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The Three Kingdoms: León

[52] Of the three kingdoms created by Fernando I's division of his realm among his sons, León was from the beginning clearly the greatest. In geographical extent, it virtually monopolized the meseta north of the Duero, leaving to Sanchos Castilla only the fringe of that plain east of the Pisuerga. To it also pertained the upland region of Bierzo in the west, pinning Garcias Galicia-Portugal against the Atlantic seaboard. In addition, to the central kingdom went the title to Fernandos recent conquests on the headwaters of the upper Duero but, above all, the ancient cradle of the kingdom, the mountain province of Asturias de Oviedo. Tradition and power were thus linked, making León preeminent from the first moment of the division in 1065.

Though it is not possible to assert or demonstrate a direct connection between the chancery of Fernando I and that of Alfonso VI, even the official documents of the latter seem to display the superior claims and assurance of the king of León. While the surviving charters of Sancho of Castilla outnumber those of Alfonso by almost two to one in the period 1065-1071, it is the total documentation associated with the Leonese court that displays the greater richness and sophistication of the traditional usage. All known royal documents of Sancho II are charters, but to the seven charters of Alfonso VI must be added yet another seven royal confirmations of private documents and two documents recording a judicial settlement, of the type called the agnitiio. These other functions of the crown were traditional and, though the absence of a record of such operations at the court of either Garcia or Sancho may be accidental, certainly the existing documents argue the greater assurance and poise of the Leonese monarch in the performance of the time-honored functions of the crown. Moreover, of the four charters purportedly issued by the royal sisters, the infantes Urraca and Elvira, one was clearly issued at Alfonso's court and a second was confirmed by him. Yet a third seems to have been a completely independent act. The last may have been confirmed by Sancho after he had himself become the king of León.

Not only in the diplomatic practice of its chancery did the court of León display a greater elaboration and organization than did the curiae of the other two kingdoms. The dignity of royal majordomo is clearly and regularly attested for this period as is that of royal alferez. None of the charters of Garcia or Sancho indicates the existence of a majordomo, and an alferez appears but once in a late diploma of Garcia, while, as we have seen, only the later literary sources speak of the Cid as shieldbearer of Sancho. Those magnates officially styled counts, also regularly appear as part of the royal curia of León, and there seems even to be as we shall shortly see, a working of the usual cursus honorum during the period 1066-1072.

Beyond the secular dignitaries of the court, three of the bishops of the realm seem to have been almost invariably in attendance. Predictably, the bishop of the royal city of León is associated with the king in twelve of the thirteen royal documents known. The two other bishops of the important meseta towns
and sees, Astorga and Palencia, were to be found in the royal presence on nine of the thirteen occasions marked by documents. In its close association of the bishops of certain sees with the royal court, the kingdom of Alfonso VI again reflects its assumption of the traditional norms.

Turning from form to substance, all three of these episcopal advisors at the early court of Alfonso VI were the choices of the latter years of the reign of Fernando I and would have reinforced the traditional prestige of the Leonese crown. Pelayo of León made his first appearance in the charter of Fernando dated March 10, 1065. Bishop Pedro of Astorga succeeded to that see after the death of Bishop Ordoño on February 23, 1065. Already consecrated by June 25, 1066, it has been argued that he was of the nobility of Asturias de Oviedo and uncle of the future mistress of Alfonso VI. Bishop Bernardo of Palencia [54] had already been named to that see by May 8, 1062. The suggestion has been made that he was a Catalan. All three prelates continued in office well beyond 1072.

Of those secular magnates who predominate in the Alfonsine documents of this period the most outstanding is Pedro Ansúrez. He confirmed nine of the total of thirteen charters whose list of those confirming survives. In the very first of them, dated July 24, 1067, he appeared as the royal majordomo. By May 3, 1071, Pedro Ansúrez had become a count but will continue to be a court figure. A sort of cursus honorum seems to have been regular practice in which sons of magnate families spent their youth at court, became either majordomo or alférez in their early manhood, and subsequently were advanced to the comital dignity, not infrequently that enjoyed by their fathers.

