Almost exactly two years before his death, Fernando I had decided that his realm should be divided among his three grown sons when that event should at last take place. The anonymous author of the Historia Silense tells us that the fateful decision was made in a great council in late December 1063 or early January 1064. This chronicle is probably the oldest narrative of the division that has come down to us, but it tells us merely that he assigned León to Alfonso, his favorite son; Castilla to Sancho, the eldest; and Galicia to García, the youngest. In addition, to daughters Urraca and Elvira were assigned all the royal monasteries of the realm of León-Castilla for the remainder of their lives or until they should marry.

A more detailed description of the division, and probably a more authoritative one, is given in the chronicle written by Bishop Pelayo of Oviedo at a slightly later date. Pelayo was Alfonso VI's choice for that important bishopric in 1102 and was a prominent figure at court during the reigns of both Alfonso and his daughter, Urraca.

According to Bishop Pelayo, Sancho was given all Castilla from the Pisuerga River east, Nájera, Pamplona, and all regalian rights therein. Since both Nájera and Pamplona were possessions of Sancho García IV of Navarra in 1063, the reference is probably best understood as meaning that the vassalage of the latter was to be transferred to Fernando’s heir. To Alfonso went all of León, west from the Pisuerga River, and surely including Asturias de Oviedo, which is not separately mentioned. In addition, a part of Asturias de Santillana encroached on Castilla in the north. Along the line of the Duero, Alfonso received the Zamora through Palencia in the east, which may have included new conquests in the Sorian highlands though no explicit mention is made of them. In the northwest, the favored son also was awarded the lands of Astorga, including the Bierzo defined in such a fashion as to include a substantial portion of the modern province of Lugo in Galicia. García, the youngest, was given Galicia and Portugal. A slightly later source, written after 1126, adds that to García were allotted the parias from the taifa of Badajoz, to Alfonso those of Toledo, and to Sancho those of Zaragoza.

From this division, Alfonso VI certainly emerged as the favorite son. The often disputed lands between the Pisuerga and the Cea, which Fernando had himself held when he was merely the count of Castilla, were simply regarded as Leonese. The southern lands around Palencia were also awarded to León, cutting off the easiest line of expansion for Castilla to the south. In the north, the western portion of Asturias de Santillana confined Castilla closely against Navarra. García in the west had fared scarcely better. The boundary of his new Galicia was severely drawn although the Bierzo and even the lands around Zamora had long been recipients of immigration from Galicia. These boundaries irresistibly suggest that there were not to be three equal kingdoms carved out of the legacy of Fernando el Magno but rather two subordinate ones under the hegemony of León, the traditional major power of the Christian north. Even more fateful, the bestowal of that greatest prize on a younger son rather than on
the eldest guaranteed that the settlement would be challenged once the restraining hand of the parent was removed.

This peculiar settlement has usually been seen as the result of the application of the Navarrese principle of equal division of the realm between male heirs to the new kingdom that Fernando I had acquired. Although it is certain that the tradition of the dynasty would have had some influence on such a disposition, that principle is less than satisfactory as a complete explanation of what actually occurred. In the first place, the tradition itself allowed not for an equal division but for one that subordinated the realms of the younger sons to that of the firstborn. In the second, it called for the bestowal of the patrimony of the father intact upon the first born and the satisfaction of the claims of younger sons out of his subsequent acquisitions. Only in this latter sense can one find some congruence between the Navarrese tradition and the realized division if Castilla is seen as the paternal patrimony. Even then, Castilla had never been part of the Navarrese patrimony, and it is difficult to imagine that Fernando himself, not to mention his contemporaries, would have so regarded it. In addition, it was the hegemony of the second son that was implied by the terms of the settlement as we have them.

For a rather fuller comprehension of what took place one must understand as well the size and geographical and cultural diversity of Fernando's kingdom as already sketched in the preceding chapter. In an age when governmental institutions hardly merit the application of that term and when all government is personal government, effective central rule ordinarily meant the presence on the spot of the monarch himself. It would not be unusual during the next century for Leonese kings to attempt to alleviate this problem by the delegation of their authority in specific geographical areas to subordinate members of the dynasty, as shall be seen in the case of Alfonso VI.

