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The Crisis of the Dynasty and the Aragonese Marriage

[45] In the latter part of September 1107, Urraca succeeded her deceased husband; that is, she became the ruler, under the crown, of not only Galicia but also the Zamora district and a territory stretching south and east as far as Coria, Salamanca, and Ávila. In geographic area, it was a kingdom by Iberian standards. What had been her preparation for its rule, and for the rule of the entire kingdom that events would settle upon her in less than two years?

Urraca was a widow about twenty-seven years old and a mother of two children. She was no impressionable or romantic girl but a mature woman, approaching middle age by modern reckoning but more likely having achieved it on any twelfth-century scale. Her first child, the Infanta Sancha, had been born before 1095. [1] Her second, the Infans Alfonso and the future Alfonso VII, was hardly out of swaddling clothes. He was born on March 1, 1105 [2] Given the value that the age placed upon a male heir, the likelihood is that something like seven other conceptions may have occurred, ending in miscarriages, stillbirths, or deaths in infancy. Urraca would [46] have had few illusions about men and what they required of their wives.

As to her experience of statecraft, we cannot judge. It appears to have been of the ordinary, wifely sort where it is visible at all. She was associated with Count Raymond in the issuance of his diplomas and confirmed them. There is only one surviving charter for the period before 1107 in which Urraca herself makes the grant. [3] The "Historia Compostelana" has preserved a picture of one occasion on which Bishop Gelmírez of Santiago successfully employed a mixture of blandishment and invective to secure Urraca's intercession with Count Raymond on his behalf. [4] But such accounts were likely to be almost as dominated by stylistic and literary convention as were the formulas of documents. Before her husband's death, the infanta was probably quite familiar with the politics of influence of both the court and the extended royal family. Of the politics of legal right and legitimate authority she was largely a spectator until the fall of 1107.

She never returned to or sought the secondary role of spectator again. The twelfth-century "Chronicon Compostellanum" tells us that Urraca died in adulterous childbirth in March of 1126 some nineteen years later. [5] She would have been about forty-six at that point. In the thirteenth century Jiménez de Rada relates that the queen had as lovers both Count Gómez of Candespina and Count Pedro González of Lara. She is said to have borne the former a son. [6] But no chronicler portrays Urraca as a weak woman dominated by her powerful lovers. Jiménez de Rada says that the two counts "desired" to marry her, not that they achieved it. [7]

The historians contemporary with her reign do not mention such things at all. "Las crónicas anónimas de Sahagún" [47] mentions only the disastrous marriage to Alfonso I of Aragón. [8] When the source speaks of the queen it describes her as moved with pity at the danger to one of her subjects or, again, as taking counsel with her nobles on the question of her divorce from the Batallador. [9] On other occasions of great difficulty Urraca, in speeches attributed to her, refers to herself as a lone, poor, weak
woman or as deserted in the house of her father. \( ^{10} \) But it is impossible to tell from the account whether the queen is merely describing the facts or artfully appealing to the sympathies of her listeners.

In the somewhat fuller account of the "Historia Compostelana," again the contemporary author ignores her liaisons. He is often unhappy with the queen's actions, which run contrary to the purposes of his hero, Archbishop Diego Gelmírez of Santiago de Compostela. He accounts for her failings in terms of the weakness and changeability of women, feminine perversity, and calls her a Jezebel. \( ^{11} \) On other occasions he praises her prudence, modesty, and good sense. \( ^{12} \) It is clear that this author is not a dispassionate observer. Nevertheless, he never presents the queen as merely manipulated by others. There is no question that the queen is in control, perhaps all too much in control, of events.

It seems quite clear that Urraca did have lovers. Flórez credits the paternity of both her son Fernando and a daughter Elvira, to Pedro González of Lara. \( ^{13} \) She may have been hardy enough to conceive and then have died in childbirth forty-six. Assuredly she used her sex for enjoyment but, more important, she also used it as a weapon. One should understand her liaisons primarily as political strategems that secured allies without providing her with masters. The marriage with Alfonso I of Aragón failed, in part at least, because the Batallador could not be other than master.

But all these relationships lay in the future when, in September of 1107, the body of Count Raymond was borne from Grajal for the Journey to Galicia and interment in the new Romanesque cathedral rising over the shrine of Santiago. With Bishop Diego Gelmírez, Urraca probably accompanied the corpse of her husband. \( ^{14} \) Although the documents are too few to be absolutely positive, she probably remained in Galicia. Seeing to the transition of that crucial area to her own control would have been her first concern, and it is there, on December 13, 1107, that she issues her first diploma as "totius gallecie domina." \( ^{15} \)

The grant was made to the church of Santiago in the presence of all of the bishops of Galicia: Diego of Orense, Pedro of Lugo, Alfonso of Túy and Gonzalo of Mondoñedo. The abbots of the great monasteries of Antealtares and Celanova, Count Pedro Froilaz of Traba, Count Suero Vermúdez, and most of the other magnates usually associated with the late count also confirm. The occasion of the document seems to be a general curia of the realm of Galicia whose chief business would have been assent to the terms of a settlement proposed for it by Alfonso VI.

That settlement was realized at a council or curia held at León at the end of December. We know of it because on December 30, 1107 Alfonso VI confirmed the earlier donations of Count Raymond to the church of Salamanca. \( ^{16} \) Also confirming are Bishops Gelmírez of Santiago, Pedro of Lugo, and Maurice of Braga. Urraca does not confirm nor does Count Henry of Portugal, but they were certainly at the council. Its decisions required their adherence for permanence.

What was decided was that Urraca should retain control of Galicia herself so long as she did not remarry. If she did remarry, Galicia would pass to her son, the young Alfonso Raimúndez. To these terms, the "Historia Compostelana" indicates, the barons of Galicia were required to swear in the presence of Count Raymond's brother, the Archbishop Guido of Vienne, and of Bishop Gelmírez. This account places the event at León after Count Raymond's death and before the young Alfonso had attained three years of age, all of which indicates late December. If the author is less than clear about the precise position of Urraca, that is typical of his preferences. \( ^{17} \) This concession of Alfonso was no doubt accompanied by the reassertion of direct royal control over the remainder of the lands held by Raymond in the west outside of Galicia. The charter confirming the possessions of Salamanca is an indication of the more general reassertion of that direct control.
In this settlement Count Henry of Portugal is likely to have acquiesced gracefully. The death of his cousin left him in a commanding position in the west of the realm. He could not reasonably have hoped to secure control of Galicia himself in view of the claims of Raymond's wife and son. That being so, the interests of Henry and his sovereign coincided for the moment in that they both preferred that the late count should have no very potent heir. The Portuguese count's major concern would continue to be the young successor lately designated for the entire realm, Sancho Adefonsez, and those who would support the latter.

As for Alfonso VI, he may have required the support of Count Henry for the policy that had forced Count Pedro Ansúrez into exile and left to the crown the enjoyment of that magnate's possessions. The documents indicate the presence of Count Henry at court in the winter of 1108. He confirmed two private documents of Sahagún there on February 16 and March 31, 1108. The aged king would also have reinforced the loyalty of Archbishop Bernard of Toledo by allowing him to place one of his canons in the bishopric of Palencia. Old Bishop Raymond had died there on January 12, 1108, and the new bishop, Pedro of Agen, confirmed a private document of Sahagûn at the beginning of March. Meanwhile, in Galicia, Urraca was patronizing the see of Lugo on January 21, 1108 and styling herself "tocius Gallecie imperatrix." All such leisurely and subtle political maneuvering, however, was soon to yield to a new, great crisis. The Murâbit leader, Ali ben Yusuf, had visited Andalucía in the summer of 1107. The fruits of that journey became manifest in the spring of 1108 when the governor of Granada, Tamin ben Yusuf, launched the forces of the south against the fortress of Uclés to the east of Toledo. The relief force dispatched by Alfonso VI was defeated on May 30, 1108, and the infants himself and his tutor, Count García Ordóñez, perished along with numerous other magnates. With the death of young Sancho, Urraca immediately became the center of political attention.

Alfonso VI himself moved south to see to the security of Toledo, but the attack was not to come there yet. The documentary record is almost nonexistent for this period and we must rely solely on the "Historia Compostelana." This tells us that when Bishop Gelmírez of Santiago learned of the death of young Sancho he hastened south at the head of strong force, accompanied by Urraca. After restoring the military balance in the Toledan lands, that prelate then fell and, upon recovering, joined the king in Segovia. Allowing time for the transmission of news of the disaster at Uclés, the gathering of a relief force and supplies, and the transit of the mountains of Galicia and the meseta of Old Castile, we may imagine that Urraca could have arrived at Segovia and joined her father in the first week of July 1108.

