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The End of the Reign and the Accession of Alfonso VII (1124-1126)

[181] The preoccupation of Alfonso el Batallador with purely Aragonese affairs continued until the
death of his former wife, roughly two years after the reconquest of Sigüenza. The status quo in León-
Castilla apparently satisfied the monarch of Aragón, for despite some provocation he busied himself
almost exclusively with attempts at rounding out his newly swollen realm southward and eastward and,
in 1125-1126, with a major effort at its repopulation out of the dissatisfied Mozárab minority of
Granada.

In February of 1124 Alfonso was first in old Aragón at Sos, then south almost at the limits of his new
lands at Daroca, but by March he had passed into the Castilian border district of Rioja, which was to
preoccupy him for the next four months. In July 1124 he issued a charter there while besieging the
castle of Haro. That fortress was the stronghold of Diego López, señor of Vizcaya and Alava as well,
and the old rebel of 1116. The insurrection was potentially serious and indicated the continuing
preference for the house of León-Castilla among the great magnates of that region. Diego López had
figured in the early documents of Urraca, and she or her son may have discreetly encouraged his plans
in 1124.

By sometime in August that unrest had ceased to be sufficiently serious to detain Alfonso in the Rioja,
and he was at Tudela on the way south. During September and October he was far from Castilla,
strengthening his frontier at the key fortress of Monreal de Campo south of Daroca and busy
encouraging repopulation just to the north of the latter. At the end of the year, back in Zaragoza,
Alfonso was still addressing the repopulation of the plain south of that city. Nevertheless, his hold on
eastern Castilla remained firm. A document of Palencia, dated only to 1124, acknowledged that he
ruled in Castrojeriz, Carrión, and Burgos. A document of Burgos dated July 18, 1124 cited his rule
there and in Nájera in the Rioja.

The largely passive character of the Aragonese occupation of eastern Castilla had few effects on events
in León-Castilla during 1124. The Batallador's concerns in Aragón proper had none at all. In Urraca's
realm the year seems characterized chiefly by further development of the cooperation between mother and son first set in train in the late fall of 1121. Initially, the activities of the year found their
focus in a council held at Valladolid and presided over by the papal legate, Cardinal Deusdedit.

Many considerations prompted the dispatch of a legate at the end of 1123. The renewal of the
understanding between León-Castilla and Aragón must have raised hopes that the consecration of a
bishop for Burgos, which had been waiting since 1119, was finally possible. The dispute between
Archbishop Bernard of Toledo and the new Bishop Alo of Astorga over disposition of the diocese of
Zamora was an inconvenience for Urraca, who needed a strong and stable authority in that outpost on
the Portuguese frontier. The quarrel between Archbishops Bernard and Gelmírez over control of the
The diocese of Salamanca was threatening to become a general confrontation with a large potential for political disruption. And, finally, Archbishop Gelmírez was working assiduously to secure the permanent transfer of the metropolitans of Mérida to Compostela. The transfer of 1120 had been merely a temporary one, pending the reconquest of Mérida from the Muslim.

The "Historia Compostelana" describes the arrival of Cardinal Deusdedit in the peninsula. As usual, the author is concerned with three different topics, which he pursues thematically, so that the chronology must be carefully reconstructed. The cardinal left Rome in late 1123, probably about the end of November, and probably arrived in Burgos in early January. Here, our source says, he found consecration of the bishop to be impossible because of the hostility of Alfonso of Aragón and decided to proceed to Santiago de Compostela.

There the cardinal spent eight days before proceeding to Braga, and discussed Gelmírez's possible consecration of the bishop of Burgos, among other matters. After his swing through Portugal the legate returned to central León and held a council of Valladolid. For a variety of reasons the most likely date of this council seems to be the second or third week of February.