Further understanding of the factors behind this division may be supplied by a brief consideration of the charters of Fernando I insofar as they give an indication of the general character of his government and court. The sixty-two authentic surviving charters currently known to me reinforce the central position of León and Castilla within the realm already suggested by its geography. Some twenty-three charters deal with León, twenty-two with Castilla, and only eight with Galicia, five with Portugal, and four with Asturias. That impression is reinforced by the activity of the various bishops in the confirming of those royal charters, roughly indicating their frequency at court. Of the bishops of León and Castilla, the bishop of León confirmed twenty-five, the bishop of Oca eighteen, the bishop of Palencia seventeen, and the bishop of Astorga fourteen. Of the bishops of the outlying territories, the bishop of Lugo confirmed nine, of Santiago de Compostela eight, of Oviedo eight, of Mondoñedo four, and of Oporto three. Thus far the evidence of the royal diplomas corresponds well with what could be reasonably expected.

If one turns to the secular confirmants of the royal charters, the result is rather different. In the first place, Fernando seems never to have had a majordomo. The few citations that exist do not inspire confidence. That fact suggests a small court and a quite decentralized fisc. The post of alférez, royal standard-bearer and commander of the army in the kings absence, was regularly filled and seems to have alternated between Leonese and Castilian nobles. The first to fill it was Ordoño Ordóñez, a Castilian who later served Sancho II, between April 19, 1042, and July 1, 1047. He was followed by García Osórez between October 1, 1047, and March 12, 1048. From the fact that three out of the four documents in which the latter appears are Astorgan we surmise that he was Leonese. The next alférez was Pedro Peláez, who served at least from June 3, 1049, until June 9, 1058. He too was Leonese and appeared in the court of Alfonso VI after the division of the kingdom. Pedro González held the office from November 26, 1058, until April 20, 1062. One should not identify him with his later famous namesake, Count Pedro González of Lara, but if he is a castellan in Asturias de Santillana on May 8, 1061, he would seem to be a Castilian as well. The last alférez of Fernando el Magno
was Ordoño Peláez. He held that post from December 21, 1063, until September 11, 1064, as best we can discern. (14) Ordoño was associated with León and with Asturias in particular. Three other individuals are sometimes cited as alférez but the documents involved are not reliable. (15)

[19] But an examination of those other persons who confirmed at least 20 percent of Fernandos charters reveals a quite startling imbalance. Out of eight individuals only one, Guter Alfonsez, is Leonese. The other seven, Álvaro Rodríguez, Diego Álvarez, Fernando Rodríguez, Gonzalo Álvarez, Muñoz Álvarez, Rodrigo Vermúdez, and Sarracino Fáñez, are all Castilians. Two conclusions seem to be indicated then. First, Castilian nobles predominated among the lay members of Fernandos court. Second, since the overwhelming majority of the charters that the latter confirm deal with Castilla, the authority of the crown in Castilla depended more heavily on the support of the great nobility than it did elsewhere in the kingdom.

Returning now to the division of the realm in late 1063, one finds the only indication of the membership of the curia at which it was decided upon in two charters executed just before or during that meeting. (16) Surprisingly, not one of these seven Castilian nobles appears in the list of confirmants. It is possible to suspect, therefore, that the precise terms of that division were decided without them. Whatever the real influence of the Navarrese legal tradition, it is also possible that practical politics made it desirable at once to mollify them by designating the eldest son their king and to provide for stronger dynastic control over them by the same act.