What then transpired? In the account of the "Historia Compostelana," Alfonso VI said he was going on from Segovia to Toledo and then to Compostela on pilgrimage. There is no evidence that he did either. A private document of Sahagún seems to place the court back there by September 4, 1108, for it is confirmed by the bishops of Toledo, León, and Astorga as well as by Count Henry. From then until the new year, relevant documents are wanting. It is possible but unlikely that Alfonso VI had yet formally designated Urraca as his successor. Such an occurrence would surely have left some evidence. It should be recalled that sometime during this year the king took a new wife. Although he was ill, nothing suggests that he was merely passively awaiting his own death, and some ambiguity would have been useful to him, as always. At the very least, though, he was likely to have begun the search for a new husband for his daughter. That the Batallador should have been a candidate before the death of the Infans Sancho is unthinkable; no considerations would have moved the king to supply such a formidable rival for his then heir. But if such a possibility began to be explored in the summer of 1108, it is also unlikely that the marriage
could have been celebrated that very year, as has been suggested by one of the most careful students of the question.\(^{26}\)

In retrospect it is easy to understand the reasons that led Alfonso to settle on the king of Aragón as a husband for Urraca. Despite the fact that he intended to designate her as his heir, upon his own death every head of a powerful faction was bound to attempt to dominate her government. Because she was a woman, the claims of her own young son would be used against her. Her half sister Teresa might be expected to press her own claims as well, despite her illegitimate birth. Teresa's husband, Count Henry, was sure to press his own suitability as warrior, male, and possible regent for Urraca's son. Yet Henry's claim would have the inevitable weaknesses of his own foreign birth, his wife's illegitimacy, and the suspicion that he would seek to supplant rather than support the claims of the young Alfonso Raimúndez.

A similar line of thought doubtless led the bishops and nobles of the realm to advocate the marriage of Urraca to Count Gómez González, then head of the powerful Lara clan of Castilla and former alférez of Alfonso.\(^{27}\) But the king must have suspected that a Castilian party, even one closely with his own government, would have grave difficulties maintaining itself against the supporters of Count Henry or those of the young Alfonso Raimúndez, or the in two concert. Moreover, the greatest of the Leonese nobles, the exiled Count Pedro Ansúrez, had allied himself with the idea of a marriage with the king of Aragón.\(^{28}\) In the clash of these factions, the old king could see only the prospect of civil strife, the possible loss of Toledo, and even the partition of the realm itself.

It is hardly to be wondered, therefore, that he should rather seek a solution in the choice of a husband for Urraca who was himself of the direct, dynastic line, already possessor of the transcendent dignity of kingship, and had already proven himself a formidable warrior. Alfonso of Aragón was, of course, all of these. As events were to prove, the Leonese monarch underestimated the liabilities of Alfonso of Aragón and the abilities of his own daughter, but his political reasoning had much to recommend it.

Whatever the wishes of Urraca herself as to the marriage, Count Henry of Portugal must have opposed her union with the king of Aragón as an insuperable obstacle to his own ambitions. Nevertheless the count continued at court, as is attested by his confirmation of private documents of Sahagún in March and May of 1109.\(^{29}\) There may have been a drawing together, as well, of Henry and Archbishop Bernard of Toledo, who also would oppose the marriage. Maurice, bishop of Coimbra, was translated to Braga at the end of 1108 or early 1109. Bishop Gonzalo replaced him at Coimbra about the same time.\(^{30}\) Both men were protégés of the primate.

Did Urraca herself form part of this temporarily muted opposition to the prospective marriage? On February 22, 1109 she gave to Cluny the Galician monastery of San Vicente de Pombeiro. Surely she sought the friendship of the great Burgundian monastery for some purpose. The confirmation of the charter by both Bishop Gelmírez of Santiago and Archbishop Maurice of Braga seems to indicate the establishment of contacts that would involve the primate, Count Henry, and those interested in the future of Urraca and her son.\(^{31}\)

Opponents of the Aragonese match may already have begun to employ the tactic, so successful later, of securing papal disapproval of the consanguineous marriage. After consulting with Bishop Gelmírez, Maurice of Braga had gone to Rome to secure approbation of his election and translation from Coimbra to Braga. A rash of papal letters datable to the spring of 1109 informs us, among other things, that Gelmírez\(^{35}\) had sent emissaries to Rome. Pope Paschal II, himself former Cluniac, summoned the Archbishop of Toledo, the Archbishop of Braga, the Bishop of Compostela, and the abbot of Sahagún to a council planned for the following Lent.\(^{32}\) But no one could withstand the iron will of the dying king nor, as events were to prove, of the dead king.
On May 22, 1109 the court seems still to have been at Sahagún, for the Archbishop of Toledo, the bishops of León and Astorga, and Count Henry confirmed a private donation to the abbey on that date. Very shortly afterward it must have moved to Toledo as the campaigning season advanced and the southern border of the realm erupted along its length, was inevitable after Uclés. Well to the northeast of Toledo, Alcalá fell to the Muslims in the spring of 1109 and a Christian counterattack was mounted in August. In the west in July, Count Henry captured Santarem. It was this campaign that kept him from the deathbed of Alfonso VI, although we are also told that, a few days before the latter's death, the count had left under the displeasure of his monarch. Then, on June 30, 1109, Alfonso VI died. "Las crónicas anónimas" says that his body was taken from the city on July 9 and interred at Sahagún on August 12. Bishop Pelayo says that he was laid to rest at Sahagún on July 21, 1109.

Suddenly, Urraca was queen. There was no doubt of that. The author of "Las crónicas anónimas" says that he witnessed Alfonso's designation of her as his successor. Others present, he says, were Archbishop Bernard, Bishop Pedro of Palencia and almost all the nobles and counts of Spain. "Urraka dei nutu totius yspanie regina" confirms the privileges of the church of León on July 22, 1109, the day after her father's burial as dated by Bishop Pelayo. Three-quarters, or twelve, of the then sixteen bishops of the realm confirmed. Foreshadowing the events to come, the bishops who seem not to have been in attendance were those of Coimbra and Orense in the west and of Nájera and Burgos in the east. Moreover, Count Henry had not rejoined the court but was at Coimbra on July 29, 1109, where he made a donation to that see.

Of the secular confirmants, those most notably absent are again from Count Henry's domains, although the requirements of the border may explain the fact. Galicia is represented by but two, Count Pedro Froilaz and Count Suero Vermúdez. The Castilian border is likewise poorly represented by only Count Gómez González, perhaps the queen's lover and aspirant to be her husband, and Count Pedro González, future lover of Urraca, already confirming as her swordbearer. León is well represented by Counts Pedro Ansúrez of Carrión, Froila Diaz of León, and Rodrigo Muñoz of Astorga and by the nobles Martín Ordóñiz and Diego Alvítiz. The largest single contingent, though, is made up of men largely identified with previous service to the crown; Alvar Fáñez, signing himself "Dux toletule," Fernando González, Alfonso and Telo Téllez, Diego Díaz, Diego Sarraciniz, and Muño Gutiérrez, the queen's majordomo.

This was probably the assemblage that decided that the marriage arranged by her late father would be honored. Lacarra has asserted that the Batallador was in Toledo before the death of Alfonso VI to make the necessary formal arrangements, but there is no evidence for such an event. The thirteenth-century sources uniformly attribute the choice of the Aragonese king as husband to Alfonso VI, and it is impossible to imagine that it could have been another. The contemporary sources, however, make it the assemblage of the realm that enforces obedience to that choice, against her will as she will later say. Urraca's assertion that she opposed the match may possibly be a bit of special pleading, but given her very rapid reaction against the marriage, it may well have been so.

"Las crónicas anónimas" says that this decision was made after Alfonso's interment and that the queen was given no choice. The implication of the text is that no one was really happy with the decision, but only Archbishop Bernard is explicitly mentioned as protesting the marriage of a couple who shared a common great-grandfather in Sancho the Great of Navarra. The party bias of such a protest would have been immediately apparent to everyone present, who knew that the queen had also shared a great-grandfather in Robert the Pious of France with her first husband, Raymond, which fact had never drawn the primate's displeasure.
Everyone except Count Pedro Ansúrez and the old servants of the crown had cause for discontent with the decision, which assuredly was accepted for the moment only because their purposes were mutually exclusive. Count Henry of Portugal had his own ambitions for the crown itself, or a share of the realm. The Gallegans, their leader dead, saw the entrée to power he had promised them gone glimmering. The Castilians, whatever the personal ambitions of their leaders, stood to lose directly and most dearly from Aragonese expansion in the guise of marriage. All these frustrations and fears soon found expression.

Meanwhile Urraca ruled while she might. On September 10, 1109 she confirmed the fueros of the city of León. It was a matter of local concern, and those confirming the document are local officials or members of the queen's immediate circle. Pedro González continues as alférez. Most notable is the confirmation of three members of the family of the Gallegan Count Suero Vermúdez, his two brothers Alfonso and Guter, and possibly another brother, Muño, who just this once confirms as Urraca's majordomo. The charter was probably issued in the city.

The last of the known charters of this period was issued on September 29, 1109, probably at Carrión on the way to her wedding at Monzón. It is a fuero for the men of the terra of León and Carrión. The queen is accompanied by very few bishops: Pedro of León, Pelayo of Oviedo, and Pedro of Palencia. The secular magnates who confirm are Count Pedro Ansúrez and the Leonese Count Froila, probably Díaz; two regular crown servants, Teló Téllez and Pelayo Martínez; Count Gómez, probably González; and one Fernando González, possibly a brother. All told, it does not look like an impressive wedding party, although more may have been in attendance.

