IX

Count Henrique of Portugal, Cluny, and the antecedents of the Pacto Sucessório

(Published originally in Revista Portuguesa de Historia 13 (1971); reprinted with permission.)

[155] Despite more than a century of intense scrutiny, the genesis, date and circumstances of the so-called Pacto Sucesório mediated by the Cluniac chamberlain Dalmácio Geret between the two Ibero-Burgundian counts Henrique of Portugal and Raimundo of Galicia remain subject to considerable contention. The last detailed exegetical studies, by Pierre David (1948) and Rui de Azevedo (1947 [1953], 1962), notably advance our control over this problematic text, with its subsequently influential guarantees of Portuguese territorial enlargement and its manifest relevance for the prolonged crisis in the Hispanic Empire over the succession to Afonso VI; but they diverge sharply regarding its chronology (1105-1107 as against 1095-1107) and motivation. Much clearly remains to be learned; and prominent here among other promising lines of inquiry is the as yet only perfunctorily examined role of Abbot Hugo of Cluny, a role the contracting parties themselves proclaim is central when in transmitting their covenant to him they describe it as negotiated in conformity with his command. It is in this connection that the present paper, in warmly associating itself with the homage of the learned world to Professor Paulo Merêa, would call attention to an unknown Henrician diploma that not only throws fresh light upon the Portugutese count's relations with the Burgundian abbey but provides also a possible means of determining more accurately the date and immediate antecedents of the celebrated Pacto.

I

The document in question is a privilégio of Henrique of Portugal that finds no place among the count's collected charters in the first Régios volume of the Documentos Medievais Portugueses. In form an act of donation, prepared like most of Henrique's known diplomas outside his own official scriptorium, and bearing the date Era M. C. XLIII. et noto die qui fuit III Kalendas Februarias, or 30 January 1105, its explicit purpose is to confer certain tithes and churches which belonged to Henrique and his wife D. Teresa in the Galician comarca of Sanabria upon Cluny and, more specifically, upon S. Isidro de Dueñas. This is the Benedictine royal monastery, founded in the tenth century, which Afonso VI gave to the Cluniacs in December 1073 as their first Leonese-Castilian (and indeed proto-Iberian) dependency, and which served as chief center of their trans-Pyrenean possessions until, under Urraca, it was superseded by the more strategically located priory of S. Zoil (or Zoilo) de Carrión de los Condes, henceforth the administrative capital of the Province of Hispania.

The original of the Henrician privilégio has long since vanished, but the greater part of the text is
preserved in the form of copies contained in two 18th-century diplomatic collections in Madrid, the Colección Velázquez of the Academia de la Historia, which includes two copies in different hands, and the Codex 720 of the Biblioteca Nacional. All three of these versions, like those of the other Isidorian charters with which they appear, go back to a manuscript terminating with a colophon which begins with the words *Todos estos Privilegios y donaciones se sacaron del libro que dicen del Vecerro del dicho monasterio de sant Issidro de duenas*. This contained copies of a number of the monastery's documents, chiefly but not exclusively of royal origin, extracted from its 13th-century cartulary or Becerro in April 1594 by order of the Licenciado Gil Ramírez de Arellano, a member of the Consejo Real under Felipe II and oidor of the Real Chancillería de Valladolid. This now lost manuscript, obviously prepared for legal purposes in connection with defence of S. Isidro's patrimonies and rights, did not transcribe from the Becerro the absolutely complete text of each act, but often omitted or abbreviated conventional penal and similar passages and even, as in Count Henrique's case, certain secondary dispositive or topographic details. But the invocatory and other initial protocol, the principal dispositive prescriptions, the chronological clauses, and the full list of subscriptions, are nearly always given as the compiler of the Privilegios y Donaciones found them in the Becerro; and since both the Becerro and the Ramírez de Arellano transcript presumably perished along with almost all of the rich archives of Dueñas in the destructive campaigns of the Napoleonic wars in northern Castile during 1808 and after, the 18th-century copies of the Privilegios y Donaciones are fundamental to reconstruction of this great Cluniac priory's history and temporal.

In addition there survives also at Madrid in the Archivo Histórico Nacional an invaluable índice of the entire documentation of the Isidorian archive as this existed, still inviolate, in the years 1683-1693. Prepared by the house's archivero Dom Bernardo Gutiérrez following his reorganization of the vast collection of materials, this calendars with brief but adequate summary not only the medieval pergaminhos, many of which were by this date sewn together in long rolls (rollos de pieles); but also itemizes, folio by folio, each act included in the Becerro of the 13th-century, similarly noting the content. Thus it records acts of which no separate exemplar existed; and at times provides data not carried over into the abridged text of the Privilegios y Donaciones. Such is the case with the Henrician donation, which the Índice informs us was originally on fols. 54-55 of the Becerro. From this entry we learn that the grant included tithes omitted from the version of the Privilegios y Donaciones.

The following text is essentially that of Academia de la Historia, Madrid, Colección de Velázquez, tomo IV, leg. 4, fols. 804r-805r, no. 1422 (also no. 43), which has been collated with the second copy found among the unnumbered fols. in a different hand at the end of this same legajo, where it has been given the number 1446; and also with the copy in Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, MS. 720, fols. 300r-301r, no. 43. Appended is Gutiérrez' summary from the Becerro as recorded in his Índice, fol. 13.

---

**Donación del Conde Don Enríque Conde de Portugal**

*In nomine sancte et indiuidue Trinitatis Patris et Filij et Spiritu(s) Sancti. Ego Henrricus nutu Dei Portugalensis et Columbriensis prouintie comes regisque gener cum consensu uxoris mee infantis donne Tharaisie facio hanc testamenti seriem Sancto Petro de Cluniaco et eius monasterio prenominato de Sancto Issidoro de Donnas. Ubi offero omnem decimam partem mei panis et uini seu animalium et peccorum que mihi omnibus annis nata fuerint in terra de Sanabria uel in omnibus meis palatijs que de Sanabria in hac parte modo habeo uel deinceps acquisiero, de omnibus tribuo decimam partem fruct(u) um. Et in Villa Quesxita do ibi duas ecclesias Sancti Romani et Sancte Columbe. Et in Pausata de Rey concedo alias duas ecclesias Sancte Marie et Sancti Petri, etc.* [159] Hoc autem facio anime me(e) et ut Sanctum Petrum parissadii clauigerum cuius famulos subleuare studeo in terris pium et propitium merear habere in celis, etc. Siquis tamen quod fieri non credo contra hoc nostrum factum ad disrrumpendum uenerit, etc., sit
excommunicaet us ab omni Christianorum consortio separatus, etc.

Facta autem hac carta firmitatis Era M. C. XLIII. et noto die qui fuit III Kalendas Februarias. Ego Enricus Dei gratia comes et gene(r) regis quod feci comfirmo. Tharasia regis filia et predicti comitis uxor quod dominus meus (MSS: Deus) feci (t) confirmo.


Petrus Pelaez maiordomus comitis conf.


Pelagius Erigit cognomento Botam regalis palatij notarius conf.

