Urraca's attempts in 1121 to negotiate a settlement that would maintain the integrity of her rule in León-Castilla and salvage what she could of her position in Galicia were enormously complicated by the growing strength of her opponents. Deprived by the queen of his honor and his castles, Archbishop Gelmírez turned again, as so often before, to an alliance with Count Pedro Froilaz in order to repair his fortunes. Meanwhile, the head of the house of Trastamara had drawn his own alliance with Teresa of Portugal even closer.

A document of the Portuguese monastery of Lorvão dated January 24, 1121 cites his son, Fernando Pérez, as holding Coimbra and Portugal. Whether Count Fernando became the husband of Teresa or merely her consort and lover remains an open question. But he first appeared as a confirmant in her charter of February 1, 1121 and continued by her side until both were defeated and expelled from Portugal by her son, Alfonso Enríquez, in 1128. The liaison suited the purposes of the Portuguese queen, who had never given up her designs of controlling the entire valley of the Miño from Túy to Orense. She in turn was the ideal ally for Pedro Froilaz, whose lands lay in the northwest of Galicia. Between the two lay west central Galicia, since July of 1120 under the direct control of Urraca.

The Count of Traba and the Portuguese ruler were, however, uncomfortable allies for Gelmírez. Once his honor was recovered, he would find them to the north and south of his domains as Urraca did now. But for the moment he had no choice. Moreover, as archbishop of the see of Santiago and papal legate for the provinces of Braga and Mérida, he had a prestige and an ecclesiastical machinery that his allies and foes alike found difficult to counter. Already in 1120 he had summoned the bishops of those provinces -- Coimbra, Braga, Túy, Orense, Mondoñedo, Lugo, Astorga, Salamanca, and Ávila -- to meet in council at Compostela on January 9, 1121. In the case of Salamanca and Ávila, it was the bishops-elect who were summoned, probably both of them Gelmírez's own choices for the posts.

Under the circumstances prevailing in midwinter 1121, the meeting could hardly be other than a council of war directed against Urraca. That being so, the supporters of the queen refused to attend and were suspended from episcopal office by Gelmírez. These were the archbishop of Braga and the bishops of Coimbra, Lugo, and Mondoñedo. The bishop of Astorga would not have attended for much the same reasons but may have pleaded illness and died before year's end, thus escaping both censure and our notice. The inability of Teresa of Portugal to compel the attendance of Coimbra and Braga is a commentary on her weakness at this time. What the council effected the "Historia Compostelana" does not say, but it is certain that secular concerns were a large part of its agenda.

Urraca, meanwhile, wintered in León. A donation of Count Fernando Fernández, husband of the Infanta Elvira, dated February 25, 1121, was confirmed by the prelates of Toledo, Palencia, and León and the familiars of her court. Urraca herself does not confirm, but the document was prepared by her notary Pedro Vicéntez. Conciliation seems to have been the policy of the day, for the dating formula
cites Urraca and her son as rulers in León and in Galicia.\(^{(5)}\)

She was still there on March 4, 1121, when another faithful supporter, Count Suero Vermúdez, made a donation to the church of Burgos. It was confirmed by the bishops of León, Astorga, and Palencia, by many of the usual court figures, including Count Pedro González of Lara and his brother, Rodrigo, and by three minor clerics of the church of León. Urraca did not confirm. In this case the dating formula states only that the queen ruled in León.\(^{(6)}\)

The queen remained in León as late as April 16, 1121, when another document of Count Fernando Fernández was prepared by her notary Juan Rodríguez. Neither the queen nor any of her bishops confirmed this one but Count Pedro González and her majordomo did, along with a number of other court figures. Urraca and her son are cited as reigning in Spain. The queen may have been preparing a campaign in Galicia at this date, for Count Rodrigo Vélaz, her staunch supporter and master of the territories of Lemos and Sarria, which would he along her route, also confirmed the document.\(^{(7)}\)

After receipt of the letters of Calixtus II threatening excommunication and interdict, Urraca, the "Historia Compostelana\(^{[156]}\)" tells us, reopened negotiations with the archbishop of Compostela. These broke down because of the insufficiency of the royal offers and the intransigence of the prelate. The queen then raised an army and invaded Galicia. She marched to the castle of Cira, not far off the pilgrim road west of Compostela. Then she struck south to Tabeiros and Salnes, where there was a concentration of fisc lands, probably to secure provisions. From there the royal army moved north again toward Compostela, taking up a position on Picosacro barely ten kilometers from the city.

