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Truce with Aragón and the Campaigns in the West and South

(1117-1120)

Urraca and Alfonso were not alone in their desire to find grounds for a peace or truce in 1116. At Rome Pope Paschal II had been trying since the beginning of his pontificate to adjudicate the welter of conflicting claims and evidence supplied to him by the various parties in the Iberian church. As the Christian principalities of the north uncovered their layered past through the Reconquista, the appeal to historical precedent had become a weapon to advance the various ecclesiastical and political necessities and desires of the present. Braga, Burgos, Compostela, León, and Oviedo had all tried to enlist the enhanced prestige and authority of Rome for their own purposes.

Of late, Paschal had experienced growing doubts about the continuing usefulness of the union of the primateship and the papal legatine authority in the see of Toledo. Archbishop Bernard was too clearly a party to virtually all the disputes in the peninsula. Toward the end of 1115 the latter had been deprived of legatine power over the province of Braga, but that had not ended the disputes over Coimbra's proper metropolitan or the territorial limits of Braga's suffragan Astorga and Toledo's suffragan Salamanca. Increasingly, Gelmírez sought metropolitan status for Compostela at the expense of Braga while Burgos, León, and Oviedo all guarded jealously their exemption from any metropolitan jurisdiction.

Papal attempts to bring the principals, or some of them, to Rome were easily frustrated by the hazardous conditions of travel in the peninsula. The latest summons to the prelates and abbots of Spain to attend a general council at the Lateran in mid-Lent of 1116 had produced the usual disappointing result. Only the bishop of Oporto and the abbot of Sahagún are known to have attended, and each had very particular causes to advance. The decision to send a papal legate to the peninsula was probably determined in that forum.

The choice fell on Cardinal Boso of St. Anastasia, who had had some previous experience with peninsular affairs. In the spring of 1116 he was already in the south of France presiding at the installation of Oleguer as bishop of Barcelona. Exactly when he reached Aragón and León-Castilla is not clear from the documents. "Las crónicas anónimas" speaks of his purpose to effect peace between Urraca and Alfonso of Aragón and of his itinerary from Burgos through Palencia and León, then on to Compostela and Braga, and, finally, of his return to Burgos and the council held there. Such a journey was likely to have occupied December 1116, and January 1117.

Meanwhile many of the principals may have been converging on the region of the prospective council. On January 22, 1117 Urraca issued a charter at Alesón, near Nájera in Rioja, to the monastery of Santa María de Nájera. She had not been so far east since 1110. The charter was issued jointly with her son and was confirmed by Archbishop Bernard of Toledo and the bishops of Burgos, Palencia, León, Oviedo, and Astorga, as well as by Counts Pedro Ansúrez and Pedro González and a large number of local figures. In February 1117 the same possessions were donated to that monastery by
Alfonso of Aragón, calling himself emperor and claiming the rule of Toledo, León, and Castilla. His charter was confirmed by the bishops of Huesca, Pamplona, and Roda. This charter largely follows the norms of the Leonese chancery rather than those of Aragón, and it is late for Alfonso to claim the rule of León, so that I am most suspicious of it. Still, it may reflect a maximum bargaining position taken by Alfonso on the eve of the council.

By February 15, 1117 Queen Urraca may have been in Burgos, where she granted a charter to a local figure, confirmed by the bishop of Burgos. "Las crónicas anónimas," however, places the queen in Palencia the day before the opening of the council. We do not know exactly how long the council lasted or exactly when it began. A letter of Cardinal Boso to Pope Paschal reporting the finding that Coimbra was suffragan to Mérida, not Braga, is dated February 18, 1117. The canons of the council, issued with the concurrence of Cardinal Boso, Archbishop Bernard, and the bishops of Palencia, León, Oviedo, Porto, Coimbra, Salamanca, Mondoñedo, Burgos, and Barcelona, bear the same date. These are concerned almost exclusively with ecclesiastical discipline but they do forbid consanguineous marriage. Another document of an agreement between the bishops of Porto and Coimbra over the limits of their respective dioceses, confirmed by Cardinal Boso, Archbishop Bernard, and the bishops of Barcelona, Palencia, Porto, Burgos, and Salamanca, is dated February 24, 1117. Finally, there is another letter of Cardinal Boso to Bishop Pedro of Palencia confirming the cession to that church by Pedro Ansúrez of the church of Valladolid and its possessions. It is dated only to 1117 but was given at Burgos.

Seen in the light of these documents, the council wears the aspect of a purely ecclesiastical council of the realm of León-Castilla. The absence of the bishops of Aragón is marked. Neither Urraca nor Alfonso of Aragón can be demonstrated to have attended. Yet it seems quite clear that Count Bertran, Alfonso's cousin, had conferred with Urraca on the matter of the exile of the burghers of Sahagún. The council made him, together with Bishops Hugh of Porto and Paschal of Burgos, responsible for the satisfaction to be made by the burghers to the abbot of Sahagún and for their return to their homes. Such an agreement implies the Aragonese monarch's acceptance of Paschal as legitimate bishop of Burgos. It implies also Urraca's acceptance of Count Bertran as an acceptable guardian of Aragonese interests in Castilla and his control of Carrión.

