

Narrating and accounting the costs of reform in a ‘Chronicle of the Reform of San Salvador de Oña (1450–1465)’

Carlos Manuel Reglero de la Fuente

Universidad de Valladolid

Abstract: The monastery of San Salvador de Oña was reformed by the priors of the monastery of San Benito de Valladolid between 1450 and 1456. The majority of the monks of Oña opposed this reform, which led to their being replaced by monks from Valladolid. In addition, the payment of papal taxes, lawsuits and building projects generated a substantial debt, which was repaid through the sale of the church’s silver ornaments and altarpieces, and as a result the monks who were expelled from Oña accused the reformers of theft. The priors of San Benito and its monks defended their actions in two texts: a document acknowledging the debt and explaining its origin, and a chronicle of the reform undertaken by the priors of San Benito which minimised their responsibility for the monastery’s mismanagement. Thus, the financial accountancy of the reform was combined with a literary commemoration of this undertaking.

Key words: Castile, monastery, Benedictines, reform, accounts, memory.

The monastery of San Salvador in Oña was founded in 1011 by Sancho García (995-1017), the count of Castile, and it housed both nuns and monks. Its rule was subsequently given over to Tegridia, the count’s daughter.¹ In 1033, King Sancho III of Navarre (1004-

¹ This article was produced as part of the research projects “El ejercicio del poder: espacios, agentes y escrituras (siglos XI-XV)” (reference HAR2017-84718-P) and “Los monasterios de la Corona de Castilla en la Baja Edad Media: actitudes y reacciones en un tiempo de problemas y cambios” (reference PID2021-124066NB-I00), financed by the Spanish Government’s Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación, Agencia Estatal de Investigación and FEDER, European Union MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033/FEDER, UE. Abbreviations: AHN Clero: Archivo Histórico Nacional (Madrid), Clero regular y secular.

1035) gave the monastery to Abbot Paternus in order to found a community of Benedictine monks who were to follow Cluniac customs.² The monastery received many donations over the following centuries and it established an extensive domain, making it the greatest Benedictine monastery in Castile.³ In the thirteenth century, Oña's principal rival was the royal town of Frías,⁴ however, by the fifteenth century, it was the Velasco family, who became the monastery's *encomenderos*, that is, nobility who provided protection to a monastery and its properties and tenants for a high price.⁵

The monastery of Oña was reformed by the priors of Valladolid between 1450 and 1456, and thus incorporated into the Observance of Valladolid, which preceded the Congregation of San Benito. San Benito had been founded by the kings of Castile and benefitted from the support of the court nobility. It encouraged the strict observance of monastic enclosure, abstinence from eating meat, and from the 1430s onwards, the community adopted customs inspired by Ludovico Barbo and St Justina of Padua.⁶

The reform of Oña proved traumatic for its community: most of the older monks were expelled from the monastery or left on their own volition; the expenses incurred by the reform were so high that the monastery remained in debt for decades.⁷ It was also traumatic for the community of Valladolid, whose priors were accused of stealing from Oña and of showing a greater concern for gaining power than for pursuing a religious life. Thus, it comes as no surprise that the recollection of these troubled years should taint relations between Valladolid and Oña for centuries afterwards. It was in this context that

² This first reform was also divisive: Agúndez San Miguel, "La memoria femenina." Concerning Oña's foundation and its Benedictine reform: Faci Lacasta, "Sancho el Mayor;" Isla Frez, "Oña: Innovación;" Martínez Díez, "Oña un monasterio;" Olmedo Bernal, "Una abadía;" Segl, *Königtum und Klosterreform*, 43–46; Reglero de la Fuente, "Founders and Reformers," 88–92.

³ Bonaudo, "El monasterio de San Salvador."

⁴ Alfonso Antón and Jular, "Oña contra Frías."

⁵ Diago Hernando, "La tutela nobiliaria."

⁶ Colombás and Gost, *Estudios sobre el primer siglo*; Zaragoza Pascual, *Los generales de la Congregación*.

⁷ Such cases of trauma are not exceptional and are often encountered in monastic chronicles. Albeit a very different and earlier example, the study of the Hirsau reform of Petershausen is insightful: Beach, *The Trauma of Monastic Reform*.

the monks who implemented the reform created their own account of events to defend their actions and economic interests. The account was set down in writing in the fifteenth century in two wholly distinct documents: an audit of the loans taken out to finance the reform, and an unfinished chronicle of the reform (hereafter *Chronicle*), which is published here for the first time (see Appendix). Both documents once belonged to the archive of San Benito de Valladolid, where a seventeenth-century archivist bound them together, and they are today conserved in Madrid's Archivo Histórico Nacional.⁸ *Chronicle* was not included in Fernando Gómez Redondo's masterly compilation of medieval Castilian prose, although Máximo Diago and Gonzalo Viñuales Ferreiro used it as a source for their studies on Oña.⁹ Despite being unfinished and brief, *Chronicle* is one of the scarce monastic chronicles from medieval Castile and thus of particular interest.¹⁰ With regard to the focus of this study, setting aside the very different natures of *Chronicle* and its accompanying audit, they are significant because they both seek to defend the actions undertaken by the priors of Valladolid at Oña.

The chronology covered by *Chronicle* begins in 1450 and ends with the abbacy of Alfonso de Villabrágima (1461–1465).¹¹ The original text of *Chronicle* has been lost, but the aforementioned seventeenth-century compilation contains two versions, one on parchment, and a briefer version on paper, hereafter *Chronicle* (a) and *Chronicle* (b). Both

⁸ "Oña. Quantas con S. Benito de Valladolid con su fin y quito de la una casa a la otra desde el año de 1450 hasta el de 1469. Con la historia de la reformación que hizieron fray García de Frías y fray Joan de Gumiel, priores de S. Benito, año de 1450." (AHN Clero, libro 16,757).

⁹ Gómez Redondo, *Historia de la prosa*; Diago Hernando, "La tutela nobiliaria," 99n66, 102n72; Viñuales Ferreiro, "El monasterio de Oña," 325.

¹⁰ The best known monastic chronicle is that of Sahagún (Puyol y Alonso, *Las Crónicas de Sahagún*; Ubieto Arteta, *Crónicas anónimas*), which was originally in Latin but survives as a Castilian fifteenth-century version. See Gaffard, "Martirio y taumaturgia;" Garcia, "L'anonymat individuel," "Les miracles d'un autre genre," and "Mirabilia et réforme;" Garcia and Reglero de la Fuente, "Dossier: Escritura y reescritura;" Reglero de la Fuente, "Estructura y proceso," and "La Segunda Crónica;" Schwarzrock, *Conflict and Chronicle*; Agúndez San Miguel, *La memoria escrita*. Less well known and briefer is the *Historia latina de Santa María de Valvanera* (Pérez Alonso, *Historia de la Real*, 465–501). San Benito de Valladolid's Book of Benefactors also included a brief description of its foundation (Olivera Serrano, *El Libro de los bienhechores*, 212–15, 263–64).

¹¹ The untitled *Chronicle* refers to sending monks "para rreformar el dicho monesterio" and the expenses "que se fezieran en la dicha reformación."

copies were made towards the end of the fifteenth century. *Chronicle (a)*, the focus of this study, includes several brief and sometimes incomplete paragraphs concerning the building work carried out at the monastery, as well as a longer paragraph describing the vaulting that was constructed above certain chapels, and how it collapsed in October 1454 due to the poor workmanship, bringing down the vaulting in the nave as well.¹² The parchment quire consists of eight folios, although *Chronicle (a)* takes up only the first three folios, along with a single line of the fourth. Furthermore, there are numerous blank spaces from the verso of the second folio onwards, which were meant to have been completed with additional data, the development of an idea, or as a more detailed narrative of what happened during a particular abbacy. However, *Chronicle (a)* was never completed.

The second part of the quire (fols. 4v–7r) consists of a list of properties bought and sold by the community between May 1457 and June 1459, that is, during the abbacy of Pedro de Paredes.¹³ In some cases, it specifies that the money of a certain sale was earmarked for a particular purchase; however, in general, it simply says that it was “for the community.” The last pages were left blank.

No reference is made to *Chronicle's* author, nor its date. As Abbot Alfonso de Villabrágima is spoken of in the past tense, 1465 may be established as a *terminus post quem*. However, *Chronicle* should be read as a work in progress, whose first draft was created 1457–1459, when the list of properties that were bought and sold was drawn up. The longer *Chronicle (a)* and the shorter *Chronicle (b)*, both made in the late fifteenth century, may have been used in the conflict that broke out between the monasteries of Valladolid and Oña from 1491 onwards.¹⁴ The most probable author of *Chronicle* was a

¹² Paragraph published in Viñuales Ferreiro, “El monasterio de Oña,” 325.

¹³ Ten purchases are listed worth a total of 38,700 mrs, and seven sales 75,850 mrs.

¹⁴ Zaragoza Pascual, “La implantación de la observancia,” 379–83.

monk who belonged to the community in Valladolid, but who had been in Oña at some time between 1450 and 1465, or else someone who had had contact with them.

Several documents concerning the rents and accounts between Oña and San Benito accompany *Chronicle*. Of particular relevance are the three quires of folio-sized paper that have been sewn together, and which contain the audit of the accounts concerning San Benito de Valladolid and San Salvador de Oña (hereafter *Quentas*). They consist of six documents dated between 1455 and 1469,¹⁵ four from July 1455, one from 1456 and a final one from 1469, as well as some additional notes.

The first quire consists of an audit drawn up on 5 July 1455 of the loans and payments made between the prior of Valladolid and the abbot of Oña, Martín de Salazar, along with nine other monks of Oña, most of whom had lived in the monastery during the abbacy of Pedro de Briviesca, who is discussed below. Firstly, the successive loans made by San Benito are listed and the reason for each of them is given.¹⁶ The total debt incurred came to 442,033 mrs, to which new loans valued at value of 200 doblas and 991 Aragonese florins were added the very same day; their purpose was also noted.¹⁷ A second document, dated 26 July, recorded the silver and gold paid for just a part of the loan by the community in Oña to the steward of San Benito.¹⁸ This was sold to silversmiths of Valladolid for a total of 307,317 mrs, which was discounted from the debt. Thus, the said monks of Oña acknowledged that their monastery still owed 134,718 mrs, 200 gold doblas

¹⁵ AHN Clero libro 16,757.

¹⁶ 110,000 mrs and 90,000 mrs repaid loans the prior of Rojas and the count of Haro, respectively, had issued to pay for lawsuits against Juan Marín; 159,133 mrs and 26,150 mrs were paid to the bachelor of Belorado to repay loans made, respectively, for building work undertaken in a chapel and an undisclosed debt; 40,000 mrs to pay for choir books; 10,750 mrs for clothing and provisions; and 6,000 mrs for a pair of mules.

¹⁷ 200 gold doblas *de la banda* to pay a debt to the count of Haro and spend on monastery business; 150 florins for two monks to travel to Rome to attend to the monastery's affairs; 400 florins for expenses and provisions; 441 florins to pay for the monastery's papal bulls and affairs in Rome.