Gelmírez raised an army, as did Count Pedro Froilaz and also the young Alfonso Raimúndez, and took up a position on the lower slopes of the mountain. Following some skirmishing, the archbishop successfully arranged a peace in order to prevent needless bloodshed.\(^{(8)}\)

These events are probably to be dated to midspring of 1121, for on May 23 Urraca issued a donation to one of her Galician supporters "in obsidione super Acromonte."\(^{(9)}\) It is likely that the reference is to Picosacro but has been garbled in transmission. But it is noteworthy that it is the royal force that appears to be on the offensive and that the document was both confirmed by Alfonso Raimúndez and prepared by his chaplain. We may at least suspect that the concessions made to Alfonso Raimúndez by his mother during the preceding fall had satisfied the former, that by the spring of 1121 he was again collaborating with her, and that the accuracy and veracity of the "Historia Compostelana" are not without lapses.

Whatever the precise sequence of events, peace was made \(^{[157]}\) for the moment. Urraca swore to protect the archbishop's person, his honor, which evidently was restored to him, and to return his castles by Christmastime. The oath is dated simply to 1121.\(^{(10)}\) Although he is not mentioned in this connection, the negotiations may have taken place in presence of Cardinal Boso, the papal legate, and Bishop Guido of Lescar, who was traveling with him.

It is certain that in the spring of 1121 the legate attended a council at Compostela and that Urraca, her son, the archbishop of Braga, and the bishops of Oporto, Túy, Orense, Lugo, Mondoñedo, and Segovia were present as well. We are told that two pieces of business were transacted there. First, the election of Sancho of Ávila was scrutinized and afterward he was consecrated to that see. Second, it was decided to hold a national council at Sahagún on August 25 to deal with the problems of the church and the realm.\(^{(11)}\) It seems probable that also in this context Archbishop Paio of Braga became a canon of Santiago and regularized the conditions under which he would hold some possessions of Santiago de Compostela in Portugal.\(^{(12)}\) In yet another piece of business, it is likely that at this council Bishop Gerald of Salamanca made his obedience to Gelmírez as metropolitan. Gerald had been consecrated in
Rome and may have returned in the company of the legate. (13)

All things considered, the situation had developed very favorably for Archbishop Gelmírez. He had secured royal recognition for his candidates at Ávila and Salamanca. He had also retrieved his control over west central Galicia and most of his castles.

But the interests of Teresa of Portugal had been unrepresented; none of her current supporters attended the council. [158] Having been restored to his honor, Gelmírez was again an enemy, not an ally. The same situation may have obtained for Count Pedro Froilaz, who also does not appear at the council. According to our source, during this time the archbishop laid siege to his own castle at La Coruña to recover it from the hands of Vermudo Froilaz, the count's son. (14)

But the realm was to see much more ominous developments during the summer. It is clear that the accord achieved at the council in Compostela broke down quickly and that a new crisis developed. Although the reasons remain obscure, the result is clear enough. When the council scheduled for August 25, 1121 met in Sahagún, it was supposed to have been composed of "all the bishops and abbots from Burgos to the ocean." (15) Instead it was attended only by the archbishop of Braga and the bishops of Coimbra, Porto, Túy, Orense, Mondoñedo, Salamanca, Oviedo, León, and Segovia. The most prominent supporters of the queen among the episcopacy are absent from a council presided over by a cardinal-legate and to whose convocation Urraca herself had agreed. The primate of Spain was not there, nor were the bishops of Osma, Palencia, and Lugo. Jimeno, bishop-elect of Burgos, was not there even though he was still in need of papal approbation for his consecration. Bishop Pelayo of Astorga was absent as well, but that may be attributable to illness rather than to party persuasion.

Among those in attendance, most had compelling ecclesiastical necessities, and all need not be adjudged willing parties to the aims of Gelmírez and Cardinal Boso. Since Urraca's invasion of Portugal, Archbishop Paio of Braga was a fugitive from Queen Teresa. Gonçalvo of Coimbra and Hugh [159] of Oporto were still seeking favorable resolution of their boundary dispute. Munio of Mondoñedo was involved in another boundary dispute with Gelmírez. And Bishops Pelayo of Oviedo and Diego of León, as sees directly dependent on Rome, may not have been able to resist the summons of its legate. It is possible also that the bishops of Oviedo, León, and Segovia were there to negotiate on behalf of the queen.

The participants and canons of the council and one of its acts are known to us from Portuguese sources. The terms of settlement of the boundary dispute between Coimbra and Oporto previously laid down at Burgos in 1117 were upheld, and Teresa of Portugal was so informed. The twelve canons dealt with transgressions of church law but "on account of all these evils" an interdict was to be leveled on the entire realm of Spain, to begin on November 11. (16)

Urraca is not mentioned in any of the sources, but she must have been the object of this threat. Such a sanction would advertise her as incompetent and estranged from the church. It would be a virtual invitation to depose her.

