By the close of the year 1112 the government of the realm had been firmly established. The marriage to the king of Aragón was over and there was to be no joint government of the kingdom. Count Henry of Portugal was dead and his widow, the queen's half sister Teresa, no longer had designs so great as to supplant Urraca. The queen's son, Alfonso Raimúndez, had become an heir and thus something less than a rival, although eventually he would again become one. If Urraca was still embattled in east and west, in the center of her father's domains lay a block of lands firmly under her control in which a regular government could be reconstituted.

The constitution and functioning of the royal curia of Urraca are recorded essentially in the products of her chancery, which formed no small part of the former. Besides those charters there remains only a fragmentary and fitful record of the doings of her government, sometimes illuminated in the chroniclers of the period. No reflective, administrative sketches, such as a constitutio Domus Regis, or even a Fürstenspiegel are known for the period. The foundation, outlines, and in many ways even the limits of what can be known begin and end with Urraca's charters. That being so, a consideration of the curia begins with a consideration of her chancery.

From the not quite seventeen years of her reign, some one hundred eighteen charters of the queen have survived in whole or in substantial part. The rest are mere notices of documents and confirmations to private documents. That is a meager record in comparison with the more than fifteen hundred charters and writs of her contemporary, Henry I of England, but even allowing for the fact that his reign was more than twice as long. It does suggest, however, roughly the same level of activity recorded for another contemporary, Louis VI of France, again allowing for the greater length of his rule. Closer to home, the chancery of her son, Alfonso VII, is credited with roughly one hundred eighty charters during the early years of his reign between 1116 and 1135, a period that partially overlaps his mother's rule. Still, the smallness of the sample compounds the problems of diplomatics; at most, only twenty-five of the known charters are originals, and perhaps as few as seventeen.\(^1\)

The script used by the notaries of Urraca's writing office itself indicates something of the transitional character of her reign. All of them wrote in a Visigothic script already strongly influenced by the Carolingian.\(^2\) Although there are minor variations from one notary to another, in general the \(b, e, f, h, k, l, q, r, s,\) and \(t\) remain basically true to the native forms. On the other hand, the French script's \(a, g, i, m, n,\) and \(p\) have supplanted the indigenous forms.

Although the notarial hand betrays considerable modification from the usage of the chancery of Alfonso, the style and form of the various elements of the charters show little change from the traditional. The dating formula is somewhat altered but usually continues to give the day, month, and year of issuance, the latter in the Spanish era. Only rarely is the place of issuance given. The seal continues to be drawn \(^2\) rather than an impressed or affixed one. It differs from that of her father chiefly in its incorporation of the queen's name. This practice was, perhaps, the older tradition in the peninsula in both public and private documents, but Alfonso VI had not adhered to it.
These charters were, overwhelmingly, the work of a small group of five men whose careers in Urraca's chancery for the most part overlap. Their work tells us something of the politics of the court. Of none of these is this more true than the first to be considered, Martín Peláez. A canon of the church of Santiago, he first appears "eo tempore in curia comitis et infanta palatina notarius cf." in a charter of Count Raymond to the Galician monastery of San Vicente de Pino, a donation of uncertain date. He also appears in a charter of the count to the church of Santiago on March 17, 1107, but merely as a confirmant.

Canon Martín did not figure in the early chancery of Urraca, which is not surprising for someone identified with the Raimundist faction and an official of the church of Gelmírez. His first charters occur in the fall of 1111, just when Urraca was working out an alliance with that group against her husband, Alfonso of Aragón. Martín's chancery career illustrates the temporary and opportunist character of the queen's connection with the Galician magnates. More than a decade later, when the young Alfonso Raimúndez had formed a chancery of his own, the canon became an important part of it, disappearing from the court of Urraca.

During the period he served the queen, Martín Peláez produced some fifteen of those of her charters that preserve the name of the notary; three are originals. The formula and style of these documents demonstrate the relative lack of standardization that is typical of Urraca's chancery, although their diversity is perhaps somewhat magnified by the small number of originals relative to copies. Nonetheless, the use of the imperial title by the queen is illustrated in two charters of 1112, the latter of which is an original. Urraca employs the imperial title on a mere handful of occasions at the beginning of her reign, when it may have been a conscious device to offset the authority of her "imperial" husband.

