to a publication in which I have an interest. I do so because the draft in question was first published in a volume that has been accorded scant attention by the only Portuguese reviewer asked to report on it<sup>1</sup> and also because its content suggests that the option of ‘Serving Kings or God’ may prove a false dichotomy, perhaps even *une question mal posée*.

But first an introduction is necessary.

The playmate of Castilian infantes in the 1240s and thereafter *boulevardier* in the vicinity of the Sorbonne during Aquinas’s golden years, before going on to make himself indispensable not only to two masterful kings of Castile but also to a succession of not easily biddable pontiffs as well as acquiring *en route* Castile’s primatial see and assembling one of the most remarkable libraries of his age, Goçalvo Pérez ben Juan ben Pedro ben ‘Abd al-Rahmān ben Yahyāben Hārith (or, conveniently, albeit erroneously, ‘Gudiel’) possessed all the necessary qualifications for membership of the ecclesiastical élite of thirteenth-century Europe. Yet other than for a few shrivelled column inches in the historical dictionaries, the upwardly-mobile Mozarab who died as cardinal bishop of Albano in November 1299 has remained almost entirely neglected by posterity.

At least in part, this is probably the consequence of the way in which the history of thirteenth-century Castile came to be recorded soon after the event.

---

\* St. John’s College – Cambridge.

<sup>1</sup> HERNÁNDEZ, F. J.; LINEHAN, Peter – *The Mozarabic Cardinal: the life and times of Gonzalo Pérez Gudiel*. Firenze: SISMEL/Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2004, xxiv+644 p., where the evidence underlying statements unsubstantiated in these pages will be found. For more adequate accounts than that provided in the thirteen-line notice by A. M. C. M. Jorge [*Revue d’Histoire Ecclésiastique*. 101 (2006) 424] see GONZÁLEZ JIMÉNEZ, M. [*Alcanate*. 4 (2004-2005) 374-376]; COWDREY, H. E. J. [*Journal of Theological Studies*. n.s. 56 (2005) 734-736]; KLERCK, B. De [*Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis*. 119 (2005) 116-117]; PEQUIGNOT, S. [*Revue Historique*. 636 (2005) 890-892]; PICK, L. [*Speculum*. 81 (2006) 203-204]; FERNÁNDEZ ORDÓÑEZ, I. [*Revista de libros*. 112 (Apr. 2006) 13-14]; and WRIGHT, Roger [*Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*. 83 (2006) 103-107].

Even so, here is an individual *de distinguidísimo linaje* who not only was on the most intimate of terms with both Alfonso X and Sancho IV – a royal father and son who came to hate each other with a degree of intensity remarkable even by Spanish standards – but who also succeeded in clawing himself back into the good graces of perhaps the most volcanic of all medieval pontiffs. The first moral of my tale therefore is that Gudiel was a survivor.

It is a moral perhaps best pointed by means of a summary description of his public career. Born into a prosperous Toledo family in about 1238, at the height of the period of the Reconquista kingdom of Castile's most rapid expansion ever, and a time therefore of unparalleled opportunities for the ambitious and the adventurous, Gudiel appears to have been one of the youngest of his eight siblings. With Archbishop Rodrigo having recently embarked on the rebuilding of his cathedral, and being entrusted with the primary clerical education of the Infantes Sancho and Felipe of Castile, Toledo in the 1240s was part building-site, part finishing school. The Infantes required playmates and it seems that Gudiel was recruited in that role: an association that marked the beginning of his ascent up the ladder of ecclesiastical privilege. The second moral of my tale, therefore, is always to be nice to children on building-sites, especially royal children.