Diezmos de Sanabria y de otras cuatro Iglesias [Indios, fol. 13]

Fol. 54. Vna Donacion del Conde D. Henrique conde de la Prouincia Portugalense y Coimbrense y Yerno del Rey por estar [160] casado con su hija la Infanta D. Teresa. Fecha en Era 1143 en Honor de S. Pedro de Cluni y del Glorioso S. Ysidro cuy(o) Monasterio [es clunia] cense. Dona la decima parte de todos los frutos y Ganados que le nacieren en tierra de Sanatoria, y todo el partido que de Sanabria le pertenece. Mas dona dos Iglesias suyas (?) En Villa queixa la vna de S. Roman la otra de S. Coloma con todo s(u) Diezmo. [Mas dona en] Posada de Rey otras dos Iglesias dedicadas a N. Señora y al Glorioso S. Pedro con todo su Diezmo y con todo el Diezmo de Valletonco, y quiere que todo esto lo posean los Monjes de [S. Y.].

In the foregoing document we have what appears at first glance to be, except possibly for the unusually large number of confirmations, a conventional monastic donation. The dispositive stipulations can be readily summarized. On 30 January 1105 Henrique count of Portugal and Coimbra and son-in-law of King Afonso VI, with the approval of his wife the Infanta Teresa, for the benefit of his soul and in the hope of future reward from S. Pedro whose earthly servants he thus succors, makes to Cluny and her dependency of S. Isidro de Dueñas a triple benefaction. This consists of (i) a tenth of the grain, wine and livestock annually produced on all pagos he then posesses or shall in future acquire in the Terra de Sanabria; (ii) four igrejas propias there belonging to him, together with their dizimos, namely, S. Roimao and Santa Comba in «Villa Quesxita» and Sancta Maria and S. Pedro in «Pausata de Rey»; (iii) the dizimos of «Valletonco».

To dispose first of certain preliminary questions, there is no reason to suspect the accuracy of the date as transmitted by all four sources from the Becerro of S. Isidro, which raises no discoverable difficulties for the itineraries of either Condes or confirmants. The locations of the vilas and churches named cannot all be satisfactorily identified in the present state of toponymic investigation of the region of Sanabria, lying to the north of Bragança, beyond the traditional frontier of Trás-os-Montes in
what is now the northwestern panhandle of the Spanish province of Zamora. Presumably they lay not far west of the comarcal capital of Puebla de Sanabria where the inhabited places of San Roman and Santa Columba survive, although it has not proved possible to trace the terms «Villa Quesxite», «Pausata de Rey» or «Valletronco» in the medieval texts or modern maps and geographical works pertaining to this area. There is however no doubt that the Portuguese comital house possessed properties in this Luso-Leonese borderland: between 1129 and 1135 Henrique's son Afonso was to give here to the Sanabrian abbey of S. Martinho de Castanheira (San Martín de Castañeda) the villa of Mahide between Puebla and Alcañices; and in 1169 he similarly transferred to the cathedral church of Zamora his domains at Manzanal in the Terra de Aliste. In view of Sanabria's inclusion during this epoch in the diocese of Astorga, it is to be rememberted that the metropolitans of Braga long claimed provincial jurisdiction over this diocese and that the whole zone of Western Leon was also the object of Portuguese expansionist claims under Henrique, Teresa and Afonso Henriques.

[163] It seems plain however that the Henrician diploma of 1105 was drawn up neither in Sanabria nor in the County of Portugal but somewhere farther to the east in the kingdom of Leon. Along with the complete absence of Portuguese episcopal subscriptions, the decisive testimony on this point is the corroborations of the Leonese bishops, abbots, priors and royal officials. The precedence given the name of Bishop Raimundo of Palencia among the ecclesiastics, and the fact that of the six monastic confirmants four--the abbot of Sahagún and the priors of S. Zoil de Carrión, S. Salvador de Nogal and S. Salvador de Villaceite (or Villacet) -- also belong to this same diocese, make it almost certain that the whole company attesting the comital donation to S. Isidro was gathered in the then Leonese Terra de Campos along the Palencian sector of the Santiago pilgrimage road. The cathedral city of Palencia itself can safely be dismissed as situated too far south of the great highway, and the same is even more true of the priory at Dueñas. Since not only the abbot of Sahagún, but also the priors of two of his dependent houses, were present, that great Benedictine abbey is a strong possiblility; on the other hand, the Cluniac priory of S. Zoil de Carrión, also on the camín francés a few kilometres farther east, is perhaps even more likely as the most suitable place for making a grant to Cluny.

On the other hand, the size of the corroborative assembly and the validation of the diploma by the Leonese-Castilian palatine notary Palo Eriges suggest the need to relate the document somehow to the imperial court of Alfonso VI, which in 1105 can be found moving eastward along the pilgrimage road to Burgos; and this is a problem to which we shall presently return. Before doing so however it is necessary to consider in some detail the extraordinary composition of the body of ecclesiastics and laymen who appear in Count Henrique's Sanabrian benefaction to S. Isidro.

II

[164] Prosopographic analysis of the forty-three persons other than the Condes of Portugal who subscribe the donation of 30 January 1105 reveals that they fall into two distinct categories, one Leonese, the other Portuguese. Of the twenty six Portuguese or Portuguese-linked confirmats commencing with «Petrus Pelaez», virtually all can be identified as leading members of the Minhotan aristocracy who in the years before and after 1105 served Count Henrique as administrative officers or mesnadeiros, and whose names repeatedly occur in the Portuguese diplomas of this era. At the head of the list stand the two ranking officials of the comital household: the maioerdos comitit Pedro Pais (Pedro Pelaez), the well-known mordamo-mor who can be found in the count's documents between 1101 and 1112; and the alferes Soeiro Nunes (Suero Nuniz) who can similarly be traced between at least 1097 and 1108. There follow familiar names of magnates from the comarcs around Braga. The five Pais other than Pedro (Nuno, Drogo, Egas, Menido, Gutierre) are doubtless close kinsmen of the mordomo-mor; at least two, Mando (Menendo Pelaez) and Nuno (Nunes Pelaez) -- the latter once Henrique's alferes -- are his brothers and appear with him in the act of 21 August 1105 relating to the
cession of the monastery of Tibães to the see of Braga. Of the three Moniz confirmants, Egas (Egas Munioz) must be the [165] celebrated later aio of Afonso Henriques, *o honrado e bemventurado Dom Egas Moniz de Ribadouro*, to whom circa 1100 the charters assign the lordships of S. Martinho and Arouoa. Ermigio Moniz (Ermigio Munioz), who subscribes other Henrician diplomas, is the brother of this legendary figure. As for Martim Moniz (Martin Munioz), he may well be the adventurous senhor of Montemor who succeeded, by 1092, his father-in-law Count Sismando as Count of Coimbra, was shortly thereafter deprived of this post in favor of Afonso VI's son-in-law, Count Raimundo, and became an open opponent of both the Burgundian prince and the king-emperor. This led him to take service with the Cid in the Levante and he is mentioned in the Poema as *Martin Muñoz que mando a Mont Mayor*. Apparently this high-born Portuguese aristocrat had returned to his native land after the Cid's death in 1090 or following Valencia's fall to the Almoravids in 1102, and thrown in his lot with Count Henrique, alongside whom he can later be found fighting, under the banner of King Afonso I of Aragon, in the civil wars that swept the Hispanic Empire after 1109.

Other powerful clans are likewise represented by prominent members: the Viegas (Venegas) by three; the Mendes (Menendez) by three; the Gonçalves (Goncalvez) by two. Mendo Nunes (Menendo Nunez), possibly a kinsman of the alferes, may well have a similar background, while Paio Pires (Pelayo Petri), who attests numerous charters circa 1105, is recognizable as an outstanding Minhotan magnate. He and Afonso Pires (presumably the Alfonsus Petriz of our catalogue) are mentioned by the *Vita s. Geraldi* as *duos regionum magnates*; according to this same work, Paio left to join the Moors after being accused of incest by the saintly archiepiscopal reformer of Braga. By 1105 he must have returned from this self-imposed exile.