How far their agreement may have extended is impossible to say, and it was to be misconstrued by each party in the future. Neither was willing to surrender outright its claims to either Castilla or Toledo. But it is probable that Alfonso accepted the recent rebel, Diego López of Haro, as guardian of Leonese interests in Vizcaya and Rioja at this time, and the understanding may have extended to other contested border districts as well.

For the moment, however, their interests bore them in different directions. In March 1117 Alfonso I was at the castle of Sieso in the province of Huesca, and by early July he was reconnoitering the approaches to Zaragoza in the company of Viscount Gaston of Béarn. Urraca by March 1, 1117 was probably in León, where she granted a charter to the church of Mondoñedo confirmed by the bishops of Compostela, León, Lugo, Palencia, and Orense, and a great list of the secular magnates of her court, including Count Pedro Froilaz. She was surely there on March 12, when she confirmed a private donation to the church of León. I suspect that she was still in León on May 29, 1117, when she confirmed an exchange of property between Bishop Pelayo of Oviedo and Count Suero Vermúdez. Two days later, when she confirmed a donation of Bishop Pelayo of Astorga, Urraca may have been on her way to Galicia.
When she arrived there in the late spring, the queen seems first to have turned her attention to campaigning in the south of Galicia, long contested with the Infanta Teresa. Then she moved north to Compostela, where she was planning to effect some sort of settlement between Bishop Gelmírez and the town's concejo, which had been ruling virtually to the exclusion of that prelate for the past year. Some of the townspeople suspected that the arrangements envisioned would be dangerous to themselves, and a spectacular series of events followed.

While Urraca and Gelmírez were conferring in the episcopal palace the townspeople suddenly rose in rebellion, and the pair were forced to take refuge in a new tower being built for the cathedral. The rebels then fired the tower and Urraca was forced to emerge, whereupon, in one of the most extraordinary of scenes, she was stripped and pelted with stones before being rescued by calmer heads. After extracting from the queen promises of forgiveness and concessions that probably even they knew would be worthless, the rebels allowed her to leave the city because no other course was practical. Awaiting her were the forces of Count Pedro Froilaz and her son; they were soon joined by Gelmírez, who had effected his own escape from the town. Overawed by the forces arrayed against them, the burghers capitulated quickly. Considering the gravity of their offense, the penalties assessed were relatively moderate. Episcopal government was restored. The leading rebels were exiled from the city, their property confiscated, and a substantial indemnity levied against the townspeople. In Compostela as at Sahagún, Urraca found popular regimes too volatile to be relied upon, but otherwise her extreme humiliation finds scarcely an echo in her vigorous policy.

How long all this had taken we are not told, but it probably occupied the month of June. On July 4, 1117, probably near León, Urraca issued a charter to San Isidro de las Dueñas confirmed by her son, the primate, and the bishops of Palencia, León, Burgos, Salamanca, and Osma.

Although the campaign against Portugal seems not to have been continued directly this summer, Teresa was fully occupied in the south. In late June and early July the Murábit leader Ali ben Yusuf, who had come from Morocco, laid siege to Coimbra for three weeks. Those circumstances allowed Urraca to consolidate, perhaps even to extend, her authority over Toro and Zamora on the western reaches of the Duero toward the present Portuguese border. A document of Sahagún of August 13, 1117 cites "fernando melendiz in tauro et in camorus mandante." I take the latter to be the Fernando Menéndez who confirmed Urraca's charter of October 15, 1116.

Still in León on September 6, 1117, Urraca made a joint donation to the church of San Isidoro with her daughter, Sancha, confirmed by the bishops of Astorga and Compostela. For the remainder of the year there are no notices of the queen that allow us to establish her whereabouts.

The major fruit of the truce arranged at Burgos earlier in the year came with the entry of her son into Toledo on November 16, 1117. Doubtless Alfonso of Aragón regarded this action as going beyond anything he had agreed to earlier in the year, and he continued to use the imperial title, emphasizing his claim to that city and realm. Nonetheless, there is no trustworthy evidence that he ever exercised authority in the city thereafter. It was to be part of the price he paid for his concentration on the siege of Zaragoza. A series of private documents reflects the general reassertion of Urraca's authority in the trans-Duero during the year.

The new dignity of Alfonso Raimúndez may be reflected in his second known charter, dated December 9, 1117. In it, Urraca's son styled himself "imperator," and the Archbishop of Toledo, the bishops of León, Salamanca, Oviedo, and Astorga, and the magnates Pedro Froilaz, Froila Díaz, and Pedro Ansúrez confirmed it, probably at Sahagún.
This charter is the last known appearance in the documents of the Leonese count Pedro Ansúrez. There is no satisfactory evidence for the date of his death but it is likely that it coincided roughly with the end of 1117 or early 1118. He had been too regularly a part of Urraca's court and of the political life of the realm simply to have vanished into private life. Together with the retirement from court of his nephew, Guter Fernández, in 1117, his death would heighten the influence of Count Pedro González with the queen and thus make Urraca's relations with her son and his supporters more difficult. The suspicion is irresistible that the count of Lara would use his enhanced authority to promote the position of his own children by Urraca as possible heirs to the throne. If, as García Calles believes, the count's brother Rodrigo was married about this time to Urraca's younger half-sister Sancho, the preeminence of the Lara family must have been of general concern.