Gudiel possibly accompanied the infantes during their stay at the University of Paris, and was certainly a student there himself in the mid- to late-1250s. He is next discovered in the year 1260, studying law and rector of the University of Padua. From Padua he proceeded to the papal court, establishing connexions there that were to serve him well for the rest of his life. Loaded with ecclesiastical benefices, by 1264 he was back in Castile, seemingly implicated in Pope Urban IV's scheme to revive the moribund University of Palencia, and entering (or re-entering) the service of Alfonso X, *inter alia* superintending the *repartimiento* of the old kingdom of Murcia after the recent uprising of its subject Muslims. As the brightest star within the Castilian royal chancery, he was in some sense involved in the elaboration of Alfonso's new legal code and on his appointment as notary for Castile was placed in effective charge of that principal department of state. Meanwhile, he had secured the archdeaconry of Toledo, one of the most lucrative ecclesiastical billets in the kingdom, and in 1273 was elected bishop of Cuenca – and ordained priest. By then he had accumulated a remarkable collection of manuscripts, being particularly rich in translations of works of Arabic science. Two years later, he was promoted to the see of Burgos. Continuing as notary for Castile, in 1278-79 he was sent to Rome in that capacity in order to secure the appointment of the king's candidate for the archbishopric of Toledo, Fernán Rodríguez de Cabanas, abbot of Covarrubias: a mission that failed when in May 1280, instead of the abbot, he was put into the see himself<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> HERNÁNDEZ; LINEHAN – *The Mozarabic Cardinal*, p. 3-183.

At this point I interrupt the narrative of his inexorable progress because it is to this point of it that the letter I propose to discuss belongs.

However, before doing so, there is one other point that I must not fail to emphasize. And that is that the fact that anything can be said about Gudiel more than can commonly be said not only about his Castilian episcopal colleagues but also about his mitred contemporaries further afield is due to Gudiel himself and to the squirrel-like instincts of a man who, for whatever reason – perhaps it was that chancery training of his, but for whatever reasons it was providential – was an inveterate hoarder of papers. Not only his own (the Toledo archive also contains items of importance for the history of the city of Rome and of Anglo-French relations salvaged by him from papal waste-paper baskets)<sup>3</sup>, but of his own in particular – and not only drafts of his letters but in some cases even second drafts.

Now any historian of any department of the Western Church in the thirteenth century, from Poland to Portugal, will know how exceptional such survivals are. No matter that it is not of all his letters that drafts survive. (Indeed, there is good reason for suspecting a pretty systematic culling of sections of his correspondence at one stage or another – which of course is also interesting, but another story.) Even so, there is enough left in the archive of Toledo cathedral to enable Gudiel's mind to be scrutinized at unusually close quarters – always provided, that is, that the scrutineer is prepared to accept the timeless view of research imposed by that Name-of-a-Rose-of-an-archive the *longueurs* of which have been famously celebrated by the succession of scholars who over the years have clambered up to the chambers in the cloister above the patio in the footsteps of Richard Ford and Dom Marius Férotin, with their keen anticipation of the riches awaiting them tempered by the lurking suspicion that some unpublicized quirk of the local calendar may yet again prove the road to be better than the inn<sup>4</sup>. Not that Gudiel would have had it otherwise of course. *He* didn't want his mind looked into. Anything but. And he certainly didn't make it easy to do so. The deciphering of the cursive hand in which his drafts were written has proved pure purgatory. But the effort was worth it. The English historian of the nineteenth century, G. M. Young, famously advised students of his period to read all they could on the subject and to "go on reading (...) until you can hear people talking. Then you will understand why things happened as

<sup>3</sup> LINEHAN – A papal constitution in the making: "Fundamenta militantis ecclesie" (18 July 1278). *Studia Gratiana*. 29 (1998) 575-591, repr. LINEHAN – *The Processes of Politics and the Rule of Law*. Aldershot, 2002; IDEM – The English mission of Cardinal Petrus Hispanus, the Chronicle of Walter of Guisborough, and news from Castile at Carlisle (1307). *English Historical Review*. 117 (2002) 605-621.