¹⁸ 225 marks and three ounces of silver from an altarpiece were sold to a silversmith of Valladolid for 202,837 mrs in the presence of a monk from Oña; sixty-two and a half marks of silver were later sold to the same silversmith for 56,825 mrs; the steward was subsequently given a gold image weighing five marks and five ounces, valued at 47,654 mrs. Abbot Martín de Salazar sold another 120 marks of silver from the altars to cover Oña's needs and the lawsuits against Juan Marín.

and 991 florins to Valladolid. The aforementioned silver and gold had been taken from altarpieces and church ornaments, and the monks of Oña later endeavoured to claim back from San Benito, as they considered it to have been stolen.

A second quire consists of two documents, the first of which is dated 7 July 1455, in which thirty-one monks of the new community of Oña—no longer including Abbot Martín de Salazar—acknowledged this debt. The document includes the accounts of 5 July and also justifies the origin of the debts, providing a narrative for the events that occurred from 1 September 1450 onwards. The second document records how on 14 July 1455 the monks of Oña pawned their rents from nine villages to San Benito as payment and a guarantee for the loan. These nine villages are the same ones that had previously been rented out to the count of Haro and the Bachelor Pedro Fernández de Belorado. San Benito had lent the money to pay the debt to these two lay persons and thus recuperate these villages.

A third quire includes a new acknowledgement of the outstanding debt and records the guarantee handed over the following year on 30 June 1456. This was undertaken by Pedro de la Rúa, abbot of Oña, shortly before leaving office, and another twenty-eight monks. As on other occasions, various objects were handed over as a guarantee of payment, including silks, silver ornaments and books. The dossier is completed with a document of 27 July 1469, sewn onto the quire, in which both monasteries declare that their debts have been repaid and that they do not have in their possession any asset belonging to one another.

Drawing on *Quentas* and *Chronicle* in conjunction with documents from the monastery of Oña as well as other documents related to San Benito de Valladolid concerning the reform at Oña, the latter published by Ernesto Zaragoza Pascual, this study

examines the events of the reform in depth.¹⁹ My aim is to provide a more accurate and detailed reconstruction of events, one that supersedes the partial descriptions provided by seventeenth-century authors and those who have drawn on them.²⁰

The reform of Oña by San Benito de Valladolid (1450–1456)

In 1450 Abbot Pedro de Briviesca (1419–1452), due to his advanced age, attempted to renounce the abbacy of Oña in favour of the monk Juan Marín. The news of his intended renunciation divided the community, with one faction led by the monastery's senior prior, Pedro Sánchez de Vileña. The two factions complained to the monastery's *encomendero*, the count of Haro, Don Pedro Fernández de Velasco. As the count was occupied besieging the town of Frías from July to September 1450,²¹ he delegated the resolution of this issue to his confessor, who also a master in Theology, Friar Martín de Santa María, the prior of the Dominican convent of Rojas.²² Friar Martín went to Oña and met the monks in the chapterhouse to discuss the dispute. He then gave them twenty days to prove their claims. In the meantime, the prior of Rojas chose to undertake a reform of Oña, for which he relied on the count's support and the acquiescence of the elderly Abbot Pedro de Briviesca. He also requested assistance from the prior of San Benito de Valladolid, García de Frías, who visited Oña on 1 September 1450, accompanied by twelve monks.²³

¹⁹ AHN Clero carp. 324–326. Zaragoza Pascual, “Documentos inéditos,” and “Documentación inédita.”

²⁰ See the Benedictine chroniclers of both monasteries and the order: Yepes, *Corónica general*, fol. 334v–336r; Argaiz, *Soledad laureada*, 481–85; Torres, *Libro primero de la Historia*, 199–202, 215–33. The latter manuscript is an eighteenth-century copy; Fray Mancio de Torres was a monk in the years 1618–1631 (Rodríguez Martínez, *Historia del monasterio*, 29). For twentieth-century studies: Herrera Oria, “Reforma religiosa;” Colombás and Gost, *Estudios sobre el primer siglo*, 57–59; Zaragoza Pascual, *Los generales de la Congregación*, 109–10, 129–34, and “La implantación de la observancia;” Suárez Bilbao, “El monasterio de Oña,” 166–71; Suárez Bilbao and Viñuales Ferreiro, “El monasterio de San Salvador.” Diago Hernando's article, “La tutela nobiliaria,” is a pioneering study.

²¹ Arsuaga Laborde, *Pedro Fernández de Velasco*, 120.

²² Diago Hernando, “La tutela nobiliaria,” 98–99. Yepes, *Corónica general*, fol. 334v, and Argaiz, *Soledad laureada*, 482, say that they also complained to the bishop of Burgos, Alonso de Cartagena.

²³ AHN Clero carp. 324, no. 15. *Chronicle* refers to twenty-six monks, but the document only mentions twelve. The former figures seem more realistic circa 1455.

The news of the arrival of the monks from Valladolid prompted the prior of Oña and three officials, as well as other monks, to withdraw their obedience from the abbot. They considered him incapable of serving as abbot due to his age and they endeavoured to have him confined to the infirmary. However, the prior of Rojas came to Oña accompanied by the count's son (also called Pedro de Velasco) and sixty men.²⁴ On 30 August, having convened the monks, the prior of Rojas confirmed the legitimacy of Abbot Pedro de Briviesca.

With the armed support provided by the count's son, the abbot's first action was to imprison the prior of Oña along with six other officials in the monastery's tower, and they were later joined by a further thirteen monks from San Salvador. They remained under lock and key for four or five weeks and were then expelled from the monastery and sent to its priories of Tejada and Santo Toribio de Liébana.²⁵ Letters dated 20 and 25 October 1450 set out the formal protest submitted by the heads of the two factions, the prior of Oña and Juan Marín, respectively. They complained about being imprisoned in the monastery's tower in "chains and shackles and stocks" and then being exiled. They blamed the prior of Rojas for having ordered their imprisonment and the count of Haro's son for having executed it. However, they cited the prior of Valladolid as the vicar responsible for expelling them from the monastery. They also claimed that they were blameless and denounced what had happened as being motivated by the count of Haro and his servants' plans to steal the vassals and income belonging to the monastery of Oña. They declared that this was the real reason why the monastery had been taken over by force.²⁶ In the second letter Juan Marín referred to himself as abbot on the basis that Pope

²⁴ Probably from one of the military units besieging the town of Frías, just over ten kilometres away.

²⁵ Only fifteen monks are mentioned in the documents. Seemingly they were sent to the priories of Tejada, which is where Juan Marín reappears in *Chronicle*, or Santo Toribio de Liébana, where there were fifteen monks in 1456, including at least one of those expelled in 1450: Zaragoza Pascual, "Documentos inéditos," 133–34.

²⁶ Zaragoza Pascual, "Documentos inéditos," 123–26.

Nicholas V had confirmed his designation (12 October 1450), and King Juan II had supported it.²⁷

Chronicle records that when Juan Marín received the letters from Rome confirming his appointment he went to the Trinitarian monastery of Burgos. From there he sent letters to the churches of the villages from which San Salvador de Oña received its rents and declared that they should pay the rents to him and not the monks in Oña; if not, they would be excommunicated. The villages complied, which deprived the monastery of a substantial part of its income.

The prior of the monastery of San Benito, García de Frías, died in early February 1451 and was replaced by Juan de Gumiel (1451–1465). During the following months, both factions put pressure on the aged abbot, Pedro de Briviesca, which led to him issue a number of contradictory documents. Firstly, he seems to have named the new prior of Valladolid as his vicar. He also authorised the prior of Rojas, the dean of Burgos, two monks of Oña (who were originally from San Benito), Pedro de Paredes and Pedro de la Rúa, and the cardinal of Saint Sixtus, Juan de Torquemada, to request the pope to allow the monastery to be ruled by biennial priors while remaining subject to visitations by the prior of Valladolid and any necessary corrections he deemed necessary. Then, on 1 April 1451, the abbot revoked this authorisation, as well as the orders issued by the prior of Valladolid in his capacity as vicar concerning the monastery and its farms. Instead, he upheld his demand that the monks who had come from Valladolid should stay and observe the rule they had imposed, but under the government of an independent abbot. To this effect, he named the monastery's cellarer and wine-cellarer as his procurators and sent them to Rome.

²⁷ AHN Clero carp. 324, nos. 17, 18, 19. Argáiz, *Soledad laureada*, 482; Herrera Oria, "Reforma religiosa," 63.

A month later, on 1 May 1451, Abbot Pedro de Briviesca overrode the previous revocation stating that he had received information that the prior of Valladolid was innocent of the accusations he had made about his mismanagement of the monastery and its farms, and that it had been demonstrated to him that he was “very discerning, devout, honest, religious, capable, sufficient and in all things commendable.” Abbot Briviesca stated that the mistaken accusations against him were the result of his desire to impose a strict observance of the order’s rule. Abbot Pedro de Briviesca then confirmed Juan de Gumiel as vicar, and the other five representatives mentioned above as procurators. The very next day, 2 May, he reported that he had issued the previous day’s legal powers due to his fear of the count of Haro and the prior of Rojas, whom he accused of flogging him.²⁸ He believed his monks to be “holy men” and that he had been misled in appointing the prior of Valladolid as vicar. He also accused the prior of Rojas and the count of imprisoning his monks and expelling them from the monastery. He further accused them of having stolen:

both gold and silver and crosses, as well as chalices and censers; and having stripped bare the high altar of Our Lord and Holy Saviour, and the altar of Holy Mary and the altar of Saint Michael, whose altarpieces and antependiums contained more than two thousand marks’ worth of silver; and a gold statue of Our Saviour that weighed more than twenty marks; and, furthermore, they stole the relics that his lordship Saint Toribio brought from Jerusalem; and also stole the entire library.

Furthermore, the monastery’s rents and vassals had been sold or pawned to the count and his servants. He subsequently asked the pope and king of Castile to investigate, as he

²⁸ The document does not explain the reason for the flogging. However, it could probably be understood as a measure of penitential discipline: Lusset, *Crime, châtement et grâce*, 238; Valous, *Le monachisme clunisien*, I:217-19.

himself could not, due to age and ill health. He also denounced the findings of the investigation carried out by the prior of Rojas as being false.²⁹

The faction in favour of reforming Oña had the support of Cardinal Torquemada in Rome and the count of Haro in Castile. Their dual support provided a basis for an agreement to be reached firstly between Abbot Pedro de Briviesca, the count of Haro, and Prior Juan Gumiel of Valladolid; and then between Pedro de Briviesca and Juan de Marín regarding their dispute over who exactly was abbot of Oña. The latter renounced the abbacy in January 1452 in exchange for being appointed for the rest of his life prior of Tejada, where he would be accompanied by eight monks, and he was granted a number of rents. Both Abbot Pedro de Briviesca and Juan Marín named procurators in order to renounce their authority over the abbey and leave it in the hands of the pope (17 March 1452).³⁰ Nicholas V (1447-1455) then granted the abbey to Martín de Salazar, prior of the monastery of San Juan de Burgos, which was also reformed by San Benito de Valladolid (14 June 1452).³¹ Before Nicholas V's decision could reach Castile, the elderly Pedro de Briviesca died on 11 July 1452. The community of Oña then elected their prior, Álvaro de Cigales, as the biennial abbot on 12 July 1452. He was likely to have been the candidate favoured by the prior of Valladolid; however, his appointment was considered invalid in the absence of any papal provision. As a result Martín de Salazar went onto to become abbot.