Quite conceivably, the settlement went even farther than the spare words of the chronicles indicate. If the nobility of Castilla was not represented at the curia in León, certainly the Castilian church was. The abbots of all of the major Castilian monasteries, Oña, Cardeña, Arlanza, and Silos, confirmed. That fact makes it the more difficult to understand the seeming absence of Bishop Jimeno of Oca (Burgos). But the charter to San Isidoro of December 21 was confirmed by a Bishop Jimeno "successor Aloiti episcopi Legionensis." This shadowy figure may well be the Jimeno of Oca, a special friend of Fernando, translated to the vacant see of León as part of the settlement. (17) A bishop of Oca is hard to find in the documents for the next eighteen months, and in mid-winter of 1065 Bishop Jimeno of León disappears from them. (18)

The sons upon whom the three new kingdoms were to devolve had all attained maturity, as that was gauged in the eleventh century. Their exact age is difficult to specify, but Fernando had married Sancha in late 1032. (19) Bishop Pelayo, who should have known, names the children of the marriage as Urraca, Sancho, Alfonso, García, and Elvira. (20) Since Urraca is mentioned before any of the sons this was presumably the order of their birth as well. It seems most likely that Alfonso was born in 1037 and so had attained about twenty-six years in 1063. (21) We have no reliable data to establish the age of the others, but estimates of roughly twenty-eight for Sancho and perhaps twenty-three for García appear reasonable.

Of the education of the young kings, or their sisters, nothing is known, but one can safely assume that the boys at least had some Latin and rather more solid preparation in religion and the essential businesses of warfare and politics. (22) All of the children are first mentioned in one of Fernandos charters in 1043. (23) Over the next twenty years they are frequently, but not invariably, associated with the king in royal documents.

There is some evidence that the children were associated in an even more direct way with the government of the sprawling realm of Fernando after the division of late 1063 and before his death in December 1065. The increasing tempo of the kings campaigns along the entire length of his frontiers would have made such a step useful. At any rate García of Galicias first known document is a judicial
settlement between him and Bishop Suero of Mondoñedo dated September 11, 1064. Although Femando was present and confirmed the document it was enacted in Garcías name though he does not style himself king. In the eastern part of the realm, a Riojan document of November 30, 1065, cites Sancho as ruling in Burgos. Such involvement may also be indicated when the chronicler says that "per octo tamen continuos annos intestineum bellum insolubiliter gesserunt." Though their wars certainly could not have begun in 1064, their rivalry may well date from the commencement of their participation in power even during the lifetime of their father. In fact, there is no evidence for the outbreak of the fraternal strife before the death of the widowed Queen-mother Sancha on November 27, 1067.

The full and independent exercise of their respective kingships undoubtedly began with the death of their father on December 27, 1065. For that period, up until the reunion of the kingdom under Alfonso VI in October 1072, the prime record consists of their respective charters. Between these years Alfonso VI issued seven that have survived, Sancho II eleven, and García I four. García was the last of the brothers to issue a charter, on February 28, 1068. Sancho issued the first, on April 16, 1067. Alfonso was the second to begin a permanent record, on July 24, 1067. It is perhaps symptomatic of the uncertainty of the realm in general that the chanceries of none of the three emerge clearly as the successor of that of their father. The latters notaries were not automatically employed by his sons.

King García inherited the most troubled of three successor states. At the end of the tenth century Almanzor had taken and held Coimbra, and the territories south of the Duero were amputated from the frontier province of Portugal. In the second decade of the eleventh century the attacks of the Norsemen upon the ecclesiastical centers of Oporto and Túy had added to the disorganization, and a series of obscure troubles plagued the strongest of the Portuguese noble houses after the death, or assassination, of Menendo González in 1008. It was not until Fernandos reconquest of Coimbra, just eighteen months before his death, that anything resembling a settled administration could be finally reintroduced in the country.

What the Leonese king had chosen to do then was to keep the newly reconquered Coimbra and the basin of the Mondego River separate from the old county of Portugal and to entrust it to the Mozárab landowner, Sisnando Davidez, who was not allied with any of the Portuguese nobles of the north. In the valleys of the Duero and the Miño, he had already asserted the claims of his wife Sancha to the properties of the old comital house for she was a granddaughter of Menendo González. Her inheritance provided a network of new royal properties there into which could be introduced those all-purpose estate officials, local justiciars, and leaders of the royal host in their district, the merinos. The weakening of the old comital house also was utilized to bring the leading noble houses of that area into direct, rather than indirect, dependence on the crown. This entire conception was advantageous for royal control, but its instability was a function of its novelty in 1066.

