“Según parecía por las Crónicas antiguas”: Representing Ruling Queens in Medieval Castilian Historiography



Jennifer L. Norris

Lincoln College

University of Oxford

A thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Michaelmas 2017

"Según parecía por las Crónicas antiguas": Representing Ruling Queens in Medieval Castilian Historiography
Jennifer Norris (Lincoln College)
DPhil Thesis
Michaelmas 2017

ABSTRACT

This thesis explores narratives of ruling queenship in medieval Castilian histories, tracing the evolving treatment of female rulers through a broad range of Latin and vernacular texts from the twelfth to fifteenth centuries. The investigation focuses on diverse accounts of four queens who exercised royal authority in the kingdom of Castile in the High and Late Middle Ages: Urraca of León-Castile (regnant 1109-1126), Berenguela of Castile (regent 1214-1217 and co-regnant 1217-1246), María de Molina (regent 1295-1301 and 1306-1321), and Catalina de Lancaster (regent 1406-1418). In line with methods of historiographical analysis developed by Leonardo Funes, Georges Martin, and Aengus Ward, I combine close reading of the texts with consideration of the socio-political contexts of their production and reception. The first chapter examines narratives of Urraca's sole rule across four different centuries, from the contemporary *Historia compostellana* to the *Crónicas anónimas de Sahagún*, for which I propose a recontextualization as a wholly late-fifteenth century text. The diversity of these accounts underscores the flexible treatment of ruling queenship by medieval historians. The second chapter, closely tied to the first, considers representations of Berenguela in the Latin chronicles produced around the court of Fernando III and the vernacular chronicles of the Alfonsine tradition. The analysis of multiple contemporary accounts gives insight into the creation of competing narratives, and reveals the subtle transformations wrought upon the ultimately dominant version. The third chapter evaluates the singular image of María de Molina which emerges from the *Crónica de los reyes de Castilla* and chronicles of the reigns of Fernando IV and Alfonso XI. The fourth chapter explores the fragmented narratives of Catalina de Lancaster's regency which emerge from the vernacular, non-royalist histories of the reign of Juan II.

"Según parecía por las Crónicas antiguas": Representing Ruling Queens in Medieval Castilian Historiography
Jennifer Norris (Lincoln College)
DPhil Thesis
Michaelmas 2017

LONG ABSTRACT

Although the field of historical scholarship on medieval women and power, and specifically on works exploring the unusual frequency with which royal women throughout the Iberian Peninsula ruled whole kingdoms as regents, lieutenants, and even as queens *suo jure* during the Middle Ages, has flourished in recent years, I have found myself not infrequently encountering excellent studies which nevertheless make liberal use of medieval chronicles as faithful accounts of historical queenship. The images of Isabel of Castile processing towards the Álcazar at Segovia behind an unsheathed sword, or Berenguela of Castile unfastening Fernando III's sword-belt, or Urraca of León dragged into the mud and abused by the townspeople of Compostela — these are all compelling images, fascinating stories, and their appeal to historians is easily and immediately understandable. But they are precisely that: stories, snippets of much larger narratives whose fullest sense cannot be understood when they are extracted and served, without context, as fact.

In an attempt to provide some fuller sense and understanding, this thesis examines narratives of ruling queenship in medieval Castilian histories, tracing the evolving treatment of female rulers through a broad range of Latin and vernacular texts from the twelfth to fifteenth centuries, with an eye to moments of divergence and the creation of new stories, and the "social logic" (to use Gabrielle Spiegel's term) of their inception. My investigation focuses on accounts of four queens who exercised royal authority in the kingdom of Castile in the High and Late Middle Ages: Urraca of León-Castile (regnant 1109-1126), Berenguela of Castile (regent 1214-1217 and co-regnant 1217-1246), María de Molina (regent 1295-1301 and 1306-1321), and Catalina de Lancaster (regent 1406-1418).

Although to my knowledge, these four queens have not been studied all together before, they form a particularly cohesive group: though Urraca and Berenguela came to rule by virtue of their birth alone while María and Catalina began as queens-consort, all were nevertheless part of the Castilian royal families by birth. They were all eventually recognized as rightful wielders of royal authority in governing the realm, and all exercised or attempted to exercise their power for long periods of time, outside of the expected arrangement of adult male king and queen-consort. Furthermore, because of their prolonged involvement in political functions normally performed by adult male kings, during a period of increasing historiographical production, there are also substantial accounts of

their rule preserved in multiple chronicle texts, providing a wealth of narratives for both diachronic and synchronic analysis.

I considered, originally, that Isabel of Castile (regnant 1474-1504) would serve as an ideal means of concluding the survey, and that the study could be neatly bookended with two regnant queens, especially since one of the most important discoveries I have made in the course of my thesis—pertaining to the *Crónicas anónimas de Sahagún*—links the two. Ultimately, the sheer volume of the historiography on the Reyes Católicos, the twin confounding variables of Fernando of Aragón and the Early Modern period, and the practical limits of both time and word length made this idea unworkable, but it is one to which I would like to return in the future.

In line with methods of historiographical analysis developed by Leonardo Funes, Georges Martin, and Aengus Ward, I combine close reading of the texts with careful consideration of the "internal" and "external" contexts of composition, to use Ward's terms, inasmuch as these can be determined. These include factors such as authorship, patronage, time and place of composition, the social and political contexts of production and reception, selection and repression of source texts, and formal and narrative organization.

The first chapter examines narratives of Urraca's sole rule across four different centuries, beginning with the twelfth-century *Historia compostellana*, which, though not precisely Castilian, is an essential starting point for narratives of ruling queenship given its lengthy and varied treatment of the entirety of Urraca's reign. Her journey from pleading, pious queen—whose rule is undeniably preferable to the tyranny of a foreign king—to dishonored and wicked Jezebel in the course of a single text establishes, from the outset, that these representations are inconstant and wholly subject to authorial whim. Moving into the Latin and vernacular chronicles of the thirteenth century, there are clear efforts to minimize her rule, and these narratives universally emphasize her ill-fated marriage to Alfonso I of Aragón as evidence of unsuitability for rule, while wielding her maternity and alleged sexual liaisons against her. These chronicles, and their Alfonsine successors, simultaneously allow Urraca to function as a place-holder in the history of kings, bridging the gap between Alfonso VI, "el que ganó Toledo", and Alfonso VII "el Emperador", whilst denying her recognition as a ruler in the formal structures of the texts. The fourteenth-century *Crónica de Veinte Reyes*, however, is less concerned about preserving the unbroken lineage of kings, instead relaying a fantastical account of her death which confirms the immorality of her approach to ruling. Finally, I

consider the representation of Urraca in the first of the *Crónicas anónimas de Sahagún*. This text has until now been treated as a twelfth-century text, and a contemporary counterpoint to the *Historia Compostellana* which portrays the queen in a generally favourable light. However, based on recent philological evidence as well as the unusually positive treatment of Urraca, I propose to recontextualize the *Crónica anónima* as a wholly late-fifteenth century text, one whose intended recipient was almost certainly Isabel, the second *suo jure* queen of Castile. The diversity of these accounts over such a long period of time underscores the flexible treatment of ruling queenship by medieval historians, and in Urraca's particular case I argue that we would do well to question the tidy narrative arc of "queen to harlot" outlined by Therese Martin in *Queen as King*, among others, and instead appreciate that the two images coexist in an uneasy tension in most accounts of her reign.

The second chapter, which is inextricably related to the first on account of their shared source material, considers representations of Berenguela in the Latin chronicles produced around the court of Fernando III and in later vernacular chronicles of the Alfonsine tradition. The discussion of contexts for these works is divided across both chapters, although the essentials will appear in Chapter 1. The *Chronicon Mundi* of Lucas de Tuy, commissioned by the queen, presents Berenguela in the model of a pious and maternal queen-consort, eliding any mention of her regency and minimizing much of her political involvement, which I argue is the result of the queen's own preference. The *Crónica latina de los reyes de Castilla*, on the other hand, depicts a shifting and tense relationship between the commanding queen-regent (later a protective queen-mother), her son, and the nobility. This tension disappears entirely in Jiménez de Rada's *De rebus Hispaniae*, which uses the bones of *CLRC* to construct a triumphal narrative of Berenguela's queenship, painting her as an equal, or even superior, partner in the ruling relationship with Fernando III. This diversity of contemporary accounts, especially ones which are as interrelated as these three, gives insight into the creation of competing narratives, and allows us to observe the selection of preferred narrative elements over time. Further analysis of their vernacular successors reveals the subtle transformations wrought upon Jiménez de Rada's ultimately dominant version, which prevailed not long after Berenguela's death. Post-Alfonsine chroniclers in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries propagated the image of Berenguela established in the *DRH*, wielding the example of her vigorous queenship in defense of Sancho IV's legitimacy in the *Versión amplificada de 1289,* and later María de Molina's right to the regency in the *Crónica de veinte reyes*, seeking to associate them with Fernando III's military

successes and with Berenguela's firm but conciliatory relationship with a rebellious nobility.

The third chapter evaluates the singular image of María de Molina which emerges from the *Crónica de los reyes de Castilla* and chronicles of the reigns of Fernando IV and Alfonso XI. The Latin translation of Jofré de Loaysa's chronicle is a fairly scant contemporary account but indicates the emergence of María as a defender of the royal lineage against a power-hungry nobility, already in the lines of Berenguela's image which was being cemented at the same time. This narrative is more fully fleshed out in the fourteenth century *Crónica de tres reyes* and the *Crónica de Alfonso XI*, all products of the court of Alfonso XI. Together, they develop María into a model of ideal queenship in all of its facets. As consort, the *Crónica de Sancho IV* paints a vivid portrait of the pregnant queen interceding to prevent a royal fratricide, filling the role of *mediatrix* and advisor. The *Crónica de Fernando IV* takes her as its protagonist, recounting at length the efforts and sacrifices necessary to establish her son's kingship and maintain the unity of the kingdoms in the face of royal usurpers. This image of the defiant, endlessly moral queen continues into the chronicles of Alfonso XI, which hold her up as a beacon of royal strength and virtue against grasping, scheming nobles. I also argue in this chapter that the narrative of María's regency casts the queen as the true occupier of the throne, casting Fernando IV aside in favour of a predecessor whose reign will justify Alfonso XI's efforts at consolidating royal power.

The fourth chapter explores the fragmented narratives of Catalina de Lancaster's regency which emerge from contemporary vernacular, and increasingly non-royalist, histories of the minority of Juan II and the new noble-centred historical-biographical texts like the *Victorial*. Due to her political position as simultaneous insider and outsider, the ongoing power struggles within the regency, and the circumstances under which she became queen, as well as the fact that many chroniclers of the period were aligned with her political rivals, images of Catalina as ruler are much more limited. Pero López de Ayala's chronicles of Juan I and Enrique III are concerned with her only as a means of symbolically healing the fratricidal wounds in the Castilian royal family, and eliminating the more immediate threats posed by the Duke of Lancaster's ambitions. The *Crónica de Juan II*, by virtue of Alvar García de Santa María's close relationship with Catalina's rival and co-regent Fernando de Antequera, crafts an image of the queen that invokes many of the same tensions found in narratives of Urraca and Berenguela, upholding her legal and maternal rights to the regency while simultaneously undermining her moral authority with suggestions of

secrecy, bribery, and unsavoury associations with low-born *privados*. Other accounts of Juan II's reign dwell less on the regency period, but the glimpses of the queen which emerge in the *Crónica del Halconero* and its so-called *Refundición* (which I suggest, in line with Ángel Martínez Casado's study of Lope de Barrientos, is more likely the work of Fernán Pérez de Guzmán) suggest that these associations lingered.

By highlighting the differences and continuities in these narratives, I also seek to problematize some of the current narratives being constructed around medieval Iberian queenship more broadly, and advocate for caution and nuance in the treatment of historiographical material, resisting the temptation to impose artificial neatness and order, and instead understanding these narratives as a set of stories first and foremost. These *estorias*, like all stories, cannot be taken solely at face value. When properly contextualized, they may nevertheless reveal just as much about the theory and practice of ruling queenship in medieval Castile, in all its contradictions and tensions and anxieties.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I must thank my supervisor, Dr Geraldine Hazbun, for her many years of support and guidance throughout the DPhil process. Without her *auxilium et consilium*, I and my thesis would be in a very sorry state indeed! I should also like to thank Professor David Hook, my interim supervisor, for his careful feedback and unflagging patience, especially in the chapter on Catalina de Lancaster. Professor Stephen Parkinson, Professor Jonathan Thacker, and Professor Juan Carlos Conde have also read parts of this thesis over the years, and their thoughts and suggestions have been invaluable. All remaining errors and infelicities – of which there are undoubtedly many – are wholly my own.

I couldn't have made it this far without the support of the excellent administrative staff at Lincoln and in the Faculty, especially Dr. Stephen Lay and the absolutely superhuman Carmella Elan-Gaston. This work was completed in part through support of the University of Oxford Clarendon Fund Scholarship, and I am grateful to the administrators there as well.

I am grateful to my fellow medievalist and early modern DPhils for their friendship and collegial conversation: in particular, Dr Florence Curtis, Dr Amaranta Saguar García, Dr Rich Rabone, Dr Henry Drummond, and Dr André Barros Penafiel.

To the host of friends who have accompanied me through the highs and lows of this wild adventure, and kept me sane, I owe even more. Rachael Borek, for always being there, with bells on! Anna Bond, for quite literally running the extra mile. Andrzej Stuart-Thompson, for tea, boundless moral support, and medieval chat. Michelle Lim, for joining me in some truly hare-brained schemes. Veronica Koven-Matasy, for being an excellent houseguest. Sam Ivell, Ashley Walters, Richard Gagen, Mike Juniper, and the rest of the Lincoln gang, for being there from the start. And last, but certainly not least, I am deeply, eternally grateful to all of the many excellent (gender-neutral) chaps of Oxford University Morris Men and Oxford City Morris Men, for providing more Diet Coke than a girl could ever drink, and for allowing me to share in the very best of Oxford traditions for the last three years.

Last but not least, I must thank my family—my mother Nancy and my sister Stephanie, and my beloved father Robert, who sadly did not live to see this journey complete—without whose unconditional love and support this whole endeavour would have never even got off the ground. And to Josh, my wonderful partner, for everything.

JLN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

I: Urraca of León-Castile 27

II: Berenguela of Castile 97

III: María de Molina 167

IV: Catalina de Lancaster 212

Conclusions 259

Bibliography 272

Chronicle Sources and Abbreviations

I. Urraca of León & Castile

HC	*Historia Compostellana*
CLRC	*Chronica Latina Regum Castellae*
CM	*Chronicon Mundi*
DRH	*De rebus Hispaniae*
EE/PCG	*Estoria de España/Primera Crónica General*
CVR	*Crónica de veinte reyes*
CAS	*Crónicas anónimas de Sahagún*

II. Berenguela of Castile

CLRC	*Chronica Latina Regum Castellae*
CM	*Chronicon Mundi*
DRH	*De rebus Hispaniae*
EE/PCG	*Estoria de España/Primera Crónica General*
CPSF	*Crónica particular de San Fernando*
CVR	*Crónica de veinte reyes*

III. María de Molina

CRC	*Chronica Regum Castellae*
CTR/CCR	*Crónica de tres/cuatro reyes*
CAX	*Crónica de Alfonso X*
CSIV	*Crónica de Sancho IV*
CFIV	*Crónica de Fernando IV*
CAXI	*Crónica de Alfonso XI*
GCAXI	*Gran Crónica de Alfonso XI*

IV. Catalina de Lancaster

CEIII	*Crónica de Enrique III*
CJII	*Crónica de Juan II*
Halconero	*Crónica del Halconero*
Refundición	*Refundición de la crónica del Halconero*
Victorial	*Crónica de Don Pero Niño, conde de Buelna*

Introduction

One evening in the dark of winter, four and a half million Spaniards gathered to watch Isabel, Princess of Asturias, resplendent in white, crown herself Queen of Castile[1] on the steps of Segovia's Iglesia de San Miguel. The year was not 1474, but 2012, and the coronation was the climactic series finale of RTVE's critically-acclaimed historical drama *Isabel*.[2] With tongue firmly in cheek, perhaps we might see in *Isabel*'s success a unique example of popular culture finally aligning with trends in medieval studies. For, although that audience of millions may not have known it, historical scholarship on medieval women and power, and exploring the frequency with which royal women in the Iberian Peninsula ruled whole kingdoms as regents, lieutenants, and queens *suo jure* during the Middle Ages, has flourished in recent years.

I. Medieval Queens as Objects of Study

Female historical actors, including queens, have never been totally neglected by history and historians, but have traditionally been studied in isolation, as exceptional women performing unusual roles due to accidents of birth and circumstance. This treatment can be attributed partly to the fact that Western thought has, taking its cues from Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas, considered women to be the "marked gender", a deviation or an aberration from the male norm,[3] even as they comprise an essential part of the same gender system. This presents challenges for those wishing to study historical women, and the problem is particularly acute when the objects of study are medieval,

[1] Fernando Morales, "'Isabel' se corona en TVE batiendo su récord de audiencia", *El País*, 4 December 2012 <http://cultura.elpais.com/cultura/2012/12/04/television/1354648747_678572.html> [accessed 16 November 2015].
[2] "La nueva reina", *Isabel*, La 1, 3 December 2012 <http://www.rtve.es/television/isabel-la-catolica/> [accessed 13 January 2016].
[3] *The Oxford Handbook of Women & Gender in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Judith Bennett & Ruth Karras (Oxford: OUP, 2013), p. 1.

because the literature, law, and history of the Middle Ages were crafted, almost entirely, by men and for men — and a limited subsection of men at that, for the urban and rural laboring classes do not often have their voices represented in medieval law or literature regardless of sex[4]. The medieval women best documented are, however, those most readily studied, and medieval writing of a historical bent tends to concern itself primarily with those elements of society possessed of power: specifically, the aristocracy, and at its head, the royal family.

The focus on queens as women of exceptional status and exemplary virtue pre-dates the rise of feminist critical theory; though such studies of queens tend towards the biographical, it is often explicit that their interest in queens is to better understand the lives of kings. Henrique Flórez, in the *razón* that opens the eighteenth-century *Memorias de las reynas catholicas*, declares that "[l]a Chronologia de toda la Casa Real no se puede averiguar por otros medios" than having a clear understanding of "lo que es propio de las Reynas." The reason queens are central to the royal lineage is pragmatic: due to the proliferation of Alfonsos and Fernandos, even the most expert of historians could be confused by the "enmarañado… hilo historial de las personas Reales". Realizing that kings might be more easily identified by their consort than by their father or sons, Flórez set about constructing a lineage of queens, secondarily casting them as "mugeres de gloria" to enhance the "fama de Varones ilustres".[5]

More recently, a revival of scholarly attention to queens has grown out of twentieth-century feminist studies of medieval women. Though the work of Eileen Power and Hilda Johnstone[6] was critical to changing the way medieval women and medieval queens

[4] Eileen Power, *Medieval Women* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975; repr. 1997), pp. 3-4.
[5] *Memorias de las reynas catholicas, historia genealógica de la casa real de Castilla y de León*, I (Madrid: Antonio Marín, 1770), pp. 2-8.
[6] Hilda Johnstone, "The Queen's household", in *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336*, ed. by J. F. Willard and W. Morris (Cambridge, MA: The Medieval Academy of America, 1940), I, pp. 250-99.

were written about, only the rise of feminist studies in the sixties and seventies brought prolonged, serious, and widespread scholarly attention to queenship studies. Jo Ann McNamara and Suzanne Wemple's article on women's public power and political agency in the Early Middle Ages[7] challenged conventional wisdom regarding female inheritance, property ownership, and exercise of power, and sparked a new wave of interest in the institution of queenship and the exercise of authority by aristocratic women in the decades that followed.[8] That interest has manifested itself in two main ways: in the form of a large number of publications devoted to rediscovering and restoring the names and reputations of medieval women using primarily historical methods of investigation, and in more self-consciously theoretical works like *Women and Power in the Middle Ages*[9] and its successor, *Gendering the Master Narrative*, which proposed new lenses through which to consider the lives of queens and the office of queenship, while reaffirming the importance of placing queens in their social and historical contexts[10].