The castle of Monzón was a mere twenty-five kilometers from Carrión, so the likelihood is that Urraca and Alfonso I of Aragón were married in early October. "Las crónicas anónimas" says only that they were married during the vintage time, and most historians have settled on September, but that seems a little too early in light of the charter above.

Her new husband was, as his nickname indicates, the foremost warrior in an age of not inconsiderable warriors. Beyond that, his person is barely separable from his public record. The contemporary chroniclers of León-Castilla have no love for him, and his own little kingdom produced only a few, spare annals. He is known largely for the unfortunate episode of his marriage to Urraca, for his conquest of the great taifa of Zaragoza in 1118, and for a will in 1134 that left his much-enlarged realm to the new military orders of the Hospital, the Temple, and the Holy Sepulcher. Neither the marriage nor the will accomplished its purpose.

The most personal note we have of Alfonso comes from the Muslim historian Ibn al-Athir, who relates that once, asked about his failure to take concubines, Alfonso responded that a real soldier lives with men, not women. The remark has the ring of truth to it. Certainly Alfonso had not been married before his luckless match with Urraca in the fall of 1109. He was probably thirty-six at that time to his bride's twenty-nine. After his definitive separation from her, he would never attempt marriage again, dying childless in 1134.

Urraca is reported to have accused him of physical abuse, and the tendency has been to see him as a simple, direct, somewhat brutal soldier whose uncomplicated emotions found an outlet in religion rather than in domestic life. Again, such a characterization may be true but it is based on very slim evidence. Yet it probably would have been equally true of a great many husbands of that period. In itself Alfonso's martial character need not have resulted in a failure of the marriage nor even have surprised his wife very much. The great failure, which rapidly made the marriage a political rather than a personal impossibility, was Alfonso's failure to beget a child by Urraca with the necessary speed. It has been argued that he was sterile and I am inclined to think that this was so.
Whatever the cause, the failure to produce an heir, or the promise of one, in the early days of the marriage made it liable to all sorts of attack. Had a male heir been born to the couple, the question of consanguinity could have been managed. Even if the royal couple had eventually been compelled to separate, the problem of succession would have been alleviated both for Aragón and for León-Castilla. The brilliant prospect open to such an heir would have quickly attracted irresistible support while making Urraca and Alfonso's interim position practically unassailable. But a marriage without issue was eminently vulnerable. Its consanguineous nature and the rights of other heirs, already extant, were urged against it, and the settlement of Alfonso VI unraveled with startling speed.

Finally, against the temptation to account for the failure of the marriage on personal grounds when the evidence is both scant and partisan, one must remember that it was a political match for both Urraca and Alfonso. But for Alfonso of Aragón it was a match full of advantage and promise; for Urraca it was a duty and the loss of the authority she had known since September of 1107. For the queen, then, the failure of the marriage's chief purpose must inevitably have led to a search for other avenues to restore her authority.

The personal problems of the royal pair were hardly to develop in a vacuum, though. Resistance to the new state of affairs may have preceded the marriage itself. Galicia was the first province in rebellion and Count Pedro Froilaz, guardian of Alfonso Raimúndez, was its leader. It may have begun as soon as the count returned from León and the curia in July 1109 that agreed on the Aragonese marriage. It appears that even so soon the count began to enforce a particular loyalty to his young charge at the expense of the queen and her new husband, although our source does not so put the matter. The count's opponents, supporters of Urraca and Alfonso, reacted by forming a hermandad for mutual protection of each other and, by extension, the rights of the crown.

The bishop of Santiago de Compostela, Diego Gelmírez, also chose to associate himself with this latter group. Almost certainly he would have been cautious at this point about the chances of success of the rebellion, and his shrine church was accustomed to the patronage and the largesse of the crown. His personal loyalties may also have lain with the young queen. But the lines in the province were inevitably drawn with reference to local concerns as well, so that the division assumed a north-south character.

In southern Galicia around Santiago the feudal authority of the bishop of Santiago was paramount. The north was the preserve of Count Pedro and the Trastamara family. The family holdings included the bishopric of Mondoñedo, whose bishop, Gonzalo, was the brother of Count Pedro. When Bishop Gonzalo died in early 1108 Gelmírez took advantage of the vacancy to push harder for a solution of a long-standing border dispute between the two dioceses. By March of 1110 he had so far succeeded as to have secured oaths of loyalty from the clergy and laity of the districts in dispute. In this effort he managed to prevail over the opposition of a new, and ill-fated, Bishop Pedro. The latter was also apparently related to the house of Traba. A series of papal letters indicates that in this same period Bishop Gelmírez and Count Pedro were also at odds over the monastery of San Nicolás de Cinis. Another consideration that inevitably entered the calculations of the bishop of Santiago was the attitude of Count Henry of Portugal, who had his own reasons to be unhappy with the marriage and its implications. The count had not as yet declared himself. On December 10, 1109 he made a donation to Archbishop Maurice of Braga, probably in Braga to judge by the purely local character of the confirmants. On the one hand, the Portuguese count had interests that tied him to the Count of Traba, and Pedro, the new bishop of Mondoñedo, had made his obedience to Maurice of Braga as his metropolitan late in 1108 or early in 1109. On the other hand, the bishop of Santiago was nearer and a powerful figure in the realm. Archbishop Maurice of Braga had done homage to Gelmírez in return
for the lands of Santiago in Portugal between the Limia and Duero on September 16, 1109.\textsuperscript{(62)} He was unlikely to have taken such a step without the approval of the count.

In the heart of the realm, however, the political situation was apparently quiet. A private document of Sahagún, dated December 21, 1109, reads "Regnante adefonso rege aragonensi in legione" and the document was confirmed by Archbishop Bernard of Toledo and Bishops Pedro of León and Pedro of Palencia.\textsuperscript{(63)} Also in December, perhaps about the same time as the Christmas court in Sahagún, a formal marriage agreement was worked out.

The tone of this document raises the question whether it is the first agreement or a revised one. Both parties agree that if either leaves the other against that other's will, the offender forfeits the loyalty of his or her followers. Alfonso in particular must agree not to desert Urraca for reasons of blood relationship or excommunication. The lands that Alfonso surrenders to his wife are of surprising extent and importance. Moreover, if he has a son by Urraca, the child and Urraca are to inherit his territories jointly after his death, but \textsuperscript{(64)} even if there is no child Urraca and her heirs will inherit. In the case of the prior death of Urraca, Alfonso would inherit jointly with their child, if any, but would have only the usufruct of her lands during his lifetime if they had no issue. After his death her lands would go to Alfonso Raimúndez.\textsuperscript{(64)}

The agreement seems to demonstrate the extent to which the Batallador was willing to make concessions. To meet the independence and sense of worth of his bride, he was prepared to be generous. To satisfy the objections of the supporters of Urraca's son he held out the inheritance of his lands if the marriage produced no heirs and Urraca survived him. At the very least, if the marriage produced no heirs, the reversion of Urraca's lands was pledged after his own decease even though he might have had children by a subsequent marriage. He could not, one thinks, have gone further and surrendered the rights of their possible mutual offspring or have recognized the right of the young Alfonso Raimúndez to an independent principality in Galicia. To do either would have been to guarantee civil war in the future. The alternative, as it developed, was civil war in the present.

For the moment, though, the threat of the Muslim occupied virtually everyone in the realm with the exception of Galicia and the far north. In the latter days of the summer of 1109 the leader of the Murâbits, Ali ben Yusuf, had taken Talavera de la Reina to the west of Toledo. His troops seem also to have overrun much of the country to the northeast of Toledo about Madrid and Guadalajara as well.\textsuperscript{(65)} This activity, especially around Talavera, threatened Count Henry and encouraged his Muslim subjects to rebel. He was tied down there, particularly at Santarem, through 1109 and in 1110 was defeated badly. On May 26, 1111 Santarem fell to the Murâbits.\textsuperscript{(66)} Those failures would have depressed his position relative to that of Alfonso of Aragón, who was more successful at this time.