Much later sources tell us that Pedro Ansúrez had been both ayo, guardian, and companion of the young Alfonso. The latter is quite probable but the former is unlikely since the two were of approximately the same age. The Leonese noble never appears in the documents of the reign of Fernando I and he lived until 1117 or 1118. That he would have been of the years or maturity to be entrusted with the responsibility of guiding a royal scion is most unlikely therefore. A recent biographer gives Pedros birthdate as approximately 1037, which would have meant that he, like Alfonso VI, was some twenty-nine years of age in 1066.

His father was Assur Díaz, a count and not an infrequent figure at the court of Fernando I. The family holdings stretched north and south from Saldaña, through Carrión de los Condes, to Monzón de Campos along the Carrión River in the territories disputed since 1035 between León and Castilla. Their adherence to the cause of Alfonso VI was thus crucial. At this period, however, the control of those estates may have been in the hands of Pedros elder brother, Diego Ansúrez, who appears in four documents of the time also associated with Alfonso's court.

Second in importance among the secular magnates of the court was the alférez, Martín Alfénez, who first appears incontestably in that charge on June 25, 1066. He appears in eight of the thirteen royal documents of this period and had been advanced to countship by October 15, 1071 at the latest. Again we have a young man whose name never appeared in the documents of Fernando I but whose career suggests a courtly orientation and the patronage available to the son of an established family. He may be the son of Count Alfonso Núñez, whose name appeared occasionally in the documents of Alfonso VI's father. If so, the family held possessions about the royal palace at Cea, on the river of the same name north of Sahagún, and south of that royal monastery and pantheon as well as at Melgar de Arriba on the same river. They were ensconced, then, in the heartland of the royal fisc lands and so their loyalty was vital to Alfonso also. Under such circumstances it would not be surprising if the
Gonzalo Alfónsez who had replaced Martín as alférez by October 15, 1071, was his younger brother. (18)

Another of these young men who seemed to have formed a coterie about Alfonso VI was Pedro Múñoz. The latter appears in six court documents, one of which is a charter which the king granted to him on July 7, 1068. (19) From it he can be identified as the son of the late Count Muño Alfónsez so prominent in the court of Fernando I. He may have been a first cousin to the Ansúrez brothers as well. (20) The Pelayo Múnoz [56] who also figured in three court documents of this period was his brother. (21) Neither Pedro nor Pelayo acceded to their fathers comital dignity, however.

What one misses among all these scions of important families is precisely the presence of their elders. Given the scant character of the surviving documentation, unqualified conclusions are difficult to draw. It may be that the great figures of the reign of Alfonso's father had either died off or were progressively enfeebled. We should remember too the predominance of Castilians among the secular magnates of the court of Fernando I, and these would have gravitated naturally to the court of Sancho. Nevertheless it is at least possible to suspect some of the greater nobility of consciously holding aloof from full involvement in the affairs of Alfonso VI's reign and waiting on events. If true, such a situation may go far to explain Alfonso's defeat at Sanchos hands in early 1072.

A case in point is Pedro Peláez, first alférez and then count under Fernando. We know at least that this Asturian noble continued to be a count long after, but he appears in only two documents of Alfonso VI, and these are both of 1067 before the death of the queen-mother Sancha. Sancho Ordóñez, count under Fernando and still alive, appears in but one of Alfonso's documents although he too was probably Leonese. (22) Count Vermudo Ordóñez, again probably Leonese, makes but a single appearance at court. Count Fernando Fernández appears in three Alfonsine documents of the period, but he seems to have been a new man as well, there being no reliable record of him in the preceding reign.

One notable exception to this pattern, perhaps, is Count Guter Alfónsez, a long-time associate of Fernando el Magno, who appears in four of Alfonso VI's charters. The formers son, Telo Gutiérrez, also appears in two. (23) Still, when Alfonso VI chose a new majordomo in 1071, to replace Pedro Ansúrez who had been raised to countship, the choice seems to have fallen on a new and heretofore unknown man, Domingo Pérez. (24)

[57] This review of the documentary evidence for the period between 1066 and 1072 suggests that Alfonso VI was conscious of the superior dignity and tradition of his own kingdom of León among the realms established by his fathers decree. He seems to have carefully maintained its procedures and offices and to have enjoyed the support of the major prelates of his fathers times and the association of those other figures of the dynasty, his sisters Urraca and Elvira. The nucleus of his court consisted of a group of young men in their late twenties or early thirties like himself, offspring of the greatest families of León and probably the companions of his youth. At the same time, his reign seems to have lacked the unreserved support of some of the great magnate families, which weakness may be reflected in the events of 1072.