<sup>4</sup> IDEM – History in a changing world: the case of medieval Spain. In IDEM – *Past and Present in Medieval Spain*. Aldershot: Variorum Reprints, 1992, p. 7.

they did”<sup>5</sup>. Here we can hear the archbishop of Toledo talking to himself. It is not often that a medievalist is permitted to enter the mind of an archbishop of Toledo and listen to him as he considered changing it.

In May 1280 the archbishop had the awkward task of explaining to Alfonso X why it was that, having been sent to the papal curia in order to secure confirmation of the election of the abbot of Covarrubias, the king’s man, for the see of Toledo, what instead had happened was that on Friday the 3rd of May the abbot had been prevailed upon to retire from the race and on the following day the job had been given to Gudiel – though only after the pontiff, in the words of Nicholas III’s letters of appointment, had ‘solicitously cogitated the matter’.

There was background to this of course. More than four years before, doubtless on royal instructions, the chapter of Toledo had elected the abbot of Covarrubias. But then questions had been raised at Rome about the abbot’s having purchased votes – and it was Gudiel who had raised them. It was also the case that by May 1280 the Castilian political establishment had polarized, originally between the old king’s supporters and those of the de la Cerda claimant to the throne, latterly between Alfonso and his increasingly restive son the Infante D. Sancho. It was in these circumstances that in May 1280 Gudiel found himself thrust into the see of Toledo. This of course was not at all to his surprise, since for the previous four years he had been angling for this outcome and engaged in squaring various cardinals in order to secure it.

His problem now was how to break the news to Alfonso without revealing his complicity in the matter; how to imply without actually stating as much that he was no more than the innocent beneficiary of a failed diplomatic initiative conducted in good faith.

There is a whole clutch of Gudiel’s letters and drafts of letters addressed to his supporters in Castile at this time, and full of interesting detail, and thoughts, and further thoughts, and crossings-out they all are. For example, there was no end of crossings-out and cancelled crossings-out around the delicate question whether to describe himself to his brother of Seville as ‘primate of the Spains’ and thereby alienate the colleague he needed to foster<sup>6</sup>.

But here I limit myself to what was perhaps the single most important letter he had to write at this time, his first letter to the king after the pope had put him into what the king regarded as *his* archiepiscopal see. Although we have Alfonso’s

---

<sup>5</sup> ‘London Addresses, I’. In YOUNG, G. M. – *Today and Yesterday: collected essays and addresses*. London, 1948, p. 112. I am obliged to Dr Boyd Hilton for locating this reference for me.

<sup>6</sup> HERNÁNDEZ; LINEHAN – *The Mozarabic Cardinal*, p. 440-447. Cf. LINEHAN, Peter – *La Reconquista de Sevilla y los historiadores*. In CONGRESO INTERNACIONAL CONMEMORATIVO DEL 750 ANIVERSARIO DE LA CONQUISTA DE LA CIUDAD DE SEVILLA POR FERNANDO III, REY DE CASTILLA Y LEÓN, 1998, Sevilla – *Sevilla 1248*. Madrid: Editorial Centro de Estudios Ramón Areces, [2000], p. 229-244.

reply to it, we do not have Gudiel's final version of this supreme exercise of his diplomatic skill. What we do have is his much-corrected draft.

To judge by this evidence, the account the archbishop provided of his exertions on the king's behalf was less than entirely frank. Describing himself not as he did to others at this time as 'archbishop of Toledo, primate of the Spains and chancellor of Castile', but as 'elect of Toledo, your notary and your creature (*merced*)', and acknowledging the lord whose *merced* he was – and in whose *merced* he lived as one whose *mucho saber* he 'held above everything else in the world', he begins (lines 1-5) by informing Alfonso of the circumstances of the abbot's election: "Señor, fazemos uos saber" ('My Lord, we would have you know'). But no, that wouldn't do. The king hardly needed reminding of the particulars of the election in which he had invested so heavily over the previous five years, particularly in view of the issue that had to be broached next. "Vos sabedes", therefore ('As you know', 5); better. Altogether more difficult was the problem of breaking the news of the abbot's disqualification and Gudiel's own emergence from the fray. For, having already written to other contacts in Castile, he had to allow for the twin possibilities, both that this was Alfonso's first notification of the outcome and also that it was not. And Alfonso was ill as well as ageing and his reaction when crossed was also liable to prove volcanic.