But well before August the monarch must have been painfully aware that her only hope lay in appealing to Calixtus II himself against his legate. Cardinal Boso was no impartial negotiator but a friend and virtually a pensioner of Archbishop Gelmírez. (17) It appears that immediately after being appointed legate he had written to Gelmírez asking, in effect, how the latter wished his legatine powers to be used. (18) In fact, the absence of Gelmírez from the council at Sahagún may have been a device to secure at least the appearance [160] of impartial proceedings. (19) In any event, the archbishop was kept informed of what had transpired at Sahagún. (20)
How Pope Calixtus was persuaded to intervene in the affairs of the realm and effectively to set at naught the designs of his legate and the prelate of Compostela is impossible to say. Perhaps the latter was responsible for his own undoing.

The pontiff may have been dismayed by the vigor with which the new archbishop of Santiago de Compostela set about building his province and exercising his legateship for it and the province of Braga. As early as June of 1121, Calixtus acted to support the metropolitan rights of Braga by confirming its authority over the sees of Galicia and Portugal. At the same time he removed Braga from the legatine authority of Gelmírez and reproached the latter for his aggressive proceedings against that church. Whereas the pope indicated his willingness to bear the further claims of both parties, he had administered a major check to the ambitions of the archbishop of Compostela.

Still, that rebuff must have paled to insignificance after the papal action of November 3, 1121. Scarcely a week before the interdict threatened at Sahagún in August would have begun, Calixtus made a sweeping renewal and major extension of the authority of Archbishop Bernard of Toledo, who had not even attended the council. The pope confirmed the legatine authority of Bernard over all of Spain except the provinces of Braga and Mérida, the latter now transferred to Compostela. Bernard's primatial authority over all of Spain was confirmed as well. But the metropolitan rights of the see of Toledo were not only reaffirmed; they were extended to include the dioceses of León and Oviedo, until then directly dependent on Rome itself.

Coming as they do at this time, the papal letters can be read only as a repudiation of the attempt by Cardinal Boso and Gelmírez to force the abdication of Urraca in favor of her son. They spring from a reconciliation of the pope, the queen, and her son mediated by the Archbishop of Toledo. The confirmation of rights was made at the explicit request of Alfonso Raimúndez. Urraca herself was nowhere mentioned in the letters, and it is best understood that the full confidence of Calixtus reposed in the primate rather than in the queen or her sixteen-year-old son. Bernard was the key to the agreement, and the aged former monk of Cluny was strengthened against the archbishop of Compostela. For that reason, León and Oviedo were subjected to him even at the expense of direct papal authority and certainly also to the diminution of Urraca's influence with them.

Although the papal letters make no reference to it, there is a possibility that Archbishop Bernard effected this extraordinary result by a personal journey to Rome. I can find no indication of his presence at home in peninsular documents between September of 1121 and the following spring. On September 1, 1121 he and the bishops of León and Palencia confirmed a charter of Urraca's daughter the Infanta Sancha to the monastery of San Pedro de las Dueñas. Probably issued at León or Sahagún in the presence of the court, it cited Urraca as ruling León and Alfonso Raimúndez Toledo, and the lay confirmants included Count Pedro of Lara, his brother, Count Rodrigo, and a number of other stalwarts of Urraca's court.

[162] Shortly thereafter, on September 13, 1121, the primate and the bishops of León, Palencia, and Oviedo confirmed a private donation to Sahagún. After that date Bernard is absent from such documents until late the following spring.

No doubt the queen's preoccupation with these matters forced some neglect of the affairs of Castilla. There is a reference to a charter of hers, now lost, granted to the cathedral of Burgos but dated simply to 1121. There is a similar reference also to a charter of hers to the monastery of Oña. But her purported charter to Oña dated July 5, 1121 is hardly creditable. It is, I believe, a forgery modeled on the genuine charter of July 5, 1116. Yet it may record the fact that Urraca was in Castilla during the summer of 1121.
Nevertheless, Alfonso of Aragón appears to have made no attempt in 1121 to capitalize on his former wife's difficulties. Now, as often before, the good sense of Urraca's policy of a vaguely defined truce in the east was demonstrated. Despite its costs, it had left her free from interference by the Aragonese in the affairs of her own realm since 1117. All during this troubled year her husband had devoted himself to consolidation of his own growing kingdom. In February 1121 he was at Montearagón busy with repopulation.\[29\] \[163\] By September, however, he had moved ten kilometers west of Burgos to Tardajos, which he was besieging.\[30\] In the following year, when he became aware of the dramatic growth in the power of his old enemy, Archbishop Bernard of Toledo, and in the authority of his young rival for Toledo and the imperial dignity, Alfonso Raimúndez, the Aragonese monarch would be forced to concern himself more forcefully with the affairs of León-Castilla.