In Galicia the situation was quite different. There the royal fisc and its agents were old and well established. There was no recent history of a central countship, and the incursions of both Almanzor and the Norsemen, though real, had wrought little permanent effect. The central problem of royal control there seems to have involved rather those ecclesiastical lords, the bishops of Lugo and of Santiago de Compostela. The bishopric of the hill town of Lugo had developed very real aspirations to become the metropolitan see of all Galicia and Portugal, absorbing the old title of the ancient see of Braga in Portugal. This ambition necessarily conflicted with the aims of the growing see of Santiago de Compostela to secure the kinds of honors and position befitting its apostolic patron and his relics.

At the outset of the reign one might have expected that the advantage in the rivalry would be with Santiago, whose venerable bishop, Cresconio, had held that see for thirty years and had but a year
before placed [23] a protégé of his in the see of León itself.\footnote{33} Moreover, the intercession of St. James the Great may have been widely regarded as responsible for the recent successful conclusion of the siege of Coimbra.\footnote{34} But it was to the younger Vistruario of Lugo, bishop but for six years, and two unidentifiable counts that King García is recorded as swearing to respect their honors and their properties on February 17, 1066.\footnote{35}

In the following month, on March 24, 1066, it was also Bishop Vistruario who was in the company of the king while the latter was visiting his Portuguese domains. The event was an important one for it resulted, as demonstrated by the charter of that date, in the forced donation by the Portuguese noble, García Múñoz, of the whole of his property to the king.\footnote{36} These possessions were significant enough to have been made the object of two subsequent, surviving charters of King García to his supporters in Portugal. García Múñoz seems to have been of some importance during the reign of Fernando, and his virtual expropriation would have both worried and angered others of his class. It is possible that he was also exiled and took refuge at the court of Sancho II of Castilla. At least three of the charters of that monarch during 1068 and 1069 were confirmed by someone so named. One of the motives of Sancho's later successful intervention in his brothers' kingdom may derive from the latter's action of 1066.\footnote{37} The others who confirmed the charter of donation included the bishop of Oporto and bearers of names who would figure largely in the history of the county for the next forty years.

The repercussions from his actions may have made it advisable for King García to seek the counsel of his brothers. At any rate, on June 25, 1066, he was in or near León when his sister made a donation to the church of Santiago de Compostela that involved lands in Portugal. That charter was confirmed by Bishop Vistruario as well as by the three kings. Curiously enough, Bishop Cresconio was not even mentioned in the document.\footnote{38}

\footnote{24} For 1067 there are no trustworthy records of the reign of García of Galicia. At the end of the year the Queen-mother Sancha died, and what is presumed to be her moderating influence on the rival careers of her three sons ceased.

On January 4, 1068, the king was again involved in the affairs of Portugal. He then made a donation of some of the former property of García Múñoz to his faithful ally Muño Veniegaz.\footnote{39} The king seemed well attended by the nobility of northern Portugal on the evidence of those who confirm the grant. Still, there seems to be a considerable reliance on advisors from Galicia and even farther afield by this point. Bishop Cresconio of Santiago confirmed as did five nobles styled "de galetia." One Count Pedro Peláez also appeared. This is certainly the former alfériz, or shieldbearer, of Fernando I and the governor of the extreme western district of Asturias.\footnote{40} Finally, a Pelayo Cidiz "of Asturias" confirmed as well. As shall be seen later on, this noble was the royal merino in the Bierzo rather than in Asturias proper. Both of these latter then were figures of some importance, but in the kingdom of Alfonso of León rather than that of García himself. Such assistance could easily and almost insensibly pass over into tutelage.