When the legate arrived in Burgos the Sigüenza campaign was still in progress. It is just possible that Urraca's charter to that city on February 1, 1124 was issued in the council but I suspect not. Rather, it is probable that Urraca's charters of February 12, 1124 to the monastery of San Román de Hornija in Bierzo and of February 17, 1124 to Bishop Bernard of Zamora were issued at the council or in the gathering that preceded or succeeded it. The only surviving document of the council itself is undated. That document is a decision of the legate that, while Bishop Bernard of Zamora lives, he will enjoy the untroubled administration of his see, but that on his death it will be absorbed by the church of Astorga. It is confirmed by Archbishop Bernard of Toledo, the bishops of Osma, Segovia, Sigüenza, Salamanca, Zamora, Palencia, Orense, Ávila, Coimbra, and Oporto, and by the representative of the archbishop of Braga.

The participation of Braga was important to a resolution of the dispute over Zamora because the diocese of Astorga was Braga's suffragan. Also, the matter of to whom Coimbra was suffragan was again discussed, and both Braga and Toledo seem to have lost. In the spring of the year, Coimbra was directed by Calixtus II to recognize Compostela as metropolitan.

On another front Bernard of Toledo did slightly better. Bishop Muño of Salamanca, whom he had consecrated and whose election he had probably arranged as well, was recognized, although in June the pope would reaffirm that Salamanca was suffragan to Compostela.

It is certain that the resolution of the matter of Burgos was discussed. The council agreed to the consecration of Bishop-elect Jimeno and, probably, to his consecration by Gelmírez. From Valladolid the cardinal-legate and Jimeno proceeded to Sepúlveda. There the cardinal gave Jimeno a letter of authorization directing Gelmírez to preside at his consecration. Although the reason for this delay is not specified in our source, I believe it likely that it was to consult with representatives of Alfonso of Aragón and to secure their consent.

It is possible as well that the Peace of God was proclaimed by the council. The evidence is not unequivocal but it seems to suggest as much.

A striking feature of the Council of Valladolid was the absence of Archbishop Gelmírez and all the bishops of Galicia, with the sole exception of the bishop of Orense. Given the circumstances, their absence appears to have been intentional and was probably prearranged with Cardinal Deusdedit so that Archbishop Gelmírez would have the opportunity to hold his own provincial council to promulgate for Galicia the canons of Valladolid, thus emphasizing his independence of Toledo once again.
And Gelmírez did call a council for the middle of Lent in 1124, about March 15. Archbishop Bernard, however, on being notified of his intentions wrote a scathing letter forbidding the holding of such a council, implying that the bishop of Salamanca was improperly summoned to it, arguing that Ávila was suffragan to Toledo, and, finally, summoning Gelmírez to León after Easter to make satisfaction under pain of excommunication. To all of this the archbishop of Compostela replied in kind. He defended his consecration of the bishop of Ávila, reasserted his claim to Salamanca as suffragan, and argued his own freedom of action as ordinary of an exempt see and as papal legate.

But did Archbishop Gelmírez actually hold the council contemplated? The "Historia Compostelana" says that he did, and the major authorities have accepted that assertion. The bishops of Astorga, Mondoñedo, Ávila, Lugo, Salamanca, and Túy are said to have been present, along with Alfonso Raimúndez and almost all the magnates of Galicia. The source does not say what they did but does claim that the archbishop of Braga and the bishop of Coimbra were condemned afterward for nonattendance.

The major reason for doubting that the council of March 15 was in fact held is that yet another council was held at Compostela on April 20, 1124. It was attended by the bishops of Astorga, Mondoñedo, Lugo, Salamanca, Zamora, Oporto, and Túy. Three days later, on the advice of the council, Bishop Jimeno was consecrated to the see of Burgos, but our source states that this was not the reason for holding the council.