As events developed, it was Teresa of Portugal who reacted first. Perhaps as early as the summer of 1121 she had invaded southern Galicia and reappropriated the valley of the Miño. On February 17, 1122 she issued a charter to the inhabitants and to Bishop Diego of Orense. Among the confirmants of that document are the abbot of the monastery of Celanova south of the city, Velasco Muñez, and Counts Fernando and Gómez. The latter are probably Count Fernando Yáñez, señor of Puente Sampayo on the border between the dioceses of Túy and Compostela, and his son-in-law, Count Gómez Núñez, señor of the territory of Toroño, roughly coterminal with the diocese of Túy.\[31\] It appears that by this date all of southern Galicia had passed into her hands. These magnates, along with Velasco Muñez, had been opponents of Gelmírez and sometimes partisans of Urraca or Alfonso Raimúndez by turns. They had now decided that the Portuguese sovereign would be the surest guarantor of their interests.

Urraca had no choice but to meet this newest challenge \[164\] from her half sister. The itinerary of the Leonese monarch is impossible to follow in the fall of 1121 and the early winter of 1122. On February 28, 1122 she issued a charter to the church of Palencia, but in view of events almost immediately subsequent, perhaps it was granted at León. Among the confirmants of the charter were the archbishop of Toledo and the bishops of León, Oviedo, Mondoñedo, and Segovia, as well as Count Pedro of Lara and his brother. The donation was made jointly with her son, who also confirmed.\[32\]

A week after this major gathering of the prelates of the realm, Urraca had moved on, apparently to Lugo. On March 7, 1122 the queen, her son, her daughter Sandia, Archbishop Diego Gelmírez of Compostela, the bishops of León, Oviedo, and Lugo, and the prior of the monastery of San Zoil in Carrión confirmed the donation to Cluny of the Asturian monastery of San Salvador de Cornellana by Count Suero Vermúdez and his wife. The lay confirmants are a curious mixture of Galicians and Asturians, and the document was prepared by a canon of León.\[33\]

The most likely interpretation of the document is that Urraca had come to Galicia prepared for either war or peace. Lugo was a city that had long been especially loyal to her, and its bishop was her former chaplain. Moreover, it was only a day's march from Compostela or Orense.

The following day Archbishop Gelmírez celebrated a council of the provinces of Braga and Mérida in his city at the direction of Urraca and her son. These latter, we are told, remained with the bishop of Lugo. In addition to the Bishops Sancho of Ávila and Muño of Mondoñedo, the \[165\]other prelates who attended the council -- Orense, Túy, Coimbra, and Oporto -- all came from lands controlled by Teresa of Portugal. Their presence was probably by her leave, and even as her representatives, since the unfortunate archbishop of Braga was unable to attend. He was a refugee from his ruler's wrath and stayed safely in Zamora.\[34\]

On the other hand, Bishop Gerald of Salamanca, who had been staying with Gelmírez since being expelled from his own see, absented himself from the council just days before it occurred. His presence there would have been most unwelcome to the archbishop of Toledo, who still struggled to retain
Salamanca as a suffragan see. Presumably it would have been intolerable also for Alfonso Raimúndez and his mother. (35)

Although the "Historia Compostelana" says nothing about the business of the council except that the diocesan boundaries of Oporto were discussed, I believe that its most important agenda was the negotiation of a peace between Urraca and her sister. It seems, too, that most of the immediate differences between them were resolved, for Teresa was able to move south. On April 5, 1122 she forced a settlement of the old boundary dispute between the sees of Oporto and Coimbra in the presence of the most important of the Portuguese magnates, including those formerly associated with the party of her son. (36) On May 24, 1122 she rewarded her consort, Count Fernando Pérez, in a charter issued together with her son, Alfonso Enríquez, the enmity between the latter two apparently having subsided for the moment. (37) Shortly thereafter she felt strong enough to arrest the archbishop of Braga, who, trusting to the general reconciliation of the times, had returned to his church. (38)

