In the twelfth century the Church was, in León-Castilla as everywhere in western Europe, a great social institution, involved at every level in politics and economics as well as in matters more narrowly considered religious. Nowhere was that interaction between the Church as institution and the other powers of society so intense as in the persons and office of the episcopacy. The monasticism of Cluny continued to be important and that of Cîteaux was raising new questions of direction, organization, and purpose, but the growing emphasis of the papal reform movement on structures and law increasingly found focus in the episcopal office. The bishops themselves, whether giving body to old claims or jurisdiction over the diocesan countryside or adapting to the new demands of the burgeoning towns, were conscious and confident of the prestige of their office.

Such vigor had profound implications for every contemporary monarch in western Europe, yet everywhere the circumstances in which a proper response had to be framed differed somewhat. Urraca's reactions and solutions must of necessity vary from those of Henry I of England, Louis VI of France, or Henry V of Germany. Yet all these monarchs had a single purpose in view: they had to continue to control their bishops. The extent of secular power vested implicitly as well as explicitly in the episcopal office determined that the bishop would be a rival if he was not a subordinate. A bishop's position as a subordinate of another, pope or noble, placed what the crown perceived as intolerable limits on the scope of action necessary to the monarch.

The demands of ideology, law, and custom would eventually be adjudicated by the several political dynamics of the great monarchies of the west. It is no exaggeration however, to assert that the allocation of the right to select the bishop was the central political problem of the first half of the twelfth century.

In León-Castilla bishops condemned Urraca's marriage to Alfonso of Aragón, supported rebellion on behalf of her son, and organized military expeditions in the defense of her realm against Aragonese in the east and Muslims in the south. For Urraca to have been either unconscious of their power or indifferent to it was impossible.

But the opportunities for the queen to select her bishops were limited. In the east Calahorra had passed within the orbit of Aragón. In the west, Braga and Coimbra had similarly gravitated toward a nascent Portugal, or at least a de facto independent half sister. Túy and Orense threatened to do the same, and for a time Burgos in Castilla was held by the king of Aragón.

Yet Urraca did exercise some initiatives in the selection of bishops, as the surviving records indicate. Twenty-one bishoprics lay within her domains. Of these, four -- Ávila, Segovia, Sigüenza, and Zamora -- were established only in the last six years of her reign and constituted particular problems. Of the remaining seventeen, another five -- Santiago de Compostela, Ourense, Oviedo, Palencia, and Túy -- were held by bishops chosen during the reign of her father who lived on into the reign of her son. In only twelve sees did she have the theoretical opportunity to make a choice. The choice once made, all but three of those bishops outlived the queen, so only three reappointments could be made. Such was
the field for royal initiative.

Other circumstances narrowed that scope even more. The primatial see of Toledo had been held, at Urraca's accession, by Archbishop Bernard for almost a quarter of a century. Bernard, a Cluniac monk, had been sent to the peninsula by the great Abbot Hugh at the request of Alfonso VI. Installed first as abbot of Sahagún in 1080 and then in Toledo after its reconquest, Bernard had filled the bishoprics of the kingdom as often as he could with Frenchmen whom he had [227]personally recruited. His protégés held Osma, Palencia, and Salamanca in 1109.

Bernard's successes in this regard flowed not only from his primatial authority and his close working relationship with Alfonso VI but also from the fact that Pope Urban II in 1088 had made Toledo the metropolitan see for all dioceses whose traditional metropolitan see lay still within Muslim territory. On April 25, 1093 Pope Urban had added to that authority the papal legateship in the peninsula. (1)

As we have already seen, Archbishop Bernard was a regular member of the court of Urraca. If in some respects his authority and power rivaled her own, the queen needed him. His connection with the past glories of her father's reign and his hostility to the power of Alfonso of Aragón within León-Castilla worked to legitimize her own position. If it involved her in Toledo's quarrels with Braga and Santiago de Compostela over its primatial and legatine rights, still the fight of Toledo was Urraca's fight as she attempted to strengthen her own authority over those outlying, sometimes rebellious areas.

For fifteen years the two were allies until the archbishop's death at the beginning of April 1125. Even the date of Bernard's death is strangely obscure and most of the circumstances surrounding the election of his successor are lost. (2) The bull of Honorius II dated November 30, 1125 confirmed [228] the election of Bishop Raymond of Osma to Toledo by the "suffragan bishops, clergy, and people of Toledo." (3) This formula beloved of the papal chancery may or may not have corresponded to actual events. But Honorius spoke also of the letters of transmittal that had informed him, one of them from Alfonso VII. Urraca was not mentioned.