Stimulated by the achievements of his co-religionists, al-Mustain of Zaragoza launched an offensive against Aragón in the winter of 1109-1110. Alfonso hastened east from Sahagún and defeated and killed his enemy at Valtierra north of Tudela on January 24, 1110.\textsuperscript{(67)} Urraca accompanied her husband, and on March 24, 1110 is found issuing a charter to the monastery of Montearagón, one of the places ceded to her by Alfonso the preceding December.\textsuperscript{(68)} Count Pedro Ansúrez may have accompanied them also and made the donation to the church of Pamplona dated only to 1110.\textsuperscript{(69)} From the evidence of the documents, León-Castilla remained quiet in their absence, with Alfonso and Urraca regularly cited as joint sovereigns.\textsuperscript{(70)} The royal pair, in this period, also jointly have swung south to visit the lands beyond the Duero.\textsuperscript{(71)}

In early May, flushed with his success over Zaragoza, Alfonso marched to put down the rebellion in Galicia. "Las crónicas anónimas" says the queen went with him and that they had a falling out over
Alfonso's execution of an enemy who had surrendered. Urraca left her husband to return to León while he devastated the countryside; but by a divine punishment, says our source, he was forced out of Galicia within three months. Although the chronology is something of a problem, this account agrees with that given independently by the "Historia Compostelana." Alfonso had captured the castle of Monteroso, roughly midway between Lugo and Santiago, and is said to have ravaged the lands of Count Pedro Froilaz. But the campaign could not have been too successful, and on July 13, 1110 he was at Samos in eastern Galicia apparently on his way back to León. The donation that he makes to the monks is sparsely confirmed. Pedro [67] of Mondoñedo is the only bishop who appears, and that indiscretion contributed to the approaching loss of his see. Of the five nobles who confirm, only two, Suero Nuñez and Ero Armentárez, figured consistently in the records of the time and represent at least momentary defection from the old party that supported Count Raymond.

Such paltry results encouraged the Batallador's enemies and, returning toward León, the Aragonese was refused entrance to the fortress city of Astorga. Worse, during his absence a papal condemnation of the marriage had arrived, and Urraca, meeting with Archbishop Bernard and Bishops Pedro of León and Pelayo of Oviedo, had agreed to separate from him. Back on the scene, however, Alfonso seems to have brushed aside all objections, perhaps pending an appeal to Rome, and rushed on to Aragón, for two of his documents place him there while it is yet July. During his absence in Galicia the partisans of the Murâbits in Zaragoza had delivered that city into their control.

The needs of his native Aragón were to keep the Batallador there until the end of the year. Two documents, one dated to October 1110 and the other to December, place him there. The latter was issued at Montearagón.

Meanwhile, his new kingdom was slipping from his control. As far back as June 26, 1110, while he must still have been in Galicia, Urraca had issued a diploma to the important Riojan noble Diego López in her own name as "Ispanie regina." It had been confirmed not only by Count Gómez González and Count Pedro González of Lara but also by Alvar Fáñez of Toledo and Count Rodrigo Muñoz of Astorga. By August 15, 1110 the queen was at Nájera in the Rioja at the head of an army on her way to Zaragoza. A charter issued there to the monastery of San Millán was confirmed by most of the same nobles, with the important exception of Alvar Fáñez, and with the additions of Count Pedro Ansúrez and Bishops García of Burgos and Sancho of Nájera.

Why Urraca was making a demonstration in the direction of Zaragoza is impossible to say. It may equally well have been either a politic gesture in support of Alfonso against the Muslim or a return to her father's policy of support for Zaragoza against Aragón. The most significant aspect of the incident is the demonstrated breadth of her following at this moment. Her actual line of march may have taken her more northward, toward the upper Ebro, for on September 6, 1110 she granted the monastery of San Adrián de Palmas to one Julian. She was accompanied by most of the same supporters.

On October 15 Urraca had probably returned to Burgos, where she granted another charter to Pedro Julianez confirmed by most of the same nobles. From Burgos the queen moved perhaps as far to the southwest as Valladolid. A swing through that area to consolidate support would have been useful. In any event, on December 15, 1110 she made a donation to the church of Valladolid confirmed by Archbishop Bernard of Toledo, Bishop Pedro of Palencia, and Abbot Pons of Silos, as well as many of the same cortege that had accompanied her through the late summer and early fall. Urraca was back at Sahagún in time for Christmas court, where good news from the west awaited her. While she had been consolidating her authority in Rioja, Castilla, and the trans-Duero region, her supporters had scored a major success in Galicia.
In the late summer of 1110, the "Historia Compostelana" tells us, a sizable party from troubled Galicia had journeyed with the young Alfonso Raimúndez as far as Castrojeriz in Castilla. There they became convinced that Urraca was seeking a reconciliation with her husband, not just reinforcing her position on the border. Count Pedro Froilaz then consulted with Count Henry of Portugal. On the latter's advice, he seized those members of the party who were partisans of the queen rather than of her son, his ward. Returning to Galicia, he bargained their freedom for the surrender of a castle on the Río Miño, on the border of Portugal.\(^{(84)}\)

Just how Count Henry had been consulted is not said. The inference is that he was in Castilla, but the threat to his southern domains from the Murâbits would seem to militate against that. The Anales toledanos I tell us that in 1110 the Muslims held Toledo under siege for nine days, so perhaps their major effort was there.\(^{(85)}\) There are, however, two curious Portuguese charters issued in late October and early November of 1110 by the Infanta Teresa herself;\(^{(86)}\) her husband does not appear. There is also a document of Sahagún, dated December 15, 1110, which he confirms.\(^{(87)}\) It may be, then, that Pedro Froilaz was able to concert plans with him in person. In any event, the acquisition of the castle on the Miño must have been intended to establish communications between the two for the future.

But the Galician count had badly underestimated the energy and ability of his opponents. He had hardly ensconced his wife and the boy, Alfonso Raimúndez, in that castle when he himself was driven off and the castle hard besieged. To arrange terms both sides, we are told, summoned Bishop Gelmírez of Santiago in whom all had confidence. Or so it appeared. After Gelmírez had negotiated the surrender of the castle, he and Alfonso Raimúndez and Count Pedro’s wife were all suddenly seized by the supporters of Urraca. After a few days the bishop was released in order to negotiate with the count of Traba.\(^{(88)}\)

Thus, in the scarce six months since her separation from her husband, Urraca had come to enjoy the support of Castilla, León, Rioja, the trans-Duero "Extremadura," and at least part of Galicia. So powerful had her position become that Alfonso of Aragón attended her Christmas court in 1110 for both its festivities and its negotiations. After the document of December 15, 1110 mentioned above, Count Henry may have returned to Portugal.\(^{(89)}\) Of the Batallador's presence at Sahagún there is no doubt. On December 26, 1110 Urraca issued two donations, one to Suero Ordóñez and the other to the Countess Enderquina.\(^{(90)}\) Both are issued in her own name and both are confirmed by her husband. They illustrate well the changed state of affairs since the previous winter, when Alfonso issued charters in both their names.

The visit of the Aragonese monarch to the court of his wife seems to have been brief. On January 18, 1111 Urraca was concerned with building support in the east of the realm and granted a donation to the monastery of Oña.\(^{(91)}\) It was confirmed by the bishops of Burgos and of Palencia, by Fernando Garcia of Hita, Alvar Fáñez, and Count Rodrigo Muñoz of Astorga. It was not confirmed by Alfonso I, who would have been an interested party. Two days later another charter of Urraca to the church of León was confirmed mostly by Leonese nobles. The king of Aragón does not appear, but the confirmation of one Count Suero Vermúdez of Galicia is interesting. It may indicate that even this early the queen was negotiating with Count Pedro Froilaz of Galicia and his allies.\(^{(92)}\) Three pieces of documentary evidence indicate that the young Alfonso Raimúndez was soon to be formally associated with his mother in the government of the realm.\(^{(93)}\)

So far as the Aragonese monarch was concerned, the time for negotiation was now over. He would assert his rights. At Carrión in Castilla, only thirty-five kilometers from Sahagún, he issued a donation in February 1111 "regnante me dei gratia in toleto, legione, castella et aragone."\(^{(94)}\) Suiting action to words, in April 1111 he struck south and occupied Toledo.\(^{(95)}\) For all parties concerned, the recourse
would now be arms.

In Portugal, Count Henry was unable to react until the early summer. Documents of his chancery indicate his continuing presence there until June 1111. Then, both the Aragonese occupation of Toledo and his own loss of Santarem to the Murâbits on May 26, 1111 convinced him that drastic action was necessary. The count left for France, probably for Burgundy, to raise forces sufficient to establish his own and his wife's claims in the developing civil war.

Yet another factor in his decision was the accord reached in Galicia between the parties of Urraca and her son. That agreement was to lead to the anointing and coronation of Alfonso Raimúndez at Santiago de Compostela by Bishop Gelmírez on September 19, 1111. Shortly thereafter it would produce a Galician army marching over the mountains of León to the assistance of Urraca. Its more immediate effect was to end any possibility of Count Henry of Portugal's becoming the leader of the old Raimundist party.

The late summer found Urraca on the eastern frontier, at Burgos, where disaster struck. There she issued charters to the monasteries of Santillana del Mar in eastern Asturias and to Oña in Rioja. The notary who drew up the charters was Martín Peláez, canon of Santiago and former notary of Count Raymond, now making his first appearance in Urraca's chancery. He was later to pass naturally into the early chancery of Alfonso VII. His presence in the royal court at Burgos is one more sign of the bargain already struck by Urraca.

If anything, the position of Urraca seems to have become too strong. Count Henry of Portugal, returning from his recruiting visit to France, joined forces with her estranged husband, Alfonso. At the battle of Candesquina near Sepúlveda on October 26, 1111, Urraca's available forces were defeated. Count Pedro González of Lara fled back to Burgos and the queen. Count Gómez González was killed on the field by Count Henry himself.