Urraca's Christmas court that year was probably held at León or Sahagún. She issued a charter on January 4, 1118 to the monastery of San Zoil de Carrión, whose dating formula cites her as reigning with her son "per totam hispaniam." It was confirmed by Bernard of Toledo and the bishop of Palencia. On February 7, 1118 a private donation to Cluny cites Urraca as reigning in León and Castilla and her son Alfonso in Toledo and the trans-Duero. The queen was probably still in León as late as March 18, 1118, when she granted a charter to its bishops confirmed by Alfonso Raimúndez and his sister, Sancho.

Meanwhile Alfonso of Aragón was marshalling a great army against Zaragoza. To Alfonso's own forces were added those under Viscount Gaston of Béarn and the latter's brother, Centule of Bigorra, and together they began the siege in earnest in May 1118. In the same month Alfonso issued a charter in which he styled himself simply "king" and made no claims to Castilla.

There is some indication that Urraca herself was in eastern Castilla at this same time. On May 19, 1118 she granted a charter to the monastery of Oña and in it claimed the rule of Galicia, León, and Burgos. If there were conversations between the two at this time, subsequent events of the year indicate that they had little lasting effect. The "Historia Compostelana" relates that Urraca assembled a great army during the spring campaign against the king of Aragón. More precisely, she campaigned to reestablish her authority over those local notables who had enjoyed practical independence since the death of Alvar Fáñez in 1114 and sometimes admitted allegiance to the Aragonese monarch.

The dimensions of the army can be gauged roughly by the presence of elements not only from León and Castilla but also from Asturias and Galicia and by the presence in the host of Archbishop Bernard and the bishops of Osma and Salamanca. Still, there was a rising in Segovia against the queen while she and her court were holding a council there, which probably failed but indicated the continuing problems in the region.

To that council came Paio Mendes of Braga to be consecrated archbishop on June 2, 1118. That event gave evidence of the growing strength of Urraca in Portuguese matters and the practical weakness of her sister Teresa, and probably determined Urraca's decision to travel to Galicia.

From Segovia Urraca may have returned briefly to Burgos, for on July 20, 1118 she issued a diploma to the men of that city. But it seems more likely that the charter was given at Segovia, for it appears that by July 29, 1118 she was in Galicia, where she issued two charters and generally assumed control of the tangled affairs of the far west.

While the queen proceeded to Galicia, Archbishop Bernard probably led at least a portion of the army she had mobilized to the assistance of the realm of Toledo. It is certain that in that year an expedition under his leadership wrested the castle of Alcalá on the Tajo from the control of the
It is impossible to follow the movements of the queen herself after late July of 1118 until the death of Bishop Paschal of Burgos on October 13 provoked a new crisis over that much disputed city. The evidence of intense activity at court in November and December of that year reflects, perhaps, reaction not only to that event but also to the apparently increasing possibility that Alfonso of Aragón would indeed conquer Zaragoza.

On November 15, 1118 Alfonso Raimúndez granted fueros to the inhabitants of Toledo, calling himself emperor. Five days later, on November 20, he made a donation to the church of Toledo confirmed by his sister, Sancha, the bishops of León, Palencia, Salamanca, and Osma, and by Count Pedro González de Lara and Count Pedro Froilaz among the secular magnates. The list of confirmants suggests that the charter was issued in Urraca's court, and I think it certain that both these charters were in fact issued at León.

Between November 15 and December 6, 1118 five charters were issued by Urraca, all of which were confirmed by Alfonso Raimúndez and four by her daughter Sancha. The five are grants to the cathedral of León, to a Leonese monastery, to the cathedral of Oviedo, to the Galician monastery of San Martín Pinario, and to a private individual. The confirmations to these charters indicate the presence at court also of the queen's two half sisters Sancha and Elvira, Archbishop Bernard, the bishops of Palencia, Astorga, León, Túy, Orense, Compostela, and Oviedo, and Counts Pedro González de Lara and Count Pedro Froilaz, as well as most of the other great secular magnates of the realm.

One of the actions of this impressive curia was, in all likelihood, the approval of the election of Bishop Jimeno to the vacant see of Burgos. Early in 1119 Jimeno appears as bishop-elect in Urraca's charters. This action was not to be accepted either in Burgos itself or by the Aragonese king. Nevertheless, if Archbishop Bernard of Toledo was at the court of Pope Gelasius II at Alais on December 12, 1118, this was one of the actions whose approval he sought.

The renewed attempts of Bishop Gelmírez of Compostela to secure the archepiscopal dignity for his see were probably discussed there as well. Open disapproval would have been difficult for Urraca, but she seems to have been less than enthused. Bishop Gelmírez had been trying to send legates to Pope Gelasius since late spring but they had been stopped by agents of Alfonso of Aragón, and one of them was imprisoned after an interview with that monarch before Zaragoza. A second legation sent in the fall met with the queen at Sahagún and was dissuaded from continuing. At her suggestion the prior of San Zoil de Carrión was entrusted with the task instead.

One of the conditions made clear by this account is that Castrojeriz and Villafranca de Oca in eastern Castilla remained in the hands of Alfonso I. Another is that, although the Batallador's animosity towards Gelmírez remained strong, he at least was behaving properly toward Urraca. It is also evident that each had a fair knowledge of what was transpiring in the realm of the other.