It is clear from the bull that Urraca was not directly involved in the choice of Bernard's successor as archbishop of Toledo. By 1125 the kingdom of Toledo undoubtedly had passed to her son as a side effect of Bernard's death. She may have been consulted and it is unlikely that she would have objected. As Bishop of Osma, Raymond had not been a regular part of her court but he had confirmed eight of her charters, the most recent in 1124. He was a protégé of Archbishop Bernard, and Urraca had probably agreed to Raymond's promotion to Osma in 1109. In 1125 he was a safe choice for a fledgling monarch and a satisfactory one to an ailing queen.

Much the same circumstances must have prevailed in the choice of a successor to Raymond at Osma. Eventually Bertrand, a canon of Toledo and another of the Frenchmen brought to Spain by Archbishop Bernard, succeeded but his reelection may have been delayed, for there is no notice of his episcopacy dating before 1128. (4) If it is not due merely to a lacuna in the documents, the long wait may have been occasioned either by the death of Urraca in March 1126 or by the necessity to consider the possible opinion of Alfonso [229]of Aragón, for the Burgo de Osma was a sensitive outpost on the upper Duero.

Although Queen Urraca never had the opportunity to name her own primate-archbishop, the episcopal level offered more occasions for choice. That may have been true of Osma in 1109. Bishop Pedro died in August 1109 at Sahagún and his successor, Raymond, may have been chosen at the curia there that approved the marriage of Alfonso I and Urraca. (5) Archbishop Bernard's candidate, he would have almost automatically received the approval of the new queen. He would hardly have become bishop once the marriage was consummated, for he appears as an opponent of Alfonso of Aragón. (6)
Following that marriage, fortunately for Urraca and just as unfortunately for her new husband's chances to consolidate his hold on his new possessions, there were no deaths among the bishops until the spring of 1112. The next two years offered major opportunities to the queen and her supporters.

In April and May of 1112, when Urraca was in Galicia organizing support for a counteroffensive against Alfonso of Aragón and working out a temporary alliance with Count Henry of Portugal, the canons Muño Alfónsez and Hugh of Santiago de Compostela were elected to the sees of Mondoñedo in Galicia and Oporto in Portugal, respectively. The election was a major triumph for the church of Santiago and its bishop, Diego Gelmírez, and is so presented by our source. It also involved financial and property considerations for Archbishop Maurice of Braga. But there can be no doubt that the assent of Urraca and of Count Henry had to be secured to such an arrangement.

The election probably took place at Urraca's Easter court in Santiago on April 21, 1112. The "Historia Compostelana" gives no details, stating only "facta utriusque election." That laconic observation dismisses an election that cannot have been routine. It involved the advancement of two canons of Santiago, formerly a suffragan see of Braga but exempt since 1095, to two of the other suffragan sees of Braga. The later drive of Santiago to displace Braga as metropolitan of the province was already implicit in it.

Moreover, it involved as well the deposition of Bishop Pedro of Mondoñedo, who had supported Alfonso of Aragón in 1110. Such violent changes could not have been carried through, even by Gelmírez, without the full support of Urraca. The two bishops-elect were consecrated at Lérez in Galicia on Passion Sunday, March 23, 1113, by the archbishop of Braga in concert with the bishops of Santiago Tuy, and Orensei.

The church of León also saw rapid alterations in 1112. During the summer of that eventful year its venerable Bishop Pedro died. Moreover, during the confused days following the death of Count Henry of Portugal in May and before the last brief reconciliation of Urraca and Alfonso el Batallador, Archbishop Maurice of Braga appeared in León, presumably by permission of the latter. A private document of June 3, 1112 of León reads "Mauritus archiepiscopus in legione" but does not tell us in what capacity. León was not an archbishopric.

Not until October 1, 1112 does a new bishop of León, Diego, appear. All the evidence points to the likelihood that he was Urraca's choice. For one thing, he was the nephew of his predecessor and subsequently, like his uncle, her firm supporter and regular companion. For another, the flagging fortunes of Alfonso of Aragón during the late summer of that year make it unlikely that he would have had sufficient influence. Finally, the subsequent deposition of Bishop Diego at the Council of Carrión in 1130 through the machinations of Alfonso VII and Gelmírez of Santiago make it unlikely that Diego was of the Raimundist faction.