Not all the names in this section of the list necessarily conform to this same pattern. Alvaro Velazquez, Ramiro Arias and Pelagius Gomez are still to be identified. As for the important figures of Telo Teles (Tel Tellez) and Afonso Teles (Alfonso Tellez), these two brothers were comparative newcomers to Portuguese soil, who had once been among the chief Leonese proceres of the Terra de Campos and Palencia but had joined forces with Henrique and D. Teresa. As late as 1103 Afonso was still serving as *maior-domus* of Afonso VI, although it is evident from Portuguese pergaminhos of 1108 and 1112, as well as from our text of 30 January, that soon after 1103 he -- and presumably Telo as well -- abandoned the imperial household and aligned himself politically with Henrique.

Now it is true that not a few of these nobles regularly accompany Henrique and Teresa down to the former's death in 1112, as their documents demonstrate. So, in 1097, we find with the condes Nuno Pais (then still Henrique's alferes) and Soeiro Nunes; in 1101, Soeiro Nunes and Pedro Pais; in 1106, in February (with Teresa [167] alone), Egas Moniz, and in August, with both condes, Telo Teles, Afonso Teles and Egas Moniz; in 1108, Pedro Pais, Telo Teles and Egas Moniz; in 1109, Martim Moniz and Mendo Viegas; in 1110, Mendo Viegas, Gomes Viegas, Egas Moniz, Egas Pais, Mendo Pais and Pedro Fais; and in 1111, when they are all explicitly styled members of the *scola comitis*, Pedro Gonçalves, Mendo Viegas, Mendo Pais and Pedro Pais. But in no single extant Henrician document other than the Sanabrian donation to Dueñas do we encounter more than five of such subscriptions; in none does there ever appear so impressively complete a muster of the Portuguese count's chief partidários. Clearly, we are dealing with an unusual occasion that must be reckoned with in assessing the historical setting of the act of 30 January 1105.

The fifteen Leonese subscriptions are no less indicative of a gathering of special significance. Of the nine churchmen present, the three bishops -- Raimundo of Palencia, Pedro of Leon, Pelâgio or Paio of Astorga -- all govern sees in Leon. On the monastic side, Abbot Diego of Sahagún is well known as
having ruled that great Leonese abbey from 1087 to 1110[^35]; the second Diego must be affiliated with the important but sparsely documented house of S. Claudio de Leon in the imperial capital[^36], and the third abbot of this name, from the venerable monastery of S. Pedro de Montes in the Bierzo to the north of Astorga, turns up also in a royal charter of Afonso VI promulgated at Astorga on 31 March 1105[^37]. Each abbot hails from the diocese of one [168] of the three bishops, so that we have representing Palencia, Bishop Raimundo and Abbot Diego of Sahagún; Leon, Bishop Pedro and Abbot Diego of S. Claudio; Astorga, Bishop Pelágio and Abbot Diego of S. Pedro de Montes.

The three priors however do not conform to this distribution. Something has gone wrong with the name of the first of the trio, for between 1101 and 1107 a Prior Bernardo ruled this major Cluniac dependency at Carrión de los Condes[^38]; nor can this error be explained as simple transposition of the next name on the list, since it is certain that at this time S. Salvador's prior was in fact named Bernardo[^39]. In any event, the prior was a Cluniac of the Palencian diocese; and the other two priors, Bernardo of Nogal and Mundo of Villacet, although not Cluniacs, have the same provenance. Both these latter monasteries must, at the time of Count Henrique's charter, have been possessions of Sahagún. S. Salvador de Nogal (or Nogar), situated a little north of Carrión, had been given to the great abbey by Afonso VI in 1093, and remained in Sahagún's hands until Afooso VII briefly alienated it to certain nobles of his court before returning it in 1127 to the [169] mother house[^40]. S. Salvador de Villacet, although its status circa 1105 is less readily determinable, also appears to have then belonged to the Leonesa abbey. We know that when, in 1103, Hordonius Sarraciniz acquired one-third of S. Salvador from his wife, Fronildi Ovequiz, the pair immediately transferred this portion of the house to Sahagún[^41]. Presumably Fronildi did likewise with the other two-thirds, although her donation act is missing; at any rate, by 1113 she was excommunicated by the Council of Palencia for having taken back Villacet into her own hands, and in 1115 she had formally returned most of it to Sahagún's possession[^42]. Furthermore, as late as 1104 Villacet was still ruled by an abbot, Pedro, not a prior[^43], so that Munio's confirmation of the charter of 30 January -- apparently the unique occasion on which he can be discovered in the available documentation -- suggests that he was either acting in his abbots's stead, or that Pedro by 1105 had been replaced by a prior. In any case, our three priors all hail from the same diocese of Palencia, one of them a Cluniac, the other two delegates of Sahagún’s daughter-houses.

As for the lay subscriptions here, the six names that immediately follow those of the ecclesiastics belong to persons high in the aristocracy and official bureaucracy of the Leonese monarchy. Martin Flainez, once the alferes of Afonso VI and, other than Henrique himself, the only count present, is familiar from ca. 1090 for his associations with the districts of Valladolid, Simancas, Aguilar and Cea, and appears in numerous royal documents[^44]. [170] He was also, as a benefactor in 1089 of S. Zoil de Carrión, a good friend to Cluny. Of his two sons who confirm the Isildorian act, Gomez Martinez, the elder and holder of the title potestas, also subscribes along with his father a pergaminho of Count Pedro Ansures to Sahagún in 1101; of Diego Martinez nothing more can be learned[^45]. The other three figures in this group, the prepositi terrarum, Munio, i.e., Munio Diaz de Carrión and Saldaña, Miguel Alfonso of Leon and Cea, and Ero Gutierrez of Astorga and Campos, are royal meirinhos in charge of administrative areas at this time[^46]. These meirinhados of Carrión-Saldaña, Leon-Cea and Astorga-Campos correspond geographically to the bishoprics of Palencia, Leon and Astorga, so that from each of these districts surrounding the imperial capital in the heartland of the Leonese state, a bishop, an abbot and a royal meirinho corroborate Henrique's gift to Dueñas.

To sum up, the impression is of an unusual assembly of notables, partly Laonese, even more Portuguese, brought together by the Count of Portugal at the end of January in the Terra de Campos.
While the unmistakably dual composition of Count Henrique's confirmatory assembly might possibly be explained as a fortuitous (or even deliberately selected) fraction of the imperial court, and such an hypothesis might seem to gain support from the role of the palatine notary Paio Eriges in the drawing up of the diploma, the weight of the evidence is against this solution. No known testimony places Afonso VI or his curia in the Terra de Campos as early as January 1105; on the contrary, in late March, the king-emperor was still far to the west at Astorga in the course of his slow progress across Leon and Castile towards the Campos and eventually to Burgos. From the imperial documents falling between 31 March and 12 December, furthermore, it is demonstrable that relatively few of the persons present with Henrique and Teresa in January shared the subsequent itinerary of the court during the remainder of the year. Of the Leonese, only the three bishops, the Abbot Diego of S. Pedro de Montes, Count Martin Flainez, and the letter's son, the potestas Gomez Martinez, act as confirmants. In contrast with certain household officers or retainers of Count Raimundo of Galicia, no Portuguese, not even the mordomo-mor Pedro Pais or the alferes Soeiro Nunes, witnesses these diplomas, even if we suppose that some of Henrique's mesnadeiros must have attended him and Teresa in Burgos. As for the notary Paio Eriges, whose name also appears in a Henrician diploma of 1097, although only in its subsequently appended confirmation of Afonso VI, he may well have been available while awaiting at Sahagún or Carrión the king-emperor's arrival as he moved toward the Castilian capital. Finally, neither Henrique nor Teresa seems to have joined the court until some time shortly before 14 May, when Afonso had reached Castrogeriz just east of the Campos in Castile. It looks, then, as if in late 1104, or at the very beginning of 1105, the Count of Portugal, his wife and an exceptionally large escort of Portuguese magnates travelled to the Terra de Campos well in advance of the king-emperor; and at Sahagún or Carrión met in conference with Leonese churchmen, meirinhos and nobles, after which most, if not all, of the Portuguese other than the condes returned to Minho, while half of the Leonese contingent dispersed to their customary stations.