For the king of Aragón prospects were very bright indeed. The most strenuous efforts of the Murâbits of Andalucía to relieve Zaragoza had failed. The combined forces of Granada and Córdoba under Abd Allah ben Mazdali failed to achieve the needed victory, and that Muslim leader died in Zaragoza in the latter part of October or early November. On December 18, 1118 the great city on the Ebro, despairing of effective assistance, surrendered to Alfonso I.

Alfonso immediately set about securing the hinterland of that city and the remaining Muslim strong points on the middle Ebro. By February 22, 1119 the most important of them, Tudela, was in his hands. Its capture was followed in short order by those of Tarazona, Moncayo, and Borja, and, a little
farther south, of Rueda and Epila.\(^{53}\) The whole of the plain on the right bank of the middle Ebro between Tudela and Zaragoza was now in his hands, and he must already in the spring of 1119 have been making plans for the siege of Calatayud to the southwest. That fortress town sat astride the road from Andalucía.

At the same time he was also pushing forward along the old Roman road from Tarazona through Agreda to Soria. His movements are not easy to follow in 1119 but it is certain that by the fall some of his forces had reached Soria across the Sierra del Madero. Soria, on the headwaters of the Duero, was only fifty-five kilometers from Urraca's supporter, Bishop Raymond at Osma. In September 1119 Alfonso's fuero to the new settlers of Tudela listed Jimeno López as *señor* in Soria and Burgos.\(^{54}\)

Urraca's itinerary in 1119 is equally difficult to trace. Beyond\(^{134}\) the relatively scanty documents, only the "Historia Compostelana," whose author was concerned with Bishop Gelmírez's pursuit of the archiepiscopal prize, provides some precious information about the movements of the queen.

Late in 1118 Pope Gelasius had decided to send a new personal legate, Cardinal Deusdedit, to Spain. Our source says only that the purpose of his legation was to invite the bishops of Iberia to a council to be held in the Auvergne on March 1, 1119. It seems a fair surmise that he was charged to promote the fragile truce between León-Castilla and Aragón as well. It is certain that Gelasius was profoundly interested in anything that would aid the capture of Zaragoza.

We are not given the cardinal's itinerary, but in all likelihood he visited Alfonso before Zaragoza and then Urraca in León before proceeding on to Compostela. Since he bore a letter of Gelasius dated November 17, 1118, he could hardly have reached the city of Santiago before mid-December at best, even if he had left the south of France on that date.\(^{55}\)

The information that the cardinal brought was apparently heartening enough for Gelmírez to decide to attend the projected council. He sent letters ahead asking the bishop of Jaca and the prior of Nájera to intercede with Alfonso of Aragón for a safe-conduct and set out for Sahagún, probably after the Christmas solemnities in early January. On arriving in Sahagún he discovered that the safe-conduct had been denied, and, tarrying there, learned that Pope Gelasius had died on January 29, 1119.

The bishop decided to visit Urraca, who was then in Burgos. Because the direct road was unsafe, he traveled south to Palencia, where, we are told, he spent almost a month before proceeding to Burgos in the company of the bishop of Palencia. There he was received by Urraca.\(^{56}\)

This narrative would place Urraca in Burgos from mid January until at least mid-March. It was a long stay, but the [135] need to watch the movements of the Aragonese king after his conquest at Zaragoza and then Tudela makes it credible. The documents support the same conclusion. On February 22, 1119 Urraca issued a charter to the monastery of Arlanza, south of Burgos. It was confirmed by her son, her half sister Sancha and daughter of the same name, and by Archbishop Bernard, the bishops of Palencia, León, Salamanca, and the bishop-elect of Burgos. No place of issuance is given, but the list of secular confirmants indicates a Castilian provenance.\(^{57}\) The following day there is a notice of a charter she gave to the monastery of Silos, south of Burgos.\(^{58}\) Another grant of Urraca to Silos is dated March 26, 1119. It is confirmed by the same members of her immediate family and the same prelates, except that the bishop of Salamanca does not appear but Bishop Gelmírez does.\(^{59}\)

The "Historia Compostelana" indicates that Gelmírez spent some little time in Burgos with the queen. It was there that he received the letter of Calixtus II, written at Crest on the Rhone, dated March 2, 1119. The letter was conveyed by the pope's brother-in-law, who was on pilgrimage to Compostela.\(^{60}\) It is likely, then, that Urraca's charter of April 1, 1119 to the Galician monastery of San Martín Pinario was also granted in Burgos at the request of Gelmírez. The list of confirmants to that charter has not
survived.\(^{(61)}\)

Shortly thereafter, however, Urraca seems to have moved south from Burgos to Palencia in company with Bishop Gelmírez. The latter then moved on to Sahagún but Urraca did not. From Sahagún Gelmírez sent a new agent to the papal court, which the envoy reached in late May or early \(^{(136)}\) June at Montpellier. But this emissary's itinerary had taken him first back to Palencia to confer with the queen.\(^{(62)}\)

Urraca, then, probably spent most of April and early May in or near Palencia. What indications there are of her activity point to her concern to protect the eastern flank of the realm of Toledo, presumably against Alfonso I but possibly against the Murâbits as well. It may be at this time that she confirmed the fuero of Palenzuela near Palencia, but this action is undated.\(^{(63)}\) At this time, too, she may have issued her charter, dated only to 1119, granting the villages of Hita and Uceda to Fernando García. The confirmants show her still surrounded by the members of her family, including Alfonso Raimúndez, and Archbishop Bernard and Bishop Pedro of Palencia.\(^{(64)}\) Hita and Uceda were strategic positions on the Henares and Jarama rivers, respectively, both of which flow southwest toward Madrid and ultimately to Toledo. Urraca would thus have strengthened the position of the faithful Fernando García of Hita, who in 1119 appears more frequently in her charters than any year before and after except 1110.