According to "Las crónicas anónimas," the alliance that produced the victory was founded upon an agreement to divide the realm of León-Castilla between the victors. But Henry of Portugal may have found the prospect of the Batallador as a neighbor unnerving. The same source tells us that at Sepúlveda after the battle he was approached by followers of Urraca also offering a division of the realm. Since her cession would offer better title, Henry accepted and turned against his erstwhile ally. Forewarned, the Aragonese retreated to the nearly impregnable fortress of Peñafiel on the Duero, where the combined forces of Henry and Urraca besieged him without result.

From there the new allies withdrew northwest to Palencia to work out the details of the division, which would have given Henry both Zamora and the royal fortress at Ceia north of Sahagún. Obviously Henry wanted not only portions of the west but also a commanding position at the very heart of the realm and even territories in Castilla. While ostensibly carrying out the agreement, Urraca now entered into secret negotiations with Alfonso of Aragón. "Las crónicas anónimas" attributes her change of heart to the queenly pretensions of her half sister Teresa, who had joined her husband, Count Henry.

When Henry sent off to take possession of Zamora, Urraca and Teresa proceeded to Sahagún. Urraca then went on to León. She had also left instructions with her followers in Palencia to surrender that city to Alfonso. So quickly did the Aragonese move that he almost captured Teresa as he entered Sahagún.

From there he proceeded to the city of León. If Urraca had expected such swift action by her spouse, she probably did not expect it to be so successful. To avoid becoming more a hostage than a wife, she retreated into the mountains of Galicia. Whether she was in touch with her major supporters in that province is hard to say because of the vagueness of the chronological development. On the whole,
one is inclined to think that she was not and that they were simply to blunder into a completely altered situation.

After the young Alfonso Raimúndez had been crowned in Santiago on September 19, Count Pedro Froilaz and Bishop Gelmierez had organized an army and an expedition. Marching west they first effected the surrender of Lugo, which had been held by partisans of the Batallador since his Galician expedition of 1110. That done, the army, perhaps somewhat reduced in numbers, proceeded over the mountains of León toward that city. At Viadangos, some twenty kilometers from León, they were ambushed by Alfonso of Aragón. Outnumbered roughly three to one, according to the "Historia Compostelana," they were badly defeated. Count Pedro himself was captured. Those who managed to escape retreated hastily to the city of Astorga, hostile as before to the Aragonese monarch.

But the greatest prize escaped the victor. Seeing the battle turning into a rout, Bishop Gelmierez fled, taking with him Count Raymond's son, the young king Alfonso, and delivered him safely to his mother in Galicia. Whether the prelate acted out of pure panic, the direst necessity, basic loyalty to his queen, or a combination of all three, the result was the same. For the first time during her reign Urraca had the priceless advantage of physical custody of her son, who constituted the most potent rallying point for any opposition to her own rule.

Gelmírez's action had delivered Urraca again from the power of her husband. In the field, the latter was almost everywhere victorious and the kingdom was in his hands from Toledo to León. He seems to have reached an accord with Count Henry, and a document of Sahagún of December 20, 1111 reads "regnante rex addefonsus in legione in carrione simul in aragone....Henricus comes in alcamora et in astorice simul in portuca." Urraca is not even mentioned. But without her as wife, Alfonso had scarce title to what he had conquered, and as long as she had possession of her son she held the key to the support of the Raimundist faction in the lands of the west. Henry of Portugal would have to treat with her.

Urraca's problem in the winter of 1111-1112 was the translation of her moral and legal authority, as designated heir of her father and mother to the succession, into military and financial support. With rare lapses, however, the queen seems always to have been more astute at diplomacy and politics than were her adversaries. By late winter she seems to have reached some sort of accord with Henry of Portugal. On March 1, 1112 Count Henry granted property in Astorga to Count Froila Díaz, long a member of the Raimundist group and a supporter of the queen. Urraca and her son confirmed it. The list of confirmants includes many figures identifiable with their cause in the regions of Astorga and Bierzo. Count Pedro Ansúrez also confirms, indicating that the powerful Leonese magnate continued his support.

From Astorga the queen moved north to rally the province of Asturias to her cause and to ensure the support of Bishop Pelayo of Oviedo, appointee and chronicler of her father. There, on March 27, 1112, she granted a charter to the church of Oviedo in return for substantial financial support. Associated with the queen in the issuance of the charter were her son, Count Henry, and his wife, Teresa, who had accompanied her. This donation demonstrates that the new coalition against Alfonso of Aragón was growing steadily.

Turning west, Urraca held Easter court in Santiago on April 21, 1112, and spent much time and energy consolidating her support in Galicia. On April 28 she was on the border of the county of Portugal at Túy, where she and her son issued a charter in favor of that cathedral. The continuing rapprochement between Urraca and Count Henry is indicated on April 12, when his own charter to Braga was confirmed by the bishops of Santiago, Túy, Orense, and Lugo. So much did the queen hold the upper hand that two canons of Santiago, Muño and Hugo, were elected to the sees of
Mondoñedo and Oporto at that time. Both sees were suffragans of Braga. In addition, the election of Muño involved the deposition of Bishop Pedro of Mondoñedo, who had been unwise enough to support Alfonso of Aragon in the spring of 1110, although our source ignores that aspect of the affair.  

Her husband meanwhile was attempting to consolidate his position in León-Castilla. He seems to have introduced an Aragonese garrison at Sahagún, where the burghers were favorable to him. Under pressure the abbot of Sahagún abdicated, but Archbishop Bernard of Toledo, who was present there, managed to secure the choice of another monk without the knowledge of Alfonso. The king however, was not to be balked, and forced the installation of his own brother, Ramiro, as abbot. Probably also at this time Alfonso moved against the hierarchy of the realm, expelling the bishops of León and Burgos from their sees and taking prisoner those of Toledo, Osma, Palencia, and Orense. Although there is some confusion in our source, some such action undoubtedly took place. 

Whether these initiatives strengthened Alfonso as much as they hurt him is hard to say. He was shortly to be in difficulty, for Urraca had completed her preparations and was marching against him. By the first of May she was at Astorga, only forty kilometers away. With her were Prior Stephen of the Cluniac house of San Zoil in Carrión; the treasurer of Cluny, Dalmatius Geret; and Archbishop Maurice of Braga. The presence of the Cluniacs probably indicates negotiations to secure the support of that great power for her sole rule on the condition that she designate her son as successor. 

The queen was also still building support in Galicia. No fewer than six of her documents dealing with that region survive for the month of May. She may even have had to return briefly to Santiago for aid. The confirmants to these documents indicate the presence in her camp of most of the old adherents of the party of Count Raymond and a scattering of old servants of her father. Also present is Count Pedro Froilaz, who we may suspect had been released by Alfonso of Aragon in the hope that he might sow division between the respective followers of Urraca and her son. 

Two other charters of the same month reveal more about the intentions and the prospects of the queen. One is a donation to the Leonese nobles Telo and Fernando Téllez, who also had ties to Count Henry of Portugal. Although he does not appear in these documents of local import, the count was certainly there. The other is a charter to one Diego Arias. The confirmants illustrate the rallying to Urraca of important magnates of Asturias, León, Rioja, and Castilla. The "Historia Compostelana" indicates that they joined her at Astorga. On the other hand, it says that the king of Aragón, as he advanced to the siege, was also supported by men of Rioja, Castilla, and León. Alfonso, however, was defeated and had to retreat to Carrión in Castilla, where he was besieged for a time by Urraca and her followers. 

This siege ended in yet another brief reconciliation between the spouses. The initiative seems again to have been Urraca's and was probably the result of the exorbitant price of the Portuguese alliance then, as it had been in the previous fall. By May 22, 1112 Count Henry of Portugal was dead, perhaps from wounds received at Astorga, but his widow continued his policy. One need not accept the purported treaty between Urraca and her sister, recorded in the "Liber Fidei" of Braga, in order to credit Teresa's desire to retain Zamora, Salamanca, perhaps Ávila, and the modern province of Extremadura, all in the Count's hands at the time of his death, and Urraca's unwillingness to allow just that. 

For a period of almost five months, from the end of May until late October, the documentary record of the queen fails and we must depend on the chroniclers. The reunion of Alfonso of Aragon and Urraca was an uneasy one and endured only for the summer of 1112. The "Historia Compostelana" tells of a visit to Spain by the abbot of Chiusa in Piedmont, a papal legate, and of his attempts to secure the separation of the royal pair. It relates also the efforts of the spouses themselves, together with the magnates of León and Castilla, to secure a firm definition of the conditions of their joint rule.
Finally, it says, Alfonso violated those conditions by installing Aragonese garrisons in such strong points as he could. Faced by the subsequent opposition of the magnates assembled at Sahagún, he fled east. (122)

"Las crónicas anónimas" recounts much the same story, with several additions. For one, it says that Urraca agreed to go to Aragón while her husband remained in León and that Alfonso considered having her seized and imprisoned there. The chronicler places the queen in Huesca, whither the displaced Abbot Domingo goes to complain to her. In her absence, Alfonso carried forward the installation of the Aragonese garrisons. The queen returned, meeting Alfonso at Valtierra on the Ebro first, and going on to Burgos, Carrión, and Sahagún after Alfonso became very sick.