But the abbacy of Martín de Salazar got off to a bad start due to a breakdown in relations with the prior of Valladolid, who was no longer able to exercise the same degree of power as he had under the previous abbot. Thus, the prior returned to Valladolid with his monks, and took with him the books and church ornaments he had brought to Oña. As

²⁹ Zaragoza Pascual, "Documentos inéditos," 126–33. The account by Mancio Torres is based on these documents, *Libro primero de la Historia*, 201–02, 215–17, esp. 217.

³⁰ AHN Clero carp. 325, nos. 1–3

³¹ AHN Clero carp. 325, nos. 4–5.

a result, only nine monks remained in Oña, eight who had accepted the reform and one who had come from San Benito. These monks were united in their wish that their monastery should not be subject to that of Valladolid. In short the crisis that took place during the summer of 1452 reveals the existence of two distinct reform projects. On the one hand, the prior of Valladolid wished to place Oña under the authority of his monastery, and that it be ruled by biennial priors. On the other hand, the monks of Oña, who had already accepted the reform of the customs (strict enclosure, etc.), refused to relinquish their status as an independent abbey. It is possible that the latter were initially supported by the prior of Rojas and the count of Haro.

Echoes of this conflict eventually reached Rome. In March 1453, Cardinal Torquemada wrote to the prior of Valladolid asking him to heal the discord, send monks to Oña and put an end to the accusation that he, as prior, prioritised his own power over reform.³² The prior complied by sending at least a dozen monks.³³

Despite the concerns expressed by the cardinal, the prior of Valladolid continued to try to reduce the abbey of Oña to the status of a priory, and implement the rule that its priors or abbots should be biennial rather than perpetual. Furthermore, he sought to bestow on himself and on the subsequent priors of Valladolid the right to undertake visitations of the monastery. To achieve this, the monks sent from Valladolid to Oña were made to swear to endeavour to attain this outcome, and that they would not accept being appointed abbot without the permission of the prior of Valladolid, and finally that they would adhere to and uphold the reform of customs implemented at Oña.³⁴

³² *Quod dicitur de vobis, quod in Oña magis quaerebatis dominationem quam reformationem*: Beltrán de Heredia, "Colección de documentos," 303–04, doc. 4.

³³ Torres, *Libro primero de la Historia*, 225–26, states that there were six in October 1453, yet the register of monks show records at least twelve new monks from March or April (AHN Clero carp. 325, nos. 10, 14).

³⁴ Five prominent monks issued a letter dated 16 September 1453; another, undated, was signed by eleven, although between two and four of the signatories coincide (AHN Clero carp. 325, nos. 8, 10).

By 1454 a mutual understanding had been achieved between the abbot of Oña and the prior of Valladolid, as can be seen in a letter sent by Cardinal Torquemada on 15 March of that year. Nevertheless, King Enrique IV (1454-1474) had to persuade the prior of Valladolid to visit Oña in person in order to attend to matters concerning the reform (Tordesillas, 11 April 1454). The king, who considered the monastery in Oña to be one of the most important religious houses in the kingdom, was concerned about the small number of monks living there (“a tenth of the number of monks normally there”), and he stated that “the monks of that house of Oña should live in the same way as the monks of San Benito de Valladolid.” The king wrote in a similar vein to the count of Haro, and he identified him as “the principal cause that the aforesaid monastery had been reduced to the said observance,” and he likewise wrote to the prior of Rojas.³⁵ In the latter letter, he pointed out that some of his ancestors were buried in the monastery, and that the reason for there being only a few monks was that the observance was not adhered to, hence many of the monks had left.³⁶

The prior of Valladolid visited Oña in December 1454 and convinced Abbot Martín de Salazar and another fifteen monks to name him vicar of the monastery.³⁷ In this capacity, he obtained a papal bull from Calixtus III (1455-1458) stating that Oña should be ruled by biennial abbots, who were to be elected by the community but confirmed by the prior of Valladolid; these abbots would not be obliged to go to Rome to be blessed; the monks had to promise to adhere to perpetual enclosure; the monastery would pay the half *anata* (a papal tax of half the income generated by the abbey over the year) every twenty years; and the prior of Valladolid would undertake the visitation, correction and

³⁵ Published in Yepes, *Corónica general*, fol. 335r-v.

³⁶ Yepes, *Corónica general*, fol. 335v.

³⁷ Herrera Oria, “Reforma religiosa,” 69. During the visitation, the monks of Oña kissed the hand of the prior of Valladolid.

reform of the abbey (20 June 1455).³⁸ The monks of Oña were notified of the papal bull on 22 August 1455, following Martín de Salazar's renunciation of the abbacy. That same day, the thirty monks who made up the community (only seven of whom were from the pre-1450 community) delegated the election of the new abbot to the prior of Valladolid, who chose Pedro de la Rúa, which was then approved and agreed. In fact, Pedro de la Rúa had already been named abbot by Calixtus III on 18 June, before the pope even granted the bull for the monastery's reform.³⁹

A year later, Pedro de la Rúa renounced the abbacy, alleging reasons of health. In fact, he did so following an argument with the count of Haro, who complained that the abbot was not respecting the rules of strict enclosure. A new election was then held in the presence of the prior of Valladolid. The chosen monk was Pedro de Paredes, who was not originally from Oña but had been prior of the monastery of Santa María de Sopetrán, which was another of the monasteries reformed by San Benito de Valladolid. The proposal was ratified by the prior of Valladolid on 31 August 1456. His rule lasted until 1461,⁴⁰ and he was succeeded by two monks who had come from Valladolid and formed part of the community of Oña after 1455: Alonso de Villabrágima (1461–1465) and Juan de Roa (1465–1479).⁴¹ All of these were biennial appointments, although they were re-elected and confirmed by the priors of Valladolid.

The death of Juan Gumiel, prior of Valladolid, coincided with the end of the abbacy of Alonso de Villabrágima in Oña in 1465. Over the decades that followed, Oña continued

³⁸ AHN Clero carp 326, no. 5.

³⁹ AHN Clero carp. 326, nos. 4–5.

⁴⁰ AHN Clero carp. 326, no. 7.

⁴¹ Zaragoza Pascual, "La implantación de la observancia," 377, and "Abadologio del monasterio," 566–67. The documents clearly show the correct date for Pedro de Paredes's election was August 1456, not 1457.

to belong to the Observance of Valladolid, but a new lawsuit arose under the abbacy of Juan Manso (1479–1495), which led to Oña temporarily recovering its independence.⁴²

The reform of Oña took place during an intense phase of monastic reforms and new foundations undertaken by the monastery of San Benito de Valladolid, during which seven monasteries were integrated into the Observance of Valladolid. This task was undertaken by two priors, García de Frías (1436–1451) and especially Juan de Gumiel (1451–1465).⁴³ However, as Diago has stated, the role played by the count of Haro in the reform of Oña should not be forgotten. The count was well known for his support for religious communities, and this also led him to protect the creation by Franciscan Lope de Salazar y Salinas of a dozen small monasteries of strict observance (1430–1458), as well as his foundation of a hospital in Medina de Pomar and other charitable institutions.⁴⁴

The cost of the reform of Oña

The reforming activity undertaken by Juan de Gumiel, the prior of Valladolid, is considered by some to have been controversial. Aside from his ecclesiastical activity, he sought to bequeath a testimony of the work he undertook as administrator of the monastic communities for which he was responsible. For example, he preserved the notes he made in June and July 1456 while travelling to the monasteries of Dueñas, Calabazanos, Oña and Sopetrán to oversee their reform or attempted reform.⁴⁵ Another illustrative example of his attention to detail with regard to administration and accountancy are the accounts

⁴² Zaragoza Pascual, *Los generales de la Congregación*, 194–96; Herrera Oria, “Reforma religiosa,” 77–83, 155–59.

⁴³ Zaragoza Pascual, *Los generales de la Congregación*, 101–47.

⁴⁴ In 1459 he separated from his wife Beatriz Manrique de Lara, by mutual agreement, to live a celibate life. Diago Hernando, “La tutela nobiliaria,” 97–98; González Crespo, *Elevación de un linaje*, 291–94; Arsuaga Laborde, *Pedro Fernández de Velasco*, 233–98.

⁴⁵ The text has been published by Zaragoza Pascual, “Documentación inédita,” 701–02. The notes refer to documents submitted in Oña, which included their obligation to repay two loans received from San Benito, for 179,000 mrs and 110,000 mrs respectively. The detailed arrival and departure times given for each location led Pérez Álvarez, “Concepción moderna,” 144, to conclude that Juan de Gumiel, prior of Valladolid, wanted to create detailed itineraries for future journeys.

related to the transfer of the community of the monastery of Calabazanos to the monastery of San Miguel de Zamora (1458), which were drawn up in 1460.⁴⁶ Similarly, his concern for meticulous management and accountancy is clearly demonstrated by the reform of Oña.

The reform of a monastery was, of course, a costly matter. It was not sufficient for the monks to accept the strict enclosure and other practices of San Benito de Valladolid. It was necessary to achieve papal approval, compensate the “abbots” and monks who rejected the reform, create an ideal architectural space, and reorganise the monastery’s administration. All this had a very high price for the community of Oña.

According to *Chronicle* in 1456 the count of Haro declared that he had loaned Oña 30,000 florins (around 3,150,000 mrs), an amount twelve times the monastery’s annual income. The figure was perhaps exaggerated, but even so, the amounts stated in *Chronicle* and *Quentas* are very high. *Chronicle* states that, following the election of Martín de Salazar as abbot, he requested a loan of some 11,000 florins to pay the half *anata* corresponding to his appointment and to pay for various building projects undertaken at the monastery.

A document from March 1453 explains how these loans worked. Initially the count of Haro had delegated the prior of Rojas to undertake the reform, and he took charge of obtaining the money. He requested loans in cash from a number of members and servants of the Velasco family, from citizens of Burgos and Medina de Pomar, including a Jew, and even the Dominicans. As these loans were issued with a high interest rate, and he then proceeded to rent out the monastery’s properties and assets for a period of several

⁴⁶ AHN Clero leg. 8,349 (16 September 1458 to 1460). A summary of the monastic accounts in: Maté Sadornil, Prieto Moreno, and Santidrián Arroyo, “El papel de la contabilidad.” There are numerous studies devoted to English monasteries, including Snape, *English Monastic Finances*; Dobie, *Accounting at Durham*. Research on medieval Castile is hampered by the scarcity of sources. A noteworthy exception are the accounts of the Benedictine monasteries in the Province of Toledo: García González, *Vida económica*; Moreta Velayos, *Rentas monásticas*; Reglero de la Fuente, “The Administration of the Castilian.”

years, collecting the full payment in advance.⁴⁷ Evidently this did not clear the debts, as when the prior of Valladolid took control of Oña in 1455, he chose to repay the outstanding debts with cash from his own monastery, and it was this that gave rise to the accounts drawn up in the audit studied here. As a guarantee of the debt incurred by Oña the prior of Valladolid was given numerous silver and gold objects, as well as the assets and properties that had previously been rented out to members of the laity. The income from these properties would be subtracted from the debt, and when the latter had been repaid the properties would be returned to Oña.⁴⁸

The accounts for July 1455 show that San Benito had, over the previous five years, lent no less than 442,033 maravedis, 200 doblas and 991 florins to Oña.⁴⁹ This was a considerable sum, given that in 1458 the income of Oña scarcely exceeded 250,000 maravedis.⁵⁰ Part of this debt was repaid using the silverwork from a number of San Salvador's altars. The silver that was handed over to the monastery of San Benito as payment (400 marks), and that which was sold directly by the abbot and community of Oña (120 marks), was bought by silversmiths in Valladolid.⁵¹

Quantas shows that one year later, on 30 June 1456, a considerable sum of money, 169,000 mrs, continued to be owed. As surety of payment, one crosier, two crosses, one casket and one necklace—together weighing fifty silver marks (45,000 mrs)—plus twenty-four rods of brocaded silk and sixteen books, mainly concerning law, were handed

⁴⁷ The Bachelor Pedro Fernández de Belorado loaned 204,600 mrs in exchange for the grain incomes paid by eight villages (AHN Clero, libro 16,757, 17 March 1453); the count lent 1,000 gold *doblas* (around 150,000 mrs), and received a village as a guarantee.