For the early years of his reign, neither the chroniclers nor the documents furnish the sort of evidence that would allow anything like an adequate history of his actions as monarch. During the year 1066 we have some private documents that suggest, because of those who confirm them, the presence of the court in Sahagún or León in the late spring. (25) Then the entire royal family, including his brothers Sancho and García, joined Alfonso there, as recorded by the Infanta Urracas donation to Santiago de Compostela on June 26, 1066. (26) This conference probably reflected the familys uneasiness with Garcias brusque assertion of his newfound power in Portugal, as mentioned in chapter 2. It may also be at this same time that Alfonso granted a charter to the Castilian Fernando Rodríguez, usually associated
with the court of his brother, Sancho, and the important fortress town of Castrojeriz.\(^{27}\) The significance of such a gift must have been equivocal.

The record for 1067 is not much more ample. Again Alfonso seems to have been in or around León and Sahagún in mid-spring.\(^{28}\) On July 24, 1067, when he granted a charter to the cathedral of León, Alfonso was certainly there. The importance of the occasion may be indicated by a rare appearance of the bishop of Oviedo at court. That the affairs of the kingdom of Galicia-Portugal were a matter of discussion is certain\(^ {58}\) from the inclusion of the bishop of Mondoñedo among the signatories as well.\(^ {29}\)

Alfonso seems to have been at León again on September 3, 1067, when he ratified a judicial settlement in favor of Bishop Pelayo of that city in the presence of most of the royal court.\(^ {30}\) Another such judicial decision, this time in favor of Abbot Gonzalo of Sahagún, took place in the royal presence in León on October 16, 1067.\(^ {31}\) Finally, although no documents records the event, the likelihood is that all of the children attended the obsequies and burial of the Queen-mother Sancha in León after her death on November 7, 1067.\(^ {32}\)

Thus far the documents would seem to indicate that Alfonso VI was preoccupied with the internal affairs of his own realm and that he remained in or near the effective center of it, the royal city of León. Such behavior was not unusual at the beginning of a reign, but in the nature of things it was bound to give way to more far-reaching initiatives and even responses to external events.

Nevertheless, private documents confirmed by the bishops of León, Astorga, and Palencia, usually associated with the court, suggest Alfonso's continued presence near León and Sahagún in the winter and early spring of 1068.\(^ {33}\) He was certainly there when he and other court figures confirmed a private document on May 1, 1068.\(^ {34}\)

But Ramón Menéndez Pidal, depending on Muslim sources, asserts that Alfonso VI attacked the taifa kingdom of Badajoz twice in 1068, taking advantage first of the mortal illness of its king and then the rivalry of his two sons after his death, to exact tribute. The taifa king of Toledo, al-Mamun, is said to have tried to mediate the conflict.\(^ {35}\) If the source is to be trusted the first campaign may have taken place in May and June of 1068. That was certainly the prime campaigning season in peninsular warfare. After the first of May the Leonese king cannot be placed anywhere until he reappears at Sahagún in his charter of July 7, 1068, in the company of his sisters Urraca and Elvira among others.\(^ {36}\)

Such an initiative on Alfonso's part would have been the first, unmistakable sign of his intention to depart from the settlement arranged by his father. Under the terms of that will, the parias, or tribute, from Badajoz was reserved to his brother, García of Galicia-Portugal. While García himself did not, and perhaps could not, respond to this breach of that understanding, the tentative incursion into Leonese territory by Sancho II that led to the skirmish at Llantadilla on July 19, 1068, may have been provoked or suggested by it.\(^ {37}\) This latter incident seems not to have seriously disturbed Alfonso VI. Before and after it his court remains at Sahagún.\(^ {38}\) It might, however, have inhibited an immediate resumption of the attack on Badajoz. Once again private documents suggest the presence of the court in the center of the realm until November 22, 1068, when the king granted a charter to Sahagún.\(^ {39}\)

After this last charter there is no notice of the whereabouts of Alfonso until late March 1069. He may have been waging his second campaign against Badajoz during the intervening period. That might help to explain why the charter of his sister, Elvira, to Santiago de Compostela on December 10, 1068, was not executed at court.\(^ {40}\)
For the year 1069 we have no chronicler to reveal the doings of the Leonese monarch nor even a single royal charter. Private documents reveal that the court was at the royal monastery of Sahagún in March, May, and again in August. At the end of the year, on December 20, the new cathedral was consecrated in Astorga. Since that episcopal town was one of the four key centers of the realm of León, the presence of the king and court may safely be assumed.