Within a year Urraca also secured the promotion of one of her chaplains, Pedro, to the see of Lugo. That city had supported Alfonso of Aragón, and its bishop, another Pedro, was discredited if not implicated. At the Council of Palencia in October 1113, according to the "Historia Compostelana," he asked to be relieved of the episcopacy. When some of the clergy of the church of Lugo asked Archbishop Bernard of Toledo for a new bishop, we are told, those clerics and "other venerable persons designated" the chaplain of Urraca, who was then dispatched to Lugo to be canonically "promoted."

Subsequently Archbishop Bernard wrote to Bishops Gelmírez of Santiago, Muño Alfónsez of Mondoñedo, Alfonso of Túy, and Diego of Orense stating that the clergy and people of Lugo had elected the queen's chaplain as their bishop. He asked them to certify that the election was canonical
and, if they so found, to see that the elect was duly consecrated by Gelmírez, who would act as Bernard's vicar. These precautions were sensible given, first, the peculiar circumstances of the election itself, and second, that the consecration was not to be performed by Maurice of Braga. The latter was the metropolitan of Lugo but had been suspended from his office for disobedience to Rome, according to Bernard. Archbishop Bernard entitled himself not primate but Roman legate. Those so charged found the election canonical, and Urraca's chaplain was consecrated at Santiago on April 25, 1114 by Gelmírez in the presence of Bishops Muño Alfonso of Mondoñedo and Diego of Orense. (17)

Later that same year a new, crucial struggle developed over the selection of a bishop of Burgos. The contest between León and Aragón for control of the chief city of Castilla had been begun by Urraca in 1113 and was to continue until its definitive recovery by her son in 1127. The choice of a friendly bishop there was central to the interests of both contestants.

On October 4, 1114 Bishop García Aznárez died. (18) Appointed during the reign of Alfonso VI, García had been a supporter of Urraca, and the "Historia Compostelana" tells of his expulsion from Burgos by the king of Aragón as a result. (19) When he died, El Batallador was in control of the city.

As luck would have it, however, Archbishop Bernard of Toledo had called a council at León for October 18, 1114. Documentation of that assemblage derives largely from the "Historia Compostelana," which publishes the canons. (20) Bishop García may actually have been at court with some of his entourage when he died, for his successor, Paschal, seems to have been elected at that council by direction of Bernard of Toledo. (21) Because Burgos had been directly dependent on Rome and exempt from any metropolitan jurisdiction since 1099, Bernard wrote informing Pope Paschal II of his election and requesting permission to consecrate him.

Alfonso of Aragón was prepared to accept none of this. Instead, he secured the election of his own brother, Ramiro, by the clergy and people of Burgos and wrote to Rome himself, challenging the election of the archdeacon Paschal on the grounds that neither he nor the people of Burgos knew of it. On April 10, 1115 Pope Paschal wrote to Archbishop Bernard informing him of the challenge and requesting him, as papal legate, to convocate a council to judge between the candidates. (22)

Such a council met, presumably in the early summer of 1115, for on August 19, 1115 the pope again wrote to Archbishop Bernard complaining of the precipitation with which it had proceeded to the consecration of Paschal after deciding for him. The pope summoned all parties to Rome for Easter of 1116, but none of them in fact made the trip. (23) Bishop Paschal meanwhile functioned as prelate of Burgos, confirming six charters of Urraca in 1116 and 1117. (24) His presence in the Council of Burgos of 1117 indicates his eventual acceptance by both the pope and the Aragonese king. Urraca and the primate of Toledo had won the first round.

On October 13, 1118 Bishop Paschal of Burgos died. (25) Alfonso of Aragón was bending every energy toward the successful conclusion of the siege of Zaragoza at this time, and Urraca seems to have taken advantage of his preoccupation to secure the election of one Jimeno as bishop of Burgos. We know little about him except that he appears as confirmant of two of her charters in early 1119 as bishop-elect. (26) Perhaps he had been chosen at her Christmas court of 1118. In any event, she was not going to repeat the hasty consecration of 1115. Once again, the Aragonese king was not disposed to accept the fait accompli. He seems again to have effected an election of his own candidate, and as late as September 1121 a document of his cites one García Sanz as bishop-elect of Burgos. (27)