It seems at least possible, then, that the council of mid-March [187] was never held but that the author of the "Historia Compostelana" has confused it with that of April 20. The decree concerning the Peace of God, which was promulgated in the latter, then becomes explicable as a repetition of the action of the Council of Valladolid. The fact that the decree was addressed to the entire realm of Spain has long been noted. It was therefore more properly the work of a legate to the entire peninsula than of a legate in two of its provinces. The political sense of Gelmírez might have led him to present it as his action, suppressing any reference to Valladolid or Cardinal Deusdedit, but more probably his biographer chose this as a way to enhance the dignity of his subject.

It is certain that the council of Compostela in April of 1124 was a triumph for Archbishop Gelmírez. It underlined his influence at Rome, as with the cardinal-legate. That influence was once more to be demonstrated in June, when Calixtus granted permanent transference of the metropolitanate of Mérida to Compostela and again awarded the sees of Salamanca and Coimbra to his church. At the same time, Archbishop Bernard of Toledo was not completely humiliated. He kept his suffragan at Zamora for the present and also maintained his candidate in the see of Salamanca. Nor was it in the interests of Urraca to allow too full a triumph to the Compostelan, although she must have enjoyed seeing the primate humbled ever so slightly. She and her son had been mediating the dispute between the two archbishops and probably had much to say about the solution in the spring of 1124. Our source also admits that Urraca continued to enjoy the support and assistance of Alfonso of Aragón.

The arming of Alfonso Raimúndez by Archbishop Gelmírez at Santiago de Compostela on Pentecost, May 25, 1124, must be viewed in light of these facts. The "Historia Compostelana" speaks of an estrangement between Urraca and her son just then but does not present the event as one of rebellion. Rather, the tone of the author suggests that neither prelate nor heir could afford to offend the queen. Indeed, it is most likely that the arming of her son, an act that signalized the entrance of a young king into his majority during this period, was by permission of Urraca.

From the description of the ceremony it does not appear that Urraca herself was present. Nor, in two donations made less than a week later at Compostela, does Alfonso Raimúndez appear in the presence
of anyone of note.\(^{(28)}\) It is impossible to be sure just where the queen was at this time.

A month before the arming of Alfonso both he and his mother may have been at Astorga, possibly on their way to Galicia. On April 27, 1124 both had confirmed a private document of that church.\(^{(29)}\) After that the documentary record fails for Urraca. Her charter donating the monastery of San Fausto of Trevino to Cluny is dated merely to 1124.\(^{(30)}\) So, too, is a notice of a donation of hers to the Asturian monastery of Corias. A notice of her confirmation of a private document of Palencia, dated August 8, 1124, if it could be relied upon would place the queen and her curia in that city.\(^{(31)}\)

\[189\] On June 3, 1124 the daughter of the late Count Pedro Ansúrez made a donation to Cluny confirmed by Archbishop Bernard, the bishops of Palencia, Osma, and Segovia, and written by Petrus Vicéntez, canon of Palencia.\(^{(32)}\) Urraca does not confirm and seemingly was not present, although these bishops were among the strongest of her supporters and Petrus Vicéntez is the name of one of her most active notaries. On June 23, 1124 her daughter Sancha also made a donation to Cluny, but again Urraca seems not to have been present.\(^{(33)}\)

To conclude from this evidence that Urraca had retired from active governance of the realm in favor of her son would be unwarranted, however. Only three charters of Alfonso Raimúndez are known for this year. On April 6, 1124 he apparently issued a fuero to Santa Olalla, in the territory of Toledo.\(^{(34)}\) On November 1, 1124 he made a donation to the see of Sigüenza confirmed by Bernard of Toledo and the bishops of Segovia, Osma, Zamora, and Palencia, by Count Fernando Fernández, husband of Urraca's half sister, the Infanta Elvira, and by a Count Bertran, probably Bertran of Carrión, the cousin of Alfonso of Aragón.\(^{(35)}\) Urraca does not confirm. For late December there is notice of a donation of her son to the church of Segovia.\(^{(36)}\) Four other of his charters sometimes attributed to this year are either forgeries or misdated.\(^{(37)}\)