But if this makes it highly unlikely that our charter is a product of the imperial court, at any rate the roll of its subscriptions must be evaluated in the light of the imperial succession problem which at that moment dominated all Leonese-Castilian-Portuguese political activity. By January 1105, some two years after Afonso manifested his intention to abandon his previous commitment to Count Raimundo and in effect designated the Infante Sancho as his heir, the governing classes of the Hispanic Empire, ecclesiastical and secular, must have been in a state of acute polarization between the two candidates for the throne; and the king-emperor's advanced age -- he was in January 1105 just three and a half years away from his final agony at Toledo -- brought ever closer the moment of national disruption and civil war. Under such circumstances it is difficult, if not impossible, to believe that Count Henrique's bipartite assembly of 30 January could have been convoked solely or even chiefly for the purpose of securing corroboration of a conventional monastic donation. Behind the eleemosynary intent a more fundamental, distinctly political purpose can be discerned, the winning over of key figures in the Leonese Church and bureaucracy to some measure of agreement or cooperation with him -- in short, an attempt to create a Luso-Leonese coalition in the face of the Raimundist-Sanchist factionalism.

It by no means follows that such a scheme was intended to defend Raimundo's rights to the Hispanic throne against Sancho; on the contrary, given what we know of Count Henrique's political goals, the reverse is almost certainly the case, especially when it is observed that the Pacto Sucesório vividly reflects a state of acute antagonism between the imperial sons-in-law. Most writers, to be sure, have assumed that this agreement attests a close collaboration of the two Burgundians in mutual defiance of Afonso's succession formula: such, for example, is the view, explicit or implied, of Saraiva, Herculano,
David and Rui de Azevedo. But others, notably López Ferreiro and Gonzaga de Azevedo, have much more convincingly seen behind the Pacto an underlying conflict between its principals; and it is hard indeed, in view of the major political, territorial and financial concessions made to the Count of Portugal, to reach any other conclusion than this: that these were extracted from Raimundo -- even if in return for a pledge of political and military support -- only because the Galician prince faced the fatal consequences of Henrique's opportunist opposition and stood in desperate fear of being denied the indispensable Portuguese assistance against Sancho.

Aside from the Pacto, Count Henrique's role in the dynastic crisis prior to Raimundo's death at the end of 1107 has hitherto been more readily conjectured than documented. Whether with Herculano we fix in 1103, or with Ruas in 1101, the prince's presumed departure for the Holy Land, Gonzaga de Azevedo has proved from four Henrician confirmations to pergaminhos of Sahagún, that he was present in the Peninsula during 1104. This agrees perfectly with the implication of the Sanabrian donation of late January 1105, that decisions and plans for the Luso-Leonese meeting in the Terra de Campos must have been made in the preceding year. In any case, we can be confident that Henrique's policy in the face of Afonso VI's proposed dynastic revolution would be determined not, as so often facilely reiterated, by sentiments of affection towards Raimundo on grounds of their supposed kinship and common Burgundian origin (neither of which factors need be taken seriously), but by the dazzling opportunity that the imminent struggle for the Empire presented in furtherance of two objectives he vigorously pursued down to his death in 1112: maximum emancipation of Portugal from centralizing imperial rule; expansion of Portuguese territory not merely to the south against the infidel, but eastward into the Leonese kingdom and its newly annexed estremaduras. For the second of these objectives we can adduce his assumption, in 1111, at a time when Raimundo and Afonso were both dead and Urraca was hard pressed by civil strife, of the title comes in Alçamora et Asturica et in Portugal; and his encouragement of the Church of Braga's metropolitical claims over the diocese of Astorga against Toledo and Compostela.

It is on this question of Henrician-Raimundist schism during the climatic years of the succession crisis that the Isidorian diploma is particularly suggestive. Leon obviously was the big prize, if war with Sancho's partisans shattered the unity of the Hispanic Empire, partly because of its significance for the imperial office, hardly less because its annexation promised enormous increase of power and prestige to the ruler of either Portugal or Galicia. In the years before 1105 Raimundo's presence in the Leonese territories was already strong by reason of his employment by Afonso VI as administrator of Zamora and as repovoador of Salamanca, where in 1102 the count installed as bishop the Cluniac Jerónimo, a refugee from the Cid's fallen Valencia. But the Galician prince was also well established in the heartland of the older Leon through his possessions of lands and political authority to the south of Sahagún at Grajal, where he tended to reside in his last years and where in November-December 1107 he died. In Grajal also in 1106 he can be found, for example, giving to the church of Santa Maria Magdalena at Sahagún the vila of «Vulxote»; here also he exercised governmental power over the district through his own personal meirinho Martin Ceidiz. As legitimate heir, consort of the king-emperor's oldest daughter, D. Urraca, and ruler of Galicia, Raimundo must have seemed to many Leonese far preferable to the more visibly Castilian-oriented Infante Sancho; and when we encounter him on 16 January 1105, at the time when Enrique was busy in the Campos, he and Urraca are in Galicia presiding over a mixed company of clerics and nobles that included four interesting non-Galicians: the metropolitans Bernardo of Toledo and Geraldo of Braga; and also the two Leonese bishops Pelágio of Astorga and Pedro of Leon who a fortnight later are to subscribe Henrique's donation to S. Isidro. Evidently Raimundo was busy constructing his political fences in the northwest at the very time Henrique in the Campos was also seeking to enlist supporters.
The Count of Portugal's position in Leon was of course far weaker. Other than the patrimonies in Sanatoria that are the subject of his benefaction to Dueñas, Henrique is known to have possessed within the kingdom only Villameriel near Saldiaña, a property he exchanged with Sahagún in 1101 for the monastery of S. Pedro de Tronco, also, perhaps, in the same area\(^{63}\); nor do we find him participating in the repovaçao of the Leonese Estremadura. In seeking to secure allies beyond the Portuguese frontier, he was therefore at a distinct disadvantage as compared with Raimundo; but Henrique [177] must have expected to attract to his banner not Leonese magnates who, like the powerful Count Pedro Ansurez, loyally accepted their monarch's choice of heir, but rather those churchmen and nobles in the kingdom who opposed Afonso and the Infante Sancho but were not yet formally committed to a Raimundist alternative.