⁴⁸ AHN Clero, libro 16,757 (7 June 1455).

⁴⁹ The equivalent of approximately 576,100 mrs or 5,485 florins.

⁵⁰ On the accounts of 1458: Diago Hernando, "Fuentes de ingresos," 456–62. That year, the income in coin was 57,129 mrs, while the income in cereals was valued at 137,355 mrs, and for wine at around 60,000 mrs. As other lesser sources of income had to be added the total surpassed 255,000 mrs. On the monastic estate of Oña: Bonaudo, "El monasterio de S. Salvador."

⁵¹ After discounting the payment made at the end of July 1455, the remaining debt was 134,718 mrs, 200 doblas and 991 florins (268,785 mrs in total).

over.⁵² All these items were deposited in the monastery of San Benito on the condition that they could be sold if the debt were not paid. Oña promised to pay the debt before the end of 1458, but this did not happen until 1469, as recorded in *Quentas*. It is likely that the audit of the monastery's income for 1458, as studied by Diago,⁵³ was prompted by the need to keep track of its capacity to pay Oña's outstanding debt.

A significant sum of the money owed had been spent in Rome on lawsuits against Juan Marín, paying off the half *anata* following the election of Martín de Salazar and again following the election of Pedro de la Rúa,⁵⁴ the purchase of papal bulls related to the abbey's reform, as well as other papal rights, travelling expenses incurred by the monks sent to Rome, and payments made to procurators and lawyers, etc. In order to cover these expenses, San Benito lent San Salvador a further 110,000 mrs, and the count of Haro likewise lent the latter monastery 1,000 doblas of gold (around 150,000 mrs).⁵⁵

Another major expense was the building work undertaken at the monastery by its successive abbots. *Chronicle* states that Abbot Martín de Salazar spent 1,000 florins on the vaulting over the chancel and a similar sum on the transept chapels.⁵⁶ All this investment was lost when the pillars and the new vaulting collapsed, which also brought down part of the vaulting in the nave. During the subsequent abbacies, *Chronicle* recounts

⁵² Argaiz, *Soledad laureada*, 483, says that Pedro de la Rúa asked Gonzalo García de Villalpando, the King's book-keeper (*contador*), for a loan of 600 doblas (90,000 mrs) on 19 June 1456.

⁵³ Diago Hernando, "Fuentes de ingresos," 456-62.

⁵⁴ The papal accounts register the payment by Oña of the common service on 19 October 1450 and 28 June 1452, which consisted of payments of 166 florins and 8 gros (Hoberg, *Taxae pro communibus*, 315). These payments would correspond to the appointments of Juan Marín and Martín de Salazar as abbot, and should have been followed by a third payment Pedro de la Rúa's appointment in 1455. According to Sáez, *Demostración histórica*, 336-37, the papal chamber florin was valued at three for four Aragonese florins, which means each payment was worth about 222 Aragonese florins; multiplied by three, this would be equivalent to around 70,000 mrs.

⁵⁵ To repay this sum, San Benito had to lend another 90,000 mrs and 150 doblas (22,500 mrs), to which must be added previous loans: 150 florins for a journey to Rome and 441 to pay for papal bulls (equivalent to over 62,000 mrs).

⁵⁶ A total of about 300,000 mrs, without taking into account other building work. *Quentas* indicates that the cost the vaulting over the chancel came to 200,000 mrs, for which the bachelor of Belorado loaned 159,133 mrs, which was guaranteed with the rents from various villages; once again the monastery of San Benito repaid this loan.

other lesser expenses related to building work, such as the carving of the wooden choir stalls (8,000 mrs) and the purchase of an altarpiece (12,000 mrs), although many other building projects and purchases of church ornaments are not valued.⁵⁷

Thirdly, part of the loans corresponds to the payment of ordinary expenses, food or clothes that the monks needed when Juan Marín took over the abbey's income.⁵⁸ It is clear that the period 1450–1456, when San Benito implemented the reform of Oña, was a disastrous period for the monastery from an economic perspective. To pay for the reform Oña had to sell a considerable amount of the gold and silver it owned in the form of church ornaments, in addition to incurring major debts that took almost two decades to pay off.⁵⁹

The enduring memory of the reform

The memory of the costs that the monastery of Oña had to pay between 1454 and 1456, as well as the sale of its silver and gold, endured for many years. In 1622, the archivist and chronicler Mancio de Torres strongly criticised “the accusations stating that the monks of San Benito had robbed them, which were invented by the monks of Oña and targeted at the prior of San Benito.” He told of how the monks of Oña had included these accusations “at the start of the book containing the visitation reports, and they were read publicly every time the visitation reports were read.” Eventually, the monks of Valladolid complained to the 1524 General Chapter, which resulted in the accusations being eliminated from the aforesaid preamble to the visitation reports. However, during the time

⁵⁷ The cost of the choir books, valued at 40,000 mrs., brought by the monks of Valladolid must be included in this category of expense.

⁵⁸ In 1453, 6,000 mrs were paid to an innkeeper of Burgos for supplying oil and fish. In addition, the accounts of 1455 register four consignments for provisions worth 66,750 mrs.

⁵⁹ Argaiz, *Soledad laureada*, 483, records further economic harm derived from the reform: following the imposition of the enclosure, the monks of the priories were transferred to the monastery, which left these churches in the hands of the secular clerics, who with the support of the Bishop of Burgos, exploited them to their advantage, thereby reducing the rents paid to the monastery.

of Mancio de Torres, the memory of this “theft” continued to be recounted and transmitted every time a new monk of Oña received his habit.⁶⁰ Furthermore, Gregorio de Argaiz, keeping with the latter tradition of Oña, in 1675 described the five abbots from Valladolid as intruders, while he referred to the expelled monks as legitimate and deeply religious. He also accused the abbots from Valladolid, who governed the abbey for twenty-two years, of having removed the silver that covered three altars.⁶¹

The accounts of 1455

Quentas, the accounts drawn up on 7 July 1455, were intended to provide a statement of the debts owed by the monastery of Oña, as well as a record of what happened. This record was intended to justify the debt against any possible complaint, and in fact, the document went on to be translated into Latin, suggesting that it was meant to be used by ecclesiastical judges.

It opens with a long preamble stating the need to set down in writing what is to be remembered, just as Moses did in the Book of Genesis. Aside from a concern for mere historical memory, the author’s aim was to avoid malicious rumours and state the truth in writing. Thus, before any reference is made to the debt, an account is given of the monastery’s reform.

In this case the point of departure is the conflict between Abbot Pedro de Briviesca and the monk Juan Marín, who sought to become abbot, and how this caused a division between the monks and gave rise to the “destruction of the said house.” The account continues in the following terms. Firstly, Abbot Pedro de Briviesca and then his adversaries formally complained to the count of Haro, who in turn delegated responsibility to the prior of Rojas, whom both parties entrusted with finding a solution.

⁶⁰ Torres, *Libro primero de la Historia*, 215–16.

⁶¹ Argaiz, *Soledad laureada*, 482–83.

The prior's arbitration went against Juan Marín, who refused to accept the decision, declared himself abbot, and then tried to take control of the abbey by force.⁶² Pedro de Briviesca then named the prior of Rojas as vicar, and it was he who asked the count for armed assistance. The armed men sent by the count expelled Juan Marín and the monks who supported him from the monastery and defended Abbot Pedro de Briviesca's possession of the abbey.

Evidently, this account of events sought to deny the monastery of San Benito as having any responsibility for what happened during the crisis; it also denies that Juan Marín was in any way a legitimate abbot, as no written evidence or concession is cited in support of his claim. Furthermore, it limits the role of the count of Haro to one of mediation; he is presented as seeking to restore peace and legality through the arbitration of a cleric and not a lay person. It is Juan Marín who is blamed for initiating violence with his attempt to take control of the monastery by force (which goes unmentioned in the other sources), while the count merely defended the abbot, who is described as being almost one hundred years old. Essentially, the account provided here interweaves the events that took place between 1450 and 1452 in order to construct a narrative that discredits the aims of Juan Marín. It must be noted that all these points played an important role in the dispute that followed, as they gave legal validity to Abbot Pedro de Briviesca's actions, as well as those of the count and the prior of Valladolid.

Having established that Pedro de Briviesca was still the legitimate abbot of Oña, an account of the reform follows. It is stated that Abbot Pedro de Briviesca requested the prior of Valladolid to send "religious, willing and honest" monks for the purpose of reforming the monastery.⁶³ Evidently the author intended to underscore the fact that San

⁶² Yepes, *Corónica general*, fol. 334v.

⁶³ He later defines them as "professed monks, male and religious, wise, praiseworthy and chaste, honest, devout, knowledgeable in science and customs, full of virtue, brought up in the cloister, knowledgeable about the observance of the rule, agreeable to God and to men, in all things commendable."

Benito did not attempt to impose the reform on Oña; instead, it was seemingly an initiative of the legitimate abbot. Following the arrival of the monks requested by Pedro de Briviesca, he then undertook the reform of the monastery. No mention is made of the prior of Valladolid in Oña, nor the imprisonment or expulsion of any of the original monks of San Salvador. Instead, it is insinuated that Juan Marín and all of his supporters were expelled before the monks from Valladolid arrived; this was not true.

The author then recounts the origin of the monastery's debts. Firstly, Juan Marín is identified as having contributed to this situation when he sequestered the rents from Oña's properties and vassals. It is stated that this was done by force, and no mention is made of the papal bulls supporting his appointment as abbot. Juan Marín is also reported to have pursued a lawsuit at the papal court. The need to pay soldiers to defend the monastery, the costs of the lawsuits pursued in Rome and Castile, which meant paying messengers, lawyers and procurators, and the "thefts" of the monastery's rents are identified as the cause of Oña's financial crisis. Once more, the prior of Valladolid was freed from any responsibility for the events that took place up until the death of Abbot Pedro de Briviesca, as no mention is made of him having been named vicar of Oña, nor having had his powers withdrawn, nor being reappointed as vicar.

It is then stated that, following the death of Abbot Pedro de Briviesca, the monks chose Martín de Salazar as abbot, which ignored the fact that this had been arranged by Pope Nicholas V to the detriment of Álvaro de Cigales. It is declared that the payment of the half *anata*, the papal bulls confirming the reform, the building work on the chancel, the fence built around the vegetable garden, the repairs made to the monastery and other expenses, were all paid by the new abbot through a loan of 11,000 florins, which was taken out at a high interest rate. According to *Quantas* it was as a result of these usurious debts that San Salvador was obliged to ask San Benito for a further loan of 110,000 mrs.