Hence, the new archbishop mentions the 'adversary' who had scotched the abbot's chances (7) – but not that that adversary was himself. The abbot had renounced 'all the right he had in the election', he continues (he had first written, 'had renounced the case': 9-10). But how to proceed? How both to explain what had then ensued and also to account for his own acquiescence in the papal *démarche*? Would 'whereupon the pope and the cardinals had to decide the provision to the church of Toledo' (10-11) do?

'Decide the provision': there was the nub of the matter. Everything turned on that. Or rather, everything turned on Gudiel's account of it and the response of a king who regarded the appointing of his kingdom's bishops as something he decided himself<sup>7</sup>. "Ouieron a auer su acuerdo sobre la prouision" was the crux: (11): *had to decide*, with the implication that it was indeed for the pope and cardinals to decide it. Gudiel hesitates. He strikes out "a auer". He seems to be searching for an alternative verb, one that will distance him further from the eventual outcome. But if so, he fails to find one, and settles for "a auer" after all.

It is indeed rare to be able to observe at such close quarters a medieval churchman wrestling with what was every medieval churchman's worst nightmare. One insufficiently ambiguous phrase, one ill-considered emphasis,

<sup>7</sup> Part. 1.5.18: *Las Siete Partidas*, ed. Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid 1807 [repr. Madrid 1972], I, 207; LINEHAN, Peter – *The Spanish Church and the Papacy in the Thirteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971, p. 108.

and he was liable to find himself disfavoured and exiled, the fate suffered by so many of his episcopal colleagues. The merest hint that he had been implicated in flouting the king's will, and his fate was sealed. There had been 'much talk' about the succession, he reports (deleting 'much labour':12). But in the event, it had been upon him that the pontiff's choice had fallen. This had been on a Saturday in May. Here we cannot read *which* Saturday that had been, though in another letter sent later he would date the happy event to the 11th of that month. In fact, it had been on the *previous* Saturday, the 4th. It looks rather as if Gudiel was withholding from Alfonso the significant detail that, for all the talk of 'solicitous cogitation', the pope and his cardinals had found it possible to reach a conclusion in his favour on the very day after the abbot's withdrawal from the contest. And it was above all essential not to arouse suspicions on that score.

So he is at pains to emphasize that it was not to any merits of his own that his promotion was due: "non fue por nuestros merescimientos"(14). (To his *exertions* in the matter, on his own behalf, of course, he does not refer.) His promotion was due to the *merced* of God and the *merced* of the king – 'and above all by virtue of having been raised in your household as your creature' ("a vuestra merced"). Moreover, there was the prospect that with him in charge ("por nos") 'the church' may the more fully enjoy the king's *merced* (15-16).

All told, Gudiel was much preoccupied with *merced* of one sort or the other during the month of May 1280. He seeks the king's approval *por merced* of what has occurred and *por merced* craves his assurance as to the future – though his request that the king send him letters of administration making over to him the temporalities of the see he thinks better of, cancels, and rephrases (18-19). While representing himself as one who had been taken wholly by surprise by the outcome, it would hardly do for him to appear unduly anxious on that score so early on.

Yet with the abbot's allies in Castile well placed to mount a pre-emptive strike against him, and with no means of knowing what the king's reaction would be to the news that he was sending, even less could he afford to leave the matter unbroached. Two alternative forms of words are successively experimented with, and both rejected. The bearer of this difficult missive, Johan Pérez de Cibdad (i.e. Burgos, the see from which he had just been translated) would report further concerning 'certain things' that the archbishop prefers not to commit to writing (26-28 and note 14). He was still choosing his words with extreme circumspection. In another, slightly later, letter to the king he strikes out a reference to the church of Toledo as 'ours'<sup>8</sup>, doubtless because so to have described it might have seemed presumptuous.