If indeed young King García was already having difficulties in controlling his new kingdom, he was now to experience yet more of them. Sometime late in January or early in February the aged Bishop Cresconio of Santiago died. The end of his long episcopate added to the instability of the realm even though he was almost immediately succeeded by his nephew, Gudesteo.\footnote{41} Bishop Gudesteo appears for the first, and only reliable, time in the charter García issued to the monastery of San Antolín de Toques on February 28, 1068.\footnote{42} One suspects that the document was issued in connection with Gudesteo's episcopal consecration. It was confirmed by Bishop Vistruario of Lugo and Bishop Suero of Mondoñedo, by abbots Fagildo and Adulfo of the influential Compostelan monasteries of San Payo de Antealtares and of San Martín de Pinario respectively, and by Count Muño Rodríguez, Count Vela Ovéquez, and Countess Elvira Velásquez.
It is possible that the new bishop was not recognized outside the jurisdiction of García. The latter's brothers would have been concerned, necessarily, with the character of the new bishop of what was fast emerging as the central shrine of Christian Spain. Yet, if I am right about the chronology, there would have scarcely been time to consult with them. Certainly Gudesteo was not mentioned in the donation his sister, Infanta Elvira, made to Compostela on December 10, 1068. Even more startling, in little more than a years time he was murdered by his own uncle for reasons not made clear. From the Lenten season of 1069 then, when the murder took place, it is difficult to imagine that García retained much authority in Galicia.

Such an action was a direct challenge to the royal authority irrespective of any particular motives that may have prompted it. There is also the distinct possibility that royal initiatives were directly responsible. That is, it is a truism of the eleventh century that bishops were kings men and that the episcopate was a favorite vehicle of royal control. Nowhere was this situation more true than in León-Castilla, where lands newly wrested from the Muslim were consolidated by the restoration of ancient bishoprics whose bishops were both royal nominees and royal administrators of the district. In such a light should be seen the decision taken by King García to restore the see of Braga. Our source asserts that he was responding to the request of Bishops Vistruario of Lugo and of Cresconio of Iria, but such requests are easily prompted to save the forms. Such a restoration would have constituted a major reinforcement of royal authority vis-à-vis the nobility of the territory, and it would also, the same source tells us, have required their surrender of substantial properties to effect the endowment of the new see. The unfortunate Bishop Gudesteo, himself marked by the fresh evidence of royal favor, may have incited his assassins by merely trying to implement royal policy in this respect.

In fact, it seems most probable that King García was acting all too energetically and precipitately for the tastes of the nobility of Galicia-Portugal. The evidence is that he was attempting to restore not just the see of Braga but those of Lamęgo and Túy as well. Success in that endeavor would have almost doubled, when added to Lugo, Mondoñedo, Oporto, Orense, and Compostela, the number of bishoprics in his kingdom and therefore the number of royal lieutenants as well. His brothers too must have looked askance at such ambition, whose product would have contrasted sharply with the single bishopric of Oca in the kingdom of Sancho II and even with the four bishoprics of Oviedo, León, Astorga, and Palencia in the kingdom of Alfonso VI.

The paltry documentary evidence for the remainder of King García's brief reign places that monarch in the south of his kingdom. It is possible that Galicia was already slipping from his grasp, although it must be recognized that the erection of the new Portuguese bishoprics might simply have required his presence there. Whatever the reason, it was in Portugal that he made a donation to his faithful follower, Alfonso Ramírez, on May 16, 1070. Again the properties involved were part of the spoil of the estates of the noble, García Múñoz, and the recipient was related to other notable powers among the Portuguese magnates. An important meeting is indicated since both the bishops of Oporto and Túy were present as were numerous Portuguese nobles. His alférez, however, was a Galician apparently of a family of some importance in that province. The latter, along with other of the confirmants, would shortly go over to the camps of his brothers. Also confirming is Count Muño Menéndez, who would raise a rebellion against the king in the following year.