In references to himself, Martín styled himself "chancellor" in no less than five charters, all of them of the dark days of 1112. None of these is an original, but they come from widely scattered churches. Before and after 1112 Martín ordinarily calls himself "notary." Although the two titles are not paired in the charters that survive, the use of both "empress" and "chancellor" is occasional, quite unusual, and seems to be defensive. The vestiture of empire was probably felt to be even more exclusively masculine than the other parts of Urraca's inheritance.

There was another Martín notarius in the chancery during much of this same time. Between December 1110 and January 1116 he produced fine known charters, two of which are originals. On the basis of script and diplomacy he must be distinguished from Martín Peláez, but nothing more can currently be established about his identity. He never employed the title of chancellor nor styled Urraca empress.

The most prolific member of the chancery was Fernando Pérez who has left twenty-two charters, though perhaps only one original in his own hand. His products cover the period from August 1110 until November 1123, and after Urraca's death he became a member of the chancery of Alfonso VII. A personal reference in a charter of 1113 tells us that he was at that time a canon of both the churches of Santiago and of León. In 1115 he also appeared as a canon of Santiago and notary of the queen in a donation of Bishop Gelmírez of Santiago to the Gallegan monastery of San Martín Pinario. In 1123 the "Historia Compostelana" speaks of him as "Reginae Cancellarium" and he may also have been that cleric of the queen whom she entrusted with a minor role in negotiations with Gelmírez in 1120 when the latter was briefly her prisoner. Unlike Martín Peláez, Fernando Pérez appears first in the service of the queen and then as the canon of Santiago. It is possible that the latter dignity was a result of his position in the chancery.
In the charters for which he is responsible, Fernando Pérez [210] never himself employs the imperial title. Nor does he refer to himself as chancellor but almost invariably as notary. There are two charters in which he calls himself "scribe." These instances, like others to be considered shortly, militate against Sánchez Belda's suggestion that a species of cursus honorum existed in the chancery at this time. The terms clerk, scribe, notary, and even chancellor seem to be used as simple synonyms.

Certainly that is the case with Juan Rodríguez. In the nine charters of Urraca that he prepared between July of 1109 and June of 1116, he alternately styled himself clerk and notary. Three of these are originals. We know little about his career beyond the fact that he frequently prepared private documents, six of which survive and show that he was still royal notary as late as 1121. He also employed the imperial title for Urraca just once, in late 1110.

The final regular member of her chancery was Pedro Vicéntez. Between March 1115 and February 1124 he is responsible for fifteen charters, of which two are originals of his own and his confirmation of a third an original. Pedro does not use the title of chancellor but that of notary with few exceptions. He does not use the imperial title for Urraca. Of his career outside the chancery we currently know only that on June 3, 1124 one "Petrus Vicentii Palentinus sedis canonicus" composed a private donation for the daughter of Count Pedro Ansúrez.

This brief examination reveals the chancery under Urraca as a moderately busy place. Its center is a group of five notaries whose service to the queen is relatively permanent, with a variety of others pressed into service on occasion. The former were professionals, and two of them subsequently passed into the nascent chancery of her son in an identical capacity. The diplomatic norms they employ are far from completely standardized, but they have become regular. The genesis of this body is hard to explain, especially given the paucity of surviving charters for the last years of Alfonso VI. It seems probable that there was little institutional link with the chancery of Alfonso VI but that a strong awareness of the latter's procedures influenced those of Urraca's chancery. Finally, in its operations it remained Urraca's chancery and never became that of her husband or her son. Like the realm itself, it was only the queen's to direct.

Through this chancery the queen associated her rule with the dynasty as a whole. By this means she could, while maintaining control, enhance her authority. Of no one is this more true than of her son, heir, and possible rival. The young Alfonso confirms or is cited in no less than thirty-seven of the seventy-one charters of her reign dating after 1113. Her daughter Sanche confirms or is cited in some twelve documents of the same period and Urraca's half sister Sanche in the same number. This evidence indicates that the royal progeny were frequently at court, and perhaps more frequently than their confirmations indicate. It is, however, unwarranted to make them, singly or as a group, an invariable part of it.