<sup>8</sup> HERNÁNDEZ; LINEHAN – *The Mozarabic Cardinal*, p. 442.



Meanwhile June passed, and then July. Lodged in Viterbo with the cardinals, by the end of that month Gudiel was doubtless increasingly on edge. You can almost smell the anxiety exuding from the Toledo drafts of those weeks. Why the delay? Why no reply from the king? Two and a half months had passed, yet still there was no word. As the Italian summer intensified, Gudiel would have been basing his calculations on the assumption that the emissaries he had sent in late May would have reached Toledo by the end of June. But as he awaited every next post what he cannot have known was that because the king was not in Toledo in July 1280 but in the deep south the round trip was bound to take considerably longer.

And to Gudiel they must have seemed very long weeks. He must have been concerned lest Alfonso be informed that he was also working on the Infante Sancho, as indeed he was, in the draft of his letter to him (also full of deletions and insertions) initially venturing to suggest that when the Infante eventually inherited his father's kingdom he would also inherit his father's servants, before on reflection cancelling that sentence and replacing it with a statement of his affection for one who 'ever since he [the Infante] was a little boy' had always loved and honoured him<sup>9</sup>.

It cannot have been much before mid-September that Alfonso's reply, dated Córdoba 31 July, reached him<sup>10</sup>. And though in the event this proved reassuring, at least to the extent that it expressed pleasure at his appointment, by then Gudiel was in further trouble because on the 22nd of August his protector Pope Nicholas had dropped down dead, and that created a problem.

But for the rest of the story you will need to refer to the book – or to the more informative reviews of it.

With the archbishop's agonizings of May 1280 in mind, here I wish only to remark on the inadequacy of the Kings or God dilemma. The choice was not a bipolar one. It was not a matter of the king or God. Indeed, God scarcely came into it. But the pope did. And so did the self-serving instincts of the archbishop himself as well as those of another constituency, which, though not mentioned in this particular letter, played a huge part in his personal history – and that of his family

The role of family in the story of Goçalvo Pérez ben Juan ben Pedro ben 'Abd al-Raḥmān ben Yahyāben Ḥārith cannot be underestimated. Throughout the thirteenth century his family treated the see of Cuenca more or less as its bailiwick – or rotten bishopric. Of Cuenca's eight thirteenth-century bishops, four if not five were members of that family, and when Boniface VIII gave him

<sup>9</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 446-447.

<sup>10</sup> A[rchivo] C[apitular,] Toledo, A.7.G.2.16a (publ., from A. M. Burriel's copy in Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid: *Memorial Histórico Nacional*, II, Madrid 1851, no. clxxv).

the red hat in 1298, it was one of them, his nephew, Gonzalo Díaz Palomeque, who succeeded him as archbishop of Toledo<sup>11</sup>. The supreme importance of family and its ramifications in the history of the entire peninsular Church will surely be one of the truths that will be confirmed when the data collected for the on-going prosopographical project comes to be analysed. In the nuncupative will of Egas Fafes, the Portuguese archbishop-elect of Compostela, for example, to which Professors Coelho and Morujão refer in their paper, we find some thirty relatives of one sort or another amongst his beneficiaries, not to mention others not described there as such, understandably perhaps since they were his son-in-law, Vicente Martiniz Curutelo, and grandchildren<sup>12</sup>. And also we find, amongst the provisions for borrowing the volumes bequeathed by him to the church of Coimbra the following eloquent testimony to the strength of dynastic forces at this time:

Mandamus quod (...) si aliquis fuerit de genere nostro tam ex parte patris quam ex parte matris aptus<sup>13</sup> ad adiscendum cum supradictis conditionibus recipiat dictos libros, et hec mandamus fieri computata genealogia usque ad decimam generationem ita quod propinquiores semper antecedant.