The same dearth of substantial sources continues in the following year. It is worth noting that the royal sisters Urraca and Elvira appeared in the court of Sancho of Castilla on January 18, 1070, but there is no hint of the reason for their presence there. During the spring and summer Alfonso VI was often at or near Sahagún. At León on October 1, 1070, he confirmed a private donation whose chief interest to us lies in the fact that it was also confirmed by the prior of the Galician monastery of Samos. By this time, as we have already seen, García of Galicia-Portugal was rapidly losing control of the northern portion of his domains and his bishop of Santiago de Compostela had been murdered with apparent impunity. The presence of an official of the important Galician monastery of Samos at the Leonese court suggests Alfonso's readiness to consider intervention in that realm. On November 24, 1070, the king was still at León, but events were to move swiftly toward a spectacular climax.

January 13, 1071, found the Leonese king at Sahagún. Open rebellion was in process in Portugal, however, and even though García was to defeat and kill the leader of the opposition there in late February, Leonese intervention had already become virtually inevitable. Alfonso was at León on February 19, 1071, entertaining the Galician bishop of Mondoñedo. His sisters, Urraca and Elvira, were at the court of Sancho II on March 26, 1071, perhaps explaining to that monarch the actions planned by Alfonso VI in Galicia. In early May the latter was still near Sahagún.

[We have a series of notes here, likely detailing various events, movements of the king, and interactions with other nobles and churches.]

During the latter part of November a great meeting was held at León or Sahagún, which Sancho of Castilla may himself have attended. Although he himself did not confirm either of the documents, that of November 18 cites him as regnant in Castilla, and that of November 23 cites him as ruling in Castilla and Galicia and Alfonso as ruling in León and Galicia. But an agreement for joint rule in Galicia could not, in fact, be really equal. It must work to the advantage of Alfonso VI, whose lands adjoined those of García.

In the list of those who confirmed Alfonso's charters in the fall of 1071 one notes already the new presence of the magnates of the northwest. Rodrigo Ovéquez, who confirmed as "filii comes" in June, had become "comes" by December. He, with his brothers Vela and Vermudo, who also first appear now at court, dominated the strategic area about Lugo in Galicia. Fernando Vermúdez, another Galician magnate, confirmed in October. So did the powerful Froila Arias from southern Galicia in November. And when on December 21, 1071, Alfonso gave a charter to Armentario Velásquez it was confirmed by another noble of the same region, Muño Velásquez, and by Alfonso's own merino for the adjoining region of Bierzo, Pelayo Cidiz.
Sancho II could hardly have been expected to view complacently the near doubling of Alfonso's influence and the latter's gradual consolidation of his power in the west of the peninsula which would inevitably follow. Such a gain, coupled with the traditional preeminence of the throne of León in the Christian north, would have confined his own royal dignity too closely, eventually making a mockery of the supposed equality of the brothers. As we have seen, the Castilian king decided to trust in the fortunes of battle rather than his brother's sense and assurances of equity. He invaded León and in January 1072 and defeated and captured Alfonso VI at Golpejera. By that stroke Sancho II gained a truly imperial realm if he could but secure general assent to his rule, for the territories to which he had thus acceded were divided by geography, tradition, and recent history.

As already noted, the documents of the immediate period are confused [63] and so one must fall back on the chronicles with all their vagueness as to chronology. The victor's first action, dictated by the twin necessities of security and retaining the initiative, were to despatch his captured brother back to Burgos in chains and to proceed himself immediately to the royal city of León. By January 12, 1072, he had secured possession of that central position. We are told, however, on that day he crowned himself. Such an action should be taken not as arrogance but as a result of the unwillingness of Bishop Pelayo of León, to whom the right pertained, to crown him. It was the first indication of the political task that now awaited him.