They also record how San Benito had lent the money to repay the count of Haro (90,000 mrs), as well as the Bachelor Pedro Fernández (26,150 mrs) and other high interest debts. It is mentioned that certain amounts of gold and silver had to be taken from the sacristy, but no details are given. The community of Oña acknowledged these debts and promised to pay them, and used the monastery's properties and rents as a guarantee. Any profits they made were turned over to San Benito and were valued at the price they attained in September at the markets of Burgos, Briviesca or Poza.⁶⁴

On the basis of all these justifications, there can be no doubt that the author sought to demonstrate that the prior of Valladolid was not responsible for the debts accrued by the monastery of Oña. Likewise, the author of *Quentas* sought to present the prior of Valladolid as an altruistic benefactor of the monastery, unlike those who incurred the debts that he helped to repay. Clearly the explanations given in this account were intended to counter the previously circulated accusations of San Benito having led San Salvador into ruin. Seen in this context, the audit studied here is as much an exercise in obfuscation, erasure and forgetting as it is of recording, recollection and memory. The role played by the priors of Valladolid in the entire process of the reform is covered up. The sale of gold and silver church ornaments and of elements stripped from the altarpieces in the church of Oña for the purpose of paying the debts to San Benito is mentioned only in passing; these details are saved for another document. Similarly, no details are given of the building work undertaken in the monastery, yet this is a feature of *Chronicle*. Once more the reform is clearly presented as an initiative pursued by the monastery of Oña, whereby it is the latter community that must take responsibility for the expenses incurred.

The chronicle of the reform

⁶⁴ Clearly this document precedes the aforementioned loan dated 14 July 1455.

The second text, *Chronicle*, was drawn up and evidently written by the reforming monks as a defence of their reform of Oña, and it provides a much more detailed account than that given in *Quentas*. Once more it defends the actions of the priors of Valladolid and the reforming monks, seeking to place the responsibility for the harm suffered by the monastery, in particular the debt, squarely upon the shoulders of those abbots of Oña whose actions broke with the Observance of Valladolid.

The first element worthy of note is the statement that the reform was initiated by the aged Abbot Pedro de Briviesca, at the request of the prior of Rojas. The reform is thus shown to be a response to the internal crisis within the community, following the schism between the supporters of Juan Marín, who is referred to as the monastery's steward, and those of the prior of Oña, Pedro Sánchez de Vileña.

Another important aspect of this account is the role ascribed to the count of Haro. It is worth noting that in this source the two sides agree to his being the arbitrator in the dispute.⁶⁵ Although the count had a reputation for being conciliatory and a good Christian, this meant that a conflict that should normally come under ecclesiastical jurisdiction would be arbitrated by a lay person, whereby any resolution would have been rejected by ecclesiastical judges. Therefore, *Chronicle* stresses the point that the person who actually intervened was the count's confessor, the prior of Rojas. The count and his son are presented as mere witnesses to the events. Furthermore, the prior of Rojas did not involve himself with the provision of the abbacy, which corresponded to the pope, but only the issue of the monks' refusal of obedience to the abbot.

Chronicle dates the arrival of the monks from Valladolid as having taken place after the imprisonment of the prior and the officials. The monks of Valladolid had been invited

⁶⁵ The count was famous for being conciliatory, as he demonstrated in the political sphere by mediating between the Infantes of Aragon and Don Álvaro de Luna in what is known as the "Seguro de Tordesillas" (Marino, *El "Seguro de Tordesillas"*).

by the prior of Rojas to reform the monastery, and they were expected to live according to the “good rule and cloistered.” The aim of this claim is clearly to show how the commitment to reform displayed by the prior of Oña and his supporters preceded the arrival of the prior of Valladolid and his monks. Nevertheless, the latter would probably have been aware of their attitude beforehand, as they would have departed from Valladolid at least five days before.⁶⁶ *Chronicle* underscores that the abbot and the count’s son solemnly received the monks from San Benito, and that the abbot handed over the offices of the monastery to the monks of Valladolid in the chapterhouse. The opposition to this measure shown by the monks of Oña is clearly demonstrated by the discussion of the imprisonment and expulsion of the thirteen monks who supported the prior. *Chronicle* highlights that it was the abbot of Oña who sent the monks to prison, not the prior of Valladolid, which preserved the canonical legality of these acts, and also exempted the reformist party—that is the priors of Valladolid and Rojas and the count’s son—from any responsibility. Nowhere is it stated that the prior of Valladolid was named as the abbot’s vicar, which excused him from responsibility in the events.

Said events occurred between 1 September 1450, when the monks of San Benito arrived in Oña, and the designation in July 1452 of Martín de Salazar as abbot. They are narrated only briefly, and attention is focused on the dispute with Juan Marín. *Chronicle* recounts how the latter came to be in Tejada, and how he swore under oath not to stray more than a league from the priory, perhaps because he was one of the monks who had been expelled from Oña following the reform. *Chronicle* also stresses the fact that he broke his promise upon receiving the papal letters naming him abbot.

On the other hand *Chronicle* attributes to the prior of Rojas and the monks of Oña the decision to send a Dominican friar along with the new prior of Oña to Rome to oversee

⁶⁶ Calculated according to the journey made in 1456: Zaragoza Pascual, “Documentación inédita,” 701–02.

the lawsuit against Marín. At the same time, the prior of Rojas, with the support of the bishop of Burgos, negotiated with Juan Marín, who finally renounced the abbacy in exchange for becoming prior of the community in Tejada. The agreement was ratified by the community of Oña, as well as the count of Haro, who once again played a leading role. However, there is not a single reference to any intervention by the priors of Valladolid, nor to the revocation, devolution, and renewed revocation of the powers that had been granted to them by Abbot Pedro de Briviesca. Furthermore, no mention was made of the accusations by the expelled monks against both the prior of Valladolid and the count.

Similarly, the author remains silent about the community's appointment of Álvaro de Cigales as abbot on 11 July 1452.⁶⁷ With regard to this episode, the papal bull naming as abbot Martín de Salazar, the prior of San Juan de Burgos, would have been obtained at the request of both the prior of Rojas and the prior of Oña. The prior of Rojas had joined with the bishop of Burgos to take it upon themselves to convince the appointee to accept. *Chronicle* contrasts Martín de Salazar's initial rejection of the abbacy with his later actions at the head of the monastery. Once more, the prior of Valladolid plays no role whatsoever.

The only reference to the discrepancies between the new abbot and the prior of Valladolid emerges with regard to the reforming monks who chose to return to Valladolid rather than obey the new abbot of Oña. The count of Haro tried to avoid this by negotiating with the prior of Valladolid, but he was unsuccessful. After a month, the monks returned to Valladolid, taking with them the books that they had brought. The sole explanation for this is that the community of Oña refused to accept the authority of Valladolid. Thus it

⁶⁷ A footnote to a later letter states that Abbot Pedro died on 11 July 1452, was buried the following day, and Álvaro, who was the prior of Oña, was elected the next day.

may be deduced that the expenses incurred by Abbot Martín de Salazar and those generated by his decisions could not be attributed to San Benito or the reforming monks.

The narrative of Martín de Salazar's abbacy focuses on the building work he commissioned for the monastery and its church, and we are told that he spent a thousand florins for the vaulting over the chancel, another thousand on the transept chapels, the gate to the kitchen garden, and works in the wine cellar, along with other purchases. The building work in the transept chapels turned out to have been poorly executed. As a result, on 18 October 1454, three of the church's piers collapsed as did the vaulting of several chapels and a section in two of the church's naves. This is recounted in great detail, and the fact that none of the monks or the monastery's servants were killed is considered to have been miraculous; the latter had just entered the Chapel of the Kings for the consecration.

It should be pointed out that the construction and collapse of the vaulting are not discussed in *Chronicle (b)*, which may suggest this was added to supplement the account given in the original text. *Chronicle (b)* instead moves on directly to address the subject of the debts Oña owed to Valladolid. It is recounted that Abbot Martín de Salazar requested a loan of 2,000 doblas from San Benito in order to pay for the aforementioned building work and the expenses incurred during the reform. The loan involved handing over a silver cross, a silver crosier, several mitres and other objects to the monastery of San Benito as a guarantee. As mentioned above, these objects were handed over in July 1455, even though the loans had been issued some time before.

This episode preceded both Abbot Martín de Salazar's request that the prior of Valladolid send monks to Oña and the arrival of six of these monks in October 1453. However, the disagreements referred to in the letters of Cardinal Torquemada, as well as those sent by the king to the prior of Valladolid instructing him not to neglect the reform

of Oña, are omitted. The narrative in *Chronicle* (a) moves directly on to the summer of 1455 and the letter in which Abbot Martín de Salazar stated his wish to renounce the abbacy and retire to Valladolid, where he had taken vows. According to *Chronicle* Abbot Martín de Salazar delegated his responsibility as abbot to the prior of Valladolid. This prior spent the following four months governing the monastery, incorporating new monks and finally left Pedro de la Rúa, who had previously served as steward, as the new abbot. As has been discussed, the author of *Chronicle* had already commented on how the accounts between the monasteries of Oña and Valladolid were drawn up and the agreement of the loan between them, as well as the handing over of a new set of church ornaments as a guarantee. However, these events only took place in July 1455, during the stay of the prior of Valladolid in Oña. *Chronicle* thus sought to underscore that the new abbot was designated by the prior of Valladolid, just like his successors were. This designation was, in fact, established by the papal bull conceded by Calixtus III that very year, the same bull that subjected Oña to San Benito's authority, of which *Chronicle* makes no mention. Nor is any reference made to the payment of the half *anata*, which was one of the reasons for the monastery's lapse into deeper debt.

Abbot Pedro de la Rúa is severely criticised by the chronicler. His complaints and initial rejection to being abbot are contrasted with the arrogance he displayed after being blessed by the bishop of Burgos; on this occasion Pedro de la Rúa agreed to be "dressed in pontifical clothes." He then refused to obey the prior of Valladolid and argued that the bishop had absolved him from the oath he had previously sworn. Pedro de la Rúa demanded to be able to exercise the full extent of his power as abbot and to be subject to no restrictions whatsoever, as was the case before the reform. It is this haughty attitude that is given as an explanation for his removal from office the following year, and the final straw was his decision to travel across the area around Oña to consume the meals

(*yantares*) that were his due as lord of the said villages. The count of Haro reproached him for not upholding his promise to live a cloistered life:

And the aforesaid count was in Grisaleña at that time. And the said abbot went to see him, and the aforesaid count did not receive him very well; he said to him that as thirty thousand florins had been spent on the monastery, why was the abbot travelling around everywhere eating these meals? What kind of promise to live a cloistered life was this? The abbot then returned to the aforesaid monastery (fol. 3v).

This episode eloquently expresses the political dimensions of monastic reform, and how it involved the exclusion of a monastery's abbots from the political life of its surrounding district. The abbots of Oña disputed the control over this region of Castile with the counts of Haro. As the monastery's *encomendero*, the count had already managed to seize a substantial part of the political power linked to the monastery's lordship over its lands. The strict enclosure practised by San Benito and implemented at San Salvador prevented the monks from exercising their jurisdiction over their vassals, and this favoured the count's aspirations. It therefore comes as no surprise that the count should react by complaining to the prior of Valladolid, who then went to Oña, removed Pedro de la Rúa and imprisoned him in the monastery of San Benito de Valladolid, and replacing him as abbot with Pedro de Paredes.