To the tenth generation! A prelate so confident in the capacity of his contemporaries for such virtuous acts of genealogy fully deserves the closest attention of the custodians of the *Fasti Ecclesiae Portugaliae*.

---

<sup>11</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 539-547. See also LINEHAN, Peter – Ecclesiastical life in the cathedrals of Iberia. In 'L'Europa delle Catedrali', IX Convegno Internazionale di Studi Medievali, Parma (forthcoming).

<sup>12</sup> Instituto dos Arquivos Nacionais/Torre do Tombo (IAN/TT), *Cabido da Sé de Coimbra*, 1ª incorp., docs. particulares, m. 18, n. 3; *LIVRO de Linhagens do Conde D. Pedro*. Ed. José Mattoso. Lisboa: Academia das Ciências, 1980, p. 455. *Portugaliae Monumenta Historica*, nova série; 2: 1.

<sup>13</sup> MS. actus.

## APPENDIX

[1280, late May, Rome]

Toledo, Archivo de la Catedral, A.7.G.2.10b/3. Paper (155x258 mm.)

Al muy alto e muy noble etc. Nos, don G<sup>o</sup>, por ~~la gracia de Dios~~ <sup>essa misma gracia</sup>  
 2 electo de Toledo, uuestro notario e uuestra merced, nos encomendamos en uuestro amor  
 3 como de sennor cuya merced somos e en cuya merced ueuimos e cuya uida e  
 4 salut cobdiciamos sobre todas las cosas del mundo. Sennor, ~~fazemos uos~~  
 5 ~~saber que~~ <sup>uos sabedes</sup> como, uagando la iglesia de Toledo por muerte del arçobispo don Sancho,  
 6 fue electo don Ferran Ruyz, abbat de Cueuas Ruuias en la iglesia de Toledo. E  
 7 el demandando la confirmacion de su eleccion en la iglesia de Roma, ouo aduersario  
 8 que puñaua en iela embargar. E andando por el pleyto grand tiempo, ouo de  
 9 acaecer que el electo, ~~era~~ puso todo su fecho en mano del papa, renunciando ~~el~~  
 10 ~~pleyto~~ <sup>todo el</sup> derecho que auie en la eleccion. Onde el papa ~~Nichola~~ e los cardenales  
 11 ouieron ~~a auer~~ <sup>a auer</sup> su acuerdo sobre la prouision de la iglesia de Toledo. E, como  
 12 quier que mucho ~~trabaiassen sobre esto~~ <sup>fablassen en esto</sup>. En cabo, <sup>sabbado</sup> [.....] dias del mes de mayo, en Roma  
~~toue~~  
 12 acordaronse en nos e esleyeron  
 13 por ~~arobi~~ arçobispo en la iglesia de Toledo ~~e el publico~~ e proueyeron de nos. E  
 14 esto bien entendemos, sennor, que non fue por nuestros mereçimientos, mas por la  
 15 merced de Dios e la uuestra, e señaladamente entendiendo que nos eramos de uuestra casa  
 16 e uuestra merced, e que por nos aurie la iglesia uuestra merced mas conplidamient.  
 17 Onde uos pedimos por merced, sennor, que uos ploga, ~~e ca esto~~ ca esto, e  
 18 ~~todo~~ quanto nos auemos <sup>o auremos,</sup> todo lo queremos para uuestro seruicio, ~~como a sennor que nos quiere~~  
 19 ~~Otrossi uos pedimos merced,~~  
 20 sennor, que nos mandedes dar uuestras cartas, las que ouieren meester, paral arco-  
 21 bispado [... de ... ca] e de Dios en ayuso, quanto bien auemos e quanta  
 22 ondra auemos e tenemos fastal dia de de [sic] oy, todo lo auemos por uos, que  
 23 nos criastes e nos ençimastes e nos feziestes uenir a est estado en que somos.  
 24 E aun sabed, sennor, que assi lo connocemos e lo connoceremos mientra uiuamos. E mas  
 25 desto nos auemos a poner. E ~~por Dios, sennor~~ pedimos uos por merced, sennor, que nos  
 26 ayades encomendado ~~e que~~ a nos e [a] aquella iglesia en la uuestra merced para uuestro seruicio.  
 27 ~~E esta carta, sennor, fiziemos con grand priessa, por uos lo fazer esto saber lo mas~~  
 28 ~~ayna que nos podiemos por estos nuestros mandaderos, e luego uos enuiaremos nuestros manda~~  
 29 ~~deros sobre esto, con que uos entendredes dezir uuestra fazienda mas conplidamente. # \*E~~  
 enbiamos alla, a la uuestra merced, fulan e fulan <sup>Johan Perez</sup> que uos digan algunas cosas de nuestra  
 parte. E pedimosuos por merced que los ~~dixieren~~ creades de lo que uos dixieren. E que sea uuestra  
 merced de nos mandar cartas uuestras para <sup>el</sup> arçobispado, en razon de cosas que uos ellos dirian <sup>e</sup>  
 que ayades acomendado a nos e a la iglesia para uuestró seruicio, e teneruoslo hemos en merced. E deuos Dios uida e  
 uos mantenga por luengo tiempo a su seruicio.\* <sup>14</sup>  
 E, por  
 29 que non auemos aun ~~fecho~~ se sello fecho de nuevo, usamos deste de que ante soliemos usar.