According to the chronicle, the burghers of the cities of the pilgrimage road took the initiative in reminding Alfonso of the conditions he had agreed to observe. The king, somewhat chastened, rejoined Urraca and together they advanced to besiege the Infanta Teresa in Astorga. The latter managed to convince Alfonso that Urraca was plotting against his life, we are told, and Urraca fled back to León and then to Sahagún, where she found solid support. Alfonso, too, returned to Sahagún and later withdrew east after yet another futile conference. (123)

The dizzying permutations of the summer were unsettling in Galicia, where a revolt broke out that doubtless had local roots although the rebels probably claimed to be supporting the reunited king and queen. Bishop Diego Gelmírez put it down in the name of the queen and her son. (124) By September 3, 1112 Gelmírez was also patching up relations with the Portuguese. On that date a private donation to the border church of Túy was confirmed not only by Archbishop Maurice of Braga and Gelmírez but also by the bishops of Túy, Orense, Lugo, and Astorga. (125)

By October 21, 1112 Urraca was back in León. She issued a charter on that date rewarding the faithful Count Froila Díaz of Astorga for his unfailing support. (126) The confirmants are Count Pedro Ansúrez, Pedro Díaz, and Fernando Téllez, all of León; Count Pedro González and Guter Fernández, the Castilians; and Galicia was represented by Count Pedro Froilaz, Count Suario Vermúdez, and Count Rodrigo Velázquez. The essential support of Urraca had survived the trials of the past year, which had begun with the defeat at Candespira.

In the fall of 1112, then, a little more than three years after the death of her father, the experiment of the Aragonese marriage was definitely ended. Urraca was now to be ruler of her father's realm in her own right. How much of it she would retain was another question. The loyalty of Asturias apparently had never been in doubt. León had been held against her husband. Association with her son, still only seven, had secured the allegiance of Galicia. The west, Zamora, Extremadura, and Portugal remained in the hands of her half sister Teresa.

More important for the moment, most of Castilla remained in the hands of the king of Aragón and his garrisons, although Urraca also enjoyed strong support there. What his intentions would prove to be remained her central problem. Rioja, along the upper Ebro, and Soria, on the upper Duero, were potential acquisitions for an ambitious, aggressive king of Aragón. Their relationship to León-Castilla was new, the work of her father. To Alfonso, their possession would, at worst, neutralize Murábit Zaragoza and, at best, provide salients for its conquest.

Finally, there was Toledo. That realm had been her father's greatest prize. Now it lay under the permanent threat of Murábit reconquest. Furthermore, the city had received her husband, the king-emperor in the spring of 1111. Urraca enjoyed the loyalty of Alvar Fáñez in the land's eastern reaches and of its archbishop, but no king claiming the title of emperor could permit the loss, without a contest, of the ancient capitol of the Visigoths and the primatial see of all Spain. To restore and protect the integrity of her inheritance, the kingdom of her father, could be the only task of Queen Urraca.
Somehow she must control and direct the centrifugal forces, represented by the great magnates of Lara and Trastamara, toward that restoration. Such would be the purpose and, ultimately, the measure of her rule.
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63. AHN, Códices, 989B, fol. 132r.

64. The text survives only in three eighteenth-century copies. It has been edited by Ramos y Loscertales, "La sucesión," pp. 67-69.

65. The chronology of the sources for the campaigns of 1109 and 1110 is not as clear as one would like. See González, *Repoplación*, 1:100-101, and García de Valdeavellano, *Historia de España*, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 393.


68. AHN, Clero, carp. 622, no. 21; Códices, 222B, fol. 11


70. Documents of Sahagún. January 24, 1110; AHN, carp. 893, no. 1, and Códices, 989B, fols. 38v-39r. February 13, 1110; AHN, Códices, 989B, fol. 236v. March 9, 1110; AHN, Clero, carp. 893, no. 2, and Códices, 989B, fol. 142. April 6, 1110; AHN, Códices, 989B, fol. 222r. June 6, 1110; AHN, Clero, carp. 893, no. 4, published in Romualdo Escalona, *Historia del real monasterio de Sahagún* (Madrid, 1782),
There is also a document of the monastery of Vega, dated February 18, 1110; AHN, Clero, carp. 3.427, no. 6; published in Luciano Serrano, ed., *Cartulario de San Pelayo y Vega de Oviedo* (Madrid, 1927), pp. 35-37. On the other hand, two purported donations of Count Pedro Ansúrez dated March 29 and 30, 1110 refer only to Urraca as ruling. Manuel Mañueco Villalobos and José Zurita Nieto, eds., *Documentos de la Iglesia Colegial de Santa María la Mayor de Valladolid*, 2 vols. (Valladolid, 1917-20), 1:72-74 and 78-79. The date of the first of these is fixed by reference to the second. Luciano Serrano, *El obispado de Burgos y Castilla primitiva desde el siglo V al XIII*, 3 vols (Madrid 1935), 2:36, believes the second has been tampered with, and I suspect them as well. There is a document, dated May 1, 1110, of Oviedo that refers only to Urraca; Santos García Larragueta, ed., *Colección de documentos de la catedral de Oviedo* (Oviedo, 1962), pp. 341-343. It has a Bishop Diego of León as a confirmant whose episcopate begins two years later.

71. Although the date cannot be fixed, Alfonso I and Urraca jointly confirmed the fueros of Castrojeriz; Muñoz y Romero, *Colección de fueros*, pp. 37-42. There are two donations of the monarchs to the Riojan monastery of Santa María de Valbanera dated simply to 1110; Manuel Lucas Álvarez, "Libro Becerro del monasterio de Valbanera," *EEMCA* 4 (1951):602-603; Juan Antonio Llorente, ed., *Noticias históricas de las tres provincias vascongadas, Alava, Guipúzcoa, y Vizcaya*, 4 vols. (Madrid, 1806-08), 410-11. The latter was granted at the castle of San Esteban de Gormaz on the upper Duero. Both cite, in the fashion of the Aragonese chancery, Count Gómez González "in Pontecorbo et in Cereso" and Count Pedro González "in Lara et in Medina," which would hardly be possible much later than the middle of 1110, after which both were supporting Urraca against Alfonso.

Alfonso and Urraca also jointly confirmed the fueros of Sepúlveda, though again without date. See Emilio Sáez, *Colección diplomática de Sepúlveda* (Segovia, 1956), pp. 7-8, for the various copies of the document.


74. AHN, Clero, carp. 1.240, no. 4, an original; published in Fletcher, "Obispos olvidados," pp. 323-324.


76. Ibid. The only extant text of such a papal letter is undated, addressed to Bishop Gelmírez, and preserved in the "Historia Compostelana," Flórez, *ES*, 20:98.

77. Both published by Muñoz y Romero, *Colección de fueros*, pp. 299-300 and 427-428. This seems early, but the urgency of the situation may explain it. Unfortunately the diplomatic study of the charters of Alfonso I, done by Pascual Galindo Romeo as a doctoral thesis for the University of Zaragoza in the 1920s, has never been published. Moreover, Carlos E. Corona Baratech, "Las tenencias en Aragón desde 1035 a 1134," *EEMCA* 2 (1946):379-396, is incomplete and therefore of limited help.


80. Ibid., pp. 298-299: "Regina exivit cum suo exercitu pera Zesaragustam medio Agosto." Private documents of the period reflect this state of affairs by dropping the name of Alfonso I in favor of a simple citation of Urraca. August 18, 1110; Mañueco Villalobos and Zurita Nieto, *Documentos de*
Valladolid, 1:82-83. October 12, 1110; AHN, Clero, carp. 3:427, no. 7; published in Serrano, *Cartulario de San Pelayo y Vega*, pp. 37-38. October 23, 1110; AHN, Clero, carp. 961, no. 4, November 17, 1110; AD León, Monasterio de Gradefes, no. 14. November 21, 1110; AD León, Gradefes, no. 18, cites them as ruling together but it is a copy and lists Bishop Diego of León, whose episcopate dates from 1112.


82. AC Burgos, vol. 70, no. 103; published in Serrano, *Obispado*, 3:139-140.

83. AC Palencia, vol. 70, no. 103; published in Serrano, *Obispado*, 3:139-140.

84. Flórez, *ES*, 20:98-99. The author states the reconciliation as an established fact, which he may have believed or may simply have asserted as a justification of what was to follow. Campelo, *Historia Compostelana*, p. 106, n. 2, identifies it as the castle at Santa María de Castrello, on the Miño near Ribadavia.