García's last known diploma was granted to Bishop Jorge of Túy on February 1, 1071. Those who confirm it are few and mostly clerics, which may indicate the weakening of the royal fortunes. At least the position of García was weak enough to encourage Count Muño Menéndez to outright revolt within the month. The count was defeated and killed at Pedrosa just north of Braga, but the days of García's reign were numbered despite his victory.
Of what transpired in the next four months there is little precise information. As shall be seen, García was clearly replaced within his realm by early June 1071. The earliest literary source says nothing of García's loss of his kingdom but only tells us that he was at liberty in late 1072 after the death of his brother Sancho and the return of Alfonso VI to power in León. The "Chronicon Compostellanum," perhaps the next earliest of such sources, relates that both Alfonso and García were defeated individually by Sancho and that the latter permitted García to go into exile "with all his soldiers" at Sevilla. It was from that taifa that García returned to be captured and imprisoned for life in 1073.

These two are the best narrative sources despite their obvious limitations. By the late twelfth century the chroniclers were already beginning to draw upon the epic cycles that formed around the brothers. The Crónica Najerense incorporated the tale of Sancho II's ruse of feigning a pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela in order to secure passage for his forces through his brothers lands and then his capture of García near Santarem in central Portugal. According to this late account the younger brother was carried off to Castilla and to a twenty-four-year captivity, nothing being said of his exile and subsequent recapture by Alfonso. In the whole of this account only the locating of the defeat of García by Sancho in the vicinity of Santarem rings true. Of the thirteenth-century historians more will be said later, but notice should be taken here of Jiménez de Rada. Writing about 1240, he incorporated into his account, which is otherwise largely dependent on Lucas of Túy at this point, an independent source which relates Sancho's defeat and capture of his brother, García. That defeat is placed after Sancho has deprived Alfonso of the kingdom of León. The disaffection of García's nobles is prominent among the causes of his downfall. Finally, the younger brothers discomfiture is placed near Santarem whither he had gone to enlist Muslim aid. Although this unknown source also bears traces of epic origin, it seems to me best to complement the earlier literary sources and the extant documents.

On the evidence of contemporary documents, it seems likely that King García acted from the first with something of the impulsiveness of youth in the administration of his new kingdom. If later chronicles borrowed from literary cycles to embellish the reaction of his nobles against such actions, it is nonetheless likely that such tales had their basis in fact. By 1069 the tension had mounted to such a point that the bishop of the great shrine of St. James could be murdered in his own palace during the holy season of Lent. In early 1071 García put down a revolt in the field led by one of the greatest of his Portuguese nobles. Given the very origin of his kingdom in an act of partition not yet six years old, such a state of affairs could not but invite intervention on the part of his older brothers. Just when the latter began to entertain such a prospect cannot be determined exactly, but some indications have survived in the documents.

The first such indicator appears in a private donation to the church of León made on October 1, 1070. It was executed in the presence of Alfonso VI and his court. Among those confirming the document was the prior of the Galician monastery of Samos. One cannot be sure what he was doing there, of course, but Samos lay within García's territories, it was one of the richest and most influential monasteries of Galicia, and it was located on the pilgrim road to Santiago de Compostela, which must serve as an invasion route if such a thing were contemplated. It is also to be remarked that within less than three years Abbot Auderico of Samos probably became Bishop Auderico of Túy in Galicia. Another private donation to the church of León, made on February 19, 1071, reveals Bishop Gonzalo of Mondoñedo at the court of Alfonso. The Leonese monarch can then be said to have displayed at least interest in his brothers' realm for some nine months before he actually came to possess it.