<sup>14</sup> \*.....\*: note on dorse marked for insertion with the symbol #, below which is the alternative formulation, cancelled: E enuiamos alla a la uuestra merced ~~fulan~~ <sup>fulan</sup> Johan Perez de Cibdad, uuestro escriuano e nuestro clerigo <sup>e uuestra</sup> merced, e fulan ... que uos diran algunas cosas ~~en que auemos meester~~ <sup>e uuestras cartas</sup> ~~de~~ en que auemos meester uuestra ~~por~~ merced <sup>e</sup> para auer los nuestros derechos del arçobispado bienparados, e pedimos uos por merced, sennor, que iela mandades dar.

2 Al mes abo 7 unio noble 7c. Esq. d. q. <sup>esta mesur un</sup> per longitudo  
 3 dno & colado. upi not. 7 unio nob. nos amandus in dno.  
 4 ano & fowr aya nhd pms 7 en nra nhd remms 7 aya nhd  
 5 pte adunms pto adp las nra al mto. <sup>up pte</sup> Sena pms  
 6 pto q' ayo unio la colado. colado p' unio. et antio d' pto  
 7 fo dno & pto pto. eto d' ayo pms en la colado & colado. 7  
 8 d' amado la pto. eto d' pto en la colado de pms. <sup>en adp</sup>  
 9 q' pms en la colado 7 amado pto al pto. unio nra. <sup>en d'</sup>  
 10 amoy q' d' dno. <sup>en pto</sup> unio nra pto en mto al pto pms d'  
 11 pto dno q' dno en la dno. <sup>en d'</sup> Sena d' pto nra 7 las amado  
 12 <sup>en pto</sup> unio nra pto pto la pms en la colado & colado. 7 am  
 13 pto q' nra <sup>en pto</sup> pto. en dno. <sup>en pto</sup> unio nra pto en nra 7 pto  
 14 pto nra en la colado & colado. 7 al pto 7 pto d' nra. 7  
 15 esto pms amandus pms q' no pms pms pms. <sup>en pto</sup> mas pms  
 16 mto d' dno 7 la nra. 7 pto nra amado q' nra amoy d' unio nra  
 17 7 unio nra. 7 pto nra ayo la colado unio nra nra pto nra  
 18 dno nra pms pto pms q' nra pto. <sup>en pto</sup> 7 a pto 7 a pto  
 19 <sup>en pto</sup> dno nra amoy, colado pms pto pms. <sup>en pto</sup> dno nra pto nra  
 20 pms q' nra mto d' unio nra amoy ~~hoy nra nra pto~~ pto nra  
 21 pto amoy d' nra 7 dno dno en agio q'ra hny amoy 7 pms  
 22 dno amoy 7 amoy pto dno d' dno. <sup>en pto</sup> nra nra pms pms  
 23 nra dno 7 nra amoy 7 nra pms nra a pto nra nra pms  
 24 7 ayo pto pms q' nra nra amoy 7 lo amoy nra amoy 7 nra  
 25 dno nra amoy a pms. 7 pms pms pms nra pms pms q' nra  
 26 agio d' dno 7 pms ayo dno nra en la unio nra pms nra  
 27 7 ayo nra pms pms en nra pto pms nra pms nra pms nra  
 28 pms pms pms pms nra nra pms nra pms nra pms nra pms  
 29 q' nra amoy. <sup>en pto</sup> nra pms pms pms nra. <sup>en pto</sup> nra dno d' q' nra pms