Negotiations with Alfonso of Aragón may have been in progress also. One of the confirmants of this charter is a Count Bernaldo. This may be Count Bertran, Alfonso's lieutenant at Carrión. Such conversations would have been at least useful at this point.

By the end of June the queen had moved north to the vicinity of Sahagún. At the castle of Grajal on June 20 she granted a charter to the granddaughter of Count Pedro Ansúrez, Estefanía Armengol. Her half sister Sancha and daughter of the same name confirmed but her son did not, nor did any bishops of the realm. Among the secular nobles who confirmed was Count Bernardo, again an indication of negotiations with the Aragonese if our identification is correct.\(^{(65)}\)

But Urraca had to deal with some type of attempted coup at home. The evidence is scattered and incomplete. The "Historia Compostelana" relates that sometime in the spring Urraca's former majordomo, Guter Fernández, had seized Count Pedro González of Lara and imprisoned him in the castle of Mancilla, some twenty kilometers southeast of León on the Río Esla. The reason given is the latter's excessive familiarity with the queen and the spread of his power thereby.\(^{(66)}\) His captivity must have been brief, for the count of Lara confirmed Urraca's charters of March 26 and June 30 in 1119. Nevertheless, his imprisonment so close to León itself and the stature of Guter Fernández indicate a plot with considerable backing.

Nor was the trouble over quickly. On July 18, 1119 there was fighting in León itself, and Urraca was besieged in the royal fortress of that city.\(^{(67)}\)

To this conspiracy should be linked the complaints of Archbishop Bernard to Pope Calixtus made in the early summer of 1119. The primate \(^{(138)}\) seems to have suspected the complicity of the bishop of Compostela and to have warned the pope that such unfortunate initiatives might end by costing the young infans his inheritance of the realm.\(^{(68)}\) Similarly, the refusal of the queen to permit Gelmírez to travel to France later in the year, because she suspected him of using the trip to secure the immediate succession of her son, should also be related to these events.\(^{(69)}\)

The entire conspiracy is best understood as a premature reaction of León and Galicia against what appeared to be the excessively eastern and Castilian policy that Urraca had been pursuing since 1117. The abandonment of Zaragoza to Aragón, the recognition of Count Bertran at Carrión, the promotion of
the Riojan Jimeno López to majordomo, and the dismissal of Guter Fernández from that post all seemed to point to a possible reconciliation of the queen with the Aragonese monarch unacceptable to either the Raimundist faction or considerable elements of the Leonese nobility. The involvement of Guter Fernández, former señor of Castrojeriz, in the plot suggests that some in Castilla also objected to such a policy.

Even for those who realized how improbable was a full reconciliation between the Leonese queen and the Aragonese king, Urraca's policy contained disturbing potential. Its development had coincided with changes at court that also emphasized the growing distance from the great days of her father, Alfonso VI. The death of Count Pedro Ansúrez in late 1117 or early 1118 and the retirement of his nephew, Guter Fernández, from court had been followed by the death of Froila Díaz, Count of Astorga, in the summer of 1119. All three magnates had served about the crown from at least the splendid year of the conquest of Toledo. Their absence opened the way now to a noxious predominance of Castilians [139] at court generally and of Count Pedro of Lara in particular.

The latter may well have had interests in an accommodation with Alfonso of Aragón that might award his offspring by Urraca a virtual appanage in Castilla under the patronage of the Aragonese monarch. Against the threat of such a possibility, Gelmírez might well have made common cause with the nobility of León. Given the fragmentary character of the evidence, such at least are the motives and suspicions that may have inspired the unsuccessful coup of the summer of 1119.

By September 2, 1119 the danger to Urraca's government seems to have been over. On that date she issued a charter in the presence once again of the primate and the bishops of Palencia, León, Osma, and Salamanca. The confirmants also included the count of Lara and his brother, Rodrigo González, the majordomo Jimeno López and his brother, Pedro López of Haro, Fernando García of Hita, and, this time certainly, Count Bertran of Carrión. The eastern policy would continue.

That policy entailed stresses for both Urraca and Alfonso of Aragón. Both continued their claims to Castilla. But the policy must have suited their interests, for by the fall of the year, as mentioned above, Alfonso himself recognized Jimeno López as señor of Burgos and Soria, both of which were potential points of dispute. As for Urraca, although she maintained her claim to Burgos by her support of Jimeno as bishop-elect, she did not force his immediate consecration, which was probably within her power. When, also in the fall of 1119, a canon of Gelmírez's on his way to the papal court was arrested at Burgos, it is hard to determine whose writ [140] ran in that city and whether his detention was due to orders from Urraca or from Alfonso I.