Resolution of this dispute was to be long delayed by Alfonso's claims. In addition, the death of Pope Paschal II in early 1118, the briefness of the pontificate of his successor, Gelasius II, and the election of an antipope at Rome in the early days of the pontificate of Calixtus II (1119-1124) meant
additional delay. In 1121 Calixtus II seems to have authorized the consecration of Jimeno by the 
bishops of Palencia, Oviedo, León, and Salamanca, but this action never took place.\(^{(28)}\) Nor until early 
April 1124 was Jimeno finally consecrated, and then it was at a council in Santiago de Compostela with 
Gelmírez officiating. Cardinal Boso, papal legate in the peninsula at that time, conceded this privilege 
to the latter and protected the rights of Rome and the exempt status of Burgos. Our source tells us that 
the consecration was impossible in Burgos because of the hostility of Alfonso of Aragón.\(^{(29)}\)

Thus, Queen Urraca managed to retain control of the crucial bishopric of Burgos in the east. In the west 
the situation was much more complex. There she was at first allied with the archbishop of Toledo, 
whose attempts to assert the power of the primacy over the metropolitan see of Braga and to enforce his 
legatine power ran parallel to Urraca's own desires to limit and subject the authority of her half sister 
the Infanta Teresa. The alliance with Braga and Count Henry, which had led to the promotions of the 
canons Hugh and Muño of Compostela to the sees of Oporto and Mondoñedo in early 1112, had 
foundered on the count's death, the intransigence of Teresa as his successor, and Archbishop Maurice of 
Braga's interference in the see of León in June of 1112.

At least by the time of the Council of Palencia in October 1113, the counteroffensive against Braga had 
begun. One of \(236\) his suffragans, Bishop Pedro of Lugo, was there deposed in favor of Urraca's 
chaplain, and Archbishop Maurice himself, a former protégé of Bernard of Toledo, was suspended by 
the latter for disobedience to the legatine authority. By April 18, 1114 Pope Paschal II had been 
influenced to support the suspension with his own authority, citing specifically Maurice's invasion of 
the see of León. Archbishop Bernard wrote to Bishop Gelmírez of Santiago asking him to publish the 
sentence among Braga's suffragans and to inform the Infanta Teresa.\(^{(30)}\)

As when Bernard authorized him to consecrate the new bishop of Lugo in 1113, the primate was 
bidding for Gelmírez' s support. Even so late as March 1113, the latter had been cooperating with 
Maurice of Braga, who consecrated Hugh and Muño to his own suffragan sees of Oporto and 
Mondoñedo at that time. By the fall of 1114 the bishop of Santiago had deserted Maurice. At the 
Council of Palencia of October 1113, the physical location of the see of Mondoñedo had been 
transferred to Vallibriense; this action clearly concerned its metropolitan at Braga. On November 17, 
1114 Bishop Diego Gelmírez promulgated the canons of the Council of León at the request of 
Archbishop Bernard. Participating in this local council were five of the suffragans of Braga, including 
Bishop Muño Alfonso styling himself "Vallibriensis." Moreover, the assembled bishops agreed to meet 
each year during Lent for the correction of evils that had come to their attention.\(^{(31)}\) Under the guise of 
a \textit{confraternitatas} Bishop Gelmírez was fashioning an episcopal synod for the province of Braga that 
would be under his leadership.

It is unlikely that Archbishop Bernard fully realized the dangerous potential of his new ally. Since the 
time of King [237] Alfonso II of Asturias in the early ninth century, the shrine of Saint James the Great 
at Santiago had gradually become the center of a great international pilgrimage. The shrine church of 
the Apostle James had absorbed the old see of Iria Flavia, won the patronage of the Leonese kings, and 
secured independence from the metropolitan of Braga in 1095 by papal authority. Since the latter part 
of the eleventh century a great new Romanesque church had been rising over the relics of Santiago. In 
Bishop Diego Gelmírez, Santiago had found a servant who could envision his church as an 
archbishopric, its archbishop as a papal legate, and even Santiago de Compostela as the primatial see of 
the peninsula. By 1115 Bishop Diego Gelmírez was petitioning Rome for the translation to Compostela 
of the metropolitanate of either Mérida or Braga itself.\(^{(32)}\)

The three-cornered ecclesiastical rivalry that developed from late 1114 among Toledo, Braga, and 
Compostela ultimately destroyed the career of Archbishop Maurice of Braga and gravely threatened the 
independence of his church. Papal policy during the early part of this period seems to have been aimed
at maintaining some kind of balance and adjudicating the claims of the rivals, but both the ecclesiastical and political dynamics in the Iberian peninsula proved too strong to be moderated by a distant and intermittent authority, however exalted.