These new theoretical approaches were deployed in writing on queens throughout the Middle Ages, especially in northern Europe and France, though few investigations ranged much beyond the thirteenth century[11] until the 1990s, when collections of articles such as Louise Fradenburg's *Women and Sovereignty*[12] and John Carmi Parsons' *Medieval Queenship*[13] expanded the horizons of queenship studies to include southern European kingdoms and began to look to the Later Middle Ages and beyond. Amongst these new

[7] Jo Ann McNamara and Suzanne Wemple, "The Power of Women through the Family in Medieval Europe: 500-1100", *Feminist Studies*, 1 (1973), pp. 126-141.
[8] This despite the insistence that "the quarrels and ambitions of queens, however interesting, are not the most important aspect of the growing power of women," p. 133.
[9] Mary C. Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski, *Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1988).
[10] Mary C. Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski, *Gendering the Master Narrative: Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003), pp. 1-16.
[11] J. L. Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship 1445-1503* (Oxford: OUP, 2004), p. 5.
[12] Louise O. Fradenburg, *Women and Sovereignty* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992).
[13] John Carmi Parsons, *Medieval Queenship* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1993).

studies, Roger Collins' article in *Medieval Queenship* represents an early Hispanist foray into the field of queenship, with some notes on the power exercised by several related regent and dowager queens in the tenth-century kingdoms of León and Navarre.[14] These narratives are not explored in depth, however, and the focus remains on the extent of historical evidence for the queens' political activities.

Other changes coincided with this temporal and geographical expansion in the field of queenship studies. Pauline Stafford's *Queen Emma & Queen Edith*, on the lives and narratives of two queens-consort of Anglo-Saxon England, is of the first which begins to take steps away from the purely historical-biographical model of queenship studies. It was partly as a matter of necessity (on account of a profound lack of other sources) that Stafford considers the narrative uses for Emma of Normandy and Edith of Wessex in the chronicles of the eleventh century, including the apparently exculpatory narratives that each commissioned.[15] From these uses of Emma and Edith as figures of political utility, combined with documentary sources, she aims to repair the exclusion of court and household — the epicenter of queenly activity — from the historical record.[16]

In addition to the new attention to the uses of queens in historical narrative, and as proposed in *Gendering the Master Narrative*, there is also a movement towards the study of women in groups or as groups, in a conscious effort to deemphasize the more traditional "great woman" model of female agency.[17] This can be seen especially clearly in several recent studies of later medieval English queenship: J. L. Laynesmith's *The Last Medieval Queens* uses the lives and narratives of Plantagenet consorts to explore political and symbolic functions of queenship at times of social and political unrest; Lisa Benz St.

[14] Roger Collins, "Queens-Dowager and Queens-Regent in Tenth-Century León and Navarre", in John Carmi Parsons, *Medieval Queenship*, pp. 79-92.
[15] Pauline Stafford, *Queen Emma & Queen Edith: Queenship and Women's Power in Eleventh-Century England* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), pp. 6-54.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 52.
[17] *Gendering the Master Narrative*, p. 16.

John's *Three Medieval Queens* similarly investigates the lives and political power of fourteenth-century English queens[18].

Though this interest in queenship took a few years to catch on amongst Hispanic medievalists,[19] the appeal of Iberian queens was apparent in the 1990s: in some Iberian kingdoms, unlike France and England, the Middle Ages saw a number of queens-regent and queens-regnant actively participating in governance. Theresa Earenfight has even claimed that Spanish political culture "created a distinctive form of queenship similar to but substantially different from that of northern Europe".[20] The reality of the situation is not quite so optimistic or unusual as Earenfight claims, not least because female sovereignty in other kingdoms was often deliberately legally impossible,[21] but it is certainly true that the Iberian kingdoms provide a wealth of opportunities to study royal women who exercised their own legitimate authority in the political arena.

It is thus ironic that the first contemporary scholar to take up the challenge presented by the queens of medieval Iberia arrived at his destination more or less independently of the then-nascent trends in feminist medieval scholarship. He was instead seeking a foothold from which to shed light on the tumultuous history of León-Castilla in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and chose Urraca's reign for his starting point.[22] Nevertheless, Bernard F. Reilly's exhaustive study of charters, grants, and other archival documents in combination with chronicle sources provided, for the first time, a more

[18] Lisa Benz St. John, *Three Medieval Queens* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).
[19] Barbara Weissberger, writing in 2003, attributes this to the "fact that feminist study of medieval Iberian culture and society is still in its infancy." *Isabel Rules: Constructing Queenship, Wielding Power* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003, repr. 2004), p. xix. While perhaps an excessively sharp rebuke, given the volumes of work published on literary and historical women in the 1980s, it is true that, for a variety of reasons, Iberian medievalists did not come in large numbers to the study of medieval queens until relatively recently.
[20] Theresa Earenfight, *Queenship and Political Power in Medieval and Early Modern Spain* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), p. xiii.
[21] In particular, French adherence to the Salic Law's prohibition of female inheritance meant that no woman could ever occupy the throne of France.
[22] Bernard F. Reilly, *The Kingdom of León-Castilla under Queen Urraca, 1109-1126* (Princeton: University Press, 1982), pp. vii-ix.

complete picture of the reign of Urraca of León and Castile, the first woman to rule an Iberian kingdom in her own right. Despite the breadth and depth of research, it is focused on establishing a chronology of events and an understanding of the organization and administration of Urraca's kingdoms; in the quest for completeness, the queen herself is frequently not the primary subject of investigation.

But it is also clear that Reilly's study stands alone and apart from the deliberate study of medieval women and medieval queenship as it was developing elsewhere. Medievalists working on Iberian-related feminist projects in the first two decades after McNamara and Wemple were primarily interested in women as literary figures, or in the historical roles of women more broadly.[23] Much attention was paid, in particular, to the women of the epic and ballad traditions; for all its faults, Lucy Sponsler's *Women in the Medieval Spanish Epic and Lyric Traditions*[24] represented the first attempt to apply the new feminist approaches to medieval Iberian literature, and paved the way for a prolonged scholarly conversation about the roles of women and their voices in the epico-legendary narratives and lyric poetry of medieval Castile in particular. The more historically-oriented branch of medieval women's studies focused its attentions on the political, legal, and social roles occupied by women in the Middle Ages; notable examples include the rather hefty collection of articles on *La condición de la mujer en la Edad Media*,[25] Heath Dillard's exploration of the effects of the Reconquest and frontier living on Castilian women's socio-economic and legal status,[26] and Peter Linehan's study of the community of

[23] For a concise history of feminist scholarship in Hispanic studies, see the introduction to *A Companion to Spanish Women's Studies*, ed. by Xon de Ros and Geraldine Hazbun (Woodbridge:Tamesis, 2011, repr. 2014), pp. 1-12.
[24] Lucy Sponsler, *Women in the Medieval Spanish Epic and Lyric Traditions* (Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1975).
[25] Yves-René Fonquerne and Alfonso Esteban, *La condición de la mujer en la Edad Media: actas del coloquio celebrado en la Casa de Velázquez, del 5 al 7 de noviembre de 1984* (Madrid: Casa de Velázquez; Universidad Complutense, 1984).
[26] *Daughters of the Reconquest: Women in Castilian Town Society, 1100-1300* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

Dominican nuns at Zamora.[27] Aside from Reilly's study of Urraca, however, historical queens are mostly left by the wayside.

It is only around 1992, with the publication of several biographies of Isabel of Castile (timed for the quincentenary of 1492) that interest in queens and queenship as a discrete element of medieval women's studies begins to take root. Peggy Liss's[28] and Luis Suárez Fernández's biographies operate in the traditional "great woman" format, and Suárez Fernández in particular seems to consciously dissociate his study from the supposed ahistoricism of feminist scholarship.[29] Clara Estow's study of the treatment that Pero López de Ayala and Fernán Pérez de Guzmán gave to four royal widows in the fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century chronicles of their husbands' and sons' reigns, and seeks an explanation for their vastly differing representations, is a more interesting and narratively-inclined study from the same year.[30] Roger Collins' article, mentioned above, follows in 1993, and then a steady trickle of articles and book chapters; Theresa Earenfight's early work on the lieutenancy of María of Castile[31] and Miriam Shadis's exploration of the uses of royal patronage[32] and motherhood[33] by Berenguela of León and Castile are especially notable for their engagement with queenship studies outside of the Iberian Peninsula, particularly the emphasis on women's performative roles within the context of monarchy.

---

[27] *The Ladies of Zamora* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997).
[28] *Isabel the Queen: Life and Times* (Oxford: OUP, 1992; repr. 2004).
[29] *Isabel, mujer y reina* (Madrid: Rialp, 1992), p. 20.
[30] Estow, Clara, "Widows in the Chronicles of Late Medieval Castile", in Louise Mirrer, ed., *Upon My Husband's Death: Widows in the Literature and Histories of Medieval Europe* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992), pp. 153-67
[31] Theresa Earenfight, "María of Castile, Ruler or Figurehead?", in *Mediterranean Studies*, 4 (1994), pp. 45-61.
[32] Miriam Shadis, "Piety, Politics and Power: the Patronage of Leonor of England and her daughters, Blanche of Castile and Berenguela of León", in *The Cultural Patronage of Medieval Women*, ed. by June Hall McCash (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1996), pp. 202-27.
[33] Miriam Shadis, "Berenguela of Castile's Political Motherhood: the management of sexuality, marriage, and succession", in *Medieval Mothering*, ed. by John Carmi Parsons and Bonnie Wheeler (New York: Garland Press, 1996), pp. 335-58.

The turning of the millennium marks the real explosion of publication on queenship across Castile, Aragon, Portugal, and Navarre. I will highlight only those which are of most interest and importance for the study of queenly power (or, as it was by this time coming to be called, agency)[34], for the sheer volume of books and articles makes it impossible to discuss them all here. Rafael del Valle Curieses' biography of María de Molina devotes significant space to considering the historical context(s) of her regencies and negotiation of her agency as consort, mother, widow, and regent.[35] Ana Echevarría's biographical study of Catalina de Lancaster soon followed, tracing the roots of Catalina's queenship (and especially the precarious and conflictive period of her co-regency) back to the *fratricidio de Montiel* and the dynastic strife that gave rise of the house of Trastámara.[36] The success of María Jesús Fuente's *Reinas medievales en los reinos hispánicos* also shows a growing popular interest in medieval queens[37] and demonstrates a taste for specifically Iberian examples.[38]

From this point, there is a diversification in the way that scholars approach the queens of medieval Iberia. *The* queen, Isabel herself, is the subject of a study by Barbara Weissberger in 2004, though *Isabel Rules* represents a significant shift in approaching medieval queenship; this is due in part to her use of the methods of New Historicism and the focus, more than on the person of the queen, on "the shaping of the Queen's power through literary representation".[39] Therese Martin's *Queen as King* takes the Basilica of San Isidoro de León as a springboard for the exploration of the patronage and political agendas of four generations of Leonese royal women, and in particular, Urraca of León,

[34] Benz St. John, *Three Medieval Queens*, pp. 8-9.
[35] Rafael del Valle Curieses, *María de Molina, el soberano ejercicio de la concordia (1260-1321)* (Madrid: Alderabán, 2000). This represents the first study of María de Molina since Mercedes Gaibrois Riaño de Ballesteros, *María de Molina* (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1936).
[36] Ana Echevarría, *Catalina de Lancaster: reina regente de Castilla, 1372-1418* (Hondarribia: Nerea, 2002).
[37] María Jesús Fuente, *Reinas medievales en los reinos hispánicos*, Historia, 15 (Madrid: Esfera de los libros, 2003; repr. 2004).
[38] *Reinas medievales*, p. 26.
[39] Weissberger, *Isabel Rules*, p. xiv.

whose patronage of San Isidoro seems for Martin to correspond to her need to reinforce her status and preserve her legacy as regnant queen.[40] And, as if the popularity of queenship studies had needed any further proof of its momentum, the very first edition of the online journal *e-Spania* was entirely given over to the topic of "Femmes et gouvernement"[41] with an emphasis on queens in chronicles. Bethany Aram's re-visiting of the political uses of maternity in medieval Castile examined the problematic potential of combining motherhood with the complications already inherent in female sovereignty, this time extending the historical range from the reign of Urraca in twelfth century to that of Juana I of Castile in the early sixteenth.[42]

Accompanying these new approaches to queenship — the use of literary and visual culture as well as linking the late medieval with the early modern — is a geographic shift, too, one which de-centers the kingdom of Castile. Nuria Silleras-Fernández's study of María de Luna is one of the first to open the landscape to include the queens of Aragón; here, the focus is on the political battles María waged as queen-lieutenant of Aragón on behalf of her husband Martí, and on her use of religious patronage and piety to gain and maintain political power.[43] Theresa Earenfight's *The King's Other Body* examines the office of lieutenant general in the Crown of Aragón, using María of Castile's two periods of rule in Aragón to make a case for a changing understanding of monarchy during the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries.[44] Miriam Shadis's study of the political authority of Berenguela of Castile, and the role of the pan-European network of royal women with whom she was connected, in shaping the practice and performance of queenship in the

---

[40] Therese Martin, *Queen as King: Politics and Architectural Propaganda in Twelfth-Century Spain*, The Medieval and Early Modern Iberian World, 30 (Leiden: Brill, 2006).
[41] *Femmes et gouvernement: Gouverner en Castille au Moyen Age: la parte des femmes*, ed. by Georges Martin, *e-Spania*, 1 (June 2006) <https://e-spania.revues.org/30> [accessed 24 December 2015].
[42] Bethany Aram, "Authority and Maternity in Late-Medieval Castile: Four Queens Regnant", in *Aspects of Power and Authority in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Brenda M. Bolton and Christine E. Meek, International Medieval Research Series, 14 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), pp. 121-129.
[43] Nuria Silleras-Fernández, *Power, Piety, and Patronage in Late Medieval Queenship: María de Luna*, The New Middle Ages (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).
[44] Theresa Earenfight, *The King's Other Body: María of Castile and the Crown of Aragón* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010).

thirteenth century is a sublime example of the de-emphasizing of the "great woman" model[45]; in contrast, H. Salvador Martínez's massive tome on Berenguela, complete with an exhaustive exploration of the historical context of her brief rule and short regency, stands out for its explicitly biographical focus and more traditional approach.[46] Janna Bianchini is unique in examining Berenguela's authority and political power specifically as a monarch, rather than a regent or consort, with a particular focus on her cultivation of lordly or seigneurial relationships to grow her political power even during more precarious periods of her political career.[47] Elena Woodacre merits a mention, here, too, for being the first to study the five medieval queens-regnant of Navarre[48] and their exercise of power, and for examining their reigns as a group, in the fashion of the English studies of the Plantagenet consorts mentioned above.

Given such a crowded field, one might ask, has any stone (or rather, any queen) been left unturned? What could possibly be left to consider? The works discussed above are excellent studies, but they are, for the most part, historical and biographical in nature. They orient themselves towards uncovering some element of "historical truth" about their royal subjects, examining archival documents and attempting to extract grains of fact from a huge range of written and visual sources (and at times going beyond the quest for truth into the simply unknowable — Martínez, in his self-declared role as biographer, at times goes so far as to conjecture at Berenguela's thoughts and feelings). This is even true of the majority of studies which explicitly distance themselves from the traditional biographical mode — even Martin's study of Urraca's architectural legacy and Shadis's work on Berenguela and royal women, which are ultimately centered on rediscovering the historical queens. This approach relies on the use of historical narratives to inform

[45] Miriam Shadis, *Berenguela of Castile (1180-1246) and Political Women in the High Middle Ages*, The New Middle Ages (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).
[46] H. Salvador Martínez, *Berenguela la Grande y su época (1180-1246)* (Madrid: Polifemo, 2012).
[47] Janna Bianchini, *The Queen's Hand: Power and Authority in the Reign of Berenguela of Castile* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012).
[48] Elena Woodacre, *The Queens Regnant of Navarre: Succession, Politics, and Partnership, 1274-1512*, Queenship and Power (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

such rediscoveries, while the relationship between "historical truth" and chronicle sources is constructed as problematic. It is a dilemma which provides fertile ground for expanding our understanding of queenship, and at the heart of this dilemma lies the fundamentally *narrative* nature of the medieval chronicle, that is, the fact that it is intended, first and foremost, to tell a story.[49]

In an inversion of the use to which chronicles have been put by historians in the field, this thesis proposes to examine narratives of ruling queenship in medieval Castilian histories, tracing the evolving treatment of female rulers through a broad range of Latin and vernacular texts from the twelfth to fifteenth centuries, with an eye to moments of narrative divergence and the creation of new stories, and the social logic which drives them.

II. The Medieval Chronicle and the Poetics of Historical Writing

A chronicle, in the strictest sense, is "a record or register of events in chronological order", but in practice, it is used to refer to those works whose "subject matter […] claimed to be essentially historical" in nature.[50] Early medieval annals, which present the events of the past as a list of disconnected happenings, demonstrate that it is perfectly possible to represent history in a non-narrative fashion. In order to be a "proper history", Hayden White argues, an account must not only deal with real events presented in a chronological fashion, but these events must also be narrated — that is, they must be "revealed as possessing a structure, an order of meaning, that they do not possess as a mere sequence" of events.[51] Unlike the perfunctory and disconnected annals that precede

[49] Colin Smith, "History as Myth in Medieval France and Spain", *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society*, 18 (1982), 54-68, underscores the point that *estoria* means both history and story in Spanish.
[50] Chris Given-Wilson, *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England* (London: Hambledon & London, 2004), p. xix.
[51] Hayden White, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), p. 5.

them, medieval chronicles aspire to this narrativity, although they usually "[fail] to achieve narrative closure" due to their tendency to represent historical reality "as if real events appeared to human consciousness in the form of unfinished stories". Both annalistic and chronicle forms of historical representation are perfectly functional means of presenting past events — neither form is or could be a perfect reflection of the past — but both formats are "particular products of possible conceptions of historical reality" with their own coherent internal logic and external uses, and not simply "failed anticipations" of modern historical discourse.[52]

Chronicles, more than any other sort of medieval text, are taken to be true; virtually all of the studies on queens and queenship mentioned above rely on chronicles to inform their investigations because they consider that at least some element of fact must be contained within their accounting of the past. This is perfectly reasonable considering that what distinguished history from other literature concerned with the past in the Middle Ages was "its claim to be presenting the truth".[53] Medieval chroniclers placed considerable emphasis upon the word "truth" in relation to their writings, but its meaning is not exactly straightforward, or at least, it does not correspond precisely to the modern understanding of truth as "conformity to fact". Chris Given-Wilson explains in his study of medieval English chronicles that "the word 'truth' when used in contexts such as these might bear one of two meanings: 'accuracy', or 'trustworthiness'", each comprised of several different factors. Accuracy could of course be interpreted in the modern sense, the need for actions and actors to be reported factually, but the medieval chronicler also considered the "universal truth" or moral lesson of any given episode to be just as important an element of accuracy as fact. And beyond universal truths, accuracy was also partly the extent to which an event "was perceived to be plausible; that is, the extent

[52] White, *Content of the Form*, pp. 5-6.
[53] Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, p. 1.

to which it corresponded to other comparable truths."[54] Thus the chronicler's own preconceived ideas about the world, more than any factual record of historical events, are central to the construction of his narrative.

Indeed, the worldview of the chronicler was in many ways just as important as the truthful (for which read *plausible* as well as factual) nature of his text, for if "[a]ccuracy was what chroniclers claimed for their chronicles", then "trustworthiness was what they claimed for themselves" and their evidence.[55] A chronicler could establish his integrity and suitability for the job of writing by laying out his qualifications and status, usually by way of some form of prologue or other paratextual matter. For the writer of history, suitable qualifications could include, but did not necessarily include, noble status; office and education were, however, of paramount importance, for they endowed him with the authority to compose a text that would be considered truthful. This concern with trustworthiness also extended to the narrated events themselves, and in particular the means by which a particular piece of evidence was acquired: the record of an event personally witnessed by a qualified chronicler was the most preferable, but hearing or reading an account from another trusted source (as many monastic chroniclers did) was also acceptable, so long as that source could in turn be established as reliable. Chroniclers could also, equally, dismiss alternative accounts by questioning the trustworthiness of the source. There was, therefore, considerable concern with asserting the necessary criteria to reassure the reader that the chronicle's representation of past events was realistic; that it could be trusted to be, in all senses, true.

Aristotle conceived of poetics as a separate category of language use from rhetoric: the latter was focused on using language to persuade, while poetry was the art of imitation or representation of agents, and specifically of agents who "must be either

[54] *Ibid.*, pp. 1-3.
[55] *Ibid.*, pp. 6-11.

admirable or inferior".[56] In his *Poetics*, Aristotle stressed above all the importance of plot — that is, "the organization of events" — for the effective imitation of these agents, calling plot "the source and (as it were) the soul of tragedy", where tragedy is "an imitation of an action that is admirable, complete, and possesses magnitude".[57] While modern notions of poetics preserve some of Aristotle's distinction — in Jonathan Culler's words, poetics is "an account of the resources and strategies of literature", that is, how a text is put together and the effects that this construction is intended to create upon the reader[58] — this characterization of tragedy also applies very neatly to the writing of history in the Middle Ages.