After early September Urraca's activities are unknown for the remainder of the year. Two charters of Alfonso Raimúndez are preserved from that period but both have difficulties. One charter, dated September 26, 1119, to the Galician monastery of San Julian de Moraime would put him at Simancas. The list of confirmants indicates the presence of the bishops of León, Oviedo, Lugo, Orense, and Compostela, the latter prematurely cited as "Archbishop." The nobles present include not only Count Pedro Froilaz of Galicia but also Pedro Díaz, who held the towers of León for Urraca in 1118, and a Count Fernando de Campos, who is probably Fernando Fernández, husband of the Infanta Elvira. If this document has any credence, it indicates important negotiations between Urraca and her son at that date.

The second charter, dated October 8, 1119, granting a mint to Sahagún is even more remarkable. For the young king to have given this regalian right to the greatest monastery of the realm would imply power beyond anything he is known to have exercised at this time. It was confirmed by the primate[141] and the bishop of León as well as by Count Pedro Froilaz and Count Bertran.
A private document of November 20, 1119 indicates rather that the queen was extending her own power at this time. It mentions Pedro López, future majordomo of Urraca, as holding Saldaña. This town had formerly been held by Count Pedro Ansúrez, and it is surprising to find it in the hands of a Riojan noble.\(^{(74)}\)

Finally, there is a charter of Alfonso of Aragón to the men of Belchite in Aragón, dated to December 13, 1119 and issued in "Petrusa circa Sobovia," which has been identified as Pedraza, not far from Segovia. There are some problems with the charter, and no other source puts Alfonso so far west at this time.\(^{(75)}\)

Instead, the events and documents of the following year demonstrate the continuing power of Urraca. Her son Alfonso Raimúndez does not issue a single known charter in 1120. Bishop Pedro was consecrated to the see of Segovia on January 25, 1120.\(^{(76)}\) Although it has been argued that the restoration\(^{(142)}\) of Segovia was the work of Alfonso of Aragón, it seems most unlikely that the Aragonese king would have chosen a canon of Toledo and a protégé of Archbishop Bernard and of Urraca for such a post, and the evidence for such an action is almost nonexistent.\(^{(77)}\)

The restoration reflects instead Urraca's need to bolster her position in the trans-Duero region. At one and the same time it would placate the restless inhabitants of that city, who had revolted in 1114 and again in 1118, by giving them their own bishop and strengthen her authority through his collaboration in her rule. If Bernard of Toledo lost the right to continue directly administering the church of Segovia, he gained a suffragan in the face of an impending loss of Coimbra, Salamanca, and Ávila to a new archbishop at Compostela.

There is no direct evidence of the whereabouts of Urraca and her court in early 1120. On January 22, 1120 a private exchange of property in Asturias was drawn up by the royal notary Juan Rodríguez and confirmed by the bishops of León, Oviedo, and Palencia.\(^{(78)}\) Another private donation of property in Burgos, dated March 4, 1120, was confirmed by the bishops of León, Astorga, and Palencia. Confirmation by minor ecclesiastics of the church of León places its issuance in that city. It is also obvious that the document was issued at court.\(^{(79)}\) On April 16, 1120 Urraca herself may have made a donation to the church of Astorga whose confirmants were her son and her daughter, her half sister, and the bishops of León, Oviedo, and Astorga.\(^{(80)}\)

Urraca also made a donation of property in Asturias on April 27, 1120, confirmed by her daughter and her half sister Sancha but not her son, and by the Archbishop of Toledo and the bishops of Astorga, León, Oviedo, and Palencia.\(^{(81)}\) Finally, in May 1120 Urraca granted a charter to the church of Oviedo, confirmed by Bishop Diego of León.\(^{(82)}\)

The character of all these documents, makes it appear probable that the queen was at León in the winter and early spring of 1120 and that they were all issued there. Together the documents indicate also the presence at court of most of her regular supporters.

Further evidence of the strength of Urraca's position may be gleaned from a letter dated March 4, 1120, which Pope Calixtus II wrote to the bishops, princes, and counts of Spain bitterly attacking the behavior of Urraca toward her son and insisting on the validity of the oath the nobles had taken to uphold the claim of Alfonso Raimúndez to the realm.\(^{(83)}\)

The information the pope had obtained was apparently well founded, for the queen had in mind a major campaign in the west of the peninsula. Since Urraca had made a tacit alliance with the north Portuguese family of Mendo Gonçalves of Maia in 1118 and accepted Paio Mendes as the new archbishop of Braga, the Infanta Teresa sought some kind of understanding with Alfonso Raimúndez and his supporters. In the young king's charter to Toledo of November 28, 1118, two supporters of Teresa, Paio
Soares and Gomes Nuñes, appeared as *alcaldes* of Toledo and of Talavera, respectively.\(^{(84)}\)

In 1119 the bishop of Portuguese Oporto became the major agent in the negotiation with Calixtus II over the elevation [144] of Compostela to an archbishopric. Although Bishop Hugh of Oporto was a canon of Santiago and friend of Gelmírez, his actions suggest that Teresa of Portugal was supporting him as a measure of opposition to Urraca. That suspicion is heightened by the charter granted to Bishop Hugh by Teresa on April 18, 1120, at which time he must have only recently returned from his eminently successful mission.\(^{(85)}\)