Rather, it appears that the actual state of affairs is best described by a private document of Palencia, dated simply to 1124, which reads "regnante rex adefonsus in castro et carrione et in burgos, Urraka regina in legione, filius suis aldefonso in toletula."\(^{(38)}\) Private documents of June 20, 1124\(^{(39)}\) and November 5, 1124\(^{(40)}\) cite Urraca as ruling in León and Alfonso Raimúndez in Toledo and the trans-Duero. In other words, the practical control of the realm remained divided between them as it had since 1117, although we may presume that the failing health of the very elderly Archbishop Bernard of Toledo was placing the actual administration of the lands south of the Duero in the hands of the young king for the first time.

The charter of the Infanta Sancha of June 23 and a private document of León dated June 30, 1124 demonstrate that the command of that royal city and the fortresses of the Leonese countryside remained firmly in the hands of faithful supporters of the queen.\(^{(41)}\) It is to be expected that by this time all but the most intransigent of these would have been reaching some degree of accommodation with the young king. Nineteen years old and heir to the realm, he must have been more rapidly becoming the political nexus of the kingdom.

\[191\] It is possible that Urraca spent the better part of the summer and fall of 1124 in Galicia. That would account for her absence from documents prepared, presumably, in the center of the kingdom and would also accord with what had frequently been her past practice. The narrative of the "Historia Compostelana" indicates that local unrest continued in that region but, neither specifies the dates nor testifies to her presence.\(^{(42)}\)

The evidence is clear that once again her half sister Teresa of Portugal was making heavy inroads into the western domains of the Leonese queen. A charter of the Portuguese sovereign to Braga on July 25,
1124 seems to indicate her presence in the north.\(^{(43)}\) The suggestion has been made that Teresa and Urraca were drawing together against the threat represented to each by the young Alfonso Raimúndez. That thesis, however, misconstrues the relationship between the young king and his mother at the time and adduces in evidence a charter universally recognized as false.\(^{(44)}\)

Instead, the Portuguese monarch was using the problems of her sister in Galicia to aggrandize herself. After Urraca arrested Count Pedro Froilaz in the spring of 1123 that old foe never reappeared in the documents. Immediately after her demise, his sons made their obedience to the young Alfonso VII at Zamora.\(^{(45)}\) Apparently Count Pedro remained a prisoner as long as Urraca lived and those of his sons who \(^{(192)}\) remained at liberty were confirmed in their support of Teresa by that fact.\(^{(46)}\)

It is difficult to ascertain how much this coalition was able to accomplish. Perhaps it was substantial enough to function as a remote cause for the liberties guaranteed to the citizens of Compostela by Archbishop Gelmirez in January of 1125.\(^{(47)}\) Broader political currents had caused the revolt of his restive townsmen before and would again. By September of 1125 Teresa had made sufficient progress to undertake an important new initiative. Her charters of September 2 and 4, 1125 made the see of Túy the administrative center for much of northern Portugal between the Limia and Miño. In return Bishop Alfonso of Túy pledged himself and his successors to recognize the rule of Teresa. The documents were confirmed by Count Fernando Pérez, son of Pedro Froilaz, by a Count Gómez, probably Gómez Núñez, who controlled the territory of Toroño roughly coterminous with the territory of the diocese of Túy, and by Fernando Juanes, the latter's son-in-law, who controlled the lands around Puente Sampayo just to the north.\(^{(48)}\) To find Count Gómez Núñez in rebellion was hardly novel for Urraca, but the defection of Fernando Juanes was another matter, for he had figured not infrequently among her supporters in Galicia.

During this same year Teresa had also secured an important concession from the new pontiff in Rome, Honorius II. On February 21, 1125 Honorius had taken the see of Coimbra under his protection while recognizing its continuing jurisdiction over the unrestored sees of Lamego and Viseu.\(^{(49)}\)\(^{(193)}\) This papal initiative undercut, at one and the same time, the claims of the archbishop of Compostela as successor to Mérida and those of Archbishop Bernard of Toledo as primate and administrator of dioceses whose metropolitan see still lay within the area of Muslim control.