Archbishop Maurice managed to exonerate himself at Rome or at least to give a satisfactory account of his ill-advised intervention in León. On December 4, 1114 Pope Paschal wrote to him confirming the boundaries of his see, indicating that his suspension had been lifted. Seven months later, on July 23, 1115, he wrote to Archbishop Maurice again, advising him of the translation of the see of Mondoñedo to Vallibriense and inviting him to reopen the question as metropolitan of Mondoñedo when the legate whom the pope was planning to dispatch arrived. Less than four months later, on November 3, 1115, Paschal dispatched two more letters defending the claims of Braga in the most sweeping fashion.

One of them threatened Bishop Gonçalvo of Coimbra with suspension if he did not recognize Braga as his metropolitan within forty days. That prelate, who doubtless preferred the distant authority of Toledo to the uncomfortably proximate one of Braga, claimed that in antiquity Coimbra had been a suffragan of Mérida. Since the latter was still in the hands of the Muslim, Archbishop Bernard would have exercised metropolitan jurisdiction. In the other letter, the pope relieved Bernard of Toledo of his legatine status for the province of Braga on the grounds that Bernard had tried to detach Coimbra from its lawful metropolitan, had expelled Lugo's bishop from his see and substituted another, and had withdrawn territory from the bishopric of Astorga and bestowed it on that of Salamanca.

In the struggle, which had occupied the preceding two years, Braga had scored a remarkable victory that would not be allowed to stand. It confounded too many conceptions of rights, too many ambitions, ecclesiastical as well as political. Moreover, the appeal to the conditions of antiquity produced a welter of conflicting and manufactured evidence, malleable in its plenitude.

The second letter of November 1115 illustrates well the incompatibility of the papal decision and actual conditions. Based on an appeal to antique practice, the archbishop of Braga could claim as suffragans all the bishoprics of Galicia except Compostela, exempt by papal decree since 1095. He could also claim Astorga, Palencia, Segovia, Osma, and Ávila, and the Portuguese sees, including Coimbra. The new bishoprics of Oviedo and León, created essentially by the Reconquista and exempt from metropolitan jurisdiction by papal action since 1103, might possibly also be claimed.

Queen Urraca could not, and would not, accept such authority in the hands of a prelate essentially subject to the influence of the Infanta Teresa. Archbishop Bernard of Toledo defended the prerogatives of his own metropolitan authority over Palencia, Segovia, Osma, and Ávila. Unless the metropolitan status of Braga were translated to Compostela, Bishop Gelmírez had no intention of allowing the sees of Galicia to escape his control. As the future was to demonstrate, the claims of Braga ran parallel to the ambitions of the sovereign of an emerging Portugal and would be just as effective as the real power of that sovereign could make them; no less and no more.

Indeed, the papacy itself had already found it desirable to intervene in the archiepiscopate of Braga. On August 15, 1115 Pope Paschal had made Oporto directly dependent on Rome. Five days later, on April 20, 1115, he had found for Oporto in a boundary dispute with Bishop Gonçalvo of Coimbra. Bishop Hugh of Oporto, who had been in Rome in 1115 on behalf of both Gelmírez and himself, was back in Rome by March 24, 1116. At this time the pope also granted him the administration of the unrestored diocese of Lamego, another of Braga's suffragans, hitherto administered by Bishop Gonçalvo of Coimbra.
These actions, or the rumors of them, brought Bishop Gonçalvo of Coimbra to Rome. There he secured two things. On June 18, 1116 Paschal wrote to Archbishop Bernard, Bishops Alfonso of Túy and Jerome of Salamanca, and "Queen" Teresa that they should determine whether Lamego should be administered by Oporto or by Coimbra. But Bishop Gonçalvo had pursued other interests as well. Another papal letter of the same date to Archbishop Bernard reopened the question of whether Coimbra was a suffragan of Braga or of Mérida. To defend the sorely threatened integrity of his province, Archbishop Maurice was by now himself in Rome.

The complexity of these claims and interests led Pope Paschal to dispatch Cardinal Boso to the peninsula as his legate in late 1116. There, in the latter part of February 1117, the cardinal held a council at Burgos attended by, among others, Queen Urraca, Archbishop Bernard, and Bishops Hugh of Oporto and Gonçalvo of Coimbra. Archbishop Maurice was not present, and the results were distinctly unfavorable to Braga. Coimbra was adjudged a suffragan of Mérida and obtained a favorable boundary rectification with Oporto. Oporto, however, in turn gained territory in the north at the expense of Braga.