He seems to have begun it, naturally enough, by issuing a charter to Abbot Fernando of Sahagún, that most favored of all monasteries of the kings of León, on January 26, 1072. His recognition as king by that abbot would be a major first step to more general acceptance. It would be no more than a first step, however, for not one of the bishops of the realm of León confirmed the charter. Moreover, the only lay magnate of León who confirmed it was Count Fernando Fernández. For the rest, Sancho appears surrounded by the nobles of Castilla.

One of the ways in which the Castilian king could reinforce his dominance and secure a fuller submission of the Leonese nobility and church would be to obtain recognition in Galicia-Portugal and to deal with his yet younger brother, García, still maintaining himself in the south of Portugal. This task he probably undertook in the late winter and early spring. The only Portuguese document that cites him as reigning there is dated May 25, 1072. Later chronicles give epic-sounding accounts of his defeat and capture of García in the south of Portugal near Santarem, but the earliest useful source simply mentions the facts and informs us that the vanquished king was allowed to go into exile at Sevilla.

Such success would have strengthened materially Sanchos position in León, and it is likely that only in its aftermath would he have allowed his much more dangerous brother Alfonso to go, in turn, into exile. Though the chronology cannot be strictly established, it seems probable [64] that Alfonso was released from captivity in Burgos sometime in late May or June 1072 and allowed to take up residence in the taifa kingdom of Toledo. All of the accounts agree that the intercession of the Infanta Urraca was important in effecting this concession. The chronicle of the Cluniac monastery of Najera dating from the late twelfth century alleges the intervention of the great Saint Hugh, abbot of Cluny as well, and even the miraculous appearance of Saint Peter in Burgos, but the chronicle depends here on Bishop Hildebert of Le Mans twelfth-century life of Hugh. Bishko accepts the intercession of Hugh of Cluny as probable.

The internal, political necessities of the realm would have been more effective than external pressures. If Sancho of Castilla was to secure peaceful acceptance of his legitimate rule over the reunited patrimony of his father he is likely to have required, above all, the acquiescence of the two remaining, living members of the dynastic house, the infantas Urraca and Elvira. The latter remains a shadowy figure of whom we know little. All of the testimony agrees that it was with Urraca that Sancho had to
come to terms, and no doubt the safe release and relatively comfortable exile of the latter at the court of a former client was the key to whatever bargain was struck.

Nevertheless, there is little evidence that Sancho ever did manage to secure general recognition in the role he had won at Golpejera. Except for the charter to Sahagún mentioned above, no other genuine charters of Sancho survive from 1072. That may be merely a matter of chance but, on the other hand, accepting a charter from him would be the practical equivalent of recognizing Sancho as legitimate sovereign. So long as he had not finally consolidated his power, his largesse opened the recipient to a future charge of high treason if the situation should change. Perhaps the ambivalent evidence such private documents as exist for the period reflect not so much the confusion of later copyists as they do the perplexities of contemporaries. After all the citation of the "wrong" king in the final protocol of even a private document could subsequently cast a legal cloud on the validity of its contents.

At any rate, it would seem that, in addition to the abbot of Sahagún, the abbot of the important Leonese monastery of Eslonza also made his peace with the new monarch, for on May 11, 1072, he allowed a private [65] donation to his monastery to cite Sancho as ruler of León. The Leonese Count Fernando Fernández confirmed it as he had Sanchos earlier donation to Sahagún [67]. On May 12, 1072, a private donation to Sahagún cited Sancho also, and it was confirmed by the bishops of León, Palencia, and Astorga. If it could be accepted, the document would indicate a major advance for the Castilian king as signaling the submission of the major bishops of the realm of León. Whether or not Sancho ever progressed so far politically remains unclear because the document gives the long dead Ordoño as bishop of Astorga and so may be a forgery, or the confirmations of all the bishops may have been interpolated. [68]

But by the late summer the Castilians support was certainly wavering. The documents may indicate something of the sort. On August 23, 1072, a private donation to Sahagún confirmed by the bishops of León, Palencia, and Astorga simply cited no king at all in its protocol. [69] On September 5, 1072, another such donation was made jointly to the abbot of Sahagún and to Bishop Jimeno, presumably of Burgos-Oca. [70] It may thus indicate that Sancho was employing his own bishop to coordinate church matters together with the abbot of Sahagún, who had come to support the new regime.