The knighting of Alfonso Enríquez, Teresa's son, at Zamora on Pentecost, May 17, 1125, must be seen in this context. Sánchez Belda interpreted this event as evidence that Zamora itself had passed again into the hands of Teresa.\(^{(50)}\) Gonzaga de Azevedo saw in the event rather an assertion of independence by the nineteen-year-old Alfonso from his mother.\(^{(51)}\) I incline to agree with the latter historian. It is true that both before and after the arming of Alfonso Enríquez he appears associated with his mother in her charters.\(^{(52)}\) But that may mean no more than that Teresa had to accept the fait accompli.

Thinking forward to Teresa's deposition by her son only three years later, it is hard to see what she would have gained from arranging the knighting. And if she did, why in Zamora and presumably with the benediction of Bishop Bernard of that see, protégé of Archbishop Bernard of Toledo? Even if as I think quite likely, Teresa still cherished Leonese rather than simply Portuguese ambitions for herself and her son, why would Bishop Bernard of Zamora confer more legitimacy on that aim than Archbishop Paio of Braga? On the other hand, the advantage for Urraca and her son in encouraging the rivalry of Teresa and the infans is patent, the choice of one of their border cities obvious.

But even with such a reading, it remains clear that the \(^{(194)}\) division was slow to ripen. Until the death of Urraca not only what was to become Portugal but also southern Galicia continued in Teresa's grasp.
Urraca's failure finally to circumscribe and delimit the independent sovereignty of Teresa in the west must have been doubly disappointing because the status quo remained unshaken in the east. Alfonso of Aragón continued to be absorbed by the problems that had grown out of his conquest of the taifa of Zaragoza. Already in the winter of 1124-1125 his attention had been focused on Murâbit Andalucía by the internal troubles of that empire and the unrest within its Mozárab population. By mid-October of 1125 the Aragonese monarch was already at Valencia on his way south in what proved to be a great raid of more than twelve months' duration.

Whatever Alfonso I may have originally intended to accomplish by that expedition, its ultimate importance came to reside in the Christian Mozárabs who accompanied him on his return to occupy and populate the broad lands west and south of Zaragoza. When he returned, his former wife had already been dead some seven months.

But even before that great razzia carried him once more out of the currents of Leonese politics, his preparations for it had necessarily had the same effect. From a review of his charters of early 1125, Alfonso's preoccupation with the affairs of Aragón is noticeable. So far as the state of knowledge of his diplomas will admit, it seems evident that he had not renounced the imperial title nor his claim to Castilla. But his chancery's assertion of those claims was erratic, almost whimsical.

The king of Aragón, then, was busy elsewhere and the ambition and defiance of Teresa of Portugal resisted all remedies as Urraca's reign approached its close. Within León-Castilla there are no signs that the queen's authority diminished during this period, however. At the beginning of 1125 we cannot immediately locate her. A donation of Alfonso VII to the church of Toledo, dated January 19, 1125, seems to indicate that the young king had kept his Christmas court there. Urraca does not confirm it, nor do any of the prelates of the realm. With a few exceptions the lay confirmants are largely unknown, presumably local figures.

The outstanding exceptions are the confirmations of Count Bertran, Martin Pérez, and Froila Pérez. The first of these is undoubtedly that cousin of Alfonso of Aragón who at this time controlled both Carrión and Logroño for the Aragonese monarch. Earlier he had confirmed Alfonso Raimúndez's charter to Sigüenza of November 1, 1124. Count Bertran's growing familiarity with the court of León-Castilla cost the Aragonese his control of Burgos in 1127. Martin Pérez is probably to be identified as the son-in-law of the late Count Pedro Ansúrez, and Froila Pérez as the latter's Son. Thus, the family of the great Leonese count was beginning to drift into the circle of the young king.