Et p[ro]m[iss]io[n]e[m] p[ro] p[ro]p[ri]o s[er]v[ic]io q[ui]c

Et v[er]ba[m]us alia ala u[er]o m[er]ito p[ro]p[ri]a i[n] p[ro]p[ri]a q[ui]s d[omi]n[us] al[ia]m[us] r[ati]o[n]e  
m[er]ito p[ro]p[ri]a p[ro]m[iss]io[n]e[m] p[ro] p[ro]p[ri]o s[er]v[ic]io q[ui]c d[omi]n[us] r[ati]o[n]e d[omi]n[us] q[ui]c p[ro]p[ri]a  
p[ro]p[ri]a p[ro]p[ri]a m[er]ito d[omi]n[us] m[er]ito d[omi]n[us] utiq[ue] p[ro]p[ri]a cu[m] p[ro]p[ri]a d[omi]n[us]  
q[ui]c p[ro]p[ri]a d[omi]n[us] p[ro]p[ri]a p[ro]p[ri]a h[om]i[n]i cu[m] m[er]ito p[ro]p[ri]a d[omi]n[us] u[er]o  
m[er]ito p[ro]p[ri]a p[ro]p[ri]a p[ro]p[ri]a p[ro]p[ri]a p[ro]p[ri]a p[ro]p[ri]a p[ro]p[ri]a p[ro]p[ri]a p[ro]p[ri]a

Et v[er]ba[m]us alia ala u[er]o m[er]ito p[ro]p[ri]a i[n] p[ro]p[ri]a q[ui]s d[omi]n[us] al[ia]m[us] r[ati]o[n]e  
m[er]ito p[ro]p[ri]a p[ro]m[iss]io[n]e[m] p[ro] p[ro]p[ri]o s[er]v[ic]io q[ui]c d[omi]n[us] r[ati]o[n]e d[omi]n[us] q[ui]c p[ro]p[ri]a  
p[ro]p[ri]a p[ro]p[ri]a m[er]ito d[omi]n[us] m[er]ito d[omi]n[us] utiq[ue] p[ro]p[ri]a cu[m] p[ro]p[ri]a d[omi]n[us]  
q[ui]c p[ro]p[ri]a d[omi]n[us] p[ro]p[ri]a p[ro]p[ri]a h[om]i[n]i cu[m] m[er]ito p[ro]p[ri]a d[omi]n[us] u[er]o  
m[er]ito p[ro]p[ri]a p[ro]p[ri]a p[ro]p[ri]a p[ro]p[ri]a p[ro]p[ri]a p[ro]p[ri]a p[ro]p[ri]a p[ro]p[ri]a p[ro]p[ri]a

A.7.6.2.106/nº3 verso