[166] The settlement must have allowed for some sort of condominium of Urraca and Teresa over the valley of the Miño. About this time Bishop Diego of Orense issued a charter to the men of Orense by the grace of Urraca, her son Alfonso Raimúndez, and "Queen" Teresa. (39) Moreover, both the bishops of Orense and Túy as well as the abbot of Celanova were in attendance at Teresa's court and confirmed the charter that she gave to Coimbra on November 3, 1122 in the presence of her son and Count Fernando. (40) Teresa further strengthened her position in the north by marrying her daughter, Urraca, to another of the sons of Count Pedro Froilaz, Vermudo Pérez, and arrangement to which Archbishop Gelmírez was party. (41)

The terms must also have been acceptable to Queen Urraca, for she moved down into Compostela after the council. There she confirmed a charter that her son granted to the Compostelan monastery of San Martín de Pinario on March 22, 1122 in the presence of Count Pedro Froilaz, Archbishop Diego, and the bishops of Ávila and Orense. (42)

[167] This charter is significant too for its indication of the changed state of affairs in the realm. Martín Peláez signs it as "curia regis publicus notarius" and so marks his transferal from the chancery of Urraca to the incipient chancery of her son. This is also the first charter that Alfonso Raimúndez issued in four years, if we disregard the very questionable ones of 1119. (43) The young king issued no other charters this year, but a private document of Sahagún, dated December 12, 1122, cites him as ruling in Toledo and Sahagún, indicating his retention of control of the fisc lands around that monastery gained in late 1120. (44)

Within a week Urraca had returned to León. There, on March 27 and 28, 1122, she granted two charters to the church of León. At her court were Alfonso Raimúndez, her daughter Sandia, and the bishops of Mondoñedo, Lugo, Oviedo, Segovia, and Salamanca. The last, Gerald, here makes his final appearance in the documents. He may have come to court to plead his case. The lay confirmants are mostly Leonese. (45)

[168] Sometime during the next months the queen effected the consecration of Bishop Alo to the vacant see of Astorga. (46) The consecration could have taken place at León, Astorga itself, or quite possibly at Zamora. Archbishop Paio Mendes of Braga, the metropolitan of Astorga, was at this time in Zamora, a refugee from the wrath of Teresa, and he probably officiated. A royal tour of that Portuguese border district would have been expedient, and in 1122 there is a citation to a now lost charter of Urraca and her son to the church of Zamora. (47)
The royal circuit of the districts bordering the emerging realm of Portugal seems to have continued into Galicia. On July 23, 1122 a donation of Archbishop Gelmírez was confirmed by Urraca and her notary Fernando Pérez, as well as by Bishop Muño of Mondoñedo. Virtually every other confirmant was a member of the church of Santiago.

Little more than a month later, on August 28, 1122, the long-standing dispute over diocesan boundaries between Compostela and Mondoñedo was resolved by a compromise. Urraca does not appear as a confirmant in this agreement but it must have required her assent and, probably, her presence to effect.

In any event, on September 2, 1122 a private document of the church of Astorga seems to indicate the presence of the court there. The queen did not confirm it but the bishops of León, Oviedo, and Mondoñedo did, along with Archbishop Gelmírez. The text of this late copy is very rough, but it cites Urraca as ruling all Spain and her son as holding Toledo and Galicia. If it can be relied upon, its reference to Galicia indicates yet another increase in the power, or rather the dignities, of the young Alfonso Raimúndez.

There is no further notice of the queen or her whereabouts until November 11, 1122, when she granted the village of Fresno el Viejo to the Hospitallers. It is certain that at the end of the year she was at León with her court. The confirmations to a private document of León, dated December 13, 1122, establish the presence of the queen, her son Alfonso, Archbishop Bernard of Toledo, the bishops of León, Astorga, and Palencia, Count Pedro González, and Urraca's son-in-law, Fernando Fernández.

Without doubt one of the chief concerns of this Christmas court was the activities of Alfonso of Aragón in the latter part of the year. From February through June of 1122 his movements are reasonably easy to trace, from the vicinity of Zaragoza eastward toward Lérida in April, then north in May to receive the homage of Count Centulo of Bigorre, and south again in June to grant a fuero to the men of Puente de la Reina. These are activities suggestive of a monarch consolidating his position in preparation for a major initiative, and in all the known documents Alfonso styled himself emperor and claimed the rule of Castilla.

After June the whereabouts of the Aragonese ruler are unknown until, in November, he granted a charter at Olmedo in the trans-Duero, some twenty kilometers east of Medina del Campo and forty-five kilometers south of Valladolid. The following month in the village of Fresno, probably Fresno de la Fuente, some seventy kilometers northeast of Segovia, he made a donation to Bishop Peter of Segovia, he made a donation to Bishop Peter of Segovia of lands near that city. In that document, which is a curious mélange of Leonese and Aragonese chancery forms, he styled himself emperor and again claimed the rule of Castilla. Moreover, his supporter Jimeno Jiménez is cited as holding the trans-Duero.