Besides the regular members of the chancery discussed above, court officials are relatively few. The chief among these is, of course, the majordomo, whose title in the documents may be variously expressed. "Mayordomus regine" is the most common form but "mayordomus palacie" and "mayordomus curialis" are also employed. Other well-attested variants are "villicus palacie," "villicus curie," "egonomus regine," and "dapifer regine."

There are four nobles who hold this position from 1110 until the end of the reign. The first is Guter Fernández, who first appears in that capacity on October 15, 1110 and whose last appearance is on January 22, 1117. Altogether he confirms twenty of Urraca's charters in those years. That would indicate the ordinary presence of this official in the curia, but his confirmation of charters is not strictly necessary, for it is sometimes absent even in the originals.
This powerful Castilian noble was señor of Castrojeriz and had been frequently in the court of Alfonso VI. Beginning in 1134, he appeared as majordomo of Alfonso VII. Son of Maria Ansúrez, the sister of Count Pedro Ansúrez, he was an ally of the latter, sharing his fortunes. He was seldom at court in the latter years of Alfonso VI, when the influence of Raymond and Henry had procured his uncle's exile, and dropped out of the court of Urraca shortly before count Pedro's death in 1117. Initially he probably supported the marriage to the Batallador but by the fall of 1110 he had rallied to the queen. His self-interest as a Castilian noble, holding not only Castrojeriz but also allied by his marriage to Toda Díaz to the powerful Riojan family of the Ordóñez, would have inclined him to oppose the pretensions of the Aragonese monarch. The same circumstances made him a not inconsiderable influence at court against the Castilian [213] Laras and on behalf of his own. family, the Castros, also of Castilla. He and his family probably opposed the truce initiated in 1117 with Aragón because it left much of their lands in the bands of the Batallador. Guter himself, it will be remembered, was implicated in the coup directed against Count Pedro González in 1119.

Quite different was Jimeno López, Urraca's second majordomo, who served in that capacity from at least July 4, 1117 until August 21, 1120. He confirmed no less than sixteen of the queen's charters during that period. He came from a Vizcayan family of Ayala who had been supporters of Alfonso VI's annexation of Rioja from 1076. Nevertheless, from 1109 the family had been forced to cultivate its relations with Aragón. In documents of Alfonso I of Aragón of 1118 and 1119, Jimeno is twice mentioned as holding Soria and once as señor in Soria and Burgos. Although he appears in Urraca's court as early as February of 1114, his promotion to majordomo in 1117 should be seen as part of the general, temporary, understanding between the two monarchs. That understanding cleared the way for the Batallador's successful siege of Zaragoza in 1118. When that conquest led to the extension of his power westward into Soria, it would have been natural to entrust those lands to someone in whom both he and his former wife had confidence until the border could be adjudicated.

Jimeno was succeeded by his brother, Lope López, who became Urraca's third majordomo between April 16, 1121 and March 28, 1122. He figures in but three of her charters. Until 1119 he was closely associated with Alfonso of Aragón [214] and appears in a dozen of his charters, usually cited as señor of Calahorra. After October 1123 he passed to the party of the young Alfonso VII, appearing as his alférez. His career, too, is a clear indicator of the political currents of the peninsula.

The last of the queen's majordomos is Guter Pérez, who confirms three charters of Urraca in 1123 and is cited also in a private document of León. Little is known of him. In the second of the documents he is identified as "Gotherrius petrez orcus" (Auca?). A Guter Pérez confirms some ten other charters of Urraca between 1114 and 1124, so we may infer that he was probably a court figure. There was, however, another Guter Pérez, identified as "alter" in the private document of León.

In the earlier period, one Muño Gutiérrez served as majordomo between July 1109 and September 1110. It is not possible to identify him further.