Urraca could not but act against such a threatening combination, and in the spring of 1120 she came once again to Galicia. By June 13, when she made a donation to the church of Compostela, she had arrived in Santiago.\(^{(86)}\)

The significance of this grant has been greatly overemphasized, first by the author of the "Historia Compostelana" and then by the historians who have followed him too uncritically. In the face of evidence to the contrary, the grant has been presented as a major, new concession to Gelmírez by Urraca that made the former, for the first time, the legally paramount authority in west central Galicia. When compared with Urraca's earlier donation of May 14, 1112, however, the grant of 1120 emerges as little more than a confirmation of the archbishop's already existing powers and the addition of some properties and privileges.\(^{(87)}\)

Indeed, despite the attempted coup of the preceding year, [145] Urraca felt little need to make concessions. The queen had come to Galicia with her son and, prior to this donation, had secured the military support of Gelmírez against the local supporters of Count Pedro Froilaz. That campaign had been markedly successful.\(^{(88)}\)

The conclusion of these operations was marked by recurring suspicions between the queen and her archbishop, which were resolved by a new pact of friendship between them, negotiated with the help of the treasurer of Cluny, who was then in Compostela. The confirmation of Gelmírez's authority on June 13, 1120 should be seen in this context and was accompanied by the renewal by the magnates of their vows of fidelity to the archbishop, saving their allegiance to the queen herself. It is noteworthy that no mention is made of similar allegiance owed to Alfonso Raimúndez.\(^{(89)}\)

Together the preceding campaign and negotiations had opened the way for an even more important drive against Teresa of Portugal, doubtless the major reason for which Urraca had come to Galicia. The aid of Archbishop Gelmírez was again enlisted, however reluctant that prelate may have been to increase even further Urraca's power in the west. Operations went swiftly and successfully. The Miño was crossed against opposition near Túy, and Teresa was driven back to her castle at Lanhoso, ten kilometers northeast of Braga, and besieged there. Urraca's forces raided the countryside as far south as the Duero.\(^{(90)}\)

On June 17, 1120 Urraca issued a charter to the church of Braga confirmed by Gelmírez and Alfonso Raimúndez as [146] well as by Count Rodrigo Vélaz and Count Alfonso Núñez.\(^{(91)}\) About this time she may also have received recognition of her sovereignty in Portugal from the young Alfonso Enríquez and his chief supporters among the nobles of the region.\(^{(92)}\) Such recognition would have left those elements in Galicia opposed to her rule without prospect of aid from the south for the first time since 1109.

Such an accord would explain Urraca's decision to consolidate her power in Galicia by ending the extraordinary authority of Gelmírez, so recently reaffirmed. By July 20, during the return from Portugal, she had made him her prisoner.\(^{(93)}\) According to the "Historia Compostelana," the archbishop
had been warned by Teresa during the siege of Lanhoso of Urraca's intentions. If that is so, it illustrates the closeness of the relations between the two and the necessity for Urraca's action.

On the evening of July 24, 1120 the queen entered Compostela and the following day informed the canons of the church that she had terminated the "honor" of Santiago, had reclaimed its castles, and intended to make an inquiry into the use the archbishop had made of his authority. The text makes it clear that Urraca was willing to negotiate the terms of the archbishop's release, for despite her threat to do so it was clearly impossible to hold him prisoner indefinitely.

Her hand was forced, however. Her son Alfonso, who had been at least a passive witness of her actions, now withdrew from her court and joined Count Pedro Froilaz, whose troops were camped near the city. Encouraged by this division, the supporters of Gelmírez among the townsmen rioted, and Urraca had to take refuge in the cathedral. She was unable to restore the city to control and finally released Gelmírez after only eight days of imprisonment on or about July 28, 1120.

But the queen would not, as our source sadly records, restore either the castles or the "honor" of Santiago, because of her need for money. Eventually Gelmírez entered into new negotiations with Alfonso Raimúndez, Count Pedro Froilaz, and Teresa of Portugal in order to recover them.

In the meantime, by August 6, 1120 it appears that Urraca was in eastern Galicia at the monastery of Samos, to which she made a donation on that date. The charter was confirmed by the archbishop of Compostela and the bishops of Lugo, Mondoñedo, Orense, and Túy as well as a large number of the secular magnates of Galicia. Their presence indicates both the continuing reality of her power and the fact that negotiations were still in process.

Urraca was probably back in León on August 21, when she granted to Cluny the church of San Nicolas in Villafranca. Villafranca is in the western portion of the diocese of Astorga on the pilgrim road to Compostela. Nonetheless, the confirmation of the charter by the archbishop of Toledo, the bishops of León and Astorga, and Count Pedro González and his brother Rodrigo, suggests that it was issued near León instead of at Villafranca. A private document of August 22, drawn up by the royal notary Juan Rodríguez and confirmed by the bishops of León, Oviedo, and Palencia, reinforces that impression.

The grant to Cluny may have been intended in part to secure the aid of that influential monastery both in negotiating with Gelmírez and the Raimundist faction and in preventing too severe a papal reaction to her brief imprisonment of the archbishop. Another donation to Cluny by Jimena Múñoz, possibly the former mistress of Alfonso VI, is dated September 20, 1120 and may evidence the same general attempt to secure the good offices of Cluny. It was confirmed by Count Pedro of Lara and his brother, Rodrigo.