The queen had probably spent Christmas at Sahagún. She was probably there still on February 20, 1125, when Muño Románez and his wife made a donation to Cluny of a property that had been given to them by the queen. Urraca is mentioned twice in the document but does not confirm it. But Archbishop Bernard does, along with Archbishop Gelmiirez and Bishops Pedro of Lugo, Diego of Orense, and Muño of Mondoñedo. This concentration of Galician prelates at her court probably indicates Urraca's continuing preoccupation with the affairs of that province, which I have argued for 1124 and 1125. She was certainly there on March 19, 1125, when Abbot Bernard issued a new fuero to the men of the village. Urraca confirmed it along with her daughter Sancha, as did a large gathering of the monks of the abbey and the burghers of the town. It is worth noticing that the abbot issued it "concessione regine dominae urracae."

I believe that she held Easter court there as well. The evidence is a charter of donation to Sahagún made on March 26, 1125, Holy Thursday, by the Countess Doña Mayor, wife of Count Pedro Froilaz. The extant copy cites Archbishops Bernard of Toledo and Gelmírez of Compostela and the bishops of León, Oviedo, Astorga, and Palencia, all of whom I suspect confirmed in the original. A long list of court nobles surely also confirmed, and Urraca and her son, who are merely cited in this copy, probably
confirmed as well. It would have been a gathering such as this that would have discussed encouraging the young infans of Portugal to proclaim himself of age.

On May 10, 1125 the queen made a joint donation, together with Count Rodrigo González, of the Asturian monastery of Vega to the French religious convent of Fontevraud.[197] The charter was confirmed by her son, the bishops of Astorga, León, and Zamora, and the abbot of Sahagún, as well as a few court figures.[61] On the whole, it seems probable that the court was still at Sahagún, her son and heir in attendance, and the two acting in concert.

The accord between Urraca and Alfonso Raimúndez continued and even increased, as was demonstrated particularly in the religious sphere. On December 24, 1124 Pope Calixtus II had died in Rome. Although he could best be described as a partisan of the young Alfonso and former enemy of Urraca, there is no sign that the queen capitalized on his demise to attempt to strengthen her position vis-à-vis her son. Then, in early April of 1125 the venerable Archbishop Bernard of Toledo died. The primate, as much as the late pope, had helped to maintain peace and balance between Urraca and her son since 1119. Again there is no evidence that his passing altered their relationship. The choice of his successor, Bishop Raymond of Osma, was acceptable to both mother and son.

Indeed, the two jointly directed a curt letter to the archbishop of Compostela sometime in the spring or summer of 1125 warning him not to take advantage of the vacancy to diminish the dignity of the primatial see. In his reply Gelmírez comments on their newly found amity, which operated to his disadvantage.[62] But the prelate of Santiago was to discover new limits for his own actions and for the possibilities of his see just at this time. In January of 1125 he had addressed an appeal for a crusade in Spain to the clergy, princes, and Christian people.[63] It is impossible to know how [198] far his ambition for his church and its patron went, but it seems certain that he aspired to the legateship for all of Spain and perhaps even for the transferal of the primateship to his apostolic shrine. On April 13, 1125, already aware of the death of Calixtus and, it may be, of the death of Archbishop Bernard, he had sent an embassy to Rome.[64]

But the hopes of the archbishop of Compostela were to be dashed in every quarter. Urraca had rarely been his ally and usually his opponent. He had lost Alfonso at the moment when the boy king's rule of Toledo became a reality and the primatial see thus, inevitably, the chosen instrument of the latter's policy. Now the two remained united to close further options for him in Spain. Worse, when another embassy of his reached Rome in late 1125 or early 1126, they found the new archbishop of Toledo and the bishop of Coimbra already there and complaining of him.[65] The new primate and the old adherent of Toledo could have been sent only by Alfonso and Urraca. Not only did Gelmírez not secure the legateship for all Spain, but the new Pope Innocent II would not even renew his legatine powers for the western provinces of Braga and Compostela.