Two events are narrated between the episcopal blessing and the removal of Pedro de la Rúa, which stand out amidst the large blank spaces left for others to complete, but that remained empty. The first and most prominent fact is the death of Juan Marín in Tejada, and how the abbot of Oña took possession of this priory.⁶⁸ A first attempt failed because

⁶⁸ According to Argaiz, *Soledad laureada*, 483, Juan Marín served as abbot for fourteen years, which includes the period until 1464–1465. In contrast *Chronicle* states that he died during the tenure of Pedro de la Rúa (1455–1456).

the monks barred the priory gates and only gave in when they were authorised to continue residing there under the same conditions as before. Having made this promise, the abbot was able to take possession of the priory and recover the flocks it possessed there. The second detail that is recounted emulates the narrative of the previous abbacy; a description is given of the improvements made to the monastery (the wooden choir, the bells, the acquisition of church ornaments), as well as certain other purchases.

The abbacy of Pedro de Paredes is almost left blank; all that is said is that he was “most Catholic and did much for the love of God.” Yet it is interesting to note that he was named by the prior of Valladolid, after the previous abbot was removed. The same thing happened with Abbot Alfonso de Villabrágima, who was the steward and second or deputy prior of Valladolid. However, *Chronicle* merely indicates the building work he carried out and how much was spent on the projects he undertook: repairs were made to the Chapel of the Kings, and an altarpiece of the Virgin Mary, costing 12,000 mrs, was acquired for the same chapel.

Conclusion

As was the case for the reform of other important monasteries, the reform of Oña was a divisive and traumatic experience for both the community that underwent it and that which implemented it. Ernesto Zaragoza Pascual studied the reform of Oña from the perspective of the Congregation of San Benito de Valladolid, and focused on the role played by the priors of Valladolid. Máximo Diago’s analysis turned attention to the role of the count of Haro with regard to the relationship between the monastery and the Velasco family in the context of their power struggle in the area. However, in this article, I have focused on the financial problems caused by the reform, revealing a narrative that

was created to minimise the responsibility of the priors and monks of San Benito de Valladolid.

The protagonists of this reform had different aims. Pedro de Briviesca, the elderly abbot of Oña, had hoped to maintain his position by expelling the rebellious monks. The count of Haro, in addition to his religious motivations, wished to neutralise the monks' external power by enforcing strict enclosure on them, as this would allow him to exercise his powers as *encomendero* with greater freedom. The priors of Valladolid wanted to impose their understanding of monastic life, in terms of both customs (strict enclosure, abstinence from eating meat, less communal and more individual prayer) and the government of the monastery (temporary priors instead of lifelong abbots, the subordination of Oña to Valladolid through the confirmation of its abbots). However, the community of Oña, whose only fault was disobedience towards the abbot, opposed the reform. Most of the monks of Oña would be replaced by monks from Valladolid. However, a few decades later, the monks of Oña rejected the monastery's subordination to Valladolid and claimed that San Benito had "stolen" the monastery's wealth.

It is this complex political and devotional context that shaped and coloured the *Chronicle* discussed here. The narrative that has been discussed develops a theme that was already present in the *Quentas* drawn up in 1455 as an acknowledgement of the debt. Both *Chronicle* and *Quentas* alter the chronological order and omit many events in order to create a vision of the reform that presents the priors of Valladolid in a favourable light. Indeed, the brief and unfinished *Chronicle* hardly addresses the changes made to the customs or liturgy used at Oña. *Chronicle* focuses on the financial, ecclesiastical and canonical implications of the actions of the priors of Valladolid. The enormous expenditure incurred during the reform meant that Oña remained in debt for years, and this would have left the monastery and its abbots in a dire situation. The only motive for

San Benito de Valladolid to agree to loan money to San Salvador de Oña without interest, and to step back from participating in the monastery's administration, was to avoid its ruination. The reform would have been undertaken on the wishes of Abbot Pedro de Briviesca of Oña and encouraged by the count of Haro's confessor, the prior of Rojas. Furthermore, *Chronicle* stresses the power invested in the priors of Valladolid to name and remove the abbots of Oña, which would later be questioned by Abbot Juan Manso of Oña and his successors, when the monastery of Oña regained its independence (1491–1506).

Thus, *Chronicle* does not seek to defend a monastic model, but instead protect the interests of San Benito de Valladolid with regard to its dispute with San Salvador de Oña. On the one hand, it counters the accusations of the theft of silver and church ornaments, while on the other, it advocates for the prior of Valladolid's power to remove and confirm the abbots of Oña.

Works Cited

Primary Sources:

Archivo Histórico Nacional, Clero regular y secular, carpetas 324–326 (Pergaminos de San Salvador de Oña).

Archivo Histórico Nacional, Clero regular y secular, legajo 8349 (Cuentas del traslado del monasterio de Calabazanos a San Miguel de Zamora, 1458–1460).

Archivo Histórico Nacional, Clero regular y secular, libro 16,757 (Cuentas y crónica de la reforma de San Salvador de Oña).

Beltrán de Heredia, Vicente. “Colección de documentos inéditos para ilustrar la vida del cardenal Juan de Torquemada, O.P.” In *Miscelánea Beltrán de Heredia. Colección de artículos sobre historia de la Teología española*, edited by Vicente Beltrán de Heredia, I:291–322. Salamanca: OPE, 1971.

Hoberg, Hermmanus. *Taxae pro communibus servitiis ex libris obligationum ab anno 1295 usque ad annum 1455 confectis*. Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostólica Vaticana, 1949.

Olivera Serrano, César, dir. *El Libro de los bienhechores del monasterio de san Benito el Real de Valladolid*. Madrid: Dykinson, 2021.

Puyol y Alonso, Julio, ed. *Las Crónicas anónimas de Sahagún: nueva edición conforme a un ms. del siglo XVI*. Madrid: Fontanet, 1920.

Torres, Mancio de. *Libro primero de la Historia de S. Benito el Real de Valladolid*. Biblioteca Histórica de Santa Cruz, Universidad de Valladolid, Manuscrito 195.

Ubieto Arteta, Antonio, ed. *Crónicas anónimas de Sahagún*. Zaragoza: Anúbar, 1987.

Zaragoza Pascual, Ernesto. "Documentación inédita sobre la reforma de algunos monasterios benedictinos castellano-leoneses y otros (1456–1532)." In *Oña. Un milenio: Actas del Congreso Internacional sobre el monasterio de Oña (1011–2011)*, edited by Rafael Sánchez Domingo, 698–746. Oña, Burgos: Fundación Milenario de San Salvador de Oña, 2012.

Zaragoza Pascual, Ernesto. "Documentos inéditos sobre la reforma del monasterio de Oña (1450–1456)." *Boletín de la Institución Fernán González* 252 (2016): 117–34.

Secondary Sources:

Agúndez San Miguel, Leticia. *La memoria escrita en el monasterio de Sahagún (años 904–1300)*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2019.

Agúndez San Miguel, Leticia. "La memoria femenina en los diplomas falsificados de San Salvador de Oña: un monasterio dúplice frente a la reforma benedictina." *Edad Media: Revista de Historia* 22 (2021): 233–61.

Alfonso Antón, María Isabel, and Cristina Jular Pérez-Alfaro. "Oña contra Frías o el pleito de los cien testigos: una pesquisa en la Castilla del siglo XIII." *Edad Media: Revista de Historia* 3 (2000): 61–88.

Argaiz, Gregorio de. *La soledad laureada por San Benito y sus hijos en las Iglesias de España y teatro monástico de la provincia de Asturias y Cantabria, tomo VI*. Madrid: Antonio de Zafra, 1675.

Arsuaga Laborde, Diego. *Pedro Fernández de Velasco, primer conde de Haro: un estudio de la figura de un ricohombre en la Castilla del cuatrocientos*. PhD diss., UNED, 2015.

Beach, Alison I. *The Trauma of Monastic Reform. Community and Conflict in Twelfth-Century Germany*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Bonaudo, Marta. “El monasterio de S. Salvador de Oña. Economía agraria, sociedad rural (1011–1399).” *Cuadernos de Historia de España* 51–52 (1970): 42–122.

Colombás, García M., and Mateo M. Gost. *Estudios sobre el primer siglo de San Benito de Valladolid*. Barcelona: Abadía de Montserrat, 1954.

Diago Hernando, Máximo. “Fuentes de ingresos y situación económica del monasterio de Oña en los siglos XV y XVI.” *Anuario de Estudios Medievales* 28 (1998): 451–86.

Diago Hernando, Máximo. “La tutela nobiliaria sobre los monasterios benedictinos castellanos en la baja Edad Media: relaciones entre los Velasco y el monasterio de San Salvador de Oña.” *Hispania Sacra* 56 (2004): 69–102.

Dobie, Alisdair. *Accounting at Durham Cathedral Priory: Management and Control of a Major Ecclesiastical Corporation 1083–1540*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Faci Lacasta, Francisco Javier. “Sancho el Mayor de Navarra y el monasterio de San Salvador de Oña.” *Hispania* 136 (1997): 299–308.

Gaffard, Ludivine. “Martirio y taumaturgia: la construcción de una memoria original de los santos Facundo y Primitivo en la primera *Crónica anónima de Sahagún*.” In *Pratiques hagiographiques dans l'Espagne du Moyen Âge et du Siècle d'Or*, edited by Amaia Arizaleta, 2:33–54. Toulouse: Université de Toulouse-Le Mirail, 2007.

García González, Juan José. *Vida económica de los monasterios benedictinos en el siglo XIV*. Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, 1972.

García, Charles. “L’anonymat individuel au service d’une identité collective: l’exemple des *Chroniques anonymes de Sahagún (XII^e siècle)*.” In *Identités méditerranéennes. Reflets littéraires. Bulgarie, Espagne, France, Grèce, Italie, Portugal, Serbie*, edited by Monique Michaud, 97–110. Paris: L’Harmattan, 2007.

Garcia, Charles. “Les miracles d’un ‘autre genre’ dans les chroniques castillanes du XII^e siècle.” In *Miracles d’un autre genre: récritures médiévales en dehors de l’hagiographie*, edited by Olivier Biaggini and Bénédicte Milland-Bové, 41–54. Madrid: Casa de Velázquez, 2012.

Garcia, Charles. “Mirabilia et réforme de l’église en Castille à l’époque de Christophe Colomb: la conflictivité autour des monastères bénédictins.” In *Entre la péninsule ibérique et l’Amérique. Cinq-centième anniversaire de la mort de Christophe Colomb*, edited by Rica Amram and Luis Suárez Fernández, 87–101. Amiens: Université de Picardie Jules-Verne, 2007.

Garcia, Charles, and Carlos Manuel Reglero de la Fuente, eds. “Dossier: Escritura y reescritura de una crónica monástica hispánica: la *Primera Crónica anónima de Sahagún*.” *e-Spania* 19 (2014), <https://doi.org/10.4000/e-spania.23810>.

Gómez Redondo, Fernando. *Historia de la prosa medieval castellana*. 4 vols. Madrid: Cátedra, 1998–2007.

González Crespo, Esther. *Elevación de un linaje nobiliario castellano en la Baja Edad Media: los Velasco*. Madrid: Universidad Complutense, 1981.

Herrera Oria, Enrique. “Reforma religiosa del monasterio de Oña en el siglo XV.” *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos* 29 (1925): 55–83, 155–65, 335–44.