The office of alférez at the court of Urraca is almost invisible. In 1109 Count Pedro González twice appears as holding that dignity, but there is no subsequent appearance of the title for the remainder of the reign. It looks very much as though that rank was felt to be not quite grand enough for Count Pedro once he became the lover and informal consort of Urraca. At the same time, the military aspects of the post were too important for the count to have allowed anyone else to hold it.

What is, in all probability, a very minor officialdom of largely clerical character is reflected occasionally in the charters when they are confirmed by a "clericus regine" or a "capellanus regine." Sometimes one or the other is pressed into service to compose a charter, and occasionally they go on to greater things. Thus, the "Historia Compostelana" tells us, a Chaplain Pedro of Urraca was elected to
succeed a bishop of Lugo of the same name in 1113.\(^{(26)}\)

In addition to the officials of the curia, whose ordinary presence may be presumed, the royal entourage had a floating membership, sometimes in attendance and sometimes not. Prominent among these were the archbishop of Toledo and the bishops of Palencia and León. Each of these prelates appeared as a confirmant in roughly a third of all Urraca's charters. It would be an exaggeration to speak of these three as "court bishops," but it is obvious that they were very frequently at court and the charters must indicate only some of those occasions. It is possible to regard them as regular advisers of the queen.

Less frequent members of the court are the incumbents of the important bishoprics of Astorga, Compostela, and Oviedo, each of whom appears as a confirmant in roughly fifteen percent of the royal charters. Symptomatic of the growing particularism of the Portuguese territories is the rarity of appearance of the archbishop of Braga or the bishops of Coimbra, Túy, and Porto. Similarly, in the east, the bishop of Calahorra never appears and the bishop of Burgos only infrequently.

Bishoprics like those of Ávila, Segovia, Sigüenza, and Zamora were, of course, reestablished only late in the reign but the bishops of the Gallegan sees of Lugo, Mondoñedo,\(^{(216)}\) and Orense and those of Osma and Salamanca were rarely at court. The evidence indicates that the abbots of the great monasteries of the realm played a surprisingly diminutive role in the court, even the abbot of Sahagún appearing very seldom.

The same evidence of the royal diplomas indicates that a group of lay magnates constituted an equally important group of advisers and consultants of the crown, at least some of whom seem to have been permanently resident at court. Of these, Count Pedro Ansúrez may be considered first. Señor of Carrión, Saldaña, and Cabezón, the great Leonese noble confirms some twenty-nine of Urraca's charters from 1109 until his death in 1117. His virtually continuous presence at the court and that of his nephew, the majordomo Guter Fernández, was one of the permanent political factors of the court until his death. Moreover, Count Pedro was allied, by the marriage of his daughter, to Alvar Fáñez until death removed the "duke" of Toledo from the scene in 1114.\(^{(27)}\)

But the influence of the great Leonese count was already clearly second to that of the queen's lover, the Castilian Count Pedro González of Lara, who appears in no less than fifty-two of her charters. Pedro, who was count of both Lara and Medinaceli and held the fortress of Peñafiel on the Duero, was powerfully related also. His brother, Rodrigo González, was count of Asturias de Santillana and himself confirmed some fifteen of Urraca's charters.\(^{(28)}\) Rodrigo was also the husband of Urraca's half sister the Infanta Sancha.\(^{(29)}\) When that marriage took place is difficult to determine. This daughter of Alfonso VI and his fourth wife, Elizabeth, could not have been born before 1101 at the earliest. It therefore seems likely that the marriage was part of the political arrangements of Urraca's reign and probably took place after 1112, when Pedro González had secured his own position and when the queen had a relatively free hand.