In this context the conference of 30 January, with its Portuguese and Leonese but no Galician, attendants is most naturally seen as a major step in Count Henrique's plan to secure control of all or part of Leon. Such an interpretation, furthermore, of the Campestrian assembly, which if valid would provide important new testimony to the background of comital hostility preceding the Pacto Sucesório, becomes even more persuasive when we consider the Cluniac aspects of the Sanabrian benefaction and relate these to Abbot Hugo's intervention in Spain, the immediate prelude to the negotiation of the comital covenant.

IV

The Cluniac factor in the genesis of the Pacto Sucesório and indeed the entire Leonese-Castilian succession crisis under Afonso VI and D. Urraca, although usually touched upon by the authorities, has been little investigated in depth, even otherwise so brilliant a diagnosis as that of Ramos y Loscertales dismissing it much too briefly\(^{64}\). Yet nothing could be more certain than that the abbatial command leading Afonso VI's sons-in-law to arrange their pact of mutual assistance was no isolated or arbitrary act, but one of a series of Hugo of Cluny's interventions in Iberian political affairs made on the firm basis of the confraternal and censive coniunctio or alliance existing between the Burgundian abbey and the regnum Hispaniarum since its foundation, most probably in 1063, by Fernando I and renewal by Afonso VI in 1077 and 1090\(^{65}\). Long [178] before 1105 the enrollment of Afonso as socius-benefactor of Cluny, the abbey's heavy dependence upon the annual Hispanic census duplicatus of 2000 gold dinars (metcales) for its financial liquidity and costly building program, and the institution throughout the Burgundian monastic federation of daily intercessional prayers for Afonso VI and future reges Hispaniarum that equaled or surpassed in solemnity those conceded members of the German imperial house\(^{66}\), had established Hugo's position as the patronus (Afonso's own term)\(^{67}\) and protector of the Navarro-Basque dynasty; and the quasi-feudal implications of such status were reinforced by consanguineal ties: Constança of Burgundy, Afonso's second wife and mother of D. Urraca, Count Raimundo's consort and future queen-empress, was the abbot's niece, Count Henrique of Portugal the grandson of his sister Hélie de Semur\(^{68}\).

In the light of such intimate involvement on Cluny's part in the dynastic politics of the Leonese-Castilian monarchy, it is surely significant that Henrique's grant to S. Isidro de Dueñas on 30 January 1105, made in the midst of the crisis over the Afonsine succession, marks two noteworthy innovations in the Portuguese count's previous relations with the abbey. These are, first, the gift of annual revenues and churches outside Portugal itself, in Leonese Sanatoria; and, secondly, their conferment upon Cluny herself and her Leonese dependency of Dueñas, a reversal of the previous Portuguese policy of approaching the mother abbey indirectly and along non-Leonese lines through the agency of the Nivernais priory of La-Charité-sur-Loire. On both these grounds our diploma can be viewed as intended to create for Count Henrique a new, specifically Leonese amid therefore potentially imperial, line of affiliation with Hugo, one which in the eyes of Raimundo of Galicia must have represented a
direct challenge to his own hopes of the abbot's undivided support in his struggle for the succession.

To appreciate this more fully, it is important to advance beyond the usual assumption that, since Henrique and Raimundo came of high Burgundian Cluniophil families, and had originally been recruited by Hugo to aid Afonso VI against the Almoravids, the two counts maintained in the Peninsula identical ties with Cluny. This is simply not true. Raimundo before coming to Spain had participated along with his father Count Guillaume Tête-Hardie in the donation of Salins to Cluny (circa 1086) but once on Iberian soil, whether as Count of Galicia-Portugal, Count of Galicia alone, or as Afonso VI's leading repovoador of Salamanca, Ávila and Segovia, he does not seem at any time to have given the Burgundian congregation a single monastery, piece of land or regular revenue. Conceivably, there may have been occasional gifts of money or spoils of which no record survives; and Raimundo had a direct hand in the designation of the Cluniacs Dalmace d'Auvergne and Jerónimo as bishops respectively of Campostela and Salamanca. But no Cluniac counterpart can be found for his many donations of vilas and lands to Galician monasteries and even to Sahagún, or for the annual subsidy of 1000 solidi he bestowed upon the non-Cluniac Burgundian house of Saint-Bénigne-de-Dijon. Such lack of discernible benefactorial zeal towards Cluny can hardly denote estrangement between Abbot Hugo and the Galician count; more likely it can be attributed to Afonso VI's insistence upon excluding both his sons-in-law from imitation of or infringement upon his own personal confraternal and censive alliance with the Burgundian monks. It is to be observed also that in the same way Raimundo's wife, D. Urraca, although a generous benefactor of the Cluniacs after becoming queen-empress, herself abstained from making them any donations of lands, churches or monasteries until over a year after her husband's death; and when on 22 February 1109 she ceded them the well-endowed Galician house of S. Vicente de Pombeiro, this was done, as the Infanta explicitly informs us, at her father's own suggestion, undoubtedly because at the time Afonso VI was seeking to secure Hugo's approval of Urraca's succession. At any rate, down to his death at the end of 1107, Raimundo does not seem to have enjoyed the status of Cluniac socius or benefactor, so that something more than merely rhetorical style may well lie behind the distinction made in the protocol of the Pacto Sucessório between Raimundus filius and Henricus familiaris. We can however be certain from the Pacto that after Afonso's plan of 1103 to displace Raimundo by Sancho as his heir, the Count of Galicia's legitimate rights to the throne continued to be recognized at Cluny, however painful a situation this created between king-emperor and abbot.

A quite different pattern characterizes the Count of Portugal's Cluniac relations. Even before his arrival in the Peninsula Henrique can be found among the laudateles et testes confirming a donation to the abbey by his brother Duke Eudes of Burgundy, and once he was across the Pyrenees this association intensifies. Entrusted in 1095-1097 by Afonso with lordship over Portugal, Henrique immediately associates himself with the reform program previously initiated in the diocese of Braga in 1071 by Bishop Pedro I and installs there as metropolitan the Cluniac Geraldo, a one-time monk of Agen who had become a canon of the cathedral church of Toledo under the Cluniac archbishop Bernardo. By 1099 another French Cluniac from Toledo, Maurício Burdino, has been made bishop of Coimbra, from which see by 1109 he was to be translated to that of Braga. Then in March 1100 Henrique and Teresa bestow upon the Cluniac nunnery of La Charité-sur-Loire the Church and Termo of S. Pedro de Rates near Braga, for conversion into a monastic center, and the dízimas on bread, wine and flax from all their estates (reguengos) in the extensive region between the rivers Douro and Mondego. This donation establishes at Rates the first and largest of what were to be eventually three Cluniac houses on Portuguese soil; creates in effect an annual census of presumably substantial amount in the form of the dízimas of Entre Douro e Mondego; and gives the Portuguese condes the status of Cluniac benefactores and probably also socii, at least at La Charité. This charter, incidentally, looks like
the model for that addressed to S. Isidro: both combine tithes on frutos e gados with transfer of ecclesiastical properties.

The assignment of these charities not to the mother abbey but its Nivernais affiliate cannot be disposed of by positing a personal or familial interest in La Charité on the part of either Henrique, Teresa or their episcopal counselors Geraldo and Mauricio, for no such sentiments can be detected in any of the four. The bishop of Coimbra in 1102 gave the Cluniacs within his diocese the church of Santa Justa for conversion into a priory; but this looks like nothing more than conformity with his count's action two years before (78). The true explanation lies elsewhere, in part in Afonso VI's apparent desire to monopolize for himself alone the imperial family's association with Abbot Hugo; in even greater part in Henrique's preference for a line of connection that would safeguard Portuguese autonomy aims by keeping Rates out of the hands of the strongly imperialist community of S. Isidro de Dueñas and simultaneously maintain the separate identity of the dízimas of Entre Douro e Mondego alongside Afonso's far more munificent census duplicates.