Consequent to these events Archbishop Maurice must have despaired of justice as he saw it. Himself entrusted with a diplomatic mission to the German Emperor Henry V, he seems to have gained the imperial confidence. When Pope Paschal II died in January 1118, the newly elected Gelasius quickly encountered difficulties with the emperor. In early March Henry V entered Rome but Gelasius had left it. On March 8, 1118 Maurice of Braga was elected pope in Rome and took the name Gregory VIII. Pope Gelasius II wrote to Archbishop Bernard and the other Spanish bishops on March 25, 1118 advising them of the excommunication and deposition of the antipope Maurice and authorizing them to elect a new archbishop for Braga.

These circumstances gave Urraca her only chance to intervene in the selection of an archbishop of Braga, and she seems to have taken full advantage of them. The new prelate of Braga was consecrated in Segovia by Archbishop Bernard of Toledo, probably in June 1118, in the queen's presence. The choice fell on Paio Mendes, Archdeacon of Braga and member of the powerful northern Portuguese family of Mendo Gonçalves of Maia, just then supporting the young Alfonso Enríquez against his mother, Teresa, and allied with Urraca. Although local forces would have made his candidacy powerful, it is difficult to imagine that the Leonese queen's consent would not have been decisive.

In any event, he may have confirmed a charter of Urraca on September 12, 1118. He did not, however, appear in any genuine charter of Teresa until late 1122. Earlier that year he had spent some time in refuge in Zamora and had been imprisoned by Teresa on his return.

The matter of Braga was, however, shortly to pale to near insignificance. A major alteration of the ecclesiastical map of the peninsula was at hand that would necessitate a century to work out in its full implications. Bishop Gelmírez had gone to Segovia in 1118, according to the "Historia Compostelana," to secure the return of properties in Portugal belonging to his see but held by the prelate of Braga. It is likely that Gelmírez had some idea of delaying the consecration, for he still had hopes of having the metropolitanate translated from Braga to his own see.

Both hopes were to prove illusory, but on February 27, 1120 Pope Calixtus II translated the metropolitanate of Mérida to Santiago de Compostela. Gelmírez had committed every resource to the endeavor, calling into action the friendships of Cluny and the duke of Burgundy. That the bishop of Compostela had been the guardian and was currently the political ally of the pope's nephew, Alfonso Raimúndez, doubtless had its effect. Still, the action of Calixtus II is hard to characterize as other than irresponsible.
The papal action made Compostela an archiepiscopate entirely surrounded by suffragan dioceses of Braga. For suffragans of its own, Calixtus gave Compostela two sees, both sure to be bitterly contested. One was Coimbra, to the south of Braga, already the object of dispute between Archbishops Bernard and Paio. The other was Salamanca, to which Toledo and Braga also had claims.\(^{[54]}\) To none of these disputes could Queen Urraca or the Infanta Teresa afford to be indifferent any more than could their respective sons, the cousins Alfonso Raimúndez and Alfonso Enríquez. Under these circumstances, the gift of the papal legateship for the provinces of Braga and Mérida along with the archbishopric provided [243] Gelmírez with the legal weapon necessary to create his new province and perhaps even enlarge it.\(^{[55]}\)

As would be expected, the archbishop set about the exercise of his new responsibilities energetically. Acting as papal legate, he summoned a council for his two provinces at Compostela for January 9, 1121. Bishop Gonçalvo of Coimbra did not attend and was suspended by Gelmírez. Subsequently the bishop of Coimbra was to acknowledge the authority of Compostela, but the link was tenuous and ultimately was not sustained.\(^{[56]}\) In any event, Bishop Gonçalvo outlived Urraca and so does not directly concern us here.

In Salamanca, Bishop Jerome died on June 30, 1120 and it was his successor, Bishop-elect Gerald, who was summoned to the council at Compostela in 1121.\(^{[57]}\) Gerald seems to have been the candidate of Gelmírez who was accepted and consecrated by Calixtus II during the troubled days of 1120.\(^{[58]}\) That Gerald was the choice of Gelmírez instead of the queen's may be adduced from his presence at the Council of Sahagún in August of 1121, whose real purpose was to remove Urraca from the throne.\(^{[59]}\) Both his accession and his conduct, then, were unacceptable to the Leonese queen, and in the final mention of him in the documents Urraca bears him off from a provincial council at Compostela in March of 1122.\(^{[60]}\)