In the late summer of 1122, then, Alfonso of Aragón made a calculated demonstration and perhaps a great raid, or razzia, against not the Leonese territories of Urraca but precisely those lands then actively held by Alfonso Raimúndez under the tutelage of Archbishop Bernard of Toledo. He could hardly have expected to maintain himself permanently so far west. More likely he was seeking to strengthen the hand of Urraca in the Leonese kingdom, counting on the ambiguous attitude of her supporters south of the Duero toward the installation of Alfonso Raimúndez, and seeking from the latter and the primate of Toledo some sign of their willingness to continue the détente along the Castilian and Sorian frontier that had prevailed between himself and Urraca since 1117.

His conciliatory attitude is manifest in his issuance of a charter to the church of Segovia, held by Archbishop Bernard's protégé, and in the fact that the charter recognized not only the continuing control of Jimeno López, Urraca's majordomo, in Soria but also Bernard as Archbishop of
Toledo, Peter as bishop of Palencia, and another protégé of the primate, Bernard, as bishop of the yet to be reconquered Sigüenza. These actions bespeak an invitation as much to the council table as to the field of Mars.

It appears that the invitation was accepted and the necessary assurances and guarantees furnished to the king of Aragón, for he does not reappear in the trans-Duero during the reign of Urraca. Nor do any charters later issued by Alfonso I mention any claims to it, with the continuing exception of Soria, although he continued occasionally to use the title of emperor. The indications are, then, that an understanding was reached at the beginning of the year 1123.

First of all, it is possible that at this time such a pact would have been due for renewal. If the original agreement for a truce on the eastern frontier, made in Burgos in 1117, had been for three years and had been renewed for yet another three years in the spring of 1120 after Alfonso's capture of Calatayud, then it had nearly reached its term. Beyond the possibility that its reconsideration was due in any event, the changing balance in León-Castilla between Urraca and her son during late 1121 and 1122 would have made the Batallador much more anxious about his western frontier. Moreover, the Aragonese monarch's central concerns remained the further aggrandizement, consolidation, and repopulation of the realm of Aragón, more than doubled in size by the capture of Zaragoza and subsequent initiatives. His actions during the next three years demonstrate this very clearly.

The much-discussed creation of the Cofradía of Belchite provides indirect testimony to the negotiation of such an understanding. That charter of Alfonso of Aragón, preserved in a later charter of Alfonso VII of León-Castilla, was confirmed by Archbishops Bernard of Toledo and Gelmírez of Compostela and by Bishops Raymond of Osma, Bernard of Sigüenza, and Peter of Segovia. It must have been an extraordinary event that brought together five of the prelates of León-Castilla with the Aragonese ruler and six of his own bishops. Unfortunately the document does not provide the date of this meeting. Rassow assigned it to the years 1120-1125 on the basis of the presence of Bishop Pedro of Segovia and Archbishop Bernard and thought the date was probably closer to 1120. May of 1123 has been suggested, but at that time Gelmírez was in Galicia, as will presently be shown. The most detailed attempt to date it is the work of Antonio Ubieto Arteta, who places it between February and May of 1122, based finally on the absence of the bishop of Pamplona, who had died in February 1122, and the appearance of his successor in May of the same year. But it is possible to imagine reasons for the absence of a bishop other than the vacancy of the see.

I suggest a date of December 1122 or January 1123. The necessity for important negotiations then has already been established. As will appear, the Leonese bishops who confirm the charter do not seem to have been at Urraca's court in those months. Moreover, if the negotiation entailed some delineation of respective spheres of influence along the southwestern frontier of Aragón with the new appanage of Alfonso Raimúndez in the trans-Duero and Toledo, then the Leonese bishops who were present are just those whom we would expect to find. Archbishop Diego Gelmírez, whose appearance at the court of his longtime enemy is extraordinary indeed, had been the young king's guardian and adviser for years. Archbishop Bernard had recently emerged as the latter's mentor. The bishops of Osma, Sigüenza, and Segovia would have been immediately involved in any agreement regarding the practical disposition of authority in this border district.