In the late spring Urraca and her son seem to have visited Galicia. On June 1, 1125 the young Alfonso granted a charter to the church of Mondoñedo that was confirmed by the queen. The text of the grant indicates that perhaps Bishop Muño had entered the service of Alfonso and marks yet another step in the transfer of allegiances from queen to son. There are no episcopal confirmations, and the lay confirmants are almost all identifiable as Galicians.[66] This is the last known occasion on which Urraca and her son were together. The young Alfonso alone grants one charter, dated September [199] 11, 1125, to the monastery of San Pedro de las Dueñas. The two charters that each of them is supposed to have granted separately to the Castilian monastery of Silos on July 21, 1125 are both forgeries.[67] In the charter of September 11 Urraca's son styles himself "hispanie rex" and it is confirmed by the Archbishop of Toledo and the bishops of Palencia, León, and Astorga.
In the late summer Urraca was probably in Castilla, where she confirmed an exchange of property between the monastery of Silos and Count Pedro González. The transaction was also confirmed by the bishops of Palencia and Burgos; the lay confirmants are mostly Castilians.\(^{(68)}\)

Conceivably Urraca never thereafter left Castilla, where she died early the following spring. There is no reliable information about her activities from this point on. The available evidence suggests that she continued to rule, as well as to reign, right up to her death. Her supporters held the key positions in León and western Castilla.\(^{(69)}\)

Similarly, the only evidence for the activity of her son during \[200\] this period comes from the bulls of Honorius II of November 30, 1125. These two letters confirmed the election of Raymond of Osma as archbishop of Toledo and also his legatine and primatial powers as archbishop, his jurisdiction over sees whose metropolitanate had not been restored, the possessions of Toledo, and León, Oviedo, and Palencia as his suffragans.\(^{(70)}\) The letter of notification of the election sent by Alfonso Raimúndez is mentioned by Honorius.

For some of the events immediately preceding the queen's death we must rely once again on the "Historia Compostelana." As so frequently, the information is incidental to the purposes of the author. In the late winter of 1125-1126 Archbishop Gelmírez was waging war on Fernando Juanes, the lord of Puente Sampayo, and partisan of Teresa of Portugal. In all probability Gelmírez was acting as Urraca's ally, although the narrative presents the quarrel as a local one growing out of that noble's seizure of some burghers of Compostela. Before the campaign itself Gelmírez had excommunicated the offender and his supporters and had imposed an interdict on his lands.\(^{(71)}\)

At this time an embassy from the archbishop was waiting on the queen. Their purpose was to secure the return of the castle of Cira, which the author alleges had been sold to the prelate by the queen but then enfeoffed back to her. We may conclude that the surrender of the castle, some twenty kilometers southeast of Compostela, was the price of Gelmírez's support against Urraca's enemies in southern Galicia. The embassy had found the queen ill to the point of death and already ordering her affairs. One of the arrangements she made was for the return of the castle of Cira to Gelmírez.\(^{(72)}\)

Shortly thereafter, on March 8, 1126, Urraca died at Saldaña \[201\] on the Río Carrión in the Tierra de Campos. The sources differ as to whether it was March 8 or 9 but the former, given in her epitaph at León, is preferable.\(^{(73)}\) We do not know whether her illness was an extended one or not. The testimony of the "Chronicon Compostelanum" that she died during the birth of a child conceived in adultery must be heavily discounted because of the obvious hostility of the author. Moreover, Urraca was approximately forty-six years old at the time of her death.

On the day of his mother's death Alfonso VII was at Sahagún, some thirty kilometers to the west. There Gelmírez's embassy found him and secured his agreement to uphold the wishes of his mother concerning the castle of Cira.\(^{(74)}\) The next day he rode to León, where he was received as king by Bishop Diego, the clergy, and the people. But the royal fortress in the town, the "towers of León," refused to recognize the young king and opted initially to support the late queen's consort, Count Pedro González of Lara, and his brother, Rodrigo González, Count of Asturias de Santillana.