Isla Frez, Amancio. “Oña: Innovación monástica y política en torno al año mil.” *Hispania* 225 (2007): 151–72.

Lusset, Élisabeth. *Crime, châtiment et grâce dans les monastères au Moyen Âge (XII^e-XV^e siècle)*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2017.

Marino, Nancy F. *El “Seguro de Tordesillas” del conde de Haro, don Pedro Fernández de Velasco*. Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, 1992.

Martínez Díez, Gonzalo. “Oña, un monasterio milenario en sus orígenes.” *Boletín de la Institución Fernán González* 244 (2012): 29–42.

Maté Sadornil, Lorenzo, M. Begoña Prieto Moreno, and Alicia Santidrián Arroyo. “El papel de la contabilidad monástica a lo largo de la historia en el orbe cristiano. Una revisión.” *Revista de Contabilidad* 20, no. 2 (2017): 143–56.

Moreta Velayos, Salustiano. *Rentas monásticas en Castilla: Problemas de método*. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca, 1974.

Olmedo Bernal, Santiago. *Una abadía castellana en el siglo XI. San Salvador de Oña*. Madrid: Antiqua et Medievalia, 1987.

Pérez Alonso, Alejandro. *Historia de la Real Abadía-Santuario de Nuestra Señora de Valvanera en la Rioja*. Gijón: La Industria, 1971.

Pérez Álvarez, Víctor. “Concepción moderna del tiempo en el viaje de unos frailes de San Benito el Real de Valladolid a mediados del siglo XV.” *Miscelánea Medieval Murciana* 31 (2007): 139–48.

Reglero de la Fuente, Carlos Manuel. “Estructura y proceso de elaboración de la *Primera Crónica Anónima de Sahagún*.” In *Histoires, femmes, pouvoirs. Péninsule Ibérique (XI^e–XV^e siècle). Mélanges offerts au professeur Georges Martin*, edited by Jean-Pierre Jardin, Patricia Rochwert-Zuili, and Hélène Thieulin-Pardo, 255–69. Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2018.

Reglero de la Fuente, Carlos Manuel. “Founders and Reformers. Abbots in the Kingdoms of Leon and Navarre, Ninth to Twelfth Centuries.” In *Abbots and Abbesses as a Human Resource in the Ninth- to Twelfth-Century West*, edited by Steven Vanderputten, 81–99. Zürich: Lit, 2018.

Reglero de la Fuente, Carlos Manuel. “La Segunda Crónica Anónima de Sahagún: Estructura, redacción y correcciones de un texto.” *Historia. Instituciones. Documentos* 47 (2020): 379–403.

Reglero de la Fuente, Carlos Manuel. “The Administration of the Castilian Benedictine Monasteries in the First Half of the Fourteenth Century.” In *Monastic Finance: Studies on the Economy of Benedictines, Military Orders, and Mendicants – Klösterliche Finanzverwaltung: Studien zur Wirtschaftsführung der Benediktiner, Ritterorden und Bettelorden*, edited by Jens Röhrkasten and Jürgen Sarnowsky, 101-22. Berlin – Münster: Lit, 2022.

Rodríguez Martínez, Luis. *Historia del monasterio de San Benito el Real de Valladolid*. Valladolid: Caja de Ahorros Popular de Valladolid, Ateneo de Valladolid, 1981.

Sáez, Liciniano. *Demostración histórica del verdadero valor de todas las monedas que corrían en Castilla durante el reinado del señor don Enrique IV*. Madrid: Real Academia de la Historia, 1805.

Schwarzrock, Ryan Evan. *Conflict and Chronicle in Twelfth-Century León-Castile: A Literary Study on the First Crónica Anónima of Sahagún*. PhD diss., University of Exeter, 2012.

Segl, Peter. *Königtum und Klosterreform in Spanien. Untersuchungen über die Chuniacenserklöster in Kastilien-León vom Beginn des 11. bis zur Mitte der 12. Jahrhunderts*. Kallmünz: Lassleben, 1974.

Snape, Robert Hugh. *English Monastic Finances in the Later Middle Ages*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1926.

Suárez Bilbao, Fernando. “El monasterio de Oña en tiempos de los Trastámara.” In *Oña. Un milenio: Actas del Congreso Internacional sobre el monasterio de Oña (1011–*

2011), edited by Rafael Sánchez Domingo, 136–85. Oña, Burgos: Fundación Milenario de San Salvador de Oña, 2012.

Suárez Bilbao, Fernando, and Gonzalo Viñuales Ferreiro. “El monasterio de San Salvador de Oña en la baja Edad Media.” *Circunstancia: Revista de Ciencias Sociales del Instituto Universitario de Investigación Ortega y Gasset* 24 (2011): 1–8.

Valous, Guy. *Le monachisme clunisien des origines au XV^e siècle. Vie intérieure des monastères et organisation de l’Ordre*. Paris: Picard, 1970.

Viñuales Ferreiro, Gonzalo. “El monasterio de Oña a través de la documentación: su significado o significados.” In *Oña. Un milenio: Actas del Congreso Internacional sobre el monasterio de Oña (1011–2011)*, edited by Rafael Sánchez Domingo, 322–33. Oña, Burgos: Fundación Milenario de San Salvador de Oña, 2012.

Yepes, Antonio. *Corónica general de la orden de San Benito, tomo V, centuria V [y sexta]*. Valladolid: Francisco Fernandez de Cordoua, 1615.

Zaragoza Pascual, Ernesto. “Abadologio del monasterio de San Salvador de Oña (siglos XI–XIX).” *Burgense Collectanea Scientifica* 35, no. 2 (1994): 557–94.

Zaragoza Pascual, Ernesto. “La implantación de la observancia vallisoletana en el monasterio de Oña (siglo XV).” In *San Salvador de Oña: mil años de historia*, edited by Rafael Sánchez Domingo, 368–95. Oña, Burgos: Fundación Milenario San Salvador de Oña, 2011.

Zaragoza Pascual, Ernesto. *Los generales de la Congregación de San Benito de Valladolid. I, Los priores (1390–1499)*. Burgos: Aldecoa, 1973.

Appendix: Chronicle of the reform of San Salvador de Oña

(fol. 1r) [En el nonbre de Dios Padre, Fijo, Espiritu Santo, que son tres personas e un solo Dios verdadero e a su honor e alavança. Por que los onbres de buena vida se consuelen en oyr buenas cosas.]⁶⁹ Asy es que en el año de nuestro señor Ihesu Christo de mill e quatroçientos e çinquenta años, acaesçió en el monesterio de señor Sant Saluador de Oña, avía un abad viejo de fasta çien años e duró en su abadía treynta e çinco años. En este dicho año dezían que el dicho abad, que se llamava don Pedro, que feziera rrenunçiaçión de su abadía en un mayordomo del dicho monesterio que se llamava Iohán Marín. E quando el prior mayor e otros monges de su opinión levantaron se contra él e quitaron le obediencia e pusieron dos provisosores para proveer el dicho monesterio e rrecabdar sus rrentas. E lo quisieron poner en la enfermería, saluo que non gelo consentieron algunos monges de su opinión (sic) e otros sus criados legos que ende eran. E quando esto vio el dicho abad fuese a querellar al conde don Pero Fernández de Velasco, que estava sobre la çibdad de Frías para la tomar, la qual tomó este dicho año; e fue con el dicho abad el dicho prior, e el conde oyolos e luego los enbió al dicho [su] monesterio. E dixo que el provería en ello. E luego el dicho conde enbió por un su confesor que se llamava el maestro fray Martín de Santa María, prior del monesterio de Rrojas, con el qual consultó e vino el dicho maestro al dicho monesterio e fizo juntar el dicho abad e todos los monges del dicho monesterio a capítulo. E estovo con ellos. E dixo les que qual era la rrazón e cabsa por que auían quitado la obediencia al dicho abad e qué rrazón davan de sy. E el dicho prior e los [otros] monges de su opinión dixeron que por que avía rrenunçiado la dicha abadía en el dicho Iohán Marín. E sobre esto pasaron otras muchas palabras e rrazones. E en fin dellas mandó el dicho maestro de parte del dicho conde que

⁶⁹ The words in brackets are missing from the short version, which also has some minor differences from the long version but they do not alter the meaning. I transcribe the “v” before or after “n” as “u”, and the “u” between vowels as “v.”

[de] dentro de veynte días primeros siguientes provasen los dichos prior e monges de su opinión en forma devida cómo el dicho abad avía fecho la dicha rrenunçiaçión.

En este tienpo, durante el dicho término, el dicho maestro tovo manera con el dicho abat que, pues el dicho prior e los dichos monges non le obesdeçían e andavan fuera de toda obediencia, que él ternía manera con el prior e conuento de Sant Venito de Valladolid para que le enbiase monges de buena vida para rreformat el dicho monesterio, a bevir bien e en buena regla e clausura. E el dicho abad le plogo dello e le dixo que luego escriviese a los dichos prior e monges e conuento de Valladolid para que enbiasen al dicho monesterio de Oña monges, aquellos que entendiesen que fuesen neçesarios para la casa e monesterio de Oña. E el dicho maestro puso lo en obra.

E dende a veynte días veno el dicho maestro al dicho monesterio de Oña e vino luego, en pos dél, don Pedro de Velasco, fijo del dicho conde, con fasta sesenta onbres. E estovieron con el dicho abad, e ovieron sus fablas en uno, e acabadas enbiaron dezir al dicho prior e a los dichos monges, que salían de la eglesia de dezir las oras, que se querían yr a comer, que entrasen en capítulo, que avían de fablar con ellos sobre la dicha cabsa. E luego entraron en el capítulo e venieron ende los dichos abad e don Pedro de Velasco e el maestro. E el dicho maestro preguntó al dicho prior e a los dichos monges de su opinión que qué era la cabsa e rrazón por que avían quitado la obediencia al dicho abad, que ellos lo rreçibirían por abad por letras apostólicas, e que menos de aver letras del Santo Padre en contrario, que non la podían quitar la dicha obediencia. E los dichos prior e monges dixeron que ellos eran çertificados por persona dignas de fee e de creer que avía fecho la dicha rrenunçiaçión e aun que de Rroma ge lo avían enbiado dezyr, sobre lo qual ovo otras muchas palabras. E, en fyn, el dicho abad mandó prender al dicho prior e otros seys onbres ofiçiales con él de su opinión e mandó los en la torre, los cuales luego fueron presos e echados en la [dicha] torre.//

(fol. 1v) Otro día siguiente vino fray Garçia de Frías, prior de Sant Venito de Valladolid, e traxo consigo fasta veynte [e seys] monges de mucho buena vida al dicho monesterio, e el dicho abad e el dicho don Pedro e maestro salieron los a rreçebir al corral del dicho monesterio honrrada mente, e tomaron el dicho abad e levaron le a la iglesia cantando *Te Deum Laudamus [te]*. E venieron luego al cabilldo e el dicho abad quitó los ofiçios a los monges que eran sus contrarios e fizo prior e ofiçiales a los monges de Sant Venito.

Otro día siguiente el dicho abad mandó prender a treze monges que eran de la opinión del dicho prior e echaron los presos en la torre, e estovieron asy presos por espaçio de un mes. E después sacaron los de la presión e los unos enbiaron a unos monesterios e otros a otros.