It seems likely, then, that an agreement was concluded between Alfonso I of Aragón and Alfonso Raimúndez in late 1122 or early 1123. The interests of the young king were represented chiefly by the primates of Toledo and to a lesser extent by Gelmírez. They agreed to refrain from attacking the hold of the Aragonese on Castilla at Carrión, Castrojeriz, and Burgos, and also on Soria. In return the
Batallador agreed not to press his claims in the trans-Duero region or Toledo and, in particular, not to intervene in the Leonese-Castilian reorganization of the eastern reaches of the realm of Toledo. This cleared the way for the campaign there against Sigüenza later in the year that would finally liberate that fortress, and projected episcopate, from Muslim control.

The activities of Alfonso I in the first half of 1123 seem to support the assumption that his concerns in the west had been settled, at least for the time. As early as February he was at the castle of Gardeny, which he had raised near Lérida. He was still there, as were six of the bishops of his kingdom, in May. In undertaking this campaign, which occupied him until midsummer although it proved fruitless, the Aragonese ruler ran the risk of conflict with Count Ramón Berenguer III of Barcelona, who had his own designs on the city. Such an initiative is more understandable if he was indeed assured of peace with León.

On January 19, 1123 Urraca herself was still in or near León and made two exchanges of properties with its bishop. No bishops confirmed these documents but Alfonso Raimúndez did, indicating that he continued in the court of his mother at this time. Besides Count Pedro of Lara, the lay confirmants are Leonese nobles. The brothers Jimeno and Lope López are not present and, indeed, do not reappear in the charters of Urraca. In the place of the latter Guter Pérez confirms as majordomo. Once again there is a hint of the slow shift in the allegiance of officials and magnates from mother to son and heir that emerges in these years. By the fall of the year Lope López appears as the alférez of Alfonso Raimúndez.

Again this year the queen demonstrated the importance that she attached to maintaining her position in Galicia by visiting that province during late winter. As usual she depended in these visits on her considerable local support there; a private document of León, dated February 24, 1123, reveals that most of the important lay figures of her government were still there even though Urraca had apparently already left.

On March 8, 1123 she was at Lugo, where she confirmed a private donation to that church. Except for her former majordomo, Fernando Muñoz, she was surrounded by the magnates of Galicia, including Count Pedro Froilaz and his sons. Her own son seems not to have been with her.

She was, of course, in a city almost invariably loyal to her since 1112 under its bishop, her former chaplain. She seems also to have been fortified by the support of Pope Calixtus. It is possible to see the papal approval of her policy of the past year in the confirmation of the possessions of the church of Lugo and the extension of papal protection to that see on February 5, 1123. The same sort of approval for the developing cooperation of mother and son may also be reflected in the pontiff’s confirmation of the rights and the possessions of the church of Segovia on April 9, 1123, at the request of Urraca’s son.

In any event, the Leonese queen felt strong enough to make major changes in this outlying and troublesome province. Even the author of the "Historia Compostelana” admits that Galicia was part of her domain at this time and that her son was effectively under her control. According to the story from that source, Urraca imprisoned Count Pedro Froilaz and his sons and moved to reclaim their honors. When she did this is not made clear, but it was probably subsequent to the date of the charter of March 8. Then she reaffirmed and renewed her alliance with Archbishop Gelmírez by a pact dated March 27, 1123. This agreement was confirmed by the bishops of Mondoñedo and Astorga and by her consort, Count Pedro González of Lara.

It appears that the queen spent the remainder of the spring and summer in Galicia reestablishing her authority. On May 18, 1123 she exchanged some territories with Gelmírez in the presence of the
bishops of Mondoñedo, Lugo, Túy, and Orense, and large numbers of her Galician supporters. The attendance of the bishops of Orense and Túy suggests that she had once again materially strengthened her hold on the lands of the Miño valley. On the other hand, her half sister Teresa of Portugal had mended her own stormy relations with the archbishop of Braga, who had confirmed the Portuguese monarch's charters of November 3, 1122 and January 8, 1123.

Urraca may not have returned to León until late September; at least, a now lost document of hers, dated September 21, 1123, recorded an exchange of lands with a monk of the monastery at Foncebadón, which lay in the west of the diocese of Astorga on the pilgrimage road from Compostela. On October 7, 1123 a private document of Sahagún indicates the presence of the court there, including the primate, the bishops of León and Palencia, Count Pedro González, and a good number of her regular supporters, although the queen herself did not confirm it.

She seems to have spent about a month in the vicinity of León, no doubt preparing for the forthcoming campaign against Sigüenza. She may also have effected the consecration of Muño to the episcopate of Salamanca, for his name begins to appear in the documents shortly afterward. On November 4 and 5, 1123 she made two donations to the see of León, which her son confirmed; the latter of these shows the bishops of Astorga and Oviedo present. This second document is also remarkable for the confirmation of one "Fernandus Petri minor filius," whom I take to be Urraca's son by Count Pedro González. It is a sign of the solidity of the queen's position in the realm that there could be such public recognition of her son by this union.