87. AHN, Códices, 989B, fol. 236r; published in Escalona, *Historia de Sahagún*, p. 509.

88. Flórez, *HC*, ES, 20:99-114. The author narrates all this as one continuous theme and, of course, the bishop is its hero. In the entire episode but one date is given, 1110, and the manuscript tradition varies on that. I believe the context and manuscript tradition best support a date of 1110 rather than 1111. See Campelo, *Historia Compostelana*, pp. 117-118, n. 2.

89. A private document of Coimbra, dated December 25, 1110, states that it was drawn in his presence; see João Pedro Ribeiro, *Dissertações chronologicas e criticas sobre a historia e jurisprudencia ecclesiastica e civil de Portugal*, 5 vols. (Lisbon, 1857-96), 4:164-165. There is a charter of Urraca to the church of Valladolid, dated January 7, 1111; Acad. Hist., Sección de Catedrales, 9-25-1-C-4, fols. 20r-21r; published in Mañueco Villalobos and Zurita Nieto, *Documentos de Valladolid*, 1:85-87, in which Henry is given as a confirmant. Unfortunately it also cites Bishop Raymond of Palencia, then deceased. It seems to be a reformulation of Urraca's charter to Valladolid of December 15, 1110, which neither Count Henry nor Bishop Raymond confirmed. See note 83.


91. AHN, Clero, carp. 272, no. 12; published in Juan de Alamo, ed., *Colección diplomática de San Salvador de Oña* (Madrid, 1950), 1:166-167, who believed it to be an original. It seems to me to be rather a good copy.

92. January 20, 1111; AC León, no. 1.004; and another copy in the Tumbo, fols. 26v-27r. For the negotiations, see Flórez, *HC*, ES, 20:114.

93. February 11, 1111; AHN, Clero, carp. 893, no. 5, a private document of Sahagún that appears to be
an original, reads "regnante urraka regina et filio suo parvulo in legione." On the other hand, February 26, 1111, AHN, Clero, carp. 893, no. 6, reads "regnante rex adefonsus aragonenses regina orace in sedio patri sui in spania," but this is a later copy and the text is suspicious in other ways. Yet another private document, February 27, 1111, published in Eduardo Jusué, ed., Libro de regla o cartulario de la antigua abadía de Santillana del Mar (Madrid, 1912), pp. 13-14, cites Alfonso I and Urraca as jointly ruling León, Castilla, and Aragón, but it has dating problems. Pedro Rodríguez López, Episcopologio asturicense (Astorga, 1907), 2:176, contains a notice of a donation of April 14, 1111 to the monastery of San Salvador de Foncebadón by Urraca "y su hijo D. Alfonso." Finally, a private document of Astorga, dated May 25, 1111, BN, Manuscritos, 4.357, fol. 68v, cites both son and mother as reigning.

94. AHN, Clero, carp. 711, no. 8, an original; published in Lacarra, "Documentos para la reconquista," EEMCA 5 (1952):525-526.

95. Anales toledanos I Flórez, ES, 23:387: "El rey de Aragón en XIII días kalendas de mayo entró en Toledo e regno, Era MCXLIX."

96. May 9, 1111; May 26, 1111; and June 1111; Azevado, DMP, 1:30-34.

97. Puyol y Alonso, "Las crónicas anónimas," BRAH 76 (1920):247: "traspado los montes Perineos por ayer ayuda de los françeses, con los quales, guarnecido e esforçado, por fuerça toviese el reino de Espanna." The author does not date his departure, and this must be done from the context of events and from the documents.

98. Flórez, HC, ES, 20:114-121. The bishop's biographer tells us only that the coronation took place on the seventeenth Sunday after Pentecost. In his version of the negotiations, Urraca is made to complain of the two-year-long expulsion of Bernard of Toledo from his see by the Batallador and a variety of other actions, some of which had in fact occurred by this date but others of which had not. Like many other parts of the "Historia Compostelana," the account is a reconstruction of events to which the author was not a witness. The essential truth of it is irrefutable, but details and dating must be correlated with other sources of the period.

99. August 11, 1111 and September 19, 1111; Jusué, Santillana del Mar, pp. 68 and 11-12 respectively. The earlier of these has a dating problem and may even be a fabrication founded on the latter. There are two charters to Oña as well: September 2, 1111; Serrano, Cartulario de San Millán, pp. 299-301; and October 1111; AHN, Clero, carp. 272, no. 13; published in Alamo, Colección de Oña, 1:167-169, also in Filemón Arribas Arranz, Paleografía documental hispánica, 2 vols. (Valladolid, 1965), 1:46-47 and a plate, 2:18. Both scholars consider the latter donation an original. It is not.

The two Oña charters have been very troublesome because they are both issued by Alfonso el Batallador jointly with his wife, Urraca; but at this date a reconciliation would have been impossible. The charters to Santillana are issued by Urraca alone. Martín Peláez, partisan of Alfonso Raimúndez, would scarcely have been pressed into service to draft charters of his stepfather. I believe I have discovered the solution in the Acad. Hist., Colección Salazar y Castro, sig. O-7, fols. 15v-16r. These copies give two versions of the September 2 charter to Oña, one in joint name and the other in the name of Urraca alone. It is my belief that, given the border character that the area around Oña was to retain for some decades yet, some enterprising monastic scribe carefully prepared a set of copies designed to legitimize the holdings of the monastery regardless of the eventual victor.

"Las crónicas anónimas" does not date this key event, and Luiz Gonzaga de Azevedo, História da Portugal (Lisbon, 1940), 3:181-191, places it in October 1110. He reviews the entire chronology of the period, dating Count Henry's trip to France to the early spring of 1110. The most solid portion of his chronological argument is the disappearance of Count Gómez González, Count of Castilla, from the documents after October 15, 1110. Also, he cites the appearance of Rodrigo Múñoz as Count of Castilla in a document of Sahagún; AHN, Códices, 989B, fol. 236r; published in Escalona, Historia de Sahagún, p. 509. There are however, some diplomatic problems with the latter, and it seems to me that the evidence in the preceding paragraph supports the traditional dating.

Lacarra, Vida, pp. 46-47, prefers 1111 also, but García de Valdeavellano, Historia de España, vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 401-402, follows Gonzaga de Azevedo. The most recent study of the origins and early history of the Portuguese kingdom, Peter Feige, "Die Anfänge des portugiesischen Königtums und seiner Landeskirche," GAKS 29 (1978):85-352, provides a close diplomatic study of the charters of Count Henry and Teresa and draws generally careful conclusions from them. However, he is less well informed on the Spanish documents, as distinct from the chronicles. As a result, he avoids trying to date either Henry's trip to France or the battle of Candesquina; see pp. 136-137.

101. Puyol y Alonso, "Las crónicas anónimas," BRAH 76 (1920):247-249. The author narrates all this without supplying a single date or precisely datable event. Urraca's agent in the approach to Count Henry is identified as Fernando Garciaz of Hita. This detail builds conviction, for that noble was a regular at her court, confirming some twenty-four of her charters.

It seems probable that it was during this brief period that Count Henry of Portugal issued a fuero to the inhabitants of Oca, in the easternmost part of the province of Burgos, on the pilgrimage road from France. AHN, Clero, carp. 236; published in Azevado, DMP, 1:783-785 and, with discussion by José María Lacarra, in "Dos documentos interesantes para la historia de Portugal," RPH 3 (1947):291-305. A preface to the document speaks of the partition of the realm and Count Henry grants the fuero "cum consilio de Didago Vermudez." The latter had confirmed three documents of Alfonso VI and confirmed in all four of the documents to Santillana del Mar and to Oña cited in note 98 of this chapter.

If Henry is seen as a figure whose role was limited to the county of Portugal, the scheme of partition seems insubstantial and unrealistic. But he was never just that. He may have been a count in the territories around the monastery of Eslonza, just east of León, in 1088; see ch. 1, note 15. He was certainly count in Tordesillas in 1096 and early 1097; see ch. 1, note 57. His donation to Sahagún of March 21, 1101, published in Azevado, DMP, 1:11-12, shows that he held property then around Saldaña and may have continued to hold it on January 30, 1105. Cf. Charles Julian Bishko, "Count Henrique of Portugal, Cluny, and the Antecedents of the Pacto Sucessório," RPH 13 (1970): pp. 161-162, n. 9. On April 25, 1109, published in García Larraqueta, Colección de Oviedo, pp. 339-341, a private document of Oviedo cites "Henricus comes cum uxore sua Torasia imperante Tiniego," the latter an important position in western Asturias. Francisco Javier Fernández Conde, El libro de testamentos de la catedral de Oviedo (Rome, 1971), pp. 352-353 and n. 3, believes the citation is a copyist's error in an otherwise genuine document. But consider that Pedro Peláez who was count in Tiniego on July 31, 1092 -- published in García Larraqueta, Colección de Oviedo, pp. 285-286 -- and still on May 15, 1101 -- published in Antonio C. Floriano Cumbreño, ed., El libro registro de Corias, 2 vols. (Oviedo, 1950), 1:168-170, may be better known as the majordomo of Count Henry between 1101 and 1112; see Bishko, "Count Henrique," p. 164. In all these places Henry would have had at least some basis for securing support.