Amid this concern with Galicia and Portugal, the affairs of Castilla and pacific relations with Alfonso of Aragón were not entirely neglected. Probably in August, Urraca had issued a charter to the church of Burgos confirmed by the primate of Toledo, the bishops of León and Oviedo, and by Jimeno López and his brother, Pedro, the señor of Saldaña. Although the charter is dated only by year in the copy that survives, the same Domingo Falcón of Burgos who is mentioned in it also confirmed Urraca's charter to Cluny of August 21. Possibly of the same time also was a charter of Urraca to the Castilian monastery of San Pedro de Arlanza, confirmed by the primate, the bishops of Oviedo and Salamanca, and Jimeno, bishop-elect of Burgos.

Alfonso I was also giving attention to the affairs of Castilla. A notice survives of a charter of his, dated August 1120 and issued in the "new castle of Burgos." Then or slightly earlier, the truce or understanding between Urraca and her former husband that had been formulated in 1117 was renewed.
Although neither monarch surrendered claims to Castilla, both had more immediate, pressing concerns. Alfonso's defeat of an Andalusian army at Cutanda in June of 1120 and the subsequent surrender of Calatayud and Daroca opened the way to consolidation of the entire plain on the right bank of the middle Ebro up to the limits of Medinaceli in the west and Teruel in the south. It capped his successes of the past year and a half and pointed irresistibly toward his later campaigns against Fraga and Lérida in the east. But he required time to secure his control over this great region, largely populated by the Muslim.

Urraca, on the other hand, was necessarily concerned with renegotiating her relationship with her son. In the west of her kingdom the old coalition among Count Pedro Froilaz, Archbishop Gelmírez, and Teresa of Portugal was reforming. Because she was unwilling to meet their collective demands, Urraca had to find some way to deal separately with them or, at least, with Alfonso Raimúndez. Her heir was the legal and emotional rallying point for the archbishop and the count and it was principally his plight that engaged the interest of Pope Calixtus.

No charters of Urraca are known for the remainder of the year, and the course of events must be inferred through sporadic chance references. A charter of the infanta Sancha, her daughter, dated September 27, 1120, cites Urraca as ruling in León and her son in Toledo, after the fashion usual since 1118. It also demonstrates that the strong points of León and western Castilla were in the hands of old supporters of the queen.

Then, less than a week later, on October 1, a private document of Sahagún mentions Urraca as ruling in all of Spain and "Adefonsus rex in sci. facundi." This citation might be dismissed as a simple mistake if it were not for another private document of November 8, 1120, this one redacted by the royal notary Juan Rodríguez, which reads "regnante regina domna Urracha apud Legionem filio quoque eius aput Toletum et Sanctam Facundam et Maiorigam." The document was confirmed by the bishops of Oviedo, Lugo, and Mondoñedo, all supporters of the queen, but also by the archbishop of Compostela, by Count Pedro Froilaz, by Gutér Vermúdez, the count's brother-in-law, and by Count Muño Peláez, all of the Raimundist party.

From these notices it appears that the queen had made a major concession to her son and his Gallegan supporters in the fall of 1120. The terse references probably are best understood as implying Alfonso Raimúndez's control and enjoyment of the revenues of the central block of fisc lands in and around Sahagún and perhaps extending as far as thirty-two kilometers southwest to Mayorga on the Río Cea.

The most telling pressure, which forced Urraca to consent to such a diminution of her resources, came from outside the realm rather than from within it. On October 7, 1120, from Melfi, Pope Calixtus II addressed five letters to Spain: to his new legate, Cardinal Boso, to Urraca herself, to Alfonso Raimúndez, to Archbishop Bernard of Toledo, and to the bishops of Spain. In them he demanded that Urraca release Archbishop Gelmírez and return the latter's castles and honors. If the queen were not to do so within forty days of being formally adjured by them, Cardinal Boso, the primate, and the bishops were to meet in council, excommunicate the queen and her assistants, and place an interdict on the entire realm.

Urraca's concession of control of much of the fisc lands to her son should be understood as an attempt to forestall, in the fall of 1120, the effects of such impending papal action, which she must have foreseen. Her hopes were probably based on the ambition of her son, on the fact that he was himself implicated in the initial seizure of Gelmírez, and on the adherence by all parties to the dispute to the terms of the new arrangement. The very violence of the papal reaction and the dispatch of a new legate, however, opened possibilities for compelling still more concessions that Alfonso Raimúndez, his party,
and especially Gelmírez found it impossible to resist.

The coming year threatened, at the least, the loss of control over Galicia, which Urraca had maintained since 1117. At worst, she might face general rebellion or withdrawal of support and the passage of control of the entire realm to Alfonso Raimúndez. Her unwise attempt to complete and stabilize her control in the west by seizing the archbishop of Santiago de Compostela had created a new and profound crisis, the key to which lay in the actions of Rome. As in 1110, who would rule in León-Castilla in 1121 depended largely on the papacy's reaction to a breach of church law. The queen's continuance in power depended on her ability to reach an understanding with Calixtus II, brother of her first husband and uncle of Alfonso Raimúndez.
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