The reversal of this policy in January 1105 and the bestowal of the Sanabrian tithes and churches upon Cluny herself and S. Isidro thus falls convincingly into the very different political circumstances created in 1103 by Afonso VI's switch to the Infante Sancho. The king-emperor's opposition to his son-in-law's direct approach to the Cluniacs, or Portuguese fears of imperial domination of S. Pedro de Rates and Santa Justa de Coimbra if subordinated to Dueñas, no longer mattered. What was crucial was to secure for (182) Count Henrique as much support as possible within Leonese monasticism, the hierarchy and the nobility, and for this the friendship of S. Isidro would be helpful. Even more important, Hugo's favorable attitude toward his kinsman's penetration of Leon and the Terra de Campos could best be sought through the Isidorian priory and in direct benefactorial ties with the abbot. In short, the Sanabrian concession constitutes a calculated move to strengthen Henrique's chances in the Leonesie kingdom on the eve of the anticipated struggle for power.

One thing is plain, that even more than to Afonso and the Sanchistas, such possible diversion of Cluniac sympathies towards the Count of Portugal presented a sharp challenge to Raimundo, threatening not only to weaken his indispensable support in Burgundy and Leon but confronting him with the need to make major concessions to Henrique as the price of cooperation. Indeed the combination of the new Portuguese approach to Cluny through Leon and the attempted organization of a Luso-Leonese union of anti-Sanchist notables must have aroused the Count of Galicia like an alarm-bell in the night. We can therefore suppose that in the late winter or early spring of 1105, following the assembly of the Terra de Campos at the end of January, he addressed an urgent message to the Cluniac abbot as the protector and blood relative of the imperial Navarro-Basque-Burgundian line, warning him of the dire consequences, inherent in Henrique's opportunistic scheme, to both the legitimist sucession and the maintenance of the Leonese-Cluniac coniunctio and the census duplicatus. There is no need to ascribe to the abbot in this conjuncture Machiavellian motives of extending his abbey's domination below the Pyrenees, or to picture him as acting in terms of a holy war to avert secession of Spain from Christian Europe under the leadership of an allegedly Mozarabic Sancho. Hugo must already have reacted against Sancho's succession; it was unnecessary for the count to stress how fatal to the abbey's huge interests would be a triumph of the Sanchista party.

The prologue to the Pacto Sucessório makes it perfectly clear that some such appeal reached the abbot and led him to issue the blunt command to both counts -- to Henrique, surely, much more than to Raimundo -- to meet with his envoy Dalmácio Geret and to arrive at terms for their mutual collaboration on the death of (183) Afonso VI. The hypothesis that Raimundo's call for help came in early 1105 and was followed later in that same year after the abbatial chamberlain had arrived in the Leonese-Castilian kingdom by the conclusion of the Pacto, gains confirmation from the diplomatic evidence that allows us to trace the movements of the two counts during the crucial years 1105-1107.
The dating of the Pacto Sucessório imposes certain prerequisites which Count Henrique's Sanabrian diploma now makes it possible to define more sharply than ever before. For Rui de Azevedo the comital treaty might belong anywhere between 1095 and Raimundo's death; for David, who fails to confute his own evidence that it could fall any time after 1103, the limits are 1105-1107. In our opinion, it is impossible to go back of 1103, when Afonso VI's intention of changing the succession from Raimundo to Sancho becomes a matter of public record in the acts of his chancery, and the stage is set for a contest over the imperial throne. It is, however, not the succession as such that immediately underlies the Pacto, but Raimundo's being confronted with a Portuguese challenge to his anticipated possession of Leon (and, more remotely, Castile).

The Pacto plainly provides not for a succession, Raimundo's being accepted throughout, but for a territorial partitioning of the Hispanic Empire, assuring to Henrique on vassalic terms possession of either Toledo or Raimundo's own Galicia in addition to his Portuguese holdings. Either of these promised territories represents the heavy price the Count of Galicia agreed to pay in return for Henrician support against the Sanchistas in Leon and Castile. The prime danger of course for Raimundo lay in possible loss of Leon, the imperial kingdom, without which he could not hope to establish himself as rex Hispaniarum. Henrique's expansionist interest in Leon may well have preceded 1105 by some years; but the Sanabrian diploma enables us to determine that it was at the start of that year that he took two major steps overtly challenging Raimundo's position there: alliance with leading figures in the episcopate, the monasteries and the royal bureaucracy; and the opening of the new direct line to Cluny through Dueñas. If valid, this reasoning means that in January 1105 the Pacto Sucessório, with its major premise of the political and military collaboration of the two counts, did not yet exist, which a fortiori rules out the years 1103 and 1104.

On the other hand, the final biennium of Raimundo's life, 1106-1107, also appears improbable. One would expect the Luso-Leonese assembly and Henrician benefaction to S. Isidro of 30 January 1105, as major threats to Raimundo's hopes in Leon, to be followed fairly quickly by strong countermeasures on his part; and since in this conjuncture Henrique had no reason to invoke Cluniac intervention, it must have been, as Gonzaga de Azevedo cogently argues, Raimundo who, as the legitimate heir supported by Cluny even against Afonso VI, appealed for Hugo's help in checking the dangerous Portuguese attack upon his whole position. The Pacto demonstrates that in consequence of the abbot's response to some such appeal, there was held, unquestionably on Iberian soil, a joint conference of the two counts with his deputy Dalmácio Geret. When could such a meeting of the trio have taken place?

The Cluniac camerarius, still in this period an itinerant envoy of the abbot, and not yet as he would become under D. Urraca a provincial governor permanently stationed at Carrión, would normally come to the Peninsula once a year during the summer in order to collect at the imperial court the 2000 goldpieces of the census and also perhaps to make a visitation of the Leonese-Castilian priories. The odds are against such a meeting of the trio at court in 1106, since throughout much of this year Raimundo, already seriously ill, seems to have remained at Zamora or Grajal, while Henrique cannot be shown to have gone outside the boundaries of his county. For the same reasons 1107, at the end of which the Count of Galicia dies, is even less likely; adverse also to such a solution is the known presence of Dalmácio Geret in Burgundy, at Berzé-la-ville, circa 13 August 1107. To be noted also during both 1106 and 1107 is Raimundo's sudden assumption of the imperial title. In a diploma of 1 May 1106 he abruptly styles himself comes Raimundus habens principatum apud Hispanie, while D. Urraca employs the honorific phrase regalis orta natalibus ego Urracha, as if both condes were deliberately flaunting their sovereign rights to the succession. Again, in a pergaminho of March or April 1107, Raimundo acts as ego comes Raimundus totius Galecie imperator seu toletani principis.
gener, another novel proclamation of his approximation to the imperial office. Both these protocolic entitlatures, breathing defiance of Afonso VI's plans to bar him from being the next rex Hispaniarum, may well be explained as due to the fact that just before the spring of 1106, i.e., in the course of 1105, Raimundo's position had been greatly strengthened through the conclusion of the Pacto, which assured him the powerful support of Henrique and the Portuguese, while renewing Abbot Hugo's complete adhesion to his cause in flat opposition to the king-emperor.