The strong position of Count Pedro González at court would have been further consolidated by the birth and then the betrothal or even marriage of his children by Urraca. When these children were born is impossible to say. Their son, Fernando Pérez, seems to make his earliest appearance in a private document of November 5, 1123, which Urraca and his half brother Alfonso Raimúndez confirm also.\(^{(30)}\) When he married we do not know, but it was likely to have been after Urraca's death.\(^{(31)}\) Their daughter, Elvira, was perhaps born earlier than her brother, making her debut in the documents in September 1117.\(^{(32)}\) The authorities all assert that she was first married to García Pérez, son of Count Pedro Froilaz of Traba.\(^{(33)}\) I can find no documentary warrant for it, but such a marriage would most likely have taken place, given her birth in 1112 at the earliest, sometime between 1120 and 1126 and was doubtless a part of the royal policy of pacifying Galicia. Her second marriage to Count Bertran,
nephew and ally of Alfonso I of Aragón, must have occurred during the reign of Alfonso VII and may have been part of a settlement in Castilla with his former stepfather. (34)

The dynasty was not allied exclusively with the family of Lara, however. Nor is it likely that Urraca would have wished it to be. Her half sister the Infanta Elvira, born of Alfonso VI's marriage to Elizabeth of France, was married to Count Fernando Fernández. This union may have taken place relatively early in Urraca's reign, for already in 1117 the count appeared as the husband of the infanta in a donation that he and his wife made to Cluny. (35)

The monastery granted in that document was Ferrera in Galicia, but it may have been part of his wife's inheritance. Count Fernando himself seems to have been Leonese rather than a Gallegan. He is sometimes cited in the local documents of León. In 1120 his wife sold a property that she held as a result of their marriage and that appears to have been in the territory of León. (36) And in 1121 the count himself made a donation of property in the territory of León to a supporter. (37) Though a person of considerable influence in the realm, Count Fernando seems not to have been a regular member of the court. Only nine of the queen's charters bear his confirmation.

As for the remainder of the royal family, Urraca's daughter by Count Raymond, the Infanta Sancha, never married. Urraca's son Alfonso Raimúndez married first shortly after her death. It is fair to suppose that in both his case and that of her son Fernando, by the Count of Lara, Urraca opposed a marriage during her lifetime. Any such marriage would almost necessarily have created another nexus of power in the realm, one that could have been manipulated by others if not by the principals themselves. Finally, over her half sister Teresa of Portugal the queen simply had no control.

If Count Fernando Fernández was not a court figure despite his royal marriage, there were roughly a half-dozen other magnates who can reasonably be so styled. One of the most important of them is Pedro López, brother of two of Urraca's majordomos, Jimeno and Lope López. He confirms nineteen royal diplomas between 1114 and 1125. After the death of Count Pedro Ansúrez in 1117, Pedro López comes into possession of the strategic point of Saldaña aud, probably, Ansúrez's other lands along the upper reaches of the Río Carrion.

The impressive position of Castilian and Riojan nobles at court was effectively balanced by the continuing influence of those of León. Besides those already mentioned is Count Froila Díaz of Astorga. Count Froila had been prominent in the later years of the reign of Alfonso VI and an early associate of Count Raymond. As count of Astorga he held that key position for Urraca and against Alfonso of Aragón in the years 1110-1112. Between 1109 and 1119, when he disappears from the documents, Count Froila confirmed twenty-seven of the queen's charters.

Pedro Díaz also confirmed twenty-seven of her charters. Again, he is a figure from the later court of Alfonso VI and seems to have had some slight connection with Count Raymond. But there is no discernible family connection between him and Count Froila. He seems to have been Leonese, appearing in the private documents of the monastery of Gradefes. (38) In 1118 he held the critical position of the towers of that city. He apparently supported Urraca through the troubled last years of her reign and is portrayed as a rebel against Alfonso VII at the beginning of his reign. (39)

Although Count Suero Vermúdez held the very important castle of Luna in the mountains of León from at least 1117 until 1125 and was styled count of León in 1114 and again in 1116, it would be misleading to see him as a purely Leonese magnate. He had been important in the later court of Alfonso VI, had figured in the circle of Count Raymond, and also held the district of Monteroso in Galicia. He was married to the Countess Enderquina, who endowed the see of Burgos in 1120, which marriage connected him very well with the Castilian nobility. (40) He was himself related to the old royal family of
León through his grandmother. His donation to Cluny in 1124 comprised lands scattered through the
whole kingdom north of the Duero. Suero Vermúdez confirms, as such, eighteen of Urraca's
carters. Including the confirmations given merely as Count Suero, he confirms thirty-one.