In 1123 Bishop Muño appears as successor to Gerald in the see of Salamanca. The account of a subsequent dispute between Archbishop Bernard of Toledo and Archbishop Gelmírez informs us that Muño was consecrated by the primate, who was persisting in his claim to authority over the [244] church of Salamanca. In relation to this same dispute the "Historia Compostelana" complains that Archbishop Bernard had also forbidden the archbishop of Braga and the bishop of Coimbra to acknowledge Gelmírez's authority.\(^{[61]}\) We may be sure that not all the details of this affair are aired in the documents, but it seems clear that the queen, her son, and the primate, their differences resolved by 1123, secured their own candidate for the see of Salamanca. Although Bishop Muño had, in 1124, to make a formal profession of obedience to Gelmírez, he continued in the see until 1130.

To his provincial council at Compostela in January 1121 Gelmírez had also summoned the bishop-elect of Ávila.\(^{[62]}\) The actual existence of a bishopric at Ávila in the eleventh and early twelfth century is disputed. Rivera Recio believes that Bishop Jerome of Salamanca had been assigned the administration of the sees of both Ávila and Zamora by Bernard of Toledo.\(^{[63]}\) However that may be, the lively disputes of the period had made everyone a church historian and Gelmírez moved quickly to resurrect that ancient diocese and so to supply himself with yet another suffragan. Bishop Sancho was consecrated at Compostela in March 1121 in the presence of Urraca, Alfonso Raimúndez, and the legate, Cardinal Boso.\(^{[64]}\)

Given the desperate position of Urraca during this year, resulting from her unwise seizure of Gelmírez the preceding summer, Sancho may well have been imposed on her by the archbishop of Compostela, for he never subsequently appeared in any genuine document of the queen. It is equally doubtful that he was a candidate acceptable to her son, for Archbishop Bernard of Toledo never accepted Bishop Sancho, complaining that his election had been uncanonical and [245] his consecration a usurpation.
Nevertheless, the bishop seems to have maintained himself at Ávila until his death in 1133. Although the archbishop of Toledo might have been defeated in determining the bishopric of Ávila, the episcopate in the peninsula could be elaborated in ways advantageous to him as well as to his rival. The episcopal status of Zamora was even more shadowy than that of Ávila. There was no such see in antiquity. Its early medieval status is still open to dispute but there is no doubt that it was treated as a possession of the church of Salamanca in the first decade of the twelfth century. Apparently there was a sufficient tradition, however, to suggest to Archbishop Bernard that he could convincingly erect it into an independent see. This he did in 1120 or 1121. The new bishop of Zamora, Bernard of Perigord, had been an archdeacon of the church of Toledo and was one of the Frenchmen brought to the peninsula by its archbishop. The timing of the action suggests that Urraca would have had to consent to it. Her role may have been even more active than that. A fairly old tradition makes Bernard of Perigord one of the guardians selected for Urraca's daughter the Infanta Sancha.

The bishop of Astorga later challenged the legitimacy of the bishopric of Zamora, claiming it as part of his territory. A compromise worked out at the Council of Valladolid in 1124 provided for the return of the lands of Zamora to Astorga at the death of its then bishop, but a subsequent appeal to Pope Calixtus II established the bishopric's permanency.

The full effects of Calixtus II's grant of metropolitan status to Compostela should include the reestablishment of an independent bishopric at Segovia in 1119-1120. It is certain that Archbishop Bernard was well aware of the negotiations for the change and attempted to prevent it. In this he probably had the tacit support of Queen Urraca. To compensate his see for a prospective loss of suffragans, he consecrated Peter of Agen, another of the French clerics whom he had recruited and an archdeacon of Toledo, as bishop of Segovia on January 25, 1120. The archbishop had theretofore administered that see himself. Again, Urraca's approval of the action and of the candidate is to be presumed. According to an old tradition, Peter of Agen had also been a guardian of her daughter Doña Sancha.

Toledo secured yet another suffragan in 1121 with the reconstitution of the diocese of Sigüenza in advance of its actual reconquest. This action, however, may have had more to do with the expansion of Aragón on the eastern frontier, than with the continuing competition with Compostela. The new bishop Bernard of Agen, was again a protégé of Archbishop Bernard. He had come from France at the latter's behest, had been cantor in the cathedral of Toledo, and was a nephew of the equally new bishop of Segovia. Urraca's interest and consent may be assumed here also.