102. The whereabouts of Urraca at this point is an almost insoluble puzzle. The HC, ed. Flórez, ES, 20:123-124, tells us that after the losing battle, Urraca's son was brought to her by Bishop Gelmiere "in
forti Castello Orzilione (quod Castrum est in Castella)." The bishop then returned to collect the wounded and fugitive in Astorga before traveling back to Santiago de Compostela. There is, in a part of the district of Orense called Castela, a castle called Orcellón. See Campelo, Historia Compostelana, p. 126, n. 1, who nevertheless says that the castle of which the text is probably speaking is rather in the province of Burgos. At one other point, in 1121, the HC refers to a castle at Orzilione, and this time it is clear that the one near Orense is being discussed; Flórez, ES, 20:329.

It seems to me likely that Urraca was in what we now call Galicia at Orcellón. The queen had been moving west from Palencia, through Sahagún and León. Should we imagine her doubling back, through the lands being consolidated by her husband? Can we credit that Bishop Gelmírez, fleeing from defeat with the Aragonese monarch's greatest prize in his custody, traversed the same lands twice, once to deliver the boy to his mother and then to return to Astorga for the wounded?

Still, the HC goes on to speak of Urraca leaving her son in the fortress: "ad Gallætiam proficisci disposuit. Ad asperos itaque Astures montesque lapidosos iter aggrediens, per Ovetum transitum fecit"; Flórez, ES, 20:124. For this reason, like Campelo, historians have taken "Castella" to be "Castilla." Lacarra, Vida, p. 49, suggested the castle at Monzón. If, however, we assume that for the contemporary author -- unlike for ourselves -- the Orense district was not regarded as part of Galicia proper, then the passage above permits the interpretation I follow here.

103. Flórez, ES, 20:119-123, relates the entire episode.

104. AHN, Clero, carp. 893, no. 7.


106. This itinerary is in rough conformity with the account of the HC; Flórez, ES, 20:124. See note 102 above.

107. García Larraugeta, Colección de Oviedo, pp. 345-347, and Risco, ES, 8:347-349. Another copy of the document unknown to García Larraugeta is to be found in the Acad. Hist., Colección Salazar, sig. O-8, fols. 111r-112r. The document cannot be entirely trusted, for it is clearly interpolated. See Femández Conde, Libro de testamentos, pp. 354-361. and Floriano Cumbreño, Estudios de Asturias, pp. 136-137. Still, both authorities admit that it was probably based on an authentic donation of more limited scope. It is unlikely as well that a simple forger would have departed so far from the usual form of royal documents as to associate Henry and Teresa with the queen if the original document had not done so. Also, a much more limited, simple charter of Urraca to a canon of Oviedo, dated March 29, 1112, is preserved and is also a donation in return for financial assistance; García Larraugeta, Colección de Oviedo, pp. 348-349. Significantly, every one of Urraca's seven surviving charters of 1112 associates her son with her in the government of the realm.


110. Azevado, DMP, 1:40-41.

112. Puyol y Alonso, "Las crónicas anónimas," *BRAH* 76 (1920): 250-257 and 339-343. Again the chronology of the narrative is obscure and must be supplemented by that of the documents.

113. Flórez, *HC*, *ES*, 20:116 and 141. The two accounts do not entirely agree. In addition, Alfonso would never have had the power to seize the bishop of Orense unless, perhaps, he captured him in battle.

114. She confirmed a private donation to Cluny made there; Bruel, *Recueil de Cluny*, 5:251-253. There is also a notice of a donation of her own on the same date to the cathedral of Astorga; Francisco de Berganza, *Antigüedades de España*, 2 vols. (Madrid, 1719-21), 2:13-14.

115. These documents, like most, do not specify the place of issuance. May 1112; *AC* Santiago. Tumbo C, fol. 118v; published in López Ferreiro, *Historia*, 3:81-83. May 14, 1112; *AC* Santiago, Tumbo A, fols. 30v-31r; ibid., pp. 79-80. May 18, 1112; AHN, Microfilmas, Lugo, rollo 5.869, an original. May 27, 1112; AHN, Códices, 1.044B, fols. 15v-16v and 128v-129v. These are two documents of the monastery of San Lorenzo. May 31, 1112; AHN, Clero, carp. 1.240, no. 5; a donation to the monastery of Samos.

116. May 1112; *AC* León, Fondo particular, no, 294. May 9, 1112; AHN, Códices, ISB, fol. 80r.


118. Azevado, *DMP*, 1:45 and 576-577: "post morte de ille comes Herricus." Azevado believes the document may be an original. The character of the citation -- of "Rex Anfus Aronggones. Regina Urraka" -- to this donation of the Infanta Teresa suggests to me that it is, rather, a contemporary copy to which their names have been added by way of precaution. "Las crónicas anónimas," *BRAH* 76 (1920):254, says that both Urraca and Alfonso were besieged at Carrión by Count Henry, but this may be a reference to an otherwise unknown event of the previous fall.

119. Azevado, *DMP*, 1:42 and 569-570. The treaty is undated. Given its various peculiarities, discussed by Pinto de Azevado, I am inclined to view it as a fabrication of the age of Alfonso VII designed to justify Portuguese claims or, at least, to serve as a bargaining tool. If accepted at all, it must be of approximately this date. The absence of any mention of Count Henry surely places it after his death, for nothing would justify our assuming such independence of function in his wife during his lifetime. After 1112, as we shall see, Urraca will never again be in such desperate straits as to assent to such a vast alienation nor Teresa in such a position of power as to exact it. See Sousa Soares, "O governo de Portugal," pp. 394-395, and Feige, "Die Anfänge," pp. 141-142.

Another, more partial indication of the Infanta Teresa's power at this time is seen in the confirmation of her charter of August 1, 1112 by Bishop Jerome of Salamanca; Azevado, *DMP*, 1:46-47, and Antonio da Assunção Meirales, ed., *Memorias do mosteiro de Pombeiro* (Lisbon, 1942), p. 122. This is the only occasion on which that bishop, whose see was the only one between Portugal and the Sierra de Gredos, confirmed a product of the Portuguese chancery.

120. Prudencio de Sandoval, *Historia de los reyes*, fol. 122r, cites a grant of Urraca to the monks of Samos that actually is the one of May 31, 1112. See note 113. A private donation of Lorenzana, AHN, Códices, sig. 1044B, fols. 14v-15r, dated June 13, 1112, is certainly closely related to those of May 27, 1112. It is confirmed by Urraca and probably should be of the earlier date. Finally, a notice of a donation of Urraca to the monastery of San Isidro de las Dueñas, dated July 4, 1112, is of a later date, indicated by the confirmation of Bishop Paschal of Burgos. BN, Manuscritos, sig. 720, fols. 276v-277v, and Acad. Hist., Colección Velásquez, 4, no. 1395.

121. Charles Julian Bishko, "The Spanish Journey of Abbot Ponce of Cluny," *Ricerche di storia religiosa* 1 (1957):311-319, argues that the legate has been wrongly identified and that the event should
also be redated to 1113. The latter especially is necessary, for it is clear that Abbot Pons was in France during the summer of 1112. The redating is impossible for a number of reasons. The chief among these is that in 1113 the two rulers were no longer reconciled but at war. The papacy might not have been aware of this, but the author of the HC would have been. Moreover, if the legate's journey had taken place during the summer of 1113 the legate need not have journeyed on to Galicia to see Bishop Gelmírez after conferring with Urraca. As we shall see, the documents place Gelmírez with Urraca during the summer and early fall of 1113. Finally, H.E.J. Cowdrey, "Abbot Pontius of Cluny (1109-22/6); Two Studies in Cluniac History (1049-1126)," Studi gregoriani 11 (1978):200-201 and n. 76, considers that two letters later written to Gelmírez by Pons imply that the two had never met.


123. BRAH 76 (1920):255-257 and 339-349. Jiménez de Rada, "De Rebus Hispaniae," pp. 147-148, turns the idea of the imprisonment of Urraca into a fact. He was probably following epic sources.

A charter of Alfonso I to Santo Domingo de la Calzada, dated to July 1112, has the king at war with Diego López of Haro, a staunch supporter of Urraca at Castrojeriz; Gregorio de Balparda y las Herrarias, Historia crítica de Vizcaya y de sus fueros, 2 vols. (Madrid, 1924 and Bilbao, 1933-34), 2:307. However, José María Lacarra, "Alfonso el Batallador y las paces de Támara," EEMCA 3 (1947-48):463, n. 6, points out that each of the redactions in the cartulary is dated differently and that the earliest copy is dated July 1124. A document of AC León, no. 1.385, dated June 3,1112, cites the Batallador as reigning in León and "Mauritius archiepiscopus in legione" and would seem to fix the date for the cooperation of the Aragonese and Teresa of Portugal.


126. AD León; Santa María de las Dueñas de Otero, no. 221, an original. There is also a copy of an exchange of properties between Urraca and one María Froilaz in the same collection, no. 220, dated to October 20, 1112.