The major holdings of the family may have been concentrated in León, however. Count Suero is most
likely a relative, probably a brother, of Rodrigo Vermúdez, whose name appears seventeen times as
confirmant in the Urracan diplomas. Private documents of León suggest that the latter was
identified primarily with that area.

Although, as we have seen, nobles with definite Galician connections such as Froila Díaz and Suero
Vermúdez were regularly part of the court of Urraca, almost no purely Gallegan magnates seem to have
been resident at court. One exception might have been Rodrigo Vélaz, Count of Lemos and Sarria in
eastern Galicia. He confirmed eighteen of Urraca's charters, sixteen of them between 1112 and 1120.
Count Rodrigo also seems to have been a newcomer to such circles; there are few notices of his
presence in the court of Alfonso VI.

On the other hand, one is hesitant to see Count Pedro Froilaz as a member of court. True, he
confirms some fifteen diplomas of Urraca -- a surprising number for a noble, sometimes rebel, who led
the party of her son. Still, that number includes nine donations to Gallegan sees or monasteries, eight of
which were probably granted in Galicia itself, where the count would have been present for just that
reason. After 1121 Count Pedro does not appear at all in the queen's documents.

Whereas the Gallegan presence in the curia was very scant, that of the original heartland of the
kingdom, Asturias, was nonexistent. No noble of that province appears with any regularity in the
documents. It may be that Count Rodrigo Múñoz, who held the important Asturian fortress of Aguilar
all through this period, was usually present. Many of the diplomas of Urraca were confirmed by a
Count Rodrigo, but there are five known other Rodrigos who could have been so designated. The main
influence from that province in the court seems to have been Bishop Pelayo of Oviedo, who confirmed
fifteen royal charters. Despite the lack of attention, Asturias remained remarkably loyal to Urraca,
although it often sowed revolts against her son and successor.

The region south of the Duero was also very weakly represented. Perhaps the demands of the frontier
precluded any substantial residence at court. Perhaps, too, the influence in those lands first of Alfonso I
of Aragón and then of Alfonso Raimúndez made it impolitic for holders of land there to follow Urraca's
court. The one obvious exception is Fernando Garciaiz of Hita and Guadalajara. He seems to have
confirmed at least twelve charters. In 1107 this somewhat mysterious person was alcalde of Medinaceli
and Guadalajara. When Urraca granted him the villages of Hita and Uceda in 1119, he had just
married Estefanía Armengol, the granddaughter of Count Pedro Ansúrez. Fernando was thus solidly ensconced in the trans-Duero and to the northeast of Toledo. This key region was the focus of
interest for the Murábits, Alfonso of Aragón, and Urraca over the next six years and vital to the
reconquest of Sigüenza, which Urraca was to effect in 1124. It is possible that the reason for Urraca's
confidence in Fernando was that he was her first cousin, son of the ill-fated King García of Galicia.

From this overall picture the court of Urraca emerges as a relatively small body. A reasonable estimate
would have it comprised of an average of four notaries and perhaps two minor clerics, a majordomo,
three bishops fairly regularly present and an average of two other bishops from one see or another
whose attendance is occasional, and a group of eight great nobles regularly present with perhaps
another dozen whose presence also varies with the occasion or location. Altogether, allowing for one
other member of the royal family, the curia, or consultative body for major decisions, would number
just over thirty.
Because the charters usually do not specify their place of issue, it is difficult to trace the geographic movements of the court. Sporadic notices in the contemporary chronicles and the substance of the charters indicate that León or Sahagún was the preferred place to spend the winter months from November through March. From April through October, when the needs of campaigning and political accommodation were most pressing, the court moved to the perimeters of the realm. During the years 1113 to 1116 that most frequently meant the Burgos area, for the frontier with Aragón was practically undefined. From 1117 to 1121 the court tended to take up residence in or near Galicia as Urraca sought to maintain and enlarge her hold on that province and Portugal. After 1121, a new level of activity in the region beyond the Duero moved it to the region of Soria and Sigüenza.