Despite the best efforts of the Castilian monarch, by early October he was dead by assassination before the walls of Zamora. The earliest source tells us no more than that, and that he was subsequently buried at the Castilian monastery of Oña. [71] Bishop Pelayos account adds only the name of the assassin, "Velliti Ariulfi," to this account. [72] A third chronicle, perhaps roughly contemporary with these two, tells us that a rebellion had been raised against Sancho in Zamora by the Infanta Urraca and Count Pedro Ansúrez and that the former met his death on Saturday, October 6, 1072. [73]

These are the bare facts of which we dispose, themselves written perhaps [66] between fifty and sixty years after the event. Such an event was bound to capture the literary imagination, however, and one can catch echoes of what had been done with it already by the time of the composition of the Cronica Najerense in the last quarter of the twelfth century. The full tide of that literary effort is reflected in the thirteenth century historians. If one believes seriously in the historical verisimilitude of the bards, one arrives at the sort of elaboration reflected in Menéndez Pidal. [74]

It seems to me that we must depend on the chroniclers, however spare the accounts, because of their priority in time. It has been asserted by the literary historians that the epic materials on which the historians of the late twelfth century and the thirteenth drew began rather to be composed toward the end of the late eleventh century and thus are prior to the historical accounts. [75] I find such hypotheses doubtful in the extreme. It seems to me that the growth of such a literary tradition during the reign of Alfonso VI himself, or of his daughter, Urraca, who so consciously continued her fathers policy, or of
her son Alfonso VII whose reign was so brilliant, is inherently unlikely. I expect that the ambiance that would have proved fertile for and disposed to the patronage of such efforts, is to be sought rather in the period of the division of the kingdoms of León and Castilla after the death of Alfonso VII in 1157. The continuing rivalry of the two kingdoms and the occasional state of hostility between them would have provided a proper soil for the growth of a specifically anti-Leonese literary inheritance in the form of a *Cantar de Sancho II* and, more ambiguously, the *Cantar de mio Cid*. The recent redating of the *Crónica Najerense* to the last quarter of the twelfth century would allow for the first incorporation of such anti-Leonese tales in the chronicle tradition.

Returning to the historians of that tradition, then, one finds that Sancho was faced with a rebellion sometime in the late summer or early fall of 1072. Its dimensions seem not to have been formidable. The only names of importance associated with it are those of Urraca and Pedro Ansúrez. The figures of Vellido Adolfo and of Arias González, later associated with it in the literary sources, figure in no contemporary documents of which I am currently aware. Zamora itself was a frontier outpost on the line of the Duero some 125 kilometers south of the city of León. The town was a citadel atop slopes that rose abruptly from the river and were capped by formidable walls. But these obstacles mainly looked toward the south from which the Muslim raids traditionally came.

From the north the approach to the city is quite feasible militarily and, were the northern walls to be breached, the very character of the southern terrain made of the city a cul-de-sac for its defenders. Except for its role as a border fortress, Zamora was a place of little importance in the mid-eleventh century. It will not achieve the status of a bishopric until fifty years hence, and by comparison with Astorga, León, Palencia, Burgos, or even Oviedo it was of small matter to the realm and its monarch.

In all likelihood what made the town of grave concern to Sancho was that from it communications with Toledo to the southeast where Alfonso VI was sojourning and with Sevilla to the south where García sulked in exile were virtually unimpeded. It is entirely possible that the "revolt" consisted of no more than the refusal of his sister and Count Pedro to make a formal submission to him and of their flight from court to a border town in which they could rally some support. Nevertheless, given the new and necessarily provisional character of his rule, Sancho had to react strongly as he did. The defection of a member of the royal house itself and her support by a powerful magnate and former majordomo of Alfonso VI could hardly be safely ignored. If they were given the opportunity to concert plans with the other two male members of the royal house, the whole of Sanchos fragile rule over Portugal, Galicia, León, and Oviedo could begin to deteriorate. And so he undertook, probably in September 1072, an expedition to force the rebels into submission or force their own flight into exile. In the most surprising of fashions, it led instead to his own murder before the walls of Zamora. The success of the assassin, stripped of its later dramatic literary accretions, is perhaps the most telling evidence of the insecurity of such control as his military victories had given him and his failure to achieve a subsequent political settlement.
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