In another quarter, what we can learn of the itineraries during 1105 of Raimundo, Henrique and the imperial court -- for Dalmácio Geret of course we have no record, other than the Pacto itself, for his presence in Spain until well after Afonso VI's death -- makes it extremely probable that this is the one year of the triennium in which the three parties actually could come together, and that their meeting took place in Burgos. The pertinent chronology here commences on 16 January when, as we know from Sandoval's summary of Raimundo's grant to S. Juan de Poyo, the count along with D. Urraca and their daughter D. Sancha, was still in Galicia. By 31 March, however, he must have joined Afonso VI's court at Astorga, for the real privilegio the king-emperor granted that day to the canons of the cathedral church of this city contains the confirmations, significantly in this order, of the Infante Sancho and Raimundo. Beyond Astorga we cannot chart in detail the stages of the court's eastward progress, but some time around the beginning of May it must have crossed the Pisuerga into Castile and reached Castrogeriz. A halt here is attested by the Historia Compostellana, which describes how, after Pope Paschal II had appointed Bishop García of Burgos to judge the quarrel between the sees of Santiago and Mondoñedo over the archpresbyterates of Besoucos, Trasancos and Seaya, Bishop Gonzalo of the latter see and the procurators of Gelmirez of Compostela found that Garcia could not because of illness make the scheduled trip to Astorga to hear the case. They were therefore compelled to seek out the Castilian prelate in his own diocese, and found him with King Afonso and the court at Castrogeriz. This must have been in late April or early May, since by 14 May the court had gone on to Burgos, as would appear from Afonso VI's celebrated concession to the bishop of Santiago of the right to operate a mint. Although this royal document actually bears the date 14 May 1108, Sanchez-Albornoz has shown that it must have been drawn up three years previously at Burgos, so that it fixes for us on 14 May 1105 the presence of Raimundo and Urraca in the Castilian capital.

But the charter of 14 May also contains the subscriptions of the Condes Henrique and Teresa of Portugal. Henrique's movements between the Luso-Leonese assembly of late January and his appearance here in Burgos on 14 May are unknown. Unlike Raimundo he was not present in Astorga on 31 March, and he and Teresa may therefore have tarried in the Terra de Campos until the court arrived on its way to Burgos. At any rate, from 14 May on, both Henrique and Raimundo were residing for some months with the court in the Castilian city. As late as 22 September a charter granted by Afonso to one Pedro Ibannez bears the confirmations of both the Burgundian princes and their consorts. But by 12 December an imperial confirmation of various rights to Abbot João and the Castilian monastery of S. Salvador de Oña mentions of the quartet only Count Henrique, so that sometime between the end of September and early December Raimundo and Urraca must have left for Galicia, perhaps in connection with the birth of their son Afonso Raimundes, the later Afonso VII; and Teresa may have returned to Portugal.

We have, therefore, a firm basis for placing Henrique and Raimundo in Burgos between 14 May and 22 September 1105; what remains conjectural, in the absence of direct documentary proof, is whether in fact during that time Dalmácio Geret arrived on the chamberlain's regular visit to the king-emperor and brought with him the abbot's instructions for both counts to meet with his envoy and terminate their dangerous quarrel. Still, better than any hypothesis yet proposed or that seems extractable from the evidence, the assumption of a meeting in Burgos during the summer of 1105 at which the terms of the
Pacto were hammered out to be carried back to Hugo when Dalmácio crossed the Pyrenees, satisfies the requirements of the historical conjuncture, above all as this can now be reconstructed in the light of Count Henrique's Sanabrian [188] donation. On this basis therefore, tentatively but with some fair measure of confidence, we can posit for the genesis of the Pacto the following order of events:

(i) in late 1104, the decision by Henrique to intervene in the succession crisis of the Hispanic Empire for the purpose of annexing all or part of the kingdom of Leon;

(ii) at the end of January 1105, the attempted creation on Leonese soil of a Luso-Leonese coalition embracing Henrique's chief nobles and various leading members of the Leonese Church, monasteries and royal bureaucracy;

(iii) simultaneously, through concession of tithes and churches in Leonese Sanabria, an Henrician effort to forge new Portuguese benefactorial and financial bonds with Cluny, operative through S. Isidro de Dueñas and threatening to infringe upon the Burgundian abbey's hitherto total commitment to Raimundo;

(iv) in the late winter or spring of 1105, the successful appeal by the Count of Galicia to Abbot Hugo as the ally and protector of the Navarro-Basque dynasty, seeking his help in thwarting a Portuguese political and monastic policy undermining the legitimist cause in the looming conflict with the Sanchistas;

(v) between 14 May and 22 September 1105, the arrival of the two counts at Burgos and the conference with the Chamberlain Dalmácio Geret, at which Henrique agrees to surrender his Leonese schemes in return for compensation in Toledo or Galicia, and where the conditions of his collaboration with Raimundo are incorporated into the epistle addressed to the Cluniac abbot that we know, by no means accurately, as the Pacto sucessório.
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Additional Notes

[189A] Since 1970 the timing and circumstances of the Pacto Sucessório have been commented upon by three authorities in the field.

Prof. T. de Sousa Soares (1974), rejecting David's case for 1105-1107, Azevedo's for 1095-1102, and my own for the summer of 1105, defends the year 1103. It was then that Alfonso VI's public acknowledgement of Sancho as his heir would have alarmed not only the two politically motivated Burgundian counts but also Cluny and the Leonese-Castilian and Portuguese Churches, fearful of a dangerous anti-European reaction in favor of Mozarabic, if not actually pro-Islamic, isolationism. Hence, in 1103, Archbishop Bernard of Toledo's sudden willingness to accept restoration of the Bracaran metropolitanate under Gerald of Braga, the journey of both Gerald and Count Henrique to Rome in order to obtain Paschal II's sanction, and the new cooperation of Raimundo and Henrique to prevent Sancho's succession, all fix this as the indicated year.

None of these basically ecclesiastical arguments is impressive. The Pacto is totally free from overtones of metropolitical or other ecclesiastical concern; the thesis (pressed by David) of the Sanchistas as anti-European and potentially pro-Islamic, is completely unrealistic when the actual Castilian particularist leanings of this nebulous faction are considered; and Sousa Soares' reasoning does nothing to meet my contention that Abbot Hugh pragmatically intervened in order to safeguard Raimundo's imperial hopes against the schemes of the powerful and ambitious Henrique. Sousa Soares also asserts that in contracting a designedly secret treaty the count of Portugal could not have taken along so large a company of Portuguese barons as the charter of 30 January 1105 discloses; but this misses my whole point: that the barons went only as far as the Tierra de Campos, assisted in the formation of a Luso-Leonese coalition, and then returned home well before Henrique himself went on to the imperial court at Burgos and the negotiations with Raimundo and Dalmace Geret.

Dr. Peter Feige's discussion (1978) is content simply to cite Azevedo and me (although not Sousa Soares), while placing the Pacto broadly in the years just before Raimundo's death in 1107. This radical view (which ignores the treatments of both Sousa Soares and Feige) faults my "interesting attempt [as] less than convincing" on the following grounds. First, I do not sufficiently appreciate that the mixture of Portuguese and Leonese subscribants to the diploma of January 1105, and its drafting by an imperial notary, prove it was drawn up at the court. This possibility is of course the very one I raised and dismissed for reasons that still seem to me sufficient and unfuted by anyone. Next, in a quarter where his unrivalled expertise in the diplomatics of the period merits all respect, Reilly re-dates to 1 May 1096 the charter I adduced as evidence of the reconciliation of Raimundo and Henrique in 1106; and to 1107 the charter I used under the date 14 May 1105 to narrow the time-span for the meeting of the two counts with Dalmace Geret.