If the itinerary of the court corresponded roughly to the political realities of the kingdom, so did its composition. León-Castilla was the nucleus of Urraca's realm, and the ordinary presence of the bishops of León and Palencia in the curia reflect that fact. At the same time, the presence as well of the archbishop of Toledo indicates both the importance of the primate of the peninsula and the firm intention of the queen to maintain her claims to that virtually new kingdom beyond the Guadarramas. The practical loss of Rioja and the tenuous character of Urraca's hold on eastern Castilla are reflected in the lack of attendance by the bishops of Calahorra aud, usually, Burgos.

In the west the loss of Portugal and the threatened loss, for a substantial period, of the Zamora, Salamanca, and Túy regions find similar expression. Galicia, Asturias, and even Astorga, though integral parts of the kingdom, were increasingly peripheral to its fundamental polities, as the uneven attendance of their respective prelates demonstrates. On the other hand, political relations were close, almost too close for the desires of some, with Galicia, and two of the five royal notaries can be identified with the church of Santiago.

Identification of the nobles ordinarily attendant on the queen illustrates much the same phenomena. Count Pedro González, his brother, Rodrigo, and Guter Fernández are the greatest nobles of Castilla. The disproportionate number of Riojans at court -- the brothers Jimeno, Lope, and Pedro López -- probably reflects the uncomfortably great power of the Aragonese king in those territories if they are not simply exiles. On the other hand, León is amply represented by Count Pedro Ansúrez, Count Froila Díaz, Pedro Díaz, Count Suero Vermúdez, and Rodrigo Vermúdez. Again the border areas have few or no representatives. The choices of husbands for the royal infantas reflect the same priorities.

But it will not do to overstate such dependence or concentration. The realm had not, and would not, become León and Castilla simply. The composition and movements of the court would have been much the same under Alfonso VI as they were under his daughter. Allowing for the attritions of time, there is a very strong continuity in personnel, both episcopal and noble, between their courts. Alfonso VI had, after all, made Pedro Ansúrez guardian of Urraca, and the prelate who witnessed and composed the history of the latter's reign, Bishop Pelayo of Oviedo, outlived her handily.

A strong, traditional influence is reflected in chancery practice, though not in personnel, under Urraca. The great magnates of the realm are ordinarily not purely provincial figures. Like Suero Vermúdez, Guter Fernández, and Froila Díaz, they have family and property ties almost as wide as the peninsula. The empire that was the inheritance of Urraca was in no danger of being forgotten or heedlessly sacrificed by any of these elements or persons. It was at once problem and promise for them as well as for the queen herself.
Notes for Chapter Seven

1. My own study of the charters of Urraca is complete and I hope the findings will shortly be published in a more complete form than the brief résumé given here. The pioneering work on Urraca's chancery was done by Luis Sánchez Belda, "La cancillería castellana en el reinado de Doña Urraca," *EDMP* (Madrid, 1953), 4:587-599.

2. The one document of Urraca that may be both an original and in Carolingian script is her grant of a mint to the monastery of Sahagún on October 15, 1116; AHN, Sección de Clero, carp. 893, no. 16; published in Romualdo Escalona, *Historia del real monasterio de Sahagún* (Madrid, 1782), pp. 512-513; and in Conrado Martero y Simón, *Apuntes de la iniciación a la paleografía española de los siglos XII a XVIII* (Madrid, 1963), plate 1. The notary is not of the chancery, but a monk of Sahagún.


5. See ch. 2, note 99.


8. May 18, 1112; AHN, Sección de Microfilmas, AC Lugo, rollo 5.869. This charter was written by one "Pelagius lucensis" and was confirmed by "Martinus ecclesia sti iacobi canonicis et eo tempore regine curalii notarii hanc scripturam quam iussione regine confirmo."

9. October 21, 1112; AD León, Otero de las Dueñas. December 8, 1113; AHN, Clero, carp. 1.794, no. 1.

10. 1118; AHN, Clero, carp. 512, no. 7, with much of the text lost. January 4, 1113; AC León, no. 9.277, also an original but written by another; only the subscription of Fernando is in his own hand. There are two other charters that may he originals but also may be only good copies. I suspend judgment on them at this point. The issue is not germane to our concerns here.
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