One last change in the episcopate involved Astorga. Bishop Pelayo, who had ruled there since 1099, died sometime before November 22, 1121. By March 6, 1122, Bishop Alo had been elected. Alo came from the royal court, where he probably functioned as an instructor of its youth. He was cited as "gramaticus." As such, he may be considered essentially an appointee of the queen.

The circumstances of his consecration support that assumption. Archbishop Gelmírez, as papal legate for the province of Braga, might have found grounds to claim that privilege, but in that case we should expect it to be mentioned in the "Historia Compostelana." But all that source tells us is that Gelmírez had shortly before "consecrated" an abbot of the monastery of San Andrés de Epinareda in the diocese of Astorga against the wishes of Alo's predecessor. A consecration by Archbishop Bernard of Toledo as primate would have been viewed as undesirable in Astorga, for Alo was shortly to launch a protest against Toledo's erection of the diocese of Zamora out of lands considered its own. The likelihood is that the consecration was performed by Archbishop Paio Mendes of Braga. The latter was
in Zamora in March of 1122, he was the proper metropolitan of Astorga, and was just then in alliance with Urraca. Such a combination of circumstances would have maximized the queen's influence in the original choice of the candidate.

In summary the evidence indicates that in western Europe in the first four decades of the twelfth century there was no precise understanding of what constituted a canonical election of a bishop. In contrast to the provisions for canonical consecration, which must ordinarily have been performed by his metropolitan, the stipulation for election by the "clergy and people" lacked specificity. Although the usual connotation was the clergy and people of the diocese or, more practically, the clergy and people of the episcopal city, no single individual or group could claim the absolute right to participate. This situation was to lead to the designation by the Lateran Council of 1139 of the cathedral chapter as the electoral body. In the meanwhile, such groups of cathedral clergy or even magnates as could secure the support of a council of bishops or the crown might plausibly claim they were engaging in a canonical election.

In addition, the resolution of the Investiture Controversy in France, in England, and finally at Worms in 1122 legitimized the practice of election in the royal presence as a necessary part of the electoral process. There can be no reasonable doubt that this development was a compromise on the whole favorable to the continuing royal dominance of that process. What an individual monarch might make of that opportunity, or what the attendant circumstances might permit, was another matter.

The more general development was reflected in Spain and, more particularly, in León-Castilla. Although the documentation is sparse, what there is displays a clear consciousness of canonical election as a norm and a necessity. The content of that norm is the ordinary prescription of election by clergy and people. At the same time, the crown could appeal to the papacy, and the papacy would recognize the complaint, against an episcopal election made without its knowledge. It is within this context that Urraca's opportunities and achievements must be assessed.

At one extreme, she was able to bring about the deposition of a bishop and the election of her own chaplain as his successor, as at Lugo in 1113. The deposition of 1113 was carried out with a conscious attention to ecclesiastical propriety and prescriptions. The source does not say whether the same scrupulous regard attended the deposition of 1112. The consecrations of the elect were properly performed, but it seems undeniable that both actions were largely motivated by political considerations.

At the other extreme, the queen could not prevent disruption of the established ecclesiastical organization of her realm by the elevation of Compostela to an archbishopric in 1120. The combination of the enormous popular devotion to Santiago and the genius of its bishop, guardian of her son and heir whose uncle happened to be the pope, proved irresistible.

Moreover, like every monarch, Urraca inherited the prelacy of her predecessor, which for practical purposes was largely irremovable. In the sees of Compostela, Orense, Oviedo, Palencia, and Túy, bishops presided as political powers whom she could only threaten, cajole, bribe, or placate to achieve her ends. Her own primate lived long enough effectively to eliminate any chance for her to name an incumbent to that most important see. As with the primacy itself, other opportunities, at Salamanca in 1123 and Osma in 1125, came so late and were so geographically situated that they fell to her son instead.

It seems clear, however, that ordinarily the cooperation of Urraca and her primate controlled the selection of the episcopate of León-Castilla. At Burgos they twice prevailed over the bitter opposition of Alfonso of Aragón. At Braga in 1118 they were able to secure a friendly archbishop against the Infanta Teresa. Together they could limit the effects of Gelmírez's coup of 1120 by erecting a new diocese at Zamora under a friendly authority. The security of the trans-Duero region in the east was
enhanced by the erection of the sees of Segovia and Sigüenza in the 1120s with Bernard's protégés and Urraca's advisers in each. On balance, Urraca's control over the bishops seems to have been firm and her policy successful.
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