Studies of medieval Hispanic history writing have traditionally focused on the primarily philological aspects of chronicle composition[59] — specifically the identification of sources and contexts, the process of composition, the manuscripts and their transmission.[60] Much has been written about the history of these histories, and in turn historians of medieval Iberia have relied on chronicles in order to flesh out frequently sparse documentary records. But there has been a movement in recent years, if not entirely away from the use of historical writing as a source which can conceal or reveal "truth", then certainly towards *also* viewing historical writing through a more literary lens, focusing on the poetics of the text — which, as Leonardo Funes notes, is a natural fit with the medieval view of history writing, "puesto que en [la época medieval] la historia todavía era una rama de las letras".[61]

---

[56] Aristotle, *Poetics*, trans. by Malcolm Heath (London: Penguin, 1996), pp. 3-5.
[57] *Ibid.*, pp. 10-12.
[58] Jonathan Culler, *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: OUP, 1997, repr. 2011), pp. 70-71.
[59] Leonardo Funes, "Elementos para una poética del relato histórico", in *Poétique de la chronique: L'écriture des textes historiographiques au Moyen Âge (péninsule Ibérique et France*, ed. by Amaia Arizaleta, Méridiennes, Études Médiévales Ibériques (Tolouse: CNRS — Université de Tolouse-Le Mirail, 2008), pp. 241-273.
[60] Aengus Ward, "Past, present and future in the Latin and Romance historiography of the medieval Christian kingdoms of Spain", in *Journal of Medieval Iberian Studies*, 1 (2009), pp. 147-62.
[61] Funes, "Elementos", p. 241.

In elaborating his theory of a "poética del relato histórico" for medieval chronicles, Funes defines *poetics* as not only the modern conceptualization of a medieval discursive praxis, but as the "código formal y competencia retórica operados por los cronistas medievales".[62] Poetics is therefore both a descriptive tool (for the modern scholar of medieval historical writing) and a productive framework (for the medieval writer of history), and it exists as much in the eye of the beholder as in the very nature of the historical text. The chronicler depends upon the knowledge of, and ability to manipulate, the conventions of narrative in harmony with his particular worldview.[63] The latter is what constitutes the writing of history; indeed, for White, a "genuinely historical account [must] display not only a certain form, namely, the narrative, but also a certain content, namely, a politicosocial order."[64] A chronicler's mastery of poetics is only achieved when he is able to situate the actions of his actors "en un plano de relevancia temporal específico" and bestow them with meaning within that plane.[65]

Because the poetics of writing history depends almost entirely on political and social contexts, there cannot be said to be a singular poetics of medieval historiography, but rather a plurality of poetics, shifting gradually over time and place. Funes traces the origins of history-writing in medieval Iberia to Isidore of Seville, whose brevity and perfunctory narrative style were adopted by those who revived (Christian) historiography at the end of the ninth century; even at a remove of several centuries, Isidorian conventions continued to influence the composition of Hispano-Latin and vernacular chronicles, even well into the thirteenth century. The thirteenth century, of course, brings about a radical change (or perhaps two radical changes) in the writing of history in Iberia. Lucas de Tuy and Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada begin, in the first half of

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 271.
[63] *Ibid.*, p. 242.
[64] White, *Content of the Form*, p. 11.
[65] Funes, "Elementos", p. 250.

the century, to break away from the monotonous Isidorian litany of events past by developing what Funes calls the "yo-narrador", the authorial voice that intervenes in the narration, and by interweaving the "past" of the text with the "present" of the universal narration.[66] But although Lucas and Rodrigo introduced change, it is Alfonso X who will ultimately replace Isidore as the predominant example for later chroniclers of how to write history. With its nearly obsessive emphasis on chronology, its clear focus on Spanish territory and Spanish matters, its interest in the exemplary and didactic uses of history, and its development of a distant narrative voice (offering what Funes calls "una perspectiva unívoca y un relato plural"), the Alfonsine model established the parameters of a poetics of historical writing which remained more or less in force (with some changes) until the fifteenth century.[67]

This is not to say that the chronicles that came after the *Estoria de España* and the *General Estoria* necessarily shared Alfonso's worldview, nor even his impossibly broad historical focus; indeed, save for Sancho IV's (similarly unfinished) *Versión amplificada* of the *EE*, the Alfonsine ideal was shattered almost immediately. From the model of the *crónica general*, as the work of writing history moved into noble courts and depended on what scraps of manuscript could be obtained, there sprang a diversity of interpretations: "la crónica nobiliaria, la crónica castellana, la crónica particular y la crónica real", each based on the political and social circumstances of its patron and on the breakdown of Alfonso's narrative universe.[68] The most notable change is perhaps the redefinition of acceptable temporal limits on, or divisions of, history: no longer must the chronicler look to a remote past (whether Gothic, Roman, or Biblical) in order to appropriately ground his narrative; instead, the crowning of a new king, along with his death, now constitutes a clear set of temporal limits which requires no further justification. But this re-framing

[66] *Ibid.*, p. 244-48.
[67] *Ibid.*, p. 250.
[68] Funes, "Elementos", p. 261.

of history as a sequence of kings is not the only difference; it is accompanied by another, subtler divergence from Alfonso's carefully crafted poetics.

Beginning during the reign of Sancho IV, in particular with the *Gran conquista de Ultramar*, ostensibly a chronicle of the First Crusade which makes extensive use of epic and legendary material, Francisco Bautista identifies a shift to "una poética de la historia donde la ordenación de los hechos queda supeditada a la propia narración, a su desarrollo y no ya a la cronología o al 'señorío'"[69] — that is, the narrative itself now constitutes the organizing principle of history. Bautista relates this newfound predominance of narrative to the diversity of materials included in historiographical texts from the fourteenth century onwards, as well as to the function of historical literature as entertainment in medieval Castilian courts (in no small part, of course, because chronicles were adopting important elements of the form and the content of both epic and romance). Funes attributes both of these changes — the use of kings as temporal markers, and the importance of the narrative element — to a deeper, more fundamental change that occurs at the start of the fourteenth century: the "concepción unitaria y universalista del pasado y aun de la sociedad" that marked Alfonso X's historical projects has disappeared entirely from the ideological horizon, and even though the chronicler's words might be superficially similar, "la poética que las articula ya es irremediablemente otra".[70]

The production of chronicles in the Middle Ages is frequently tied to moments when power is in the process of being consolidated. In most cases, the writing of history responds to a need to legitimate newly acquired political power, but it can be a reactionary response to defeat — the *Versión crítica* of the *Estoria de España* is nothing if

[69] Francisco Bautista, "Poesía, archivo y heterogeneidad en la historiografía castellana medieval", in *Poétique de la chronique: L'écriture des textes historiographiques au Moyen Âge (péninsule Ibérique et France*, ed. by Amaia Arizaleta, Méridiennes, Études Médiévales Ibériques (Tolouse: CNRS — Université de Tolouse-Le Mirail, 2008), pp. 215-228.
[70] Funes, "Elementos", p. 271.

not proof that history can be written by losers, too![71] Whichever side the chronicler writes from, however, the fact of the altered political landscape necessitates a need to fit the past to the new present. Gabrielle Spiegel has observed that the writing of history always constitutes the search for a usable past, even if it is written in support of a defeated cause, because "a revised past held out for contemporaries the promise of a perfectible present".[72] Medieval chroniclers constructed their narratives carefully in response to a variety of political and social stimuli, "with emphases reflecting their own interests and convictions" (or those of their patrons), working to give the actors and events in their texts useful meaning in the present "as part of a larger continuum" of history.[73]

All of this interest in the poetics of medieval chronicles — that is, the *how*, and specifically the *why* of putting these texts together — has, however, only rarely intersected with the ways that twentieth and twenty-first century historians writing on queens and queenship make use of chronicles as source texts. Mark Whittow's division of chronicles and chroniclers by what he perceives to be their relative "believability" rather neatly summarises the prevailing opinion among queenship scholars about the value of chronicles:

> "A text that throughout shows a concern, however flawed in practice, to get dates right, can be relied upon to be broadly accurate, in so far as [the] compiler knew the facts, when it talks of events such as accessions, deaths, battles, marriages or the like. On the other hand, a text that equally betrays a consistent wish to identify a pattern in the empire's affairs, whereby orthodoxy is rewarded and heresy leads to perdition, cannot be trusted for its interpretation for anything beyond the bare facts, and least of all can it be trusted for agency or motive."[74]

---

[71] Gabrielle Spiegel, *Romancing the Past: The Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-Century France* (Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993) makes this point about early Old French chronicles, whose production was sponsored by Flemish nobles in response to the increasing centralization and consolidation of royal power under King Philip Augustus.
[72] *Ibid.*, p. 5.
[73] Helen E. Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou: Queenship and Power in Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), p. 3.
[74] Mark Whittow, "Motherhood and Power in Early Medieval Europe, West and East: The Strange Case of the Empress Eirene", in *Motherhood, Religion, and Society in Medieval Europe, 400-*

This suspicion towards any text with narrative tendencies, and the clear preference for an almost annalistic style of writing, shorn of explanation and authorial intervention, elevates and prioritizes modern ideas about truth (strictly conceived of as "conformity to fact"). At the same time, it rejects essential elements of truth as it would have been understood by the authors themselves: "truth" for the medieval chronicler was, as we have seen, as much about what *could* or *should* be true as what *was* true. To cast aside a chronicler's efforts to imbue events with deeper meaning — by means of a narrative — as merely superfluous fact-obscuring material, a mountain of chaff concealing a few precious grains of wheat, is to ignore the very thing which made chronicles valuable to their authors, patrons, and audiences.

This view also fails to fully appreciate that the very process of selecting "the facts" themselves constitutes a fundamental part of identifying (or, we might say, *creating*) a pattern, even when no attempt is made to link them. This may seem a statement of the obvious, for even annals, which can hardly be called exhaustive records of events at a given time, display *some* trace of internal coherence and thus of bias. It is important to remember that "[e]very narrative, however seemingly 'full,' is constructed on the basis of a set of events that might have been included but were left out", and that "this is as true of imaginary narratives as it is of realistic ones."[75] The wide variety of events and sources available to later medieval chroniclers is a key feature of their task; Bautista views the heterogeneity of chronicle texts as a poetics in itself, another strategy in the chronicler's arsenal which might be used "para formalizar [una] crítica o para llevar a cabo una novedad que de otra forma sería invisble".[76] But many studies continue to share Paul Strohm's assessment of medieval chronicles as "deceptive compendiums of

1400: Essays Presented to Henrietta Leyser, ed. by Conrad Leyser and Lesley Smith (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 55-84, p. 80.
[75] White, *Content of the Form*, p. 10.
[76] Bautista, "Poesía, archivo y heterogeneidad", p. 228.

narratized fact and wild speculation", riskier bases for conclusions than even the most fantastical of romances.[77]

It is therefore tempting to ask why, if this is what scholars of medieval queenship think when approaching chronicles — with mistrust and frequently disdain towards any attempts at narratization — they bother to use them at all. But of course, that answer is self-evident: medieval chronicles provide some of the most extensive written sources for learning about powerful women who, despite their status and wealth, often leave little trace of their lives and deeds in more straightforwardly "factual" archival materials like charters and grants. Because these latter are in such short supply, other evidence is required to fill in the gaps. Historical narratives also have the advantage of offering, in a single text, a glimpse of a broader picture in a way that documentary sources usually do not. Paradoxically, it seems they are at once useful because they offer facts in context, but as good as useless when they offer too much context. To continually sift through chronicles in search of details seemingly factual enough to be accepted as "true" while discarding the rest seems an inefficient, even wasteful, use of resources; there must surely be a better way to interact with historical narratives when writing about medieval queens! Considering that the point of chronicles was that they presented themselves as true, examining what they present must be able to tell us things about queenship that are just as interesting as any search for facts which are often not externally verifiable in any case. After all, the choices that chroniclers made regarding what material to include in their narratives, "and the reasons why they made them — insofar as these are deducible — can tell us as much about the purposes for which they wrote as can anything that they actually said."[78]

[77] Paul Strohm, *Hochon's Arrow: The Social Imagination of Fourteenth-Century Texts* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), p. 34.
[78] Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, p. 16.

III. Examining the Representation of Queenship in Castilian Chronicles

The utility of these gaps between history and its representation in historical narratives have not gone unnoticed elsewhere in the world of medieval studies, and not just with regard to queens, though we have already seen Stafford's concern with the malleable nature and political utility of the images of both Emma of Normandy and Edith of Wessex in chronicle texts composed after the Norman Conquest. More recently, Laura D. Barefield[79] and Kavita Mudan Finn[80] have examined the intersections between gender, genre, and historiographical representation in medieval English literature, and in particular the digression or turn towards a "romance" mode when women, including queens, break into otherwise straightforwardly genealogical (and thus, male-centred) narratives. Barbara Weissberger's *Isabel Rules*, as mentioned briefly above, represents a marked departure from the purely historical-biographical focus on medieval Iberian queens, and shares more than a few features with these trends in medieval English queenship. By approaching the role of the queen through the study of Isabelline literature, and specifically the impact of female sovereignty on the literature of the period, Weissberger also provides a model for approaching the gender-specific elements of narrative representation. She draws on a broad range of textual sources, from the high (*specula principis*, chess strategy, sentimental romance, and most importantly, chronicles) to the low (satirical poetry and prose of a pornographic nature, popular ballads), and sets out to determine how each writer's work "respond[s] to the unprecedented challenge that a powerful female sovereign poses to the patriarchal status quo". Her expansion of Mark Breitenberg's concept of "anxious masculinity" — originally coined to describe the internal ideological tension between female sovereignty and the need to

[79] Laura D. Barefield, *History and Gender in Medieval English Romance and Chronicle*, Studies in the Humanities, 63 (New York: Peter Lang, 2003).
[80] Kavita Mudan Finn, *The Last Plantagenet Consorts: Gender, Genre, and Historiography, 1440-1627*, Queenship and Power (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

uphold patriarchal culture in English Elizabethan literature[81] — to include "any discursive strategy that expresses, articulates, and/or contains a perceived loss of masculine power and privilege",[82] is also useful for thinking about the representation of other, visibly politically active queens.

Though none of the pre-Isabelline regnant and regent queens of Castile were in precisely the same position as simultaneous sovereign and patron of the chronicles in which they appear, they make an excellent group of test subjects for exploring the construction of queenship in historical narratives. This is firstly because they provide both a relatively sizeable number of examples — four queens over the course of the later middle ages who each exercised legitimate authority as rulers, either regent or regnant. And though each of these four queens exercised power[83] in a slightly different fashion — whether regnant, regent, or co-regent — they all effectively exercised the power of the crown for a considerable period of time: Urraca of León-Castilla's seventeen years on the throne as queen regnant are the longest period of female rule until the fifteenth century; Berenguela de Castilla's time as regent for and then close adviser to Fernando III spans several decades; María de Molina has the distinction of acting as regent for two different kings; and Catalina de Lancaster's regency was shared with Fernando de Antequera. The variations in individual circumstance, along with the remarkably even chronological spread — exactly one queen per century, if Isabel is excluded — also offers a unique opportunity to identify much broader patterns in the treatment of female rule.

[81] Mark Breitenberg, *Anxious Masculinity in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 1.
[82] Weissberger, *Isabel Rules*, p. xiv.
[83] There is much to be said about the nuances of power and its exercise, but I take "authority" to be "the socially recognized right to make certain decisions and to require obedience," while power is understood as a more informal ability to gain compliance. Michelle Zimbalist Rosaldo, "Woman, Culture, and Society: A Theoretical Overview", in *Woman, Culture and Society*, ed. by Louise Lamphere and Michelle Zimbalist Rosaldo (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974), pp. 17-42.

There are certainly many other interesting queens to be found in the chronicles of medieval Castile — Leonor de Guzmán, for instance — but it is the intersection[84] of gender and authority in the representation of queens as political actors which are of most interest to me. On a purely pragmatic note, the prominence of Urraca, Berenguela, María de Molina, and Catalina — specifically the fact that the performance of queenly duties was inherently more visible than those of most queens-consort by virtue of their position of rulership without an adult king to overshadow them — makes for the widest and most interesting variety of chronicle narratives. Isabel as queen occupies a slightly different and more complicated position, ruling alongside Fernando II of Aragón as both regnant and consort, and chronicle representations of her queenship are fashioned accordingly.

With the objects of study now broadly delimited, the assumptions and methods of investigation must be laid out. First, I operate under the assumption that these queens are not "exceptional", at least in the sense in which it is often claimed; that is, that women with political agency were almost unimaginably unusual or impermissible in the Middle Ages in western Europe or Iberia broadly or Castile specifically.[85] Clearly, if women found themselves at the head of the kingdom of Castile five times in four centuries, in the lieutenancy of Aragón seven times in two centuries, or on the throne of Navarre five times in three centuries, in some of these cases for decades, then the state of having a female ruler — especially in Iberia — was simply *less common* than the state of having a male ruler, whatever the ideal situation might have been. This does not mean that I assume, however, that queens with agency, operating independently of adult male kings, were considered desirable leaders. Second, I operate with the clear expectation that I am

[84] Intersectionality is, of course, a growing area of interest in medieval studies, and gender is only one of many potential axes of investigation, but the study of queenship in Castile is necessarily restricted along the lines of social class, religion, and gender, and the latter is itself a marker of difference for medieval chroniclers.
[85] In particular, I reject Earenfight's claim, cited above, that queenship in medieval Spain took a unique and distinctive form from queenship elsewhere in Europe.

not seeking literal, historical "truth" about any of these queens. The historical facts of their respective periods of political power have been thoroughly investigated by historians, and for the most part, there is little need to question their findings. Instead, what I am seeking is to explore the diversity of representations and the reasons for these representations — in Weissberger's words, "not to see through the hagiographic veil" (or the decidedly less-than-hagiographic veil, in certain cases), but "rather, to examine the stuff of which it is fashioned".[86] How is the figure of a particular queen constructed in the chronicles of her own time, and in the chronicles of subsequent generations? What differences exist between these alternative depictions, and what caused the variation to be written into history?

In order to answer these questions in an organized fashion, I will begin by adopting and adapting the rather scientific method set out by Aengus Ward in his monograph on the representations of Wamba, wherein he begins to adapt some of the concerns about text, context, and representation to Iberian medieval historiography. Building on the work of Leonardo Funes and Georges Martin, who used a very similar strategy to great success in *Les juges de Castille*, Ward seeks less a "true history" of the Visigothic king than an understanding of why later medieval chronicles (and chroniclers) chose to represent Wamba the way they did, and the broad outlines of his procedures are more than flexible enough to be used for an examination of the changing representation of queenship instead of kingship. Grounded in the assumption "that any text's meaning is a function of its contexts," Ward's method relies on a combination of close reading of the chronicle text and careful examination of historical context, both external (that is, everything related to the circumstances under which a chronicle was produced, including the cultural and political situation, and even the authorial biography in cases where it is

[86] Weissberger, *Isabel Rules*, p. xiii.

known) and internal.[87] His strategy of identifying recurring "narrative blocs" that appear in differing combinations in different chronicles is also of some utility, though new blocs must be identified for each of the four queens. Changes between different chronicles' versions of these narrative blocs will be analyzed in terms of Georges Martin's "four procedures of displacement, addition, substitution and suppression", but also with an eye to Weissberger's expanded notion of "anxious masculinity"; that is, the use of discursive strategies, in the writing and re-writing of these narratives, that respond to the perceived loss of masculine power and privilege inherent in times of female rule.

I will take as my source texts a wide range of prose historiography and, with a few exceptions for Latin chronicles in the earlier part of the historical range (e.g. the *Historia compostellana* composed by contemporaries of Urraca, and the *Chronicon mundi* commissioned by Berenguela and reaching the "present day" of 1236, or the *De rebus Hispaniae,* which reaches 1243), chronicles composed mainly in the Castilian vernacular. The set of chronicles utilized will be different for each queen, though there is substantial overlap between the chronicles used in Chapters I and II. Each queen and her representations will be considered in turn, beginning with Urraca and ending with Catalina, employing chronology as an organizational device. Once the work of textual and contextual analysis has been done for all four queens, I will also discuss the potential impact of some of these chronicle representations of earlier queens on Isabel of Castile's self-fashioning in the histories she commissioned for posterity — for the inventory of her library includes more than a few of the chronicles under examination.[88] Though the example of Weissberger and the English medievalists is tempting to follow — drawing in the representations of queens in other forms of literature — my interest lies first and foremost in scrutinizing the narratives of those who claim to tell the truth, and in

[87] Aengus Ward, *History and Chronicles in Late Medieval Iberia: Representations of Wamba in Late Medieval Narrative Histories*, Later Medieval Europe, 7 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), pp. 3-5.
[88] Francisco Javier Sánchez Cantón, *Libros, tapices y cuadros que coleccionó Isabel la Católica* (Madrid: CSIC, 1950).

examining the political, social, and historical factors that gave rise to the shifting depictions of Castilian queens endowed with unexpected political agency and authority.