En este comedio enbiaron letras de Roma para que fuese abad del dicho monesterio de Oña el dicho Iohán Marín, por virtud de la dicha rrenunçiaçión. El qual dicho Iohán Marín estava en el monesterio de Tejada e avía fecho juramento de non partyr del dicho monesterio una legua enderredor a pena de perjuro. E, quando le dieron las dichas letras, quebrantó el dicho juramento e se fue para Burgos, e estovo en la Trenidad. E dende enbió çédulas para poner en todas [las] eglesias donde el dicho monesterio avía rrentas para que non acudiesen a los monges que estaban en el dicho monesterio de Oña, so pena de excomunió, saluo al dicho Johán Marín.

En esto, el dicho maestro e los dichos monges que estaban en el dicho monesterio enbiaron a Rroma al dicho prior, que era de los monges de Sant Venito, e a un frayre del dicho maestro e traxieron rrexcrito del Santo Padre para el obispo de Palençia, para que feziere pesquisa e sopiese sy el dicho abad fezyera la dicha rrenunçiaçión al dicho Iohán Marín. E entre tanto, el dicho maestro e el obispo de Burgos tovieron manera con el dicho Iohán Marín para que rrenunçiasse todo su derecho que avía a la dicha abadía e que le

diesen al monesterio de Tejada con todas sus rrentas, e allende çiertos maravedís para cada año para su mantenimiento [para en toda su vida, e estoviesen con él ocho monges de los primeros e les diesen su mantenimiento]. Lo qual concordaron el dicho obispo e el dicho maestro, lo qual quedó asy concordado por amas las dichas partes e pasó por contratos públicos. E aun después desto fue afirmado por el dicho conde e monges e conuento del dicho monesterio de Oña, sobre lo qual pasó contratos firmes.

E después desto, el dicho abad viejo rrenunció su abadía e enbiaron a Rroma doss monges de [los de] Sant Venito e traxieron bula del Santo Padre para que fuese abad del dicho monesterio de Oña fray Martín de Salazar, que era prior de Sant Johán de Burgos. El qual non quería ser abad e por rruego del dicho obispo de Burgos e del dicho maestro ovo açeptar la dicha abadía. E los monges que estavan en el dicho monesterio, que eran de los de Sant Venito non le quesieron dar obediencia, e se querían yr a Valladolid; e el conde sopo lo e vino al dicho monesterio e rrogoles que estoviesen quedos fasta que él escriviese sobre ello a fray Johán de Gomiél, que era prior del monesterio de Sant Venito, que ya era finado el dicho fray García prior.

E después dende a un mes, los dichos monges de Sant Venito que estavan en el dicho monesterio de Oña fueren se todos para Valladolid, e levaron los libros *//(fol. 2r)* que avían traydo e non quedó monges dellos en el dicho monesterio saluo uno e fasta ocho monges de los otros primeros, que avían entrado en la rregla de Sant Venito, los quales profiavan que el dicho monesterio de Oña no fuese subjecto al dicho monesterio de Sant Venito de Valladolid.

E en este medio, el dicho abad fray Martín de Salazar fizo çerrar la capilla mayor de la iglesia del dicho monesterio e costó çerrar mill florines de oro, los pordes e los çementos avía fecho el dicho abad viejo, e tenía labradas las algibes e sacada la piedra

para la çerrar, e fechas las capillas de los rrincones, que le avía costado todo facer un cuento e (*blank*) maravedís.

[E después desto, en el año seguinte, se fizo un coro de capillas junto con el cruzero, que costó mill florines, e por malos maestros que degollaron los poyales e non fezieron pilares para en que afirmase.

Viernes, a diez e ocho días del mes de octubre de L IIIIº, día de sant Lucas evangelista, salió el conuento del monesterio de Sant Saluador de Oña e acabada la misa cantada del alua que cada día se acostunbra çebrar a honor e rreverençia de Nuestra Señora a las syete oras en el dicho monesterio en la capilla de los rreys, vestiendo se los monges cada uno para misa a diversos altares que están fuera del cuerpo de la elesia, e entró el saçerdote en la segunda misa en la dicha capilla de los rreys, que es la capilla de Nuestra Señora, proçedió el dicho saçerdote en la misa rrezada de sant Lucas, e en presençia el abad don Martín con el ministro que ayudava a misa al dicho saçerdote; e acabado de alçar el santo sacramento del cuerpo de Nuestro Señor, ante que se pronunçiasen las santas palavras de la sangre, rrebentó la ovra por el gran arco que nueva mente avían rreparado sobre el pilar delgado que primero avía seydo apoyado cabe la puerta de los rreys e derribó consigo los dos pilares de cada su parte. Ca sacado de ally el dicho pilar pequeño, falleçió el dicho gran arco nueva mente mal rreparado. E estavan çiertos mançebos de la casa desconbrando la elesia por que los monges podiesen entrar a las misas e ofiçios divinales. E quando los dichos mançebos oyeron tocar la esquila para alçar, enpuxándolos la misyricordia de Dios, entrados todos por la puerta a adorar a Dios, alçada la sacra ostia, allanose el dicho arco, que estava sobre falso, con los doss dichos pilares, e trayeron consigo todas las capillas nuevas de sobre el coro que el señor conde avía fecho de bóveda, e trayeren syete capillas de lo viejo de bóveda con su tejado fasta el çielo de la nabe de medio sobre el coro, e de la otra nabe faza los rreys. E están otros tres de la otra

parte para caer. Asy, entrada la gente a la capilla, saluó Dios a todos que a Dios alavasen e ninguno feziere, e el saçerdote acabado de alçar la sacra ostia, fecho tan gran rruído, espaboresçió, e orando e llorando con gran espanto se retraxo a las sepulturas de los rreys.//

(fol. 2v) E en este tienpo fizo el dicho abad la casa de las tinas e seys tinas que se traxeron de las bodegas de los ofiçios, que estavan en las bodegas de la villa. (blank)

Mas mercó una çenefa que tiene la (blank)

Mas fizo apuesta que dezían que non era en memoria de onbres que en ella toviere vino (blank)

E mas fizo la puerta de arco de la verta (blank)]

En este tienpo el dicho abad don Martín de Salazar, aviendo grandes menesteres asy para las dichas obras como para pagar las debdas que el dicho monesterio devía por[que] quedó muy disypado en los grandes gastos que se fezieran en la dicha rreformaçión, pedieron prestado al monesterio de Sant Venito de Valladolid fasta dos mill doblas, e levaron [les] prendas una cruz de plata grande labrada e çierta plata e mitras e un báculo de plata e otras cosas. E prestaron gelas [sobre las] dichas prendas. E en este ser el [dicho] abad don Martín enbió rrogar al dicho prior de Valladolid que le enbiase algunos [de sus] monges para su monesterio e conuento. E el dicho prior le enbió seys monges. E dende a poco el dicho abad don Martín enbió dezir al dicho prior de Sant Venito que él veniese al dicho monesterio de Oña. E el se queria yr al dicho monesterio de Sant Venito e allí quería fazer su fin, pues que allí avía fecho obediencia e quería guardar el juramento que al dicho prior avía fecho de ser [a él] obediente. E el dicho prior, quando vio su carta, veno luego al dicho monesterio de Oña. E el dicho abad fuese al dicho monesterio //(fol. 3r) de Sant Venito de Valladolid e dexó su poderío al dicho prior de Sant Venito [de Valladolid]. E el dicho prior estovo en el dicho monesterio de Oña quatro meses [e más tienpo] e traxo

çiertos monges de Sant Venito al dicho monesterio de Oña. E al tienpo que se partió para se yr a Valladolid dexó por abad del dicho monesterio a fray Pedro de la Rrúa, monge que era [ante] mayordomo, el qual llorava deziendo que non quería ser abad. E después desto el dicho fray Pedro de la Rrúa estando asy abad veno el obispo de Burgos al dicho monesterio de Oña, e vendixo al dicho fray Pedro de la Rrúa abad e fizole andar en pontifical. E quando esto svpo el prior de Valladolid veno al dicho monesterio de Oña e rreclamó e rrequerió al dicho fray Pedro abad que guardase el juramento que le avía fecho e obediencia. E el dicho abad dixo que el dicho obispo le absoluía de todo ello e que él sería abad e que no le podían quitar de abad. Sobre lo qual el dicho conde mandó que fuesen a él a Villasur de Ferreros; los quales fueron a él e ally ovieron asaz quistiones e quedó en descanso el negoçio. E esto fazía el conde por complazer al obispo, que era todo suyo. E el abad vino se al monesterio e el prior fuese a Valladolid. *(blank)*.

[E] en este tienpo finó el abad Iohán Marín, que estava en Tejada; [e finado] el dicho abad, quando lo svpo, enbió un su procurador con un monge lego que era de Sant Venito para que entrase el dicho monesterio e todas las cosas que el dicho Iohán Marín abad avía dexado. E los monges que estavam dentro, que eran de los primeros, çerraron las puertas del dicho monesterio e non los consentieron entrar dentro. Sobre lo qual el dicho abad enbió por algunos de los dichos monges que estavam dentro e fizo con ellos que quedasen en el dicho monesterio de Tejada como estavam primero. E el dicho procurador e monge entraron en el dicho monesterio e tomaron posesión del e de todo lo que estava dentro para el dicho monesterio de Oña, cuyo era, e traxieron el ganado dél para Oña. *(blank)*.

[Este año el dicho abad de la Rrúa fizo el coro de madera, que costó fazer ocho mill maravedís syn la madera, e tres canpanas menores, e mercó las casas de los lenzes e una huerta por ocho mill maravedís. *(blank)*.

Mas fizo las patenas e vinajeras e la portapaz de la plata de casa.] *(blank)*.

E en el año venidero de mill e quatroçientos e çinquenta e seys años, el dicho abad de la Rrúa, //(fol. 3v) sintiendo que era escripto del prior de Sant Venito de Valladolid, salió a comer las yantares de los logares del dicho monesterio de Castilla Vieja e Borueva. E el dicho conde estava a la sazón en Grisaleña. E el dicho abad fuelo a ver, e el dicho conde non le reçebió mucho bien, e díxo[le] que en algo avía gastado el monesterio de Oña treynta mill florines para salir el abad a comer yantares por los logares, que sy era aquella la clausura que prometyera. E el abad tornose luego al dicho monesterio. E el dicho conde escrivió al prior de Valladolid. Luego que el dicho prior ovo su carta veno al dicho monesterio de Oña e despuso de abad al dicho fray Pedro de la Rrúa e puso por abad a fray Pedro de Paredes e levó consigo al dicho fray Pedro de la Rrúa para Valladolid, el qual echó en presyones fasta (*blank*)

[E este abad fray Pedro de Paredes era muy bueno cathólico e fazía mucho por amor de Dios e duró en la abadía dos años e fizo en su tiempo (*blank*)]

E después, acabo delos dos años, veno el dicho prior de Valladolid al dicho monesterio de Oña e despuso de abad al dicho fray Pedro de Paredes e puso por abad a fray Alfonso de Villabraxima, que era mayordomo e so prior de Sant Venito de Valladolid, el qual era muy entendido e vretuoso (*sic*) e de sana consciencia. E fizo adereçar la capilla de los rreys do[nde] solían estar e compró un rretablo de la Virgen santa María para el altar de la dicha capilla, que costó doze mill maravedís e fizo el dicho altar e las gradas dél, e lo fizo de llañilla e lo endereçó mucho bien.//

[*(fol. 4r)* E fizo el atril de maçonería.]