In a matter of days, however, the great magnate Suero Vermúdez, Count of Astorga and Bierzo, rode in to pledge his loyalty together with his brother, Count Alfonso Vermúdez. When negotiations by Bishop Diego and the two counts with the castellan of the towers failed to produce results, the fortress was quickly taken by assault. Apparently the resistance was not much more than a token one and the king was generous to the defeated. Shortly thereafter the magnates of León, Asturias, and of the key posts in western Castilla appeared to make their submission.\(^{(75)}\)
Ah of this must have taken place fairly quickly. Archbishop Gelmírez received his first intelligence of Urraca's death while campaigning against Fernando Juanes in southern Galicia. Returning to Compostela he encountered there a delegation from the young Alfonso asking him to proceed to León in order to crown the new monarch. The archbishop left his cathedral city for León on April 2, 1126. Given time for the embassy to Galicia to be organized and to make the trip, it seems probable that it had taken Alfonso VII something like two weeks to consolidate his control of León, Astorga, Asturias, and parts of Castilla.

The young king seems to have had few misgivings as to the solidity of his control over that portion of his realm. When Gelmírez arrived in León on Holy Saturday, April 10, 1126, he found that the king had already departed. On Easter Monday the archbishop celebrated mass for the soul of Urraca, buried in that royal city, and a new embassy from the crown asked him to proceed to Zamora to join the king. The following day, April 13, the archbishop of Compostela set out for Zamora accompanied by the bishops of Mondoñedo, Lugo, Astorga, and Oviedo. When he reached Zamora he found, doubtless to his chagrin, that he had been preceded there by the archbishop of Toledo and also by the bishops of Segovia, Palencia, Salamanca, and Ávila.

Probably before Gelmírez's arrival, Alfonso VII had taken an initiative that would further constrain his former guardian and ally. The young king had met with his aunt, Teresa of Portugal, and her consort, Count Fernando Pérez of Galicia, at the little village of Ricobayo some twenty kilometers east of Zamora and less than fifteen from the modern border of Portugal. With them he had arranged a peace whose terms or duration we unfortunately do not know. We do know that among those who made their submission at Zamora were Count Gómez Núñez and Fernando Juanes, recently partisans of Teresa, as well as the sons of Count Pedro Froilaz. Also tendering their loyalty were the leaders of the party of Urraca in Galicia, Count Rodrigo Vélaz and his brother, Count Guter Vélaz.

To this first general curia of Alfonso VII's reign also came the nobles of the trans-Duero, but that must have been a foregone conclusion. More important, some of the other great nobles of León and the Tierra de Campos who had held back now made their obedience. Finally, the brothers of the house of Lara, Counts Pedro and Rodrigo González, seeing the rapidity with which the power of the new Leonese monarch was growing, decided they must submit as well.

Whether these last came in person to Zamora is impossible to say with certainty. They do not appear as confirmants to the two known charters of Alfonso VII that were issued at Zamora. But the Infanta Elvira, Urraca's daughter by Count Pedro González, was there and made a donation to the church of Santiago. It is possible that both she and her brother, Fernando, were in fact hostage at the royal court for the good behavior of their father.

The long-awaited change of reigns had taken place, and even been consolidated, by April of 1126. Scarcely a month after Urraca's death, the constant threat of civil war in Galicia had been ended by the mere accession of her son. The new king had received the homage of the remainder of the realm and had made his first major decision in peninsular affairs. Reversing the decade-old policy of his mother, he made peace with Teresa of Portugal in order to be free to pursue the recovery of eastern Castilla from Alfonso of Aragón. He would rapidly discover, as had his mother, that to separate the two problems was beyond the power of any Leonese monarch of the age.
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