Menéndez Pidal believed that the deposition of García was effected by a joint intervention of Alfonso and of Sancho II of Castilla agreed upon in early 1071. He cited a charter of Sancho II, dated March 26, 1071, which was confirmed by Alfonso and his sisters Urraca and Elvira, and the later accounts which depended heavily on epic materials as evidence of such a concord. I regard the evidence for the
initial involvement of Sancho as unreliable. The charter cited is not confirmed by Alfonso in the critical edition and his confirmation may be a subsequent addition. Moreover, sometime in 1071 Sancho II explicitly recognized García's rule over Galicia in another of his own charters. The later stories, which make García's fall entirely the work of Sancho and adduce the reluctance of Alfonso even to permit the transit of his territories, largely ignore the facts of geography. At their closest point the borders of García and Sancho were separated by two hundred kilometers of Leonese territory, and just within García's borders lay a formidable range of mountains to be crossed with a potentially hostile Alfonso VI in Sancho's rear. Although such a venture might have made good romance subsequently, in the political situation of the time it would have been an invitation to military disaster.

The more dependable evidence, as well as the inherent probabilities, points to an initial intervention carried out by Alfonso VI alone. The latter and his court were still at León, or nearby Sahagún, on May 3, 1071, as evidenced by their confirmation of a private charter of that date. On June 13, 1071, Alfonso was in Galicia as shown by an original charter of his sister, Urraca, to the church of Túy. The confirmants of the charter include his alférez, Martín Alfónsez, some of his counts, and his bishops, Pelayo of León and Froila of Oviedo. In addition the charter is confirmed by six of the eight bishops of García's kingdom: Jorge of Túy, Gonzalo of Mondoñedo, Diego Peláez of Compostela, Ordoño of Orense, Pedro of Braga, and Pedro of Lamego. The presence of the last two indicates that García had indeed carried through his plans to restore those sees since Alfonso VI could hardly have done so in the course of an invasion. The charter indicates that the Leonese king had assumed de facto control of Galicia and northern Portugal although it seems likely that García still maintained himself in central Portugal. By July 12, 1071, Alfonso VI was back in León as indicated by his confirmation of a private donation to the monastery of Sahagún.

Shortly thereafter, however, his sister, Infanta Elvira, made a donation to the church of Lugo, dated July 29, 1071, which may have been subsequently confirmed by Sancho II. It is marginally possible that Sancho had himself invaded Galicia in the wake of his brother Alfonso's invasion, but it seems to me unlikely. The charter was confirmed by many of the same bishops who had, a month earlier, confirmed Urraca's charter to Túy. But this charter was subsequently interpolated in the most obvious fashion to describe the restoration of the sees of Braga, Lamego, and Orense by King Sancho. Closely related to this document is another, even more objectionable on diplomatic grounds, purporting to be the restoration of the see of Orense by Sancho and confirmed by Elvira. It is dated July 31, 1071. Fortunately for the historian attempting to untangle this particular skein, the earlier existence of the see of Orense is not in doubt. The falsifications are probably products of the twelfth-century squabbles among Lugo, Orense, and Braga over ecclesiastical jurisdictions in Galicia, but they were accepted as genuine by Menéndez Pidal.

Another document indicates rather the continuing authority of Alfonso VI of León in Galicia. A charter of his, dated October 15, 1071, was confirmed by Bishop Gonzalo of Mondoñedo and by Diego Vimárez, the latter of whom had confirmed García's charter to Túy of February 1, 1071. Alfonso's charter is not without its diplomatic problems, but the confirmants may indicate the realities of this period.

But if Alfonso VI had intervened unilaterally in Galicia, it would not be likely that his older brother would passively accept such an action. Already at some disadvantage in terms of the division made by his father, Sancho could scarcely have been satisfied to see that disproportion increased. Here may be the final provocation that was to lead to his attack on, and deposition of, his brother Alfonso. But Alfonso may also have recognized that his action would have such an effect and have taken measures to placate his brother. Although the evidence is scanty, there is no record that he ever styled...
himself "king of Galicia." In addition there is one document, if it can be relied upon, that would support the likelihood that Alfonso offered his brother a condominium over Galicia. In a private donation of November 23, 1071, the dating formula includes the citation "regnante rege Santio in Castella et in Gallecia et Adefonso fratre eius regnante in Legione et in Gallecia." Curiously this document is also confirmed by Alfonso's chief bishops, Pelayo of León and Bernard of Palencia, and by Sancho's only prelate, Bishop Jimeno of Oca-Burgos. It may, therefore, represent the indirect evidence of the approximate date on which such an agreement for joint rule was reached.