Under the circumstances of the time, however, such recognition raised no question as to her proper, designated heir. On October 29, 1123, at court, Alfonso Raimúndez had granted a charter to one of his mother's most faithful supporters, Bishop Raymond of Osma. It was confirmed by Urraca herself, by the primate, by the bishops of Segovia, Sigüenza, and Zamora, by Count Pedro of Lara, and by that important magnate of the Toledan realm, Fernando Garciaiz of Hita.

This charter is most important, for it shows the young monarch for the first time surrounded by what may be called a full court of his own. Melendo Bofino, of Portuguese or Galician extraction, appears as his majordomo and Lope López of Rioja as his alferez.

By November 11, 1123 the preparations for the Sigüenza campaign were already under way, and Urraca's charter of that date to the bishop of Segovia was probably granted in the latter city. It shows the queen accompanied by Bernard of Toledo and the bishops of Palencia, Osma, Sigüenza, León, Astorga, Salamanca, and Zamora. Count Pedro González, Count Suero Vermúdez, and Fernando Garciaiz figure among the lay confirmants. Perhaps a result of the dislocations in the royal entourage growing out of the necessities of organizing the campaign, this is one of the two charters of Urraca prepared by William of Narbonne.

[178] From Segovia the court proceeded to Toledo, where on November 30, 1123 Urraca made the very generous donation of a tenth of the income of the possessions of the fisc in Toledo and its territories to Archbishop Bernard. She was surrounded by the bishops of Palencia, Osma, Sigüenza, León, Salamanca, Zamora, Oviedo, and Segovia, Count Pedro González of Lara and his brother, Rodrigo, Count Suero Vermúdez, Fernando Garciaiz of Hita, a number of magnates now associated with her son's court, and others of the church and city of Toledo. The size of the gathering indicates the scope of the effort against Sigüenza, and the interest in it of Pope Calixtus himself may be reflected in the confirmation of the document by his chaplain, Bonetus. On the preceding day Alfonso Raimúndez had made a similar donation of a tenth of his income in Toledo to the cathedral.
Of the events attendant on the capture of Sigüenza nothing is known except that by the last week of January 1124 it had passed into Christian hands. On February 1, 1124 Urraca endowed the bishopric there with portions of her income from Atienza and Medinaceli.

It is difficult to estimate which realm had profited more from the Leonese reconquest of Sigüenza. Without at least the tacit assent of Alfonso of Aragón it would hardly have been possible; that city, in Christian hands, erected yet one more obstacle on the old road of Muslim advance from Córdoba toward his new conquests on the plain of the Ebro. On the other hand, although Atienza, Medinaceli, and Sigüenza in the control of Urraca and Alfonso Raimúndez closed the gap east of the Guadarramas leading north into his lands around the Ebro, they just as firmly sealed off his own prospects of expansion southwest of the Sierra de Albarracín. His consent to that eventuality registers his own estimate that opportunities for aggrandizement were better to the east in Lérida and in the southeast toward Valencia. In any case, he still needed to be concerned primarily with repopulation of his recent extensive conquest, as his activities in the next few years show.

Also implicit in this stance, however, was the surrender of the imperial title. Without access to the imperial city of Toledo, he could hardly maintain that claim. Without the imperial title, the Aragonese right to continue in the possession of Soria and Burgos, even perhaps the Rioja, was seriously weakened. So the events of late 1123 and early 1124 did much more than strengthen the eastern flank of the realm of Toledo, to which the Muslim position at Cuenca now became the most advanced threat. In fact, they pointed to the Peace of Tamara in 1127 and the recovery of Burgos, Soria, and of the imperial title.

Somewhat less directly, these events effected the exclusion of Aragón from the central meseta and the consolidation there of the hegemony of León-Castilla. Eventually the concessions of Alfonso I in 1123 were to be as fateful as those of Urraca had been in 1117. Both delimited decisively the possible frontiers of León-Castilla and of Aragón. In both cases, a practical assessment of relative strengths resulted in a basically sound political decision. Neither monarch was likely to have been unaware of the strategic options that he or she surrendered. Yet both chose a realistic stance based on the strength of what they disposed of and on the necessity for internal consolidation. In 1117 Urraca opted to hold Castilla and forgo Zaragoza. In 1123 Alfonso I opted to hold Zaragoza and forgo Toledo.
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