I

Urraca of León-Castile

(1109-1126)

Urraca, queen of León and Castile,[89] was not the only woman to inherit a throne in twelfth-century Europe. Both Melisende of Jersualem and Matilda of England were also their fathers' designated heirs, and claimed the rule of their fathers' kingdoms in their own right, even as their husbands fought to rule *jure uxoris* and their own sons struggled to seize power, too.[90] But Urraca was the first, and arguably the most successful. This is not, however, to say that her accession was preordained, or even desired. As late as the spring of 1108, less than two years before she took the throne, there was no suggestion that Urraca would inherit her father's kingdoms. Her teenaged brother Sancho, born of Alfonso's relationship with a Moorish noblewoman, was firmly ensconced in the role of heir. The eventual fact of Urraca's ascension to the throne represented the cumulative failure of at least five marriages and numerous extramarital relationships to produce a son who could outlive the king.

---

[89] There exists a substantial body of scholarship, much of it recent, on various aspects of Urraca's reign. For a guided tour of the archival evidence, the best possible starting point is Bernard F. Reilly, *The Kingdom of León-Castile under Queen Urraca, 1109-1126* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982). María Carmen Pallares and Ermelindo Portela take a slightly more biographical approach in *La reina Urraca* (San Sebastián: Nerea, 2006), while Elena Lobato Yanes focuses on the dynamics of the queen's court in *Urraca I: La Corte Castellano-Leonesa en el siglo XII* (Palencia: Diputación Provincial, 2000). Therese Martin's *Queen as King: Politics and Architectural Propaganda in Twelfth-Century Spain* (Leiden: Brill, 2006) explores the role of royal women, and particularly Urraca, in the patronage of religious architecture.

[90] For an overview of Melisende of Jerusalem, see Hans Eberhard Mayer, "Studies in the History of Queen Melisende of Jerusalem", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 26 (1972), pp. 93-182. For Matilda of England, see Charles Beem, *The Lioness Roared: The Problems of Female Rule in English History* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), pp. 25-61.

Urraca was Alfonso VI's first legitimate child, the result of his second marriage to Constance of Burgundy, daughter of the Duke of Burgundy, and although their union failed to produce further issue, it was more successful as part of Alfonso's broader political strategy of seeking political alliances and cultural exchange with France. At least three, and perhaps even four, of his wives came from the other side of Pyrenees, and Alfonso's support for the religious reforms centered around the Abbey of Cluny are well-documented.[91]

Less well-documented is the portion of Urraca's life before she was acknowledged as her father's heir. Legitimate she may have been, but Alfonso VI still held out hope for a son, and thus virtually nothing is known of her life before the turn of the twelfth century. Her birth (thought to be around the year 1080) is not recorded, and she first appears in charters and chronicles upon her marriage to Raymond of Burgundy, perhaps as a reward for his services to the king, and certainly as a means of further consolidating Leonese ties with France. Urraca's dowry was substantial: Raymond of Burgundy soon found himself governing, *jure uxoris*, the county of Galicia, which at the time included the entirety of Portugal.[92]

While much is known, through charters and chronicles, of Raymond's movements in this period, since he was Alfonso's proxy in Galicia as well as presumptive heir, Urraca's life (and involvement in the governing of Galicia) during their marriage is largely obscured. It is only with the premature death of the *infante* Sancho, fighting Almoravid forces at the battle of Uclés in 1108, that we find her in the chronicles again.

---

[91] Whether these ties to Cluny pre-date Alfonso's reign is another matter: it has been argued that the Cluniac connection began with Fernando I of Léon, and equally that Fernando I's annual donation to the Abbey was an invention intended to create the impression of continuity for Alfonso VI's agenda. For the latter, see Lucy K. Pick, "Rethinking Cluny in Spain", *Journal of Medieval Iberian Studies*, 5 (2013), pp. 1-17, and for the former, see Patrick Henriet, "Cluny and Spain before Alfonso VI: remarks and propositions", *Journal of Medieval Iberian Studies* (2017).

[92] For Urraca's early life and first marriage, see Reilly, pp. 11-43.

This time, there was no question of the succession: not only was the king elderly and infirm, but (the chronicles insist) he had been driven mad with grief. Virtually all of the narratives examined here describe a spiralling terminal illness in the final two years of Alfonso's life which is partly psychological and partly physical, the king's mind and body anticipating the ruin and destruction that would soon befall his kingdom and his dynasty. As a result of her displacement, first by her husband and then by her half-brother, Urraca emerges into these narratives fully-formed, a widow of almost thirty, with a young son and daughter, as the ruling countess of Galicia and a powerful new player in the world of politics.

In an attempt to consolidate her dynastic position and maintain equilibrium among the kingdom's noble factions whilst also ensuring the kingdom would be protected by a proven military leader, Urraca married the new king of Aragón, Alfonso I, *el Batallador*. This is perhaps the only indisputable fact we can learn about the union from chronicle accounts, for everything else pertaining to the couple is vague at best: from the essential facts (time, place, duration) to more complex questions (who proposed it, why it ended), extant documents and historical accounts offer a mind-boggling array of possible answers. But despite the general inability of medieval chroniclers to agree on details, it is this marriage—and the ensuing conflicts—which has shaped the enduring image of Urraca in the historical imagination.

Beyond the desire for a warrior-king who could continue to defend and expand Castile and León, the political appeal of such a union must have been immense. However, due to internal conflicts as well as the failure to produce an heir, the union was short-lived: married sometime between 1108 and late 1109, as they were estranged by the following spring, and despite a brief reconciliation, were definitively separated by

1112, nominally on the grounds of consanguinity in the third degree.[93] A more or less constant state of open warfare between Castile and Aragón followed the separation, as each ruler fought to (re)claim the maximum territory possible, until a truce was finally reached in 1117. The truce with Aragón marked the halfway point of Urraca's reign, and if the second half was no less turbulent than the first, it was at least quiet on the eastern front, as the truce was renewed every three years until her death. Instead, the Almoravids, the Portuguese, and domestic matters, including the succession, became her main concerns.

If Urraca entered the historical record in a haze of uncertainty, her exit from it is perhaps equally mysterious. Though the date of her death is generally agreed upon, in the sources that mention it, only one contemporary account offers an explanation. This is found in the *Chronicon Compostellanum*, a very short text that accompanies the *Historia Compostellana* in many of its manuscripts, and which provides only the most essential of details: it says that after reigning "tirannice et muliebriter" for seventeen years, Urraca died at the castle of Saldaña on 6 March, 1126, "in partu adulterini filii", in adulterous childbirth, bringing her unhappy life to an end.[94] Venom aside, there seems little reason to doubt this cause of death. The queen was by then forty-six or forty-seven, and pregnancy was dangerous at the best of times. Nevertheless, despite a reign filled with turmoil, she—by virtue of ruling "tyrannically and womanishly", in the words of the anonymous chronicler—left her son a kingdom that was largely as she had inherited it, and as peaceful as any medieval Iberian kingdom could hope to be.

[93] For the conflicting records and narratives around the marriage, see Reilly, pp. 46-114. They shared a common great-grandfather in Sancho III el Mayor, king of Pamplona. Urraca and Raymond were also married consanguineously in the third degree, though it does not appear to have been raised as an impediment at any point.
[94] Emma Falque, "Chronicon Compostellanum", *Habis*, 14 (1983), pp. 73-84.

The histories of medieval Castile tell a very different tale. The chronicles examined in this chapter span nearly four centuries and many developments in the writing of history in medieval Castile, and each constructs Urraca's exercise of ruling queenship in a unique fashion. From the *Historia compostellana* to the *Crónicas anónimas de Sahagún*, the image of León-Castile's first regnant queen offers an appealing slate onto which royal and ecclesiastical ideologies of queenship can be projected, as chroniclers attempted to negotiate the complexities of female rule at moments of political and dynastic crisis.

I. The *Historia Compostellana*

External contexts

It may seem disingenuous to begin a study of queenship in late medieval Castilian chronicles with a text that is none of those things. The *Historia Compostelana* is a Galician text written in Latin, a product of the first half of the twelfth century, and does not claim to be a chronicle. Nevertheless, for this study it is an essential starting point, for it is the only historical narrative contemporary with Urraca's rule.[95] It was composed over the course of four decades (c. 1110-1150) by monks attached to the cathedral at Santiago de Compostela during the bishopric and archbishopric of Diego Gelmírez. Galicia was far from the center of power in twelfth-century León-Castile; indeed, Richard Fletcher says that it was "effectively cut off from the community of western Christendom" until the eleventh century.[96] So although it was closer at the turn of the century than it had been in the past, Galicia remained geographically isolated by the Sierra de los Ancares, which allowed the local nobility and clergy to consolidate power beyond the easy reach of the

[95] It has long been believed that the *Primera crónica anónima de Sahagún* was also composed during Urraca's reign but, as I will explain at the end of this chapter, new research has shown that this is not the case.
[96] Fletcher, p. 28.

king, who was additionally preoccupied with the pressures of the Reconquest in the south and east.

As we have already established, Alfonso VI's relationship with Galicia was troubled, and Galician resentment of Leonese-Castilian rulership was a longstanding problem, which predated even the reign of his father, Fernando I. Importantly, Alfonso's reliance on disruptive foreign elements (most prominently the Burgundian cousins) to weaken longstanding local networks of aristocratic power was not limited to Galicia, nor to the secular nobility: both the king's consistent promotion of French Cluniac monks as well as donations to Cluny itself, and his preference for the Roman rite over the old Mozarabic rite were aimed at reasserting royal control over the religious hierarchy in his realms.

Diego Gelmírez was exactly the sort of political figure that Alfonso VI's policies were aimed at. He was firmly bound up in the Galician middle nobility, as the son of a knight, and rooted in the indigenous kinship networks that Alfonso, and later Raymond and Urraca, worked to disrupt. He was also a product of the Galician ecclesiastical community. His mentor and predecessor as bishop, Diego Peláez, for whom he served as an administrator and with whom his family shared close ties, participated in a 1085 revolt against Alfonso VI which ultimately caused him to be stripped of his mitre. Gelmírez rose through the ranks of the episcopal *curia* at Santiago de Compostela, but also mingled with lay elites, spending time at the Leonese court as a young man and serving as Raymond of Burgundy's *cancellarius et secretarius* between 1087 and 1093, before being tasked with the administration of Santiago's "temporalities" (and revenues) while the bishopric remained vacant.[97] He became, despite his humble origins and association with the troublemaking Diego Peláez, the royal family's preferred candidate

[97] Fletcher, pp. 103-07.

during the 1100 episcopal election, although it seems that, even at this early stage, he was not supported by Archbishop Bernard of Toledo,[98] with whom he would quarrel for the remainder of their respective lives.

Throughout his time as bishop, and later archbishop, of Santiago de Compostela, Diego Gelmírez's loyalties are exceedingly clear: first, to his church and his diocese; then to Galicia and its nobility, from Raymond to Alfonso Raimúndez, and Pedro Froílaz de Traba; and lastly to other factions, both lay and religous, inasmuch as they aligned with his primary interests of preserving and expanding the power, wealth, and autonomy of his (archi)episcopal domains. The *Historia Compostellana* was undertaken on Gelmírez's orders as a written extension of these aims, which inevitably conflicted with the goals of the monarchy and other elements of the church hierarchy.

The *Historia Compostellana*[99] is known to be the work of several different writers, at least three of whom claim authorship in the text; although the number of contributors may be higher (perhaps five or six in total),[100] it is generally agreed that the three named clerics are responsible for the overwhelming majority of the text. Santiago de Compostela's treasurer, Muño Alfonso, was the first to be entrusted with the task of recording the history of the cathedral and the diocese, and his selection is in line with the *HC*'s persistent focus on the material success of Santiago. There is little doubt that Muño Alfonso was responsible for much of the first book, and that this was composed shortly after Alfonso VI's death and the political turmoil following Urraca's accession and remarriage, as part of a strategy to defend episcopal patrimony against seizure, since the church had lost its two major benefactors in the king and Raymond of Burgundy.[101] A

[98] Fletcher, pp. 114-15.
[99] Hereafter, *HC*. References will be to *Historia Compostellana*, ed. by Emma Falque Rey (Turnhout: Brepols, 1988).
[100] Emma Falque, "Introducción", in *Historia compostelana*, ed. and trans. by Emma Falque Rey (Madrid: Akal, 1994), pp. 11-18, gives a useful overview of the authorship debate.
[101] Fernando López Alsina, *La ciudad de Santiago de Compostela en la Alta Edad Media* (Santiago de Compostela: Ayuntamiento de Santiago de Compostela, 1988), pp. 48-51.

French Cluniac monk called Giraldo or Gerard of Beauvais is thought to be responsible for the bulk of the writing, the majority of Books I and II, as well as their respective prologues, which he undertook late in Urraca's reign (c. 1121-1124), and specifically after the 1120 elevation of Gelmírez to the rank of archbishop and Santiago to an independent archdiocese.[102] The third and final section of the text, comprising all of Book III and the second half of Book II, has been attributed to the canon Pedro Marcio, and was composed after the death of the archbishop, likely in the period 1145-49, when the new archbishop Pedro Elías sought to smooth over a period of plotting and internal conflicts that marked the end of Gelmírez's life.[103]

Internal contexts

Unlike most chronicles of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the *HC* does not take royal genealogy or the person of the king to be its organizing principle, or even an epic hero, as in the *Historia Rodericí*. Instead, the twin centers of the chronicle are Diego Gelmírez and the cathedral of Santiago de Compostela itself. The opening lines of the prologue establish very clearly that its dual purposes are to document the deeds of Gelmírez, and to record for posterity the wealth and privileges granted to the church at Santiago de Compostela:

> "Didacus Dei gratia Compostellane sedis archiepiscopus iussit hunc librum fieri et in thesauro beati Iacobi reponi et, si aliquis per eum legere uoluerit, legat et cognoscat quantos honores et quantas hereditates et ornamenta et dignitates ipse archiepiscopus sue ecclesie acquisiu<er>it et quantas persecutiones et pericula a tyrannicis potestatibus pro sue ecclesie defensione pertulerit."[104]

[102] López Alsina, pp. 64-67.
[103] López Alsina, pp. 82-84.
[104] *HC*, Prologue.

As indicated above, the *HC* is divided into three books, but there is only one real division in the narration, which pertains to Diego Gelmírez's pursuit of and elevation to the status of archbishop. The first section, approximately corresponding to Book I, details the history of the church from the discovery of the body of St. James the Apostle through the establishment of a bishopric, offering an episcopal genealogy of sorts before arriving at the predestined election of Gelmírez, at which point the focus moves away from the past and towards the present and future under the guidance of the bishop. The second part of the narrative, comprising Books II and III, recounts his successful efforts to achieve an archbishopric for Santiago, as well as his attempt to win primacy over the Iberian Peninsula away from Toledo. Giraldo's representation of the queen in this section has become (in)famous, but it principally deals with the archbishop's struggle not only to increase the power of his see, but also to maintain his control over the town of Compostela: once the risk of Aragonese invasion had dissipated, a string of rebellions presented serious threats to his lordship, and threatened to destabilize the very edifice upon which Gelmírez had constructed his authority. Because the latter half of this section was written some time after Gelmírez's death, the narrative is neatly drawn to a close, with an eye to polishing the image of the archbishop as set out in the prologue. This third section touches only briefly on the queen's death, being more concerned with the reign of Alfonso VII, but although it is undeniably more restrained in its treatment of her—Urraca has become little more than a hazy memory—there remain echoes of earlier conflicts.

The *HC* does not at any point refer to itself as a chronicle, but rather purports to be a simple *regiſtrum*, a list of the events of the bishop's career, and as a result has something of the character of a miscellany about it. Although there are large sections of uninterrupted narrative, this is periodically interrupted to incorporate, by copying out in full, complete with salutations and lists of witnesses, the text of dozens of letters, oaths,

grants, and charters which benefit the cathedral, as well as making note of seemingly even the smallest donations to the church's property portfolio. (Ludwig Vones has suggested that the *HC*, with this structure of narrative interpolated with charters, should more accurately be called a "Chartularchronik", a cartulary chronicle.)[105] The narrative portions of the text are broadly episodic in nature, and this is supported by the organization of cartulary materials, which are generally inserted as a group after the episode to which they pertain. The broader episodes are then arranged chronologically, although the narrative occasionally loops back on itself to repeat and reinforce significant events. It is relatively unconcerned with chronology as an organizing principle, however, as dates are only provided sporadically and often imprecise when they are. In fact, it is the cartulary portions of the text which most frequently include dates, while the narrative episodes to which they pertain rarely use temporal markers more specific than *interea* (meanwhile) and *post multum uero temporis* (after a long time). This flexible treatment of time allows the narrative to flow more easily, and enables it to accommodate the ideological needs of the chroniclers, given that events without dates are even more difficult to trace independently and prove in the negative.[106]

The use of the letters, charters, and donations not only serves to record their contents for posterity and lend the weight of legitimacy to the *HC*'s cause, but the organization of documents also undergirds the whole structure of the narrative, from the very beginning of Book I. López Alsina points to the deft manipulation of sources in Book I as Muño Alfonso's most original technique,[107] but it is Giraldo who, superficially adopting the technique of weaving documentary texts into the narrative, deploys them to bolster the narrative more directly, whilst flattening it into a more linear structure.[108] The authors

[105] Ludwig Vones, *Die Historia Compostellana und die Kirchenpolitik des nordwestspanischen…* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1980), p. 35.
[106] López Alsina, p. 77.
[107] López Alsina, p. 64.
[108] López Alsina, pp. 75-77.

of the first and third books of the *HC* are relatively restrained in their use of the first person and reliance on purported eyewitness accounts, even though all of them were at various points members of the cathedral chapter and participants or observers of many of the events they recount. The second author is much more liberal with such claims, and is correspondingly less restrained in his narration: as we will see, he censures Urraca and many others harshly for their mistreatment of Santiago, but never fails to praise Gelmírez's wisdom, humility, sagacity, military prowess, and leadership of his "flock". It is Giraldo who definitively creates Diego Gelmírez and the cathedral of Santiago de Compostela as the dual, inextricably intertwined protagonists of the providential narrative that unfolds over the course of the *HC*, preordaining the success of both in much the same way as royal chronicles might preordain the victories of a king. But if Diego Gelmírez occupies the role of the king, and Santiago his kingdom, what part does the secular king play? And what becomes of the secular king who is a woman?

Urraca in the Text

That the authors of the *Historia Compostellana* did not like Queen Urraca, and thus painted her in a bad light, has been so oft-repeated as to reach the status of maxim. I would argue that interpreting the *HC*'s vast and complex representation of the queen as simply negative shows a lack of nuance in approaching the text, and that a closer reading of the text reveals more nuance in her treatment, even when the authors draw from the traditional misogyny of clerical literature. Instead, it is more accurate but, I hope, equally uncontroversial to say that Urraca's representation in the *HC* is dependant upon her relationship with the (arch)bishop of Santiago, and the authors' requirements in fashioning his image at a given moment in the narrative. This results in two strikingly different portraits of the queen: as the innocent victim of her husband and her nobles, and as a malicious and greedy woman who will stop at nothing in her hunger for power and land (synonymous as these are in the *HC*). There is a third, largely indifferent

representation of Urraca, too, and it also reflects her relationship with Gelmírez: she is the dead enemy, and he is the triumphant survivor, who can assume a merciful attitude in his victory.

It has already been noted that the formal divisions of the *HC* correspond to the two stages of Diego Gelmírez's career: Book I offers an account of Gelmírez's rise to power as the bishop of Santiago de Compostela, while Books II and III are concerned with his deeds as archbishop. Where the queen is concerned, however, the text can be divided at a slightly earlier point. During the majority of Book I, until chapter 102, she is generally allied with Gelmírez against their common enemy, Alfonso of Aragón. This represents almost exactly the first half of her reign. The second half of her reign stretches from chapter 102 until her death in chapter 80 of Book II. Urraca has by this point dispensed with her former husband and turned her attention back to controlling the western regions of her realm (that is, Galicia and Portugal) and to neutralizing threats to her authority. The fact that she is no longer reliant on Gelmírez to provide military aid allows the queen a greater degree of independence, but also means that their roles have reversed: the archbishop is now a player that the queen wishes to bring under her control, particularly due to his involvement in a resurgence of support for Alfonso Raimúndez. This seismic shift in the power balance plays out in the events of chapter 102, wherein the queen plots with her nobles to capture Gelmírez, effectively destroying their relationship of trust and mutual benefit, and causing a correspondingly dramatic change in the queen's representation for the remainder of the text. Throughout both halves of her reign, nevertheless, we are presented with a queen who acts in a full complement of dynastic and gubernatorial roles, as daughter, wife, mother, and ruling queen.

Dynastic roles: daughter, mother, wife

In much of the narrative before her break from Gelmírez, Urraca's queenship is defined by her marriage and motherhood and legitimized by invocations of her parentage. She is consistently referred to as the queen or the daughter of the king by Muño Alfonso, and there is no indication that her gender might constitute an obstacle to her accession to the throne. Little is said of her marriage to Raymond of Burgundy, although the count is remembered as a noble, prudent, "uir idoneus atque discretus"[109] for appointing Gelmírez as his personal secretary and advisor, and as the recipient of "specialis dilectionis priuilegio diligebat" from the king.[110] The mutually beneficial nature of the relationship between the monarchy and the future bishop during Urraca's first marriage is encapsulated in the metaphor of Gelmírez as a ship's captain, leading Alfonso VI, Raymond, and Urraca to safety (that is, to his administration of the church) through the turbulent waters of Dalmacio's bishopric.[111] It is also evident when Raymond, with the support of the king, decrees that the citizens of Compostela should be free from taxation by the Galician nobility, making them subjects of the bishop, he is distinguished for his "ingenii claritate" and "generis nobilitate".[112] Nevertheless, Urraca is largely hidden from view during this period, but dutifully at her husband's side when she does emerge: at Raymond's deathbed, the countess is persuaded to donate substantial lands to Santiago de Compostela.

The *HC* is similarly silent regarding the origins of Urraca's second foray into the matrimonial arena, but altogether less positive about Alfonso I of Aragón. The marriage is introduced as a *fait accompli*, with a condemnation in the form of a short letter from Pope Paschal II inserted after the death of Alfonso VI, demanding that Gelmírez punish the "tantum incesti facinus, quod a regis filia perpetratum est", and rounded out with a threat that the queen could face excommunication or the possibility of losing her

[109] *HC*, I, 4.
[110] *HC*, I, 27.
[111] *HC*, I, 6.
[112] *HC*, I, 23.

temporal power.[113] That the spouses have already separated and reunited once before they enter the narrative record underscores the unstable nature of the relationship. By consistently referring to her as the king's daughter, rather than as the wife of Alfonso of Aragón, the authors rhetorically separate her from her husband, denying the validity of their marriage by keeping her symbolically single and part of her father's lineage. There are more explicit denials, too: the aside "(si cum esset ei proxima consanguinitatis linea iunctus, uir eius est nominandus)"[114] is an acerbic statement on their union, declaring it unworthy of recognition on the grounds of close consanguinity.

While consanguinity is the main point of opposition, it is not the only one put forward: the queen's unwillingness and Alfonso I's moral failings, along with his abuse, also contribute to an undeniable argument against the marriage, one which casts Urraca as the victim of her husband and her nobles. In a lengthy speech, she asserts her rightful claim to authority, and blames her advisors for pushing her to accept an unwanted marriage after her father's death: "Sique factum est quod defuncto genitore meo secundam eorum dispositionem et arbitrium inuita nupserim cruento pialtico Aragonensi tyranno, infeliciter ei iuncta nefando et execrabili matrimonio."[115] In seeking a divorce, the queen must publicly plead her case before her own nobles, invoking the image of the battered woman. In the first person, Urraca recounts instances of verbal abuse ("me iugiter turpibus dehonorabat uerbis") as well as blows from her husband's "manibus sordidis", and even kicks ("pede suo me percussisse").[116] The king's character, too, is called into question, and he stands accused of consorting with necromancers and low-class men, having superstitious and heretical beliefs, committing atrocities, and leaving no corner of Iberia undisturbed by the "furoris strepitu uel perturbatione" of his wickedness. Though these accusations are intended, in the queen's mouth, to

[113] *HC*, I, 47.
[114] *HC*, I, 48.
[115] *HC*, I, 64.
[116] *HC*, I, 64.

demonstrate Alfonso's unsuitability as a husband, they also serve as reminders of the queen's vulnerability, deprived as she is of male protection and the ability to defend herself.

Her divorce is, in any case, a necessary step to restore balance to the monarchy and to the kingdom, which have been destabilized in the absence of a legitimate king. The damage inflicted upon Spain by the illegitimate marriage, in the view of the papal legate, is so bad that it might as well have been the work of the Moors: "Preterea tantam ecclesie persecutionem, tantam Hispanie attritionem, quantam nec Sarraceni, si siu luris esset, ei intulissent."[117] As we will see, this indictment of Urraca's ability to rule will recur in nearly every representation of her in the medieval period.

Like her marriage, Urraca's maternity—which in itself was a legitimating factor for any queen, proof of her ability to perpetuate the dynasty—is raised early on, during Alfonso VI's lifetime, and the *HC* makes much of the king's decree that his daughter should inherit his kingdom, and that his grandson Alfonso Raimúndez should inherit Galicia if Urraca were to marry again:

> "Omne equidem Galletie regimen et ius pueri pater optinuit et ideo omnes uos, qui eius iura et honores eo uiuo tenuistis et eo mortuo adhuc tenetis, filio eius, nepoti meo, procul dubio famulaturos exhibeo et totam ei Galletiam concedo, si eius mater Vrraca uirum ducere uoluerit, nec ab eo etiam michi ipsi ulla ulterius obsequia deposco […]"[118]

This is deliberately placed before Alfonso VI's death, and before an assembly of Galician nobles, imbuing the succession with the legitimacy of the royal will, while simultaneously justifying Diego Gelmírez's later actions to crown Alfonso Raimúndez as king of Galicia[119] by making it merely a fulfilment of the king's decree. Although there is

[117] *HC*, I, 79.
[118] *HC*, I, 46.
[119] The circumstances surrounding Urraca's accession to the throne and the subsequent status of Alfonso Raimúndez (in Galicia as well as in León-Castile) are exceedingly murky, and all of the

no evidence outside the *HC* that Alfonso VI made any such stipulation (since no records of the 1107 *curia* have survived), nearly every medieval chronicler, and nearly as many modern historians, has accepted this as fact, testifying to the effectiveness of the strategy. As early as her first separation from Alfonso of Aragón, the queen is said to wish for her son to be crowned: "quoniam eundem filium in regni fastigia sublimari prorsus inardebat".[120] When Gelmírez announces his intention to anoint and crown Alfonso Raimúndez as king of Galicia, Urraca not only grants her consent, but rejoices at the exaltation of her son, viewing it as a means to weaken Alfonso of Aragón's position.[121] Nevertheless, despite these moments of exemplary maternity, which primarily support the narrative of crowning and anointing being created by the second chronicler, the prince does not play a significant part in the narrative of the first half of his mother's reign.

After the breakdown of Urraca's relationship with Diego Gelmírez, however, the queen's maternity becomes suspect and toxic, and discord arises between mother and son. Alfonso Raimúndez is at this point approaching his majority, though the *HC* is characteristically vague about his age, and beginning to engage in political matters. The queen begins to see Alfonso VII as a threat to her power, driving her son to seek aid and counsel from the bishop. The prince also carries an accusation that his mother has rejoiced in the marital bed, "matrem meam maritali thoro gauissam fuisse",[122] which I take to be an allusion not only to Alfonso of Aragón, but also an oblique reference to her liaisons with Pedro González de Lara, about whom the *HC* is uncharacteristically reserved. This suspicion and betrayal of her own heir unleashes a tirade of misogyny placed in Gelmírez's mouth, tying the queen's adultery to women's inherent instability,

chronicles discussed here offer slightly different versions of events. For in-depth analysis of documentary and historical evidence, see José María Ramos y Loscertales, "La sucesíon del Rey Alfonso VI", *Anuario de Historia del Derecho Español*, 13 (1936-41), pp. 36-99.

[120] *HC*, I, 48.

[121] *HC*, I, 63 and 69.

[122] *HC*, I, 108.

making her responsible for the near-loss of the "imperium et regnum" and the total disappearance of "ueritatem and iustitiam" from the kingdom.[123] Urraca's treatment of Alfonso Raimúndez even attracts the censure of the Pope Calixtus II, whose letter to the prelates of Spain accuses her of undermining her son's position and support among the nobility: "[p]ostea uero ipsius pueri regis mater, predicti regis filia, […] alia iuramenta prioribus contraria uiolenter extorsit et ad filii sui destructionem materne pietatis oblita conatus sui molimine intendit."[124] This accusation of a lack of maternal piety comes to mind once more when, in recounting the queen's imprisonment of the archbishop, the chronicler insinuates that Urraca, possessed by "materne tyrannidis", would gladly put her own heir in chains for opposing her ("[i]psi quoque parabantur uincula"),[125] completing the final step in her transformation from devoted mother to tyrant.

Domina: Urraca as Ruling Queen

The *HC* recognizes Urraca's legitimacy and right to rule from the beginning, consistently referring to her as the king's daughter, and reporting the king's own decree regarding the order of succession. Her accession is presented in such an uncontroversial light because in the early twelfth century, Urraca was merely one more in a line of queens who legitimately exercised the full complement of royal authority, including roles normally reserved to men.[126] For Muño Alfonso at least, there is no limit to a woman's ability to rule. Belying the guiding principles of the *HC*, however, what is carefully delineated is Urraca's authority in places where it might overlap with Gelmírez's lordship over Santiago and its growing portfolio of property. Much in the same fashion that the succession decree is presented, the chronicle asserts that after the death of Raymond of

[123] *HC*, I, 108.
[124] *HC*, II, 31.
[125] *HC*, II, 42.
[126] Emmanuelle Klinka, "Entre paz de Dios y paz de las armas: el papel de las mujeres (León y Castilla en torno a los siglos XI y XII)", *e-Spania*, 20 (2015), explores the authority allowed to Sancha of León, Urraca of Zamora, and Urraca of León-Castile.

Burgundy, Alfonso VI stripped Urraca and Pedro Froílaz de Traba of dominion over the citizens of Compostela.[127] Upon the king's death, this resurfaces, amplified this time, with a reminder that all of the church's properties have been "iuste acquisita", justly acquired, "ante mortem regis nostri catholici bone memorie Ildefonsi".[128] The bishop's rights are carefully, insistently affirmed in the face of a queen testing the limits of her new authority.

Throughout the entirety of her time as queen in the *HC*, and even while she is heir to the throne, Urraca is portrayed as an involved and active leader, constantly and vigorously moving around her realms, gathering—and paying—large armies, and even accompanying her soldiers in the unpleasantries of war. After the death of the *infante* Sancho at Uclés, the princess accompanies a retaliatory force led by Gelmírez himself: "et cum filia regis Vrraca ad loca, que Mauri inuaserit, desideratus aduenit".[129] There is no indication that this might be improper behavior for a woman, at least not one of her status. The chronicler even notes, approvingly, that during the sieges of Astorga and Carrión, the queen eschewed the safe distance provided by castles and city walls, preferring instead to live in tents like her men: "non in castellis seu ciuitatibus morabatur sed in tabernaculis habitabat".[130] Her involvement is significant enough to cause inconveniences, too: a church council at Palencia must delay much of its decision-making because "regina multiplici guerrarum negotio irretitia erat", was *entangled* in the matters of war, suggesting more than a distant supervisory role.[131]

After Urraca's definitive split with Gelmírez, however, the appeal to her father's memory is used as a de-legitimizing tactic. The chronicler invokes the peace and

[127] *HC*, I, 28.
[128] *HC*, I, 46.
[129] *HC*, I, 29.
[130] *HC*, I, 75.
[131] *HC*, I, 88.

prosperity of Alfonso VI's kingdoms to contrast them with the war-torn territories ruled by Urraca, where strife and famine reign and criminals run rampant; the devastation previously attributed to Alfonso of Aragón is now, in his absence, transferred to the queen.[132] Her claims of unwillingness and coercion are no longer dismissed and forgiven as signs of feminine weakness and malleability, but rather interpreted as feminine treachery when she engages in plots against the bishop, whose heart has hardened against her pleas. Even her generous attempts at reconciliation, by donating parcels of land or the relic of St. James's head to the cathedral, though gratefully received, are also accompanied by no little suspicion.[133] Where her tears and pleading had once been successful gender-appropriate strategies for queenly action and persuasion in particular, deployed consistently throughout her reign, they are now treated as manipulative feminine wiles, and the archbishop's heart has hardened against them, and the ruler who uses them:[134]

> "Sed maledicta terri ubi puer regnat et mulier principatum tenet; regnum non precibus uel blanditiis, sed legibus et inperio regendum est."[135]

Urraca as Jezebel: the misogyny of Giraldo of Beauvais

Medieval queens, however they had come by that title, always had to negotiate the fine line between legitimate power and actions that might draw criticism, between Esther or Jezebel.[136] These were the two main Biblical models of queenship available to medieval clerics, and Urraca would be difficult, as a queen in a failing marriage and ruling in her own name, to fit into the supplicating, intercessory Esther *topos* even at the

[132] *HC*, I, 113.
[133] *HC*, I, 112, and II, 22.
[134] *HC*, II, 59.
[135] *HC*, I, 107.
[136] Lisa Benz St. John, *Three Medieval Queens: Queenship and the Crown in Fourteenth-Century England*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), p. 13.

height of her alliance with Gelmírez. But once relations turned bitter and suspicious, Jezebel would prove to be a natural fit.

For medieval chroniclers as early as the seventh century, Jezebel, the Phoenecian wife of the Israelite King Ahab, had become a useful shorthand, synonymous with bad queenship.[137] The Jezebel topos was wide-ranging and could be used to denote a whole host of different crimes, from paganism (due to her worship and promotion of the Phoenecian god Baal) to greed, adultery and sexual perfidy. But above all, to label a medieval queen as a Jezebel was to indicate that she was inappropriately accessing the power of the king, often through deceit and conspiracy, and using that power for unjust purposes. Pallares and Portela have explored the power-struggle aspect of the *HC*'s recrimination of Urraca as a "secunda Iezabel",[138] focusing on the dynamics of the relationship between the queen and the archbishop,[139] but I believe that the representation of Urraca as Jezebel extends through much more of the text than previously appreciated, especially in the chapters attributed to Giraldo of Beauvais.

Giraldo was writing at the height of Urraca's power, in the final years of her reign, when the queen and her son ruled in relative harmony and the archbishop found himself forced to the margins of both secular and ecclesiastical power. If Gelmírez had enjoyed a triumphant year in 1120, when Santiago de Compostela acquired the archiepiscopal title formerly belonging to the see of Mérida, his victory was a pyrrhic one by 1124, the terminus *ante quem* that López Alsina proposes for Giraldo's work on the *HC*.[140] In 1116, Urraca had begun a series of maneuvers that would seriously disrupt Gelmírez's

[137] See Janet L. Nelson, "Queens as Jezebels: The Careers of Brunhild and Balthild in Merovingian History", *Studies in Church History. Subsidia*, 1 (1978), 31-77.
[138] *HC*, II, 42.
[139] María Carmen Pallares and Ermelindo Portela, "La reina Urraca y el obispo Gelmírez. Nabot contra Jezabel", in *Os reinos Ibéricos na Idade Média: livro de homenagem ao Professor Doutor Humberto Carlos Baquero Moreno*, ed. by Luís Carlos Amaral et al. (Porto: Livraria Civilização, 2003), III, pp. 957-62.
[140] López Alsina, p. 74.

influence in peninsular affairs. After reaching a truce with Alfonso of Aragón, she was able to turn her full attention to domestic politics, and in particular the stream of rebellions emanating from supporters of Alfonso Raimúndez in the north and west of her realms. To address this, the queen removed her son from the guardianship of Gelmírez and Pedro Froílaz de Traba, and entrusted him with the rule of Toledo and Extremadura[141], under the guidance of Diego's old enemy Archbishop Bernardo of Toledo. To add insult to injury, in 1121, Pope Calixtus II—formerly Guy de Burgundy, brother of Raymond and uncle of Alfonso Raimúndez—had, at his nephew's request, effectively repudiated Gelmírez and endorsed Toledan primacy over all of Spain.[142]

As early as the brief episcopate of the Cluniac Dalmacio, and then throughout the remainder of his life, Gelmírez is praised for cultivating his church like a vineyard[143]—precisely like the vineyard that Naboth cultivates next to King Ahab's palace. Urraca, it is implied, is both Ahab, desiring to expand her palace (that is, her kingdom), seeking to bring the carefully-tended properties of Santiago de Compostela back under her authority, and Jezebel, conspiring with the nobility and usurping the king's seal to satisfy her greed.[144] Among the assorted other crimes of the Biblical queen was the introduction of the worship of Baal in her husband's kingdom[145] and the ensuing slaughter of "prophets of the Lord",[146] all while lavishing favor on idolatrous prophets[147] and threatening to murder the prophet Elijah.[148] Urraca's consistent portrayal as unjust in her treatment of Santiago de Compostela and its archbishop, conspiring to imprison or even kill him, and giving preference to his rival Bernardo of Toledo, certainly evokes shades of Jezebel. In being accused of machinations against her own son, too, Urraca

[141] Extremadura in the medieval sense, referring to the southern frontiers.
[142] Reilly, *Contest*, pp. 138-40.
[143] *HC*, I, 5.
[144] 1 Kings 21.
[145] 1 Kings 16:31-33.
[146] 1 Kings 18:4, 18:13.
[147] 1 Kings 18:19.
[148] 1 Kings 19:2.

follows the example of Jezebel, who was the final obstacle to the prophesied and divinely-ordained kingship of Jehu, who had been anointed and crowned by the prophet Elisha.[149] The *HC*'s insistence on Gelmírez's anointing and crowning of Alfonso Raimúndez as king of Galicia, when neither ritual was common practice for the kings of medieval León-Castile,[150] perfectly complements the image of Urraca as the Bible's wickedest queen, while allowing the archbishop to occupy the place of both the helpless victim (Naboth) and the prophet of his own vengeance (Elisha).

That vengeance is exacted in a spectacular fashion in 2 Kings, and Jezebel's injustice and impiety result in severe consequences for herself and her husband: as prophesied, the new king Jehu extinguishes every male in Ahab's lineage, and the queen's body, freshly painted and adorned with the symbols of queenly power, is thrown from a window to be eaten by dogs.[151] While such a sensational ending is unavailable to Giraldo—*his* queen still lives—the humiliations inflicted upon Urraca by the rebellious burghers of Compostela are very nearly as shocking:

> "Quam ut uidit cetera turba egredientem, concursum in eam faciunt, capiunt eam et prosternunt humi in uolutabrum, rapiunt eam more luporum et uestes eius dilaniant; a papillis siquidem deorsum nudato corpore et coram omnibus diu humi iacuit inhoneste. Multi quoque lapidibus eam uoluerunt obruere, inter quos anus quedam Conpostellana percussit eam grauiter lapide in maxillam."
>
> […]
>
> "Tunc ad locum, ubi iacebat regina in uolutabro turbis inpetentium proculcata, peruenit, et respiciens eam tam turpiter denudatam et prouolutam nimio dolore conpunctus preteriit […]"
>
> "Tandem regina, dilaniata crines, nudata corpore, prouoluta luto […]"[152]

[149] 2 Kings 9:1-6.
[150] Teófilo F. Ruiz, "Unsacred Monarchy: The Kings of Castile in the Late Middle Ages", in *Rites of Power: Symbolism, Ritual, and Politics since the Middle Ages*, ed. by Sean Willentz (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), pp. 109-44.
[151] 2 Kings 9:30-37.
[152] *HC*, I, 114.

While mussed hair might now seem a minor injury, it was almost always a grievous offense in the twelfth century. Dillard notes that although the "act of knocking off [a married woman's] *toca* or coif and of disarranging her hair" was considered highly injurious when performed by another woman, it became much more serious if committed by a man, and pushing a woman to the ground was also harshly punished.[153] Even more offensive was the cutting of a woman's skirts, which "made her appear immodest and put her to shame", and was considered "as damaging as a killing blow".[154] The only exception to this was, of course, women who were considered to have no shame or honor to begin with: "[a]nyone who discovered a harlot abroad in the daytime could strip her" and keep her clothes, with no fear of criminal charges.[155] All of these crimes are magnified in the *HC*, because the victim is not any townswoman: she is the queen, and to dishonor her body is to inflict the same damage on her kingdom. The purpose of enumerating the crimes against the queen is ostensibly to underscore the wickedness of the burghers of Compostela, but the repeated, voyeuristic descriptions of the queen's dishonor serve to emphasize her shame and symbolically punish her earlier transgressions against the archbishop, even though she is, temporarily, Gelmírez's ally once again. The chronicler has no stake in defending the her honor, so the narrative lingers, revelling in the details of Urraca's abuse, returning again and again to her tangled hair and muddy, naked body, and the spectacle of a queen brought lower than a whore. That she is soon rescued and clothed, plotting her own revenge, matters little: a woman's honor, even the queen's honor, once lost, cannot be recovered.

II. Latin Chronicles of the Thirteenth Century: *Crónica Latina de los Reyes de Castilla*, *Chronicon Mundi*, and *De rebus Hispaniae*

[153] Heath Dillard, *Daughters of the Reconquest: Women in Castilian Town Society, 1100-1300* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), pp. 174-75.
[154] Dillard, p. 176.
[155] Dillard, p. 198.

From the sweeping expanse of the *Historia Compostellana*, Urraca becomes effectively lost in the historical narratives for the remainder of the twelfth century. The *Chronica Adefonsi Imperatoris*, lauding the government of Alfonso VII, gives her a few lines, but she appears only fleetingly in Pelayo of Oviedo's *Liber chronicorum*, written more or less contemporaneously with her reign. The other notable chronicles of twelfth-century Castile and León—the *Najerense*, the *Silense*, and the *Historia Roderici*—make no mention of the queen, although her namesake Urraca of Zamora and many other royal women are given an expanded role in dynastic politics.[156] It is only in the the next century, more than a hundred years after Urraca's death, and faced with the regency of Berenguela of Castile and the potential for a ruling queen of León, that historians take a renewed interest in the figure of the ruling queen.

The first chronicles to engage with Urraca are three Latin works produced in the court of Fernando III and his mother Berenguela, the subject of Chapter 2. These texts variously purport to record the history of Spain, the world, or the kings of Castile, but they were all written in a short space of time, between approximately 1230 and 1240, by clerics attached to the royal court and its chancery, and all include substantial accounts of "recent" history and royal genealogy. We will return to these texts, and their patrons, in much greater depth in the next chapter, so I will not dwell at length on the contexts of composition here. Instead, the focus will be the way that each treats Urraca, for these representations lay foundations for the later thirteenth-century vernacular chronicles.

Crónica latina de los reyes de Castilla or *Chronica regum Castellae*

[156] Georges Martin, "Mujeres de la *Najerense*", *e-Spania*, *7* (2009).

The earliest of the chronicles in this group is the *Crónica latina de los reyes de Castilla,*[157] which, though anonymous, has long been attributed to Juan de Soria, chancellor of Castile under Fernando III, and later bishop of Osma. Though it is clear that the narrative reached a state of completion shortly after 1236, since it concludes with Fernando III's conquest of Córdoba, Inés Fernández-Ordóñez has suggested a composition in stages, with the first part of of the chronicle (which includes Urraca's reign) was initially composed around 1223 or 1224.[158] However, it remains unclear whether the text was truly "finished", or whether the extant text represents an intermediate state: as Peter Linehan notes, the structure is rough and the narrative is sparse, while the prologue is notable in its absence, suggesting an unfinished work, since medieval chroniclers tended to write their introductory matter last.[159] The text opens with a very brief genealogy of Castile's rulers from the death of Fernán González, then summarizes the reigns of Alfonso VI, Urraca, Alfonso VII, and Sancho III in slightly more depth before launching into detailed accounts of Alfonso VIII and Fernando III, which are roughly equal in length.

Urraca's appearance in the *Crónica latina*, as in all of the thirteenth-century chronicles examined in this chapter, both Latin and vernacular, revolves around her marriages. Her first husband, Raymond of Burgundy, is praised as a "uirum nobilem, in armis strenuum, ualde famosum, bonis moribus ornatum, comitem scilicet Remondum", who had been chosen by Alfonso VI specifically because of the lack of such capable men in his own kingdoms, worthy of marrying the king's daughter and, it is implied, worthy of inheriting his throne ("non inueniret talem qui uideretur dignus esse gener regis").[160]

---

[157] The text is also referred to by its Latin title, *Chronica regum Castellae*, but in the interests of minimizing confusion, I will use the more common vernacular name and abbreviate accordingly.
[158] Inés Fernández-Ordóñez, "La composición por etapas de la *Chronica latina regum Castellae* (1223-1237) de Juan de Soria", e-Spania, 2 (2006).
[159] Peter Linehan, "Juan de Soria: the Chancellor as Chronicler", *e-Spania*, 2 (2006), 3-8.
[160] Juan de Osma, *Crónica latina de los reyes de Castilla*, ed. and trans. by Luis Charlo Brea (Cádiz: Universidad de Cádiz, 1984), p. 3. Hereafter, *CLRC*.

Urraca's legitimacy as his child, born "de legitima uxore", is only half of the equation in the successful construction of a ruling pair.

Where the *HC* remains silent about how her second marriage came to pass, and indeed does not engage with it until the spouses separate, the *CLRC* is careful to establish the order of proceedings: "[m]ortuo uero supradicto rege Alfonso qui Toletum ceperat, filia eius Urraca regina supradicta ipsi successit in regno quod postea pessime administrauit. Nupsit quidem post mortem patris Alfonso, regi Aragonum […]".[161] In this account, the marriage definitively takes place after Alfonso's death, absolving the king from any responsibility for it, and placing blame squarely on the married couple. Juan de Osma underlines, with the declaration about Urraca's "pessime" governance of the realms, the difference between the queen and her father, whose epithet further reinforces the latter's successful kingship. The discussion of the conquests of Alfonso of Aragón and his immediate predecessors (that is, his father and brother) against the Moors also suggests that Alfonso possesses the capacity for good kingship and administration of the realm; he is personally highlighted for his reputation as a "uir bellicosus et magnanimus" who "multa mala intulit Sarracenis",[162] although divine justice still plays a part in his death. Alfonso I's potential for Reconquest success is itself grounds for praise and legitimation, even if he ultimately turns that ability against Castile.

The *CLRC* also apportions a very different blame for the dissolution of the marriage: "[s]ed ipso despecto et derelicto diuertit ad alia indigna relatu".[163] Contrasting starkly with the claims of abuse in the *HC*, here it is Urraca who abandons and disrespects the king of Aragón, preferring to occupy herself with unspeakable and dishonorable matters. Though these are left unstated, the implication is that they are considered beneath the

[161] *CLRC*, p. 3.
[162] *CLRC*, p. 5.
[163] *CLRC*, p. 4.

dignity of the queen, and likely related to the marital relationship, in light of the accusations that follow. Alfonso's retaliation is not the result of any inherent character defects, but rather the consequence of the spiritual pain inflicted by his wife's desertion: the "tactus animi dolore intrinsecus"[164] is what leads to the war and chaos in Castile, wrought by the king and his loyalists. Even this, however, is ultimately enabled by the queen, for they only hold their castles because the queen has given them to the king ("dicta regina tradiderat eidem regi").[165]

Despite asserting that Urraca "pessime administrauit", examples of Urraca's poor governance are in short supply. It can only be detected indirectly, in the damage inflicted upon her realm and in the nature of her other personal relationships. The chancellor highlights these relationships in quick succession, and uses them to frame the Aragonese devastation as the result of the kingdom "utpote destitutam legitimo defensore", lacking a legitimate defender. First, the Castilians are united under Count Gómez, who is accused of being "nimis familiaris erat regine ultra quam decuit", closer to the queen than appropriate. This appearance at the battle of Candespina marks Gómez's introduction into the narrative of Urraca's reign, although his role in the *CLRC* represents an embryonic stage of development. After his death, the queen takes Pedro González de Lara as a lover, with a similar accusation of excessive familiarity, and bears a child by him: "[i]psa uero regina recepit comitem Petrum de Lara… et ex ea dicitur suscepisse filium nomine Ferrando Furtado".[166] As the chronicle spells out, explicitly, that Alfonso Raimúndez was a child and therefore could not take up his natural military role, it is clear that, for the chancellor, the queen cannot be considered a legitimate defender of her father's realms. Count Gómez and Pedro González are also barred from that role, on the grounds of lineage and, perhaps, the queen's own illegitimacy as ruler. It is only when

[164] *CLRC*, p. 4.
[165] *CLRC*, p. 4.
[166] *CLRC*, p. 4.

the younger Alfonso "puberem factum" that Alfonso of Aragón desists from his attacks and returns to his kingdom. Thus, the *CLRC*, although it criticizes the Aragonese for their attacks on Castile, subtly presents them as legitimate or permissible, because Alfonso is not undermining the lordship of any legitimate (adult) king. Not only is Urraca denied the right to rule and defend her father's realms, she becomes effectively responsible for perverting her husband's capacity for good kingship with her immoral behavior.

The *CLRC* also contains the first mention of the queen's illegitimate children with Pedro González de Lara, and appears to be the origin of the name Fernán Furtado for their son. The relationship was remarked upon briefly in the *HC* but no children other than Alfonso Raimúndez and the infanta Sancha were discussed, although the infanta Elvira is mentioned as donating a town to Santiago.[167] Alfonso Raimúndez is largely dissociated from his mother in this version of events, but the statement that "regni principium debile fuit" suggests that Urraca's example or her poor government prejudiced the early years of his reign. Only the intervention of "diuina gratia",[168] which his mother lacked, diverted him from the path of destruction and allowed him to achieve greatness.

In sum, Urraca's queenship is evaluated entirely through her marital and extramarital relationships in the *CLRC*, as these are the only actions in which she is permitted any agency, assuming that the "alia indigna relatu" are in fact related to the queen's sexual indiscretions. Despite the apparently limited scope, these actions are sufficient to inflict significant destruction and suffering on her kingdoms, partly because her sex prevents her from fulfilling the military requirements of rule, and partly because her immoral behavior nullifies the legitimacy bestowed upon her by her status as Alfonso

[167] *HC*, II, 81.
[168] *CLRC*, p. 6.

VI's heir. The legitimating power of lineage passes directly to Alfonso Raimúndez, who is, thus endowed, able to dispel the threat presented by his former stepfather. Unlike his mother, Alfonso VII's imperfect government does not negate his success as king.

Chronicon Mundi

The *Chronicon Mundi* is a more polished and ambitious work than the *CLRC*, although it is fundamentally a compilation of world history extracted from a variety of different sources. It was composed by Lucas, then a deacon in León, at the behest of the dowager queen Berenguela. Emma Falque places the whole process of compilation in the 1230s, and suggests that it was completed in 1237, before Lucas became bishop of Tuy.[169] The *CM*'s world is fundamentally a Gothic one, and it draws heavily on Isidore of Seville for the first three books. The fourth and final section, which deals with recent history from Pelayo's resistance at Covadonga and ends with Fernando III's conquest of Córdoba, diversifies its sources significantly, relying on the *Crónica silense* and the *Crónica del obispo Pelayo de Oviedo*, among others.[170] Like the *CLRC*, it contains only a brief account of Urraca's reign and one which shares none of the detail of the *HC*, despite the range of potential sources. Falque suggests that Lucas was likely acquainted with the *HC*, the *Chronicon Compostellanum*, which accompanies the *HC* in many manuscripts, or the *Crónicas anónimas de Sahagún*, but for some reason chose not to incorporate those narratives into his compilation.[171] There seems little evidence of the *HC*'s rich detail, however, and as I will explain below, I do not believe that Lucas or any thirteenth-century chroniclers had access to the *Crónicas anónimas de Sahagún* in shaping their accounts of Urraca.

---

[169] Lucas de Tuy, *Chronicon Mundi*, ed. by Emma Falque (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), pp. xvi-xxi. Hereafter, *CM*.
[170] Bernard F. Reilly, "Sources of the Fourth Book of Lucas of Tuy's *Chronicon Mundi*", Classical Folia, 30 (1976), pp. 127-37.
[171] *CM*, pp. xc-xci, "con toda probabilidad debió conocer" the *HC* and the Sahagún chronicle.

As in the *CLRC*, the queen enters the narrative along with her first husband, and Lucas takes the opportunity to further embellish Raymond of Burgundy's character, this time by means of his royal Gothic ancestry ("de regali genere Gotorum") rather than his own virtues. Alfonso VI's decision to marry Urraca to Raymond is a deliberate effort to introduce this desirable ancestry into the kings of his own bloodline, "de tali coniugio regum semen suscitaretur".[172] Nothing is said on the matter of the succession, but Lucas adds another new detail: a miraculous "weeping" of the altar stones at San Isidoro de León, which is revealed to be a lament for the death, eight days later of Alfonso VI, and a lament for the devastation that would soon befall San Isidoro and the rest of Spain: "per regem Aragonum Petrum postea ipsa ecclesia spoliata fuit multis possessionibus et thesauris, atque pars regni maxima deuastata".[173] The catalyst for the destruction, however, is only implied at this stage: the death of Alfonso VI has left the church without a protector.

From the moment of Alfonso VI's death, Lucas considers Alfonso Raimúndez to be the rightful king, declaring that in the year 1146 (1108), the young Alfonso "cepit in Gallecia regnare", began to rule in Galicia. The discussion of his royal Gothic bloodline and Alfonso VI's role in shaping it clearly anticipates this accession to the throne, and serves to legitimate his rule in advance. But the succession is muddied by discord, and its source is clear: "[e]o tempore facta est perturbatio magna in Yspanie, eo quod regina Vrraca regere uolebat regnum paternum sine filio Adefonso."[174] It is specifically Urraca's desire to exercise authority *without* her son (whose age is not referenced) that causes the unrest, a nuance which allows that a king's daughter ruling together with her son is, if not ideal, then at least an acceptable arrangement which will protect against the sort of

[172] *CM*, IV, 70.
[173] *CM*, IV, 72.
[174] *CM*, IV, 73.

disruptions that spring from Urraca's unwillingness to share power. This apparent permission for mother-son ruling pairs can only be a deliberate choice, suggesting that here, at least, Lucas's source was not any historical text, but rather the political requirements of his patroness.

The circumstances surrounding the queen's marriage to Alfonso of Aragón are both confused and confusing in Lucas's account, and they differ substantially from all of the other chronicles examined in this chapter:

> "Erat tunc temporis in Aragonia rex Petrus, qui amore Vrraca regine fecit se uocari regem Adefonsum. Vrraca uero regina habebat secum comitem Enricum, qui preerat Portugalie, cuius consilio misit ad regem Aragonesem, ut properaret eam accipere in uxorem et obtineret regnum. Venit igitur rex Aragonum cum magna manu militum et reginam Vraccam accepit uxorem."[175]

Firstly, Lucas presents a badly mangled understanding of the Aragonese succession in the early twelfth century, claiming that Pedro I changed his name to Alfonso "for the love of the queen", when in fact Pedro I died in 1104, and was succeeded by his younger brother. In this version of events, Urraca, acting jointly with or on the advice of Henry of Burgundy, makes overtures to King Pedro-cum-Alfonso, inviting him to marry her and obtain her kingdom. The queen's remarriage is explicitly framed as a means for a foreign king to rule, effectively denying the throne to the rightful heir of the royal bloodline, who is established repeatedly as Alfonso Raimúndez, grandson of Alfonso VI, and son of the royal Gothic line by way of Raymond of Burgundy. The queen's preference for Henry's advice, as an outsider, rather than her own nobles, also underlines the consequences of bad counsel.

Because Alfonso of Aragón's time in Urraca's realms is spent mostly fighting brave Galicians and Asturians, his ability to pay his soldiers in the usual generous fashion

[175] *CM*, IV, 73.

("largissima manu dederat militbus") dwindles rapidly and Urraca once again acts on the counsel of Henry of Burgundy, proposing an ill-advised solution:

> "Vnde factum est ut de consilio comitis Enrici et regine Vrrace quesdam nobiles ecclesias, quas rex magnus Fernandus et filius eius rex Adefonsus theisauris ditauerant, spoliaret et etiam ad aurum sepulcri beati Ysidori mitteret manum, quod sibi et principibus suis a Deo et ab hominibus in magnum scandalum cessit. Omnes enim nobiles et innobiles ipsum et suos infideles et sacrilegos conclamabant."[176]

The choice of San Isidoro, founded by Fernando I and further endowed by Alfonso VI, is significant, although Lucas neglects to mention Urraca's own substantial role in enlarging the church in terms of both size and prestige.[177] Instead, he positions Urraca as a destroyer of her own dynastic heritage for the benefit of foreign princes, and establishes grounds for considering her attempted rule illegitimate. Not only do the co-conspirators provoke universal outrage, Lucas makes use of the *vox populi* to decry them as "infideles et sacrilegos" (infidels and grave-robbers), for the blasphemous crime of stripping gold from the grave of St. Isidore. Although queen and count are both held responsible, Alfonso of Aragón suffers almost immediate divine retribution for his part in these crimes: he receives word that the Moors are laying waste to his kingdom, and dies a mysterious death fighting them in Fraga.

Urraca's punishment is confirmation of her inability to rule, for she is besieged in the *torres de León* by an army of Leonese and Castilian knights under the leadership of Alfonso Raimúndez. Not only has her son, thus her own lineage, turned on her, but so have the very peoples who should be her natural vassals, if she were legitimately exercising lordship. Only upon surrender of the towers, and by extension, the kingdom, does the queen receive "multibus honoribus… dum uixit". The detail that her surrender comes in "paucos dies" also works to diminish the queen's capacity as a military leader. In the end,

[176] *CM*, IV, 73.
[177] See Therese Martin, *Queen as King*.

the sole means of resolving the tension between her former position as claimant to the throne and her son's pre-ordained right (by blood, by war, and by virtue) to rule is to step aside, and allow destiny, specifically the Gothic destiny, to take its course. Lucas also contrasts Urraca with her daughter Sancha, who becomes a model queen and counsellor at her brother's side: "Hec sapientissima regina Sancia, quamdiu uixit, in uirginitate permansit Christi ecclesias multis insigniis decorando, monasteria construendo, et Christi pauperes recreando."[178] Sancha's wisdom and nobility are inextricably linked to her virginity and enrichment of churches, the very qualities which her mother has been shown to lack; by taking her mother's place as queen, she is able to restore the damage suffered by their shared lineage in a way that Alfonso VII's wife Berenguela, as an external addition, lacking Gothic blood, ultimately cannot.

The result is that the *CM* seems to treat Urraca's reign as a sort of illegitimate interregnum between the reigns of Alfonso VI and Alfonso VII, an impression which is aided both by the brevity of the account—which condenses nearly two decades into the appearance of a few years—and by her exclusion from the conventions associated in the text with kings. In particular, her death is given no consideration at all, even less than that of Alfonso of Aragón; only in a handful of manuscripts is there an addition which notes that she died in 1164 *era hispánica*,[179] as well as the explicit statement that Alfonso VII took up the throne of Galicia after the death of Alfonso VI, while his mother merely "wanted to govern", implying that she did not achieve her aim. In Lucas's text, which crafts a narrative of power struggle between mother and son, Urraca becomes a more fully-fleshed model of bad queenship: greedy for power, but weak, impious and prone to wickedness.

[178] *CM*, IV, 74.
[179] *CM*, IV, 74.

De rebus Hispaniae

The last of the Latin chronicles in this period to represent Urraca is the *De rebus Hispaniae* or *Historia gótica,* the work of Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada, archbishop of Toledo, and *canciller mayor* of Castile under Fernando III. The text is dedicated to the king, although some doubt has been cast on the nature of Rodrigo's relationship with Fernando at the time he was writing; there is evidence to suggest that he became alienated from the court in the latter half of the 1230s,[180] and that although it was written *for* Fernando, it was not composed at his behest. In any case, it must have been written after this loss of status, and certainly no earlier than 1238, for it incorporates material from the *CLRC* and the *CM*, among many others. Rodrigo died in 1247, giving the chronicle a probable *terminus ad quem* no later than 1246.[181] Unlike Lucas, however, Jiménez de Rada significantly reworked his sources in the construction of the *DRH*, shaping them into a narrative that centers Spain—that is, Castile—both politically and geographically.

Urraca's representation in the *DRH* follows the broad lines set out by Lucas de Tuy, but is expanded upon and altered in significant ways, many of which relate to Rodrigo's ambivalent treatment of Alfonso VI. First, Urraca's marriage to Alfonso I of Aragón still takes center stage, but in contrast to the *CLRC* and the *CM*, in the *DRH*, the wedding comes about as a result of her father's own decision, in conjunction with the "Toletano primate et ceteris episcopis et abbatibus regni sui".[182] Alfonso VI vehemently rejects the suggestion of his magnates that he should marry Urraca to Count Gómez, "qui erat pocior", the most powerful among them. The fact that Alfonso's nobles, fearing an angry

[180] Hilda Grassotti, "Don Rodrigo Ximénez de Rada, gran señor y hombre de negocios en la Castilla del s. XIII", *Cuadernos de Historia de España*, 55-56 (1972), pp. 1-302, p. 201.
[181] Juan Fernández Valverde, "Introducción", in Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada, *Historia de los hechos de España*, ed. and trans. by Juan Fernández Valverde (Madrid: Alianza, 1989), p. 28.
[182] *DRH*, VI, 33.

reaction, send their petition secretly via the king's Jewish physician introduces an element of intrigue to the marital negotiations, with the implication that the nobles intend, unscrupulously, to manipulate the king by exploiting the personal nature of the relationship. However, the outcome also proves the magnates correct, for Alfonso threatens the physician Cidiello with death should he return to court, and vigorously asserts his right to decide on Urraca's marriage: "[m]e autem intererit me filie, set non ut postulant, prouidere".[183] There is a further hint of censure when Jiménez de Rada says, accusingly, that Alfonso VI neglected his grandson's hereditary right to the throne, favoring his daughter instead, because he disliked Raymond of Burgundy: "de quo, quia comes Raymundus non fuerat in regis oculis graciosus, quasi eius inmemor non curabat".[184]

Not only does the king arrange the marriage, but in the *DRH*, it takes place during Alfonso VI's lifetime, further emphasizing his responsibility. It is made clear that despite the "amara conspersione"—[185]literally, a bitter dough, a bad start—to the union, Urraca nevertheless goes away to Aragón with her new husband, as an obedient daughter, and with the blessing of the clergy, including the Archbishop of Toledo. The *CM*'s miracle of the weeping altar stones at San Isidoro de León is re-deployed in the *DRH* to similar ends, foreshadowing the tragedy that will befall the kingdom when the king dies and his chosen heirs come to claim it.[186] Alfonso I of Aragón is acknowledged as the legitimate ruler of Castile, and upon Alfonso VI's death,

> "… mox cum uxore sua regina Vrraca in Castellam congregato exercitu properauit et totam terram, nullis fere resistentibus eo quod uxori eius successione prouenerat, occupauit, quam ut bonus princeps quiete et pacifice ordenauit et a Maurorum incursibus uiriliter custodiuit, et regnum Castelle tanquam proprium undique dilatauit".[187]

[183] *DRH*, VI, 33.
[184] *DRH*, VI, 33.
[185] *DRH*, VI, 33.
[186] *DRH*, VI, 39.
[187] *DRH*, VII, 1.

The lack of Castilian resistance is attributed to the fact that Castile belongs to *uxori eius* — his wife — by hereditary right and thus the transfer of the kingdom's governance to Urraca's husband is the proper order, even though the "right" itself still remains within Urraca's power to transmit. The king of Aragón is, therefore, by Jiménez de Rada's account, a model king: a "bonus princeps" who maintains order in the realm, leads campaigns against the Moors, and even contributes to the ongoing Castilian territorial expansion and repopulation efforts, treating his wife's lands as though they were his own. The decision to entrust governorship of Castilian castles to Aragonese loyalists, contradicting the claim that Castile's treatment by Alfonso is somehow delicate and caring, is dismissed as simply a rational response to his concerns about the longevity and legality of the marriage ("cum que de uxoris contubernio dubitaret").[188]

The *DRH* is the first chronicle to develop the figure of Count Pedro Ansúrez, Urraca's foster-father (*ayo*), casting him in a pivotal role in the narrative of Urraca's reign. Pedro Ansúrez is not named in the *Historia Compostellana* or in Juan de Soria's account; Bernard Reilly has identified his entry into the narrative record with a "cameo" role in the *Crónica najerense* as one of Alfonso VI's men, but it is not until Lucas that he is made a significant character in Alfonso's accession to the throne.[189] Lucas does not mention him at all in the *CM*'s brief account of Urraca's reign, so this episode is entirely the innovation of Jiménez de Rada. In the *DRH*, Pedro Ansúrez, and specifically Urraca's treatment of him, becomes the pretext for the separation of the spouses: Urraca, "ingratitudinis spiritu incitata", seizes the count's lands, but Alfonso de Aragón, "non acceptans" his wife's behavior, restores them immediately. As punishment for this and other unspecified behavioral excesses ("regina in hiis et aliis excedebat"), the king orders

[188] *DRH*, VII, 1.
[189] Bernard F. Reilly, "The Rediscovery of Count Pedro Ansúrez", in *Cross, Crescent and Conversion: Studies on Medieval Spain and Christendom in Memory of Richard Fletcher*, ed. by Simon Barton and Peter Linehan (Leiden: Brill, 2014), pp. 109-26.

the queen imprisoned in the fortress at Castellar, but Urraca is able to call upon her own Castilian knights and convince them to set her free.[190] Urraca's own nobles return her to Alfonso's custody, because they disapprove of the "diuorcium" that the queen is seeking, as well as her volatile treatment of those closest to her, which contains no few echoes of her father's example.

Even so, Alfonso I, intuiting that her behaviour will never conform to his desires, liberates his wife: "rex intellexissant a suis bene placitis alienam, usque Soriam eam duxit, ibi que repudians dimisit eam suo arbitrio uoluntatis".[191] Thus dismissed, the queen returns to her foster-father for counsel and protection, returning his lands and titles. Upon the dissolution of the marriage, those Castilians who had become vassals of Alfonso return to the queen, because she is their "regine naturali domine". Pedro Ansúrez, created as the model among these vassals, goes before the king in a symbol-laden scene: "indutus scarlato et insidens equo albo et portans funem in mano",[192] cloaked in scarlet, upon a white horse, and rope in hand, offering his life for breaking his oath to the king and returning to a queen who had, despite the ties of *naturaleza* and even a familial relationship, wronged him. Alfonso's initial outrage is successfully tempered by his own nobles, and, acting the model king, is able to display mercy and *mesura* in releasing the count from his service, ultimately rewarding him for exemplary loyalty to his *señora natural*.

After their marriage has ended, not only is the ongoing conflict between Castile and Aragón attributed to Urraca's improprieties, but so are the internal divisions among the Castilian nobility, between supporters of the queen and those who, like Pedro Ansúrez, had also given their loyalties to the king. The *DRH* is vague on the details of these

[190] *DRH*, VII, 1.
[191] *DRH*, VII, 1.
[192] *DRH*, VII, 1.

conflicts, instead offering a lengthy exposition on Urraca's illegitimate relationships and their effects on the kingdom:

> "Interea comes Gomicius ad regine connubium anelabat, sicut patris tempore […] a magnatibus fuerat pertractatum. Set regina Vrraca clamculo, non legitime, comiti Gomicio satisfecit; unde et comes, quasi de matrimonio iam securus, cepit agere bella regni et pro uiribus Aragones propulsare, et genuit ex regina furtiue filium, qui dictus fuit Fernandus Furtatus. Interim autem quidam comes Petrus de Lara regine graciam clandestine procabatur, et quod uoluit, impetrauit, ut exitus comprobauit."[193]

And later, after the death of Count Gómez at the battle of Candespina:

> "Petrus autem comes de Lara cum familiare comercium cum regina indebite sperans illud matrimonio confirmare, omnibus preminebat, et cepit regis officium excercere et quasi dominus omnibus imperare; set magnates alii infamiam domine non ferentes, ceperunt ei resistere et matrimonii propositum impedire."[194]

The queen's relationships with both counts are held up as examples of her immorality: the element of deceit is emphasized, along with the illegitimacy of the relationship and the son supposedly born of the first affair, and her own inconstancy in taking a second lover. They are offered as proof of her unsuitability for rule. Urraca, we are told, simply allowed her illegitimate consorts to take command of her military, in the case of Count Gómez, and later, in the case of Pedro González de Lara, she also chose a lover-turned-military leader whose actions on the battlefield are cowardly. In both cases she uses the cover of secrecy to eschew the advice of her nobles and clerics, preferring to keep her own counsel and that of her favorites.

The internal divisions resulting from the queen's taking of favorites are great enough to allow Alfonso of Aragón to invade Castile and lay waste to it, leaving "irruptionibus et incendiis devastantes" in his wake and stripping holy sites of treasures to pay his men,

[193] *DRH*, VII, 2.
[194] *DRH*, VII, 2.

and turning him from a model warrior-king into one who causes both "scandalum et peccatum".[195] The parallels between the queen's loosely-guarded body and that of her kingdom are already obvious, but they are reaffirmed when, as Alfonso Raimúndez prepares to do battle against Alfonso of Aragón, the clergymen of both kingdoms warn that "ista dissensio posset Arabibus uiam dare sicut tempore Roderici".[196] While the pending war is, on its surface, between the two kings, its roots lie in Urraca's failed marriage and her failed kingship, which are in turn due to her illegitimate relationships and refusal to comport herself in a queenly fashion, that is, in accordance with the wishes of her husband. The invocation of Rodrigo is deliberate, carrying overtones of treason, and the destruction of Christendom as the ultimate result of a monarch's sexual indiscretions.[197]

Despite these new elements in her representation, Urraca is nevertheless minimized as much as possible. Not only does her reign awkwardly occupy portions of Book VI and Book VII, devoted to Alfonso VI and Alfonso VII respectively, but her time on the throne is explicitly limited to four years: "[m]ater autem eius regnauerat post mortem Aldefonsi, qui cepit Toletum, IIII-or annis".[198] This introduction of a hard time limit on Urraca's reign is new, and it aids in the exaltation of Alfonso and his virtues and conquests which follows. It also enables, as in the *CM*, the depiction of Urraca's reign as a brief, chaotic interregnum, an experiment in female rule which, although based in a legitimate claim to the throne, not only interrupted the proper order of succession from Alfonso VI to Alfonso VII, but which brought destruction and division upon the kingdom from enemies both foreign and domestic. Unlike both *CLRC* and *CM*, however, the *DRH* de-emphasizes the degree of conflict between mother and son, attributing the

[195] *DRH*, VII, 2.
[196] *DRH*, VII, 3.
[197] See Elizabeth Drayson, *The King and the Whore: King Roderick and La Cava* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), particularly pp. 17-45.
[198] *DRH*, VII, 3.

minimization of Alfonso Raimúndez's dynastic potential solely to Alfonso VI rather than to Urraca or any of her consorts. I suspect this is intended to regularize the deviation that Urraca, as a female king, represents in the dynastic line; Rodrigo allows her a degree of legitimate rule and eases the transition from her reign to that of Alfonso VII, which is further smoothed over by the queen's immediate disappearance from the narrative.

The changing shape of Urraca's representation over the course of the Latin chronicles of the 1230s reflects a new interest in the inner workings of a ruling pair, and issues a clear warning: bad queenship has the capacity to twist and pervert good kingship. It also demonstrates that the limits of queenship have contracted significantly since the *Historia compostelana*: no longer does Urraca accompany her men on campaign, participate in political plots and military sieges, or display largesse to churches and monasteries; instead, the focus is on her person and her relationships with those who would be king of Castile. Unlike the *HC*, which never treats Alfonso of Aragón as a rightful ruler in his wife's kingdoms, the Latin chronicles discussed here equate access to the queen's body with possession of her kingdom; she is not considered to be personally capable of governing it.

There is no quarrel with Urraca's right to the throne, or her role as transmissor of royal authority to a husband or son, but rather the problem now lies in her inconstant, secretive behavior, which endangers that transmission by metaphorically muddying the dynastic waters. We can see, therefore, an increasing importance placed on the dynastic role of the queen, which conditions her participation in governance; partly, I suspect, this is because the fact of her sole rule simply could not be avoided in the twelfth century. It must be noted that other queens like her grandmother Sancha, her aunt Urraca, and daughter Sancha Raimúndez (as well as Berenguela, as we will see in Chapter 2) are praised for their wise counsel and prudence as they rule alongside their husbands and brothers. This demonstrates that the chroniclers are not giving shape to an ideology that

denies women *all* access to power, but rather carefully establishing conditions for female participation in the act of ruling. Urraca does not satisfy these conditions, and therefore is established as a negative example, but neverthless, the thirteenth-century Latin chronicles spare her much of the strident clerical misogyny that drips from the queen's portrait in the *HC*. She may be fickle and inconstant and adulterous in these texts, too, but these flaws are not generalized to women or queens as a whole.

There are a few reasons I believe that Urraca captures the interest of these Latin chroniclers, however brief their accounts of her reign. Not only does she represent an integral link in the genealogies they crafted for Castile and its kings, but they wrote at a historical moment when the possibility of female rule had, in the form of the Leonese *infantas* Sancha and Dulce, presented a serious threat to that same lineage. By re-inventing the lone historical example of a regnant queen as an immoral and ineffective ruler, the catalyst for unprecedented chaos and destruction, Urraca embodies a warning against the consequences of improper queenship. She also provides a useful means of consolidating the image of Alfonso VI's kingship as fundamentally positive, and the focus on her performance of strictly gendered roles (wife and mother) functions as a diversion to make her responsible for the state of conflict in her kingdoms, shifting all responsibility away from her father. In actual fact, many of León-Castile's woes in the twelfth century can be attributed to Alfonso VI's vigorous approach to reconquest, cutting off the tribute payments from Moorish kings which had represented a significant revenue stream; the resumption of hostilities also contributed to Almohad success and meant that León-Castile required even more expenditure on defense even as it was left vulnerable to attack from other Christian factions in the Peninsula. But to acknowledge such would undermine the goals of Reconquest that formed an important pillar of royal ideology.

III. Vernacular Chronicles in the Alfonsine Tradition: *Estoria de España* and *Crónica de veinte reyes*

Contexts

Although Alfonso X himself emerges from the text of the *EE* as the sole, personally implicated author, the actual labor of composition was undertaken by anonymous teams of compilers, translators, and scribes, working in *talleres* principally in the cities of Toledo and Seville.[199] The process of composition began around 1270, though preparations had been ongoing for some time before, and while its prologue declares an interest in the "fecho dEspanna"[200] and its many *señoríos*, in the vein of the DRH, it seems to have been intended to complement and support Alfonso X's campaign to be elected Holy Roman Emperor, which by 1270 had already cost the king significant sums of money and suffered a serious defeat with the coronation of Richard of Cornwall in 1257.

The Alfonsine model incorporates much of the neo-Gothic discourse of its principal sources (in particular the CM), but it shows significantly more interest in Spain's Roman heritage than either of these, as well as looking beyond the borders of Castile and León to the whole of the Iberian Peninsula. Through the careful collation and alteration of its sources, the *EE* constructs a providential narrative which, as Charles Fraker has argued very persuasively, was almost certainly intended to reach contemporary history and culminate in Alfonso's coronation as Holy Roman Emperor, uniting the threads of Roman and Gothic empire in a single, divinely-ordained king.[201]

---

[199] Inés Fernández-Ordóñez, "El taller historiográfico alfonsí. La *Estoria de España* y la *General estoria* en el marco de las obras promovidas por Alfonso el Sabio", in *Scriptorium alfonsí, de los libros de astrología a las "Cantigas de Santa María"*, ed. by Ana Domínguez Rodríguez and Jesús Montoya Martínez (Madrid: Universidad Complutense, 1999), pp. 105-126.
Gonzalo Ménendez Pidal, "Cómo trabajaron las escuelas alfonsíes", *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, 5 (1951), pp. 363-380.
[200] *PCG*, Prologue, p. 4.
[201] Charles F. Fraker, "Alfonso X, the Empire, and the *Primera crónica*", *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 55 (1978), pp. 95-102.

Unfortunately for Alfonso, however, his second attempt was no more successful than the first: in 1272 Rudolf of Habsburg was elected King of the Germans, and Pope Gregory X encouraged Alfonso to renounce his claims for good. This failure, combined with an uprising among his own nobility—angered in part by the economic and political effects of his election campaign[202]—was likely the reason that the initial version of the *EE* was set aside in 1272 or 1273, unfinished. Far from reaching the desired triumphant imperial reunification, it had only arrived at the "laguna cidiana"—that is, the events of the very late eleventh century—before it was abandoned.[203] Thus, none of the passages considered in this study were part of the first version of the *EE*, the so-called *versión regia*.

It was at this point that Alfonso's attentions turned towards science and towards a new historiographical project, the *General estoria*, which was intended to be a universal history rather than a specifically Spanish one. Like the *EE*, the *General estoria* was never completed; it reached as far as the birth of the Virgin Mary before it, too, was set aside.[204] In time, however, the king returned to his history of Spain: in the final years of his life, as he sheltered in Seville after suffering a deposition by his disinherited son, the *infante* Sancho, and by the still-seething nobility. During this period between his effective exile in 1282, and his death in the spring of 1284, Alfonso X oversaw the nearly complete revision of the *EE* and significant progress of the narrative: this time, in the so-called *versión crítica*, it reached the death of Fernando II of León in the late twelfth century.[205] It was destined to remain unfinished, the writing process cut short by the king's death. The *versión crítica* is thus the first chronicle in the Alfonsine tradition to include an

[202] Julio Escalona, "Los nobles contra su rey. Argumentos y motivaciones de la insubordinación nobiliaria de 1272-73", *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*, 25 (2002), pp. 131-62.
[203] *PCG*, ch. 896, pp. 564-65. See also Diego Catalán, *De Alfonso X al conde de Barcelos*, pp. 80-86.
[204] Gómez Redondo, *Historia de la prosa*, I, pp. 686-694.
[205] *Ibid.*, pp. 684-85.

account of Urraca's reign, which draws primarily upon the *DRH*, with a few differences in nuance and emphasis.

Urraca in the text

As in Jiménez de Rada's version of events, Urraca's second marriage occurs during Alfonso VI's lifetime, but the *EE* expands on the nobles' debates, exposing their misguided ideas:

> "…departieron entre si que entre tanto que aquel ninno se criasse et cresciesse, fasta que fuesse pora mantener regno, fallauan por guisado que casasse su madre donna Vrraca, que fincaua bibda del conde, et que tomarie marido con cuyo acuerdo et conseio se mantouiessen los regnos entre tanto".[206]

A hint of anticlericalism can be detected in the addition to the bishops' eagerness to overlook Alfonso Raimúndez in their advice and consent to the marriage: "segund que ella fuera ya casada et fincaua bibda, que uno era de los meiores casamientos pora ella que ellos sabien". Nevertheless, the outcome of remarriage, which is ultimately desired by both the king and his nobles (albeit in the form of two different husbands) directly contradicts the *Siete Partidas* on the matter of regency for a minor king:

> "… si aveniese que al rey niño fincase madre, ella ha de seer el primero et el mayoral guardador sobre todos los otros, porque naturalmente ella lo debe amar mas que otra cosa por la laceria et el afan que levó trayéndolo en su cuerpo et desi criándolo; et ellos débenla obedescer como á señora, et facer su mandamiento en todas las cosas que fueren á pro del rey et del regno; mas esta guarda debe haber en quanto non casare et quisiere estar con el niño."[207]

The law is clear that a minor king's mother is the preferred guardian of the king and ruler of the kingdom, to be obeyed "como á señora", which is surely doubly enforceable when the mother in question is also the heir to the throne in her own right. To interfere

[206] *EE*, ch. 963.
[207] *Siete Partidas*, Partida II, Title XV, Law II.

with the queen-mother's governance constitutes "traycion conoscida", punishable by exile or death. But the *EE*, concerned as it is with the nuances of succession and lineage, contradicts itself, asserting that "el rey don Alffonsso non dexara heredero fijo nin fija sinon a la reyna donna Vrraca sola",[208] a complication which is absent in the *DRH*. Both Urraca and Alfonso VII are said to be the sole legitimate heirs of Alfonso VI, the confusion reflecting an inconsistent approach to royal succession that still had no clear solution even in the late thirteenth century, as evidenced in Sancho IV's own accession to the throne. Nevertheless, Urraca is repeatedly acknowledged as "señora natural" of the Castilians, which Alfonso Raimúndez is not until after the end of her reign. The obligations of *naturaleza* are substantial,[209] The *EE* also follows the *DRH* in treating conflict between mother and son briefly and in vague terms, describing an "abenençia entre la madre et el fijo, et ell abenençia fue tal que touiesse ella pora si lo que quisiesse, et lo al que lo ouiesse el fijo",[210] which alludes to Urraca's decision (c. 1120) to entrust Alfonso Raimúndez with the governorship of Toledo, whilst carefully obscuring the fact that the queen had in no way ceded any of her own authority in doing so.

The *EE* largely follows Jiménez de Rada in representing the queen's relationships and their political consequences. Alfonso of Aragón, in his outburst at Pedro Ansúrez, is said to react more "con sanna que auie de la reyna, aun mas que de lo quel fiziera el conde",[211] highlighting the bitterness of their relationship, and in particular the perils of a queen mother's remarriage, which has the potential to disrupt the relationship between a monarch and their *naturales*. Urraca's extramarital dalliances are also highlighted, with emphasis on the access that these relationships give to her lovers, and the illegitimate power they exercise over her kingdoms as a result: Count Gómez "andaua ya por el regno

[208] *EE*, ch. 965.
[209] On the fuller implications of *naturaleza* for Alfonso, see Georges Martin, "Le concept de 'naturalité' (naturaleza) dans les *Sept parties*, d'Alphonse X le Sage", *e-Spania*, 5 (2008) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.10753>
[210] *EE*, ch. 966.
[211] *EE*, ch. 965.

como por mayor et por sennor", while Pedro González de Lara "fizo con ella lo que quiso", and later also "mandaua et uedaba como rey".[212] Ultimately, the *EE* seems to make less of a distinction than the *DRH* between the queen's ostensibly legitimate remarriage (arranged by her father and blessed by the church) and her informal taking of consorts. Both lead to equally "mal prez" and "mala fama" for Urraca, and the reputational stains of all three relationships taint the whole realm.

Urraca's reign is, as in the Latin chronicles, minimally intrusive in the genealogical narrative, and she is not given her own regnal years, but is instead folded into the reign of Alfonso VII. Though not atypical in the context of its sources, this is nevertheless very unusual for the *EE*: even Sancho III, who reigned for a single year, is given his own regnal years and intitulation, as is Enrique I, whose rule was both brief and a regency; the only other ruler to be similarly excluded is Ordoño IV, referred to in the chronicle as *el Malo* and considered to be a usurper. This in itself speaks to the problematization of Urraca's legitimacy, and concerns about the integrity of the royal line: although she is explicitly declared to be her father's sole heir, and the law clearly establishes grounds for women to rule, both of which she fulfils. But, unlike kings, even fatally flawed ones, queens cannot carry the weight of dynasty.

Crónica de veinte reyes

The *Crónica de veinte reyes*[213] (also called the *Crónica de once reyes*) is an anonymous expansion of the recent history of the Alfonsine *EE*, which begins with the reign of Fruela II and ends with the death of Fernando III. Its composition and place in the Alfonsine chronicle tradition has been subjected to significant scholarly debate since Menéndez

[212] *EE*, ch. 966.
[213] References are to *Crónica de veinte reyes*, ed. by César Hernández Alonso et al. (Burgos: Ayuntamiento de Burgos, 1991). Hereafter, *CVR*.

Pidal, whose own opinion underwent significant changes; he first thought it was a product of the late fourteenth century and descended from an abbreviated version of the *EE*, and later proposed that it was derived from the *Crónica de 1344*.[214] More recently, the consensus has placed it in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century, predating the *Crónica de 1344* and viewing it as a source for the later text.[215]

The *CVR*, stripping away the histories of the founding of Spain and its settlers that form an integral part of the providential narratives of Alfonso X and his Latin sources, takes a strongly partisan focus that favours Castile to the exclusion of all other kingdoms. This bias is evident even from the selection of the twenty kings: Gonzalo Martínez Díez highlights that the choice of Fruela II, an otherwise unremarkable king, is almost certainly due to the fact that his reign marks the beginning of material relating to the judges of Castile, and thus the origins of the kingdom; similarly, the Cid and Fernán González both receive more extensive treatment in the *CVR* than in other chronicles in the Alfonsine cycle.[216] This deliberate centering of Castile is also reflected in the lack of regnal years for Leonese monarchs who are not also rulers of Castile; instead, they are, unlike in the *EE*, included in the reigns of their Castilian counterparts. There is evidently a similar bias against kings whose contributions to the cause of Castile are considered insignificant, for Sancho III and Enrique I are placed under their fathers' reigns, while Urraca is included in Alfonso VII's regnal years despite the explicit acknowledgment that "su madre rreynara estos quatro años de suso dichos después que murió el rrey don Alfonso, el que ganó a Toledo".[217]

[214] Gonzalo Martínez Díez, "La *Crónica de Veinte Reyes*" in *CVR*, pp. 13-30, offers a useful overview of the array of theories surrounding the *CVR*'s composition.
[215] José Fradejas Lebrero, "Valores literarios de la *Crónica de veinte reyes*", in *CVR*, pp. 31-51, pp. 31-32.
[216] Martínez Díez, p. 23.
[217] *CVR*, Book XII, ch. 1.

Despite the diminished role of León, the *CVR* nevertheless preserves much of the providential character of the *EE*'s narrative, and even heightens miraculous and religious elements throughout: Urraca's death in the *CVR*, in the first instance of its representation since the twelfth century, becomes almost miraculous.[218] From the reign of Alfonso VI through the death of Alfonso IX, the *CVR* diverges significantly from the *EE*, no longer following the *DRH* as closely, and drawing on different sources for the material relating to the Cid as well as the rulers of León-Castile in this period.[219] The majority of Urraca's reign in the *CVR* does follow the *DRH* and *EE* in the essentials: her marriage to Alfonso of Aragón; the miracle of the weeping stones; conflict between Urraca and Alfonso threatening Castilian autonomy; the nobility of Pedro Ansúrez. But there are three additions to the narrative which substantially alter the overall image of the queen.

The first is the elaboration of Alfonso VII's uprising against Urraca, the towers of León episode mentioned in passing in earlier chronicles, which serves to present Alfonso Raimúndez as a strong king from an early age and to cut Urraca's rule short.[220] By casting her as Pedro González de Lara's co-conspirator in an alliance against her son, the queen becomes a villainous figure who seeks to damage her own dynasty. The ensuing paternal-filial relationship constructed between Alfonso of Aragón and Alfonso Raimúndez further delegitimizes the queen and her chosen consorts: Pedro de Lara is referred to as the young king's "padrastro" while Alfonso Raimúndez explicitly offers himself as "fijo" to the Alfonso I's "padre", an offer which is accepted and reciprocated. As a result, Alfonso I stands—despite invading León and raiding its churches—as a model king whose example Alfonso VII can follow, since his mother has proven to be an unfit ruler.

---

[218] Fradejas Lebrero, pp. 33-35.
[219] Theodore Babbit, La crónica de veinte reyes*: a comparison with the text of the* Primera crónica general *and a study of the principal Latin sources* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936) remains the most comprehensive study of the sources of the *CVR*.
[220] *CVR*, Book XI, ch. 4.

The second major innovation in the *CVR* is an account of Urraca's death, which was mentioned briefly in the *HC* and not at all in the chronicles of the thirteenth century. This episode marks a new low in the historiographical treatment of the queen; the earthly shame and dishonor to which she was subjected in the *HC* is surpassed in the *CVR* by the miraculous administration of a divine, eternal punishment:

> "Después que don Alfonso fue rrey e señor de Castilla e de León, sacó de la prisión a su madre, e ovieron tal abenençia amos entre sy: que rretouiese ella para sy lo que quisiese, e lo ál que lo touiese él. Mas esta abenençia non duró mucho, ca luego començó la rreyna de fazer mucho mal en la tierra del fijo. E aviendo execo entre la madre e el fijo, ouo grandes guerras en la tierra, ca teníen grandes cauallerías con la madre. E la madre tomaua el thesoro e el aver de los monasterios, cruzes e cálizes de plata e todo lo ál quanto fallaua, e esto mesmo fazíe a todas las otras iglesias. E vino a la çibdat de León e demandó a las mongías de Sant Ysidrio quel fiziesen ayuda, e las monjas dixéronle que non teníen quel dar, e la rreyna, con la grand saña que ende ouo, dixo a sus caualleros: «Entrad dentro e tomad quanto fallardes, ca yo lo mando». Los caualleros le dixeron: «Señora, entrad vos allá e dátnoslo acá fuera e tomarlo hemos nos». Ella entró entonçes dentro con sus dueñas e tomó quanto thesoro falló, e saliendo ella con todo aquell thesoro que leuaua por la puerta de la iglesia, teniendo avn el vn pie dentro e otro fuera, quebró por medio del cuerpo, e asy murió la rreyna doña Vrraca, madre del Enperador. E soterráronla y luego, e abrieron el luzillo de vna laude e quebró aquella alaude luego por medio, e nunca quiso Dios que se más çerrase el munumento, e asy yaze oy en día la rreyna doña Vrraca."[221]

This spectacular fate is added to Urraca's life only in this version, and it relies on an awkward manipulation of the chronology of her reign, which makes Alfonso VII an adult king before his mother's death, but finds nothing of interest to report from the next thirteen years of his reign. (That is, the whole remainder of Urraca's reign.) Creative liberty has also evidently been taken with the source materials: as far as I can tell, this account derives in part from the *CM*'s accusation that the queen aided Alfonso I in robbing treasure and relics from San Isidro, and partly from the significance that the church of San Isidro occupies in Alfonso VI's reign, especially at the end of his life. The church at San Isidoro de León was a center of dynastic power from the time of Fernando

[221] CVR, Book XII, ch. 2.

I through the end of Urraca's life, and it continued to be associated with Urraca's daughter Sancha Raimúndez, who enjoyed the rank of queen alongside her brother.[222] By situating the queen's miraculous death, with divine justice administered directly to a wicked ruler, in the religious center of dynastic power, and in a place already associated with dynastic miracles and established as part of her father's legacy, the *CVR* makes a clear statement about Urraca's role in the dynasty associated with San Isidoro. She is deprived of life, barred from the heavenly kingdom as well as the earthly one (for the doors of the church are easily read as the gates of heaven), and most of all from the church's connections to her father, aunt, and grandfather. For her crimes, the very foundations of her dynasty have twice rejected her: first the altar stones of San Isidoro de León wept at her father's death, and then the stones of her tomb at San Isidoro cracked for all eternity, refusing to be made whole and conceal the disgrace brought upon her lineage. Such a death, and the life that led to it—inconstant, disobedient, promiscuous with her body and her kingdom, greedy, impious, power-hungry, inciteful to sin, and a bad mother—establishes Urraca as the model of a bad ruler, and justifies her portrayal as usurper of her son's rightful throne.

There is a third new element in the *CVR* which is not directly associated with Urraca but which, given its proximity to the account of her reign, suggests the deliberate creation of parallels for exemplary purposes. In the *EE* and the *DRH*, the early years of Alfonso VII's reign are followed with a genealogy of the kings of Portugal that focuses largely on the military exploits of Afonso Enriques and Sancho I. The *CVR* significantly expands on the process of Portugal's independence, and represents Urraca's half-sister, Teresa of Portugal, as similarly adulterous, taking a lover and working to thwart her son's claim to the throne: Afonso Enriques "non falló lugar [en Portugal] donde se acogiese, ca se alçara su madre con toda la tierra, e casárase con el conde don Ferrando

[222] See Emmanuelle Klinka, "L'affirmation d'une nouvelle dynastie", e-Spania, 3 (2007).

de Trastámara".[223] And like Urraca, she lays claim to the title of queen and ruler, establishing her hereditary right to rule with the assertion that «[m]ía es la tierra e mía será, ca mi padre el rrey don Alfonso me la dexó».[224] A nearly identical scenario of conflict between mother, stepfather, and son plays out again, with Alfonso Enriques, like his cousin, driving away the count of Traba and putting his mother in irons.

The inclusion of this narrative of maternal conspiracy (both the Urraca and Teresa versions) is unique to the *CVR*, and the addition of Teresa suggests that the chronicler has a particular interest in providing examples of queens asserting their right to sole rule. Both are constructed as "bad" queens whose example is intended to be a negative one, with Urraca as the primary example, followed by Teresa, who appears only a few chapters later, serves to reinforce the potential ramifications of following in their footsteps. I suspect that this exaggeration of negative behaviors and dynasty-endangering consequences of remarriage is not merely part and parcel of the *CVR*'s preference for legendary material, but also deliberate and related to the political circumstances of its composition. If, as Diego Catalán concluded, the *CVR* (or a prototype thereof) is the product of the first third of the fourteenth century at the latest, then we are again in a political moment when the intersection of queenship and governance becomes problematized: the period between Sancho IV's death in 1295 and Alfonso XI's majority in 1325 saw two royal minorities and a prolonged period of female regency under María de Molina. In the *Crónica de Fernando IV*, composed later in the fourteenth century, María is shown to deploy a vague reference to bad queens in defending her refusal to remarry, while appealing to the example of the "buenas reinas" of her lineage who have governed on behalf of their sons.[225] We will return to María in Chapter 3, but I believe the exemplary "malas reinas" invoked in the *CFIV* are almost

[223] CVR, Book XII, chapter 5
[224] CVR, Book XII, chapter 5.
[225] *CFIV*, p. 112.

certainly the images of Urraca and Teresa of Portugal, as represented in the *Crónica de veinte reyes*.

IV. The *Crónicas anónimas de Sahagún*

External contexts

The *Crónicas anónimas de Sahagún* are a pair of texts which relate two discrete moments in the history of the monastery of San Benito de Sahagún, in southeastern León. The first *crónica* recounts an eight-year period during the reign of Urraca of León (approximately 1109 to 1117), while the second deals with the period 1237-1255, and culminates in a visit by Alfonso X to the monastery, whereupon he granted a *fuero* to the townspeople of Sahagún. Though the two narratives do not appear to link together, they have been copied down together in the sole extant manuscript; because of their vastly different content, only the first of the *crónicas anónimas* will be considered here.

The first chronicle recounts, in detail, events from the end of the reign of Alfonso VI of León, focusing on his death in Toledo and burial in Sahagún, after a well-documented history of bestowing royal favour upon the Benedictine abbey at Sahagún and its monks. The narration concludes rather abruptly with the events of 1117, the final reconciliation between Urraca and Alfonso of Aragón, and with an expression of hope for the future as the rebellious burghers of Sahagún once again submit to the abbot in a public ritual of humiliation and obedience. There is no indication that the chronicler might know of events after 1117: in particular, Alfonso Raimúndez is mentioned only once in passing, with no reference to his later status as "emperador", suggesting that the chronicle was completed before he was of an age to exercise real authority in his mother's realms. This limited historical scope and apparently eyewitness nature of the account, as well as its detail, supports the idea that the chronicle was composed during the same period. Ubieto

Arteta suggests that it may have been written to be presented at the 1117 Council of Burgos convened by the papal legate to Spain, as a report on the abuses suffered by the monastic community at Aragonese hands.[226] Records of the council indicate that Urraca and her bishops and prelates attended the gathering in Burgos, but not Alfonso I of Aragón or any of his prelates[227], making this explanation very appealing, and even leading many scholars to pinpoint the abbot Domingo himself as the probable sponsor of the text.

The *CAS* are generally regarded as anonymous, with the assumption that the authors of both chronicles were monks affiliated with the Benedictine monastery in Sahagún. The narrator of the first chronicle claims to be a close servant to the abbot Domingo, and likely possessing of some status within the monastery. He claims to have been an eyewitness to most of the events recounted in the chronicle, and frequently slips into the first person to discuss the plight of the monks or his own situation (as he often claims to accompany the abbot when the latter is away from Sahagún). The narrator includes details of missions undertaken alongside the abbot and his steward Pedro, from journeys to Rome to seek papal favor[228] to late-night flights from the threat of Aragonese assassination plots;[229] he even recalls that he shared sleeping quarters with the abbot when they were imprisoned at the castle of Estella.[230] The narrator also claims to be well-travelled in his own right: after recounting a miraculous apparition of St. Facundo during the burghers' revolt, he takes pains to clarify that, although he did not personally witness the miracle because he was on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, the word of his fellow monks was trustworthy enough for him to believe their account.[231] There is even a

[226] *Crónicas anónimas de Sahagún*, ed. by Antonio Ubieto Arteta, Textos Medievales, 75 (Zaragoza: Anubar, 1987), p. 5. Hereafter, *CAS*.
[227] Fidel Fita, "Concilio nacional de Burgos (18 febrero 1117). Texto inédito", *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia*, 48 (1906), pp. 387-407.
[228] *CAS*, pp. 105-06.
[229] *CAS*, pp. 90-95.
[230] *CAS*, p. 108.
[231] *CAS*, pp. 101-04.

suggestion that he, along with abbot Domingo, was foreign to Sahagún, since Domingo was elected at the behest of Bernardo, archbishop of Toledo, who was himself a French Cluniac; a reference to trial-by-combat as "costumbre de España"[232] is curious but ultimately insufficient evidence. Whatever his origins, however, the loyalties of the chronicler-narrator are very clear: they lie wholly with Sahagún and with the abbot.

Such unwavering loyalty would have been a rare gem indeed, during the tumultuous early years of Urraca's reign. As contemporary evidence and earlier chronicles make clear, the first eight years after Alfonso VI's death bore witness to an endless string of shifting political and military conflicts and alliances both domestic and foreign, many stemming from Urraca's troubled and unstable marriage to the king of Aragón. The *primera crónica* largely ignores the turmoil in Galicia and on the southern and eastern frontiers, narrowing its focus to a series of events centered on Sahagún at a turning point in the town's development. The monastery of San Benito had previously been a small church housing relics of Roman-era martyrs Facundus and Primitivus, and an equally small monastic community, before suffering almost total destruction when Almanzor's forces sacked León in 988. The monastery's restoration and elevation by Alfonso VI, who made it the center of his efforts to introduce Cluniac reforms, entailed more than a mere rebuilding of the church and cloisters: it also included the creation of a fully-fledged market town whose sole lord was the abbot.[233] The speed with which Sahagún became an important population center in the final decades of the eleventh century gave rise to a period of tension and open conflict over the question of lordship and popular government. The prosperous new class of merchants and craftsmen who had been attracted by promises of economic advantage (for Alfonso VI's *fueros* granted the residents of Sahagún a variety of appealing tax exemptions) quickly found themselves

[232] *CAS*, p. 119.
[233] Juan Manuel Cuenca Coloma, *Sahagún: monasterio y villa, 1085-1985* (Valladolid: Estudio Agustiniano, 1985), pp. 26-51, gives a thorough overview of the development of Sahagún in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

chafing under the restrictive rules that emanated from the abbey, and in the early years of Urraca's reign, the town was swept up in a series of revolts against the established order.[234]

These are the circumstances posited for composition of the *CAS*, and which have been more or less held to be true by the majority of those who have edited or encountered the text since the eighteenth century. Both Julio Puyol and Antonio Ubieto Arteta are unequivocal in their assertions that, despite the lack of evidence for a Latin original (and the fact that the text is first referenced in the sixteenth century), the *CAS* are an original twelfth-century text completed before 1118.[235] Only Joaquín Traggia, writing in 1799, seriously questioned the authenticity of the text, calling it "una obra viciada, interpolada y moderna, y de consiguiente de dudosa fé", on the grounds that it did not agree with either the *Historia compostellana* or the *De rebus Hispaniae*. His secondary evidence for considering the *CAS* a falsification, however, was the text's "pasión violenta contra el Batallador y sus cosas", and the use that had been made of it by other scholars who were "empeñados en defender á una princesa"—that is, Urraca—and therefore eager to take the chronicle at face value.[236] The reference is undoubtedly to Romualdo Escalona's *Historia del Real Monasterio de Sahagún*, which reprints a vigorous defense of Urraca's morals, criticizing the *CAS* and other "voces indecentes y vergonzosas" for staining the queen's honor over the centuries.[237] The friar Joseph Perez, author of the defense, strenuously denies the queen's relationship with Pedro González de Lara, along with the existence of illegitimate children, and even the public's choice of insults ("meretrize pública") is refuted. Since the basis for these denials is grounded in a circular logic that

[234] Sahagún was not the only town in Urraca's realms to experience these uprisings; see Carlos Estepa Díez, "Sobre las revueltas burguesas en el siglo XII en el Reino de León", *Archivos Leoneses*, 55-56 (1974), pp. 291-307.
[235] Puyol, pp. 6-20, and *CAS*, pp. 5-6.
[236] Joaquín Traggia, "Ilustración del reynado de don Ramiro II de Aragón, dicho el Monge", *Memorias de la (Real) Academia de la Historia*, 3 (1799), pp. 469-562, pp.540-41.
[237] Joseph Perez, "Defensa del honor de la Reyna Doña Urraca", in Romualdo Escalona, *Historia del Real Monasterio de Sahagún* (Madrid: 1872), ed. by Carlos Estepa Díez (León: Ediciones Leonesas, 1982), pp. 366-75.

begins and ends the inherent goodness of the queens of Castile and León,[238] Traggia's skepticism is fully warranted. In fact, I believe that Joaquín Traggia's assessment, long discarded, was more correct than has been previously appreciated: several recent philological and literary studies reconsidering the text's linguistic[239] and narrative elements[240] suggest that the *CAS* may, in fact, be an original work of fifteenth-century monks associated with the abbey at Sahagún. Moreover, I will argue that the representation of Urraca in the *CAS* holds the keys to understanding and properly (re)contextualizing the chronicle.

Internal contexts

The *CAS* can be broadly divided into an expository introduction which details the history of the monastery, providing background for the "main events" of the narrative; that is, the burghers' rebellion in Sahagún, aided and abetted by the king of Aragón and his allies. The prefatory material includes brief hagiographies and miracles of the Roman martyrs buried there, as well as a lengthy accounting of the monastery's endowment by successive kings, including Alfonso VI's intention to be buried there in the church at Sahagún alongside his wives. Events throughout are presented in a more or less chronological fashion, but dates are rarely emphasised (years are given only infrequently), and the passage of time does not stand out as an organising principle of the text. When time does need to be marked, it is often calculated with reference to the passage of time since the death of Alfonso VI, whose shadow looms over the whole account.

---

[238] "Si todos los privados de las Reynas han sido sus galanes, infinitas de ellas, que consta fueron muy buenas, habrian sido malas," Perez, p. 372.
[239