Even if he is right on both heads, neither of these texts is in any sense central to my explication of the Pacto. For my part, here as elsewhere in his book Reilly (like Sousa Soares and Feige) seems to me to pay far too little attention to the Cluniac side of the story, the abbey's unique role in Leonese-Castilian dynastic and imperial crises under the alliance that dated from Fernando I's last years. As I have sought to emphasize in connection with the Pacto and the various controversial climaxes of Alfonso VI's grosse Politik, abbatial intervention below the Pyrenees has to be diagnosed within this framework. The reinforcement of liturgical commemorative honors assigned to Alfonso and Queen Constance after 1090, the subsequent precarious status of the census Hispanicas in the face of Murâbit (Almoravid)
shut-off of the parias, Hugh's significant turn for financial aid after 1096 to King Pedro I of Aragon (see the Additional Note to "Liturgical Intercession at Cluny," Study VIII in this volume) are factors affecting the abbot's anti-Alfonsine sponsorship of the Pacto and pointing to a date after 1100. All this patently awaits further study; meanwhile it is difficult to take seriously Reilly's contention that because the Pacto does not mention Portugal (which after all was not up for grabs), its formulation must precede Henrique's acquisition of the country by 1097.

Finally, of the two recent general histories of Portugal, that of Oliveira Marques favors "1106?" for the Pacto; while that of Serrão follows Sousa Soares on 1103. 
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5. Acad. Hist., Col. Velázquez, t. IV, leg. 4, fols. 668r-817v, and 23 unnumbered folios appended, containing docs. 1444-1477; B. N., MS 720, 234r-314r.

6. The relationship of this transcript to its surviving 18th century copies, as well as to the lost *Becerro* itself, will be treated in the Introduction to the edition I am preparing of the diplomatic collection of S. Isidro de Dueñas.

7. A. H. N., Códices, Dueñas, no. 41.

8. Variant readings from no. 1422 in the other two copies all of which are either minor orthographic changes or manifest scribal errors or omissions, will be indicated in my above mentioned edition of the Isidorian charters. In using the *Indice* in microfilm, I have had to resort to conjecture in several (bracketed) places, none of which affects the meaning of the text.

9. Cf. E. Flórez; *España Sagrada*, XVI (Madrid, 1795), with map between pages 68 and 69; Sebastián de Miñano: *Diccionario geográfico-estadístico de España y Portugal* (Madrid, 1826-1828), VII, pp. 434-435; Mapa Militar Itinerario de España, Hoja 23 (1918); Enciclopedia universal ilustrada europeo-americana (Barcelona, 1907 ff.), LIII, p. 1117; Fritz Krüger: *Die Gegenstandskultur Sanabrías und seiner Nachbargebiete* (Hamburg, 1925), especially p. 322 (Orts-und Landschaftsnamen) and folding map at end. It might be contended that the reading Sanabria, although found in all the 18th-century copies as well as in the *Indice*, results from a misreading in the *Becerro* for some Portuguese locale, in which case two possibilities suggest themselves: (i) *Senabria*, in Beira Litoral not far from Sobrado, to the east of the junction of the Paiva with the Douro (see Paulo Merêa and Amorim Girao: *Territorios portugueses no século XI*, in *Rev. Port. de Hist.*, II, 1943, pp. 255-263,
especially p. 260 and Map I); or (ii) Sena (mod. Seia) in Beira Alta, distrito da Guarda, then a concelho of some importance to judge from its repeated mention in the documents of Henrique and his successors (cf. DR, pp. 14, 1. 21; 35, 1. 2; 63, 1. 5; 77, n.° 62; 154, 1. 9; 176.179, n.° 152; 202, 1. 6). Henrique undoubtedly possessed paços, igrejas and other reguengos in both comarcas; their situation below the Douro might explain why in his diploma to S. Isidro as in only one other of his known documents, the count entitles himself Portugalensis et Columbriensis prouintie comes. But the dual formula frequently occurs with Henrician subscriptions in the documentation; see, e. g., Pauto Merêa: De «Portucale» (civitas) ao Portugal de D. Henrique (Porto, 1944; separata from Biblos, XIX), pp. 36-37, citing cases from 1096, 1098 and 1103; Luciano Serrano: El obispado de Burgos y Castilla primitiva (Madrid, 1935-1936), III, pp. 103 (1099), 112 (1100); A. González Palencia: Los mozárabes de Toledo en los siglos XII y XIII (Madrid, 1926-1930), vol. preliminar, p. 119 (1101). Nor does either site help on the vilas or «Valletronco»; certainly nothing can be based upon the existence at Seia of freguesias of Santa Comba and S. Romao (Grande enciclopédia portuguesa e brasileira, Lisboa-Rio de Janeiro, 1950 ff., XXVIII, pp. 124-134). A third alternative, the possible misreading of an original Saldania as Sanabria, might be linked to the location of «Valletronco». On 21 March 1101 Count Henrique exchanged with the abbey of Sahagún an herdade belonging to him in Villa Mirelli for what is described as in territorio de Tronco monasterium Sancti Petri cum sua uilla ab integro (DR, n.° 7). Azevedo, loc. cit., p. 11, places this herdade at modern Villameriel in the comarca of Saldaña, prov. Palencia; but he does not identify the monastery, Which indeed finds no notice among the possessions of Sahagún mentioned in Antonio de Yepes: Corónica general de la Orden de San Benito (Irache, 1609-1621), III, fols. 167r-203v (abridged edition by J. Pérez de Urbel: Biblioteca de autores españoles, Madrid, 1960, I, pp. 256-310); Romualdo Escalona: Historia del Real Monasterio de Sahagún (Madrid, 1782); or the numerous charters calendared by V. Vignau: Indice de los documentos del monasterio de Sahagún de la Orden de San Benito (Madrid, 1874). To the southwest of Valladolid and Simancas, in territory apparently then regarded as lying within the County of Saldaña, there exist a Villamarcial (in the valley of the Pisuerga) and a Vega del Val de Tronco (on the Hornija, another tributary of the Douro); and the interest of S. Isidro de Dueñas in this zone of the Leonese estremadura is certain from the priory's close collaboration with the Leonese magnate and Cluniophil Pedro Ansurez, count of Carrión anid Saldaña, in the foundation there of the abbey (later cathedral) of Santo Antonino at Valladolid. This solution likewise throws no light upon the two vilas of Henrique's pergaminho; and on the whole there seems to be no good reason to question that his donation to Dueñas lay in Sanabria, a conclusion which the motives of his action, to be considered below, confirm. It should be added that the inclusion of Senabria et ripeira et valdaria et baronzeli among the territorial concessions promised D. Teresa by the Queen-Empress D. Urraca in their pact of circa 1120 (?) further evinces Portuguese interest in the Sanabrian comarca. Cf. Alexandre Herculano: História de Portugal, 8th ed. (Lisboa, s.d.), II, pp. 102.103, 255-259 (Nota X); Luiz Gonzaga de Azevedo: Historia de Portugal (Lisboa, 1935-1942), III, pp. 233-236 (Nota XIII); J. M.a Lacarra: Dos documentos interesantes para la historia de Portugal, in RPH, III, 1947, pp. 291-305.
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