Such an accord, if it did in fact exist, would explain some of the confusion over the actual course of events in 1071 that has been reflected in subsequent documentary notices, in the chronicles, and in the literary accounts. It would not, however, have been of more than passing satisfaction to Sancho of Castilla. So long as an independent and rival kingdom of León lay between his realm and Galicia, his authority in Galicia was bound to be no more than a pale reflection of Alfonso's own authority there. The ultimate remedy, then, both for the inequity of his fathers original division of León-Castilla and for Alfonso's compounding of it by the virtual annexation of Galicia, lay in an attack on Alfonso and the absorption of the latter's entire realm by Sancho.

Such, I believe, was the actual course of events. In 1072 Sancho defeated and overthrew Alfonso. Only subsequently did Sancho proceed to intervene directly in Galicia and Portugal. It was sometime in the spring of 1072 that Sancho did indeed defeat Garcia, who probably had maintained himself precariously in central Portugal up to that time, near Santarem and forced him into exile at Sevilla. Such a reconstruction can be reconciled with the earliest narrative accounts of the Historia Silense and the "Chronicon Compostellanum." It is supported by the only Portuguese document, dated May 25, 1072, which cites Sancho as king. Finally, it is implied by such of the subsequent chronicles as mention Sancho's defeat of Garcia only after his defeat of Alfonso.

[33] The independent kingdom of Galicia-Portugal, established by Fernando I's division of his realm in late 1065, ceased to exist in the spring of 1072. The last remnants of it passed into the hands of Sancho II. When Sancho II was killed in the fall of the same year, that event encouraged Garcia to return from Sevilla, but there is no evidence whatsoever that he reestablished himself in his former domains. Rather, he seems to have approached his remaining brother, Alfonso, perhaps to seek his assistance in regaining those territories. He found instead a life in close captivity.

In retrospect, one might be tempted to conclude that the kingdom of Galicia-Portugal had come to the end inevitable for it; that it represented a little more in its beginnings than the emotional and traditional impulses of a monarch too much the captive of his family and his dynasty despite his great personal achievements. But in fairness to Fernando el Magno it must be said that his very accomplishments had created a situation with which his successors too would wrestle for decades if not centuries. In short, his conquests had so swollen his realms as to make almost impossible their government by a single man. Given the obvious lack of any but the most rudimentary administrative devices to project the royal presence, the sharing out of responsibilities within the dynasty represented a solution that accorded as well with practical necessities as it did with legal tradition, paternal feeling, and filial self-interest.

In contrast with León and Castilla, which shared the same meseta watered by the Duero, Galicia and Portugal alike lay beyond a continuous north-south range of mountains separating them from that great plain. To military expeditions, regular communications, political authority, and even ordinary social intercourse, that passive, natural barrier was formidable indeed under the prevailing conditions of the age. In addition, if Galicia-Portugal was but a series of adjoining coastal plains with their mountainous hinterlands to the east, the fact remains that at all times north to south travel and intercourse was manifestly more practical than that from east to west. Finally, one should recall both that the language
of Galicia-Portugal was much more sharply differentiated from that of the meseta than Leonese and Castilian were from one another and that Gallego and Portuguese can hardly be said to have been distinct at all in the eleventh century.

In short, what we are accustomed to regard as two distinct areas of two different nations constituted a single natural and cultural region or province in the eleventh century. Subsequent developments of political history should not be permitted to obscure that basic fact which would have been obvious to Fernando I. Given his realization that both [34] dynastic and political realities would force a partition of his realm at his death, Fernandos designation of Galicia-Portugal as one of the successor realms made as much if not more sense as did the division of León and Castilla. A more mature and experienced king than Garcia, willing to proceed patiently and even take a wife locally, might have effected far different political results. The history of that region during the succeeding sixty years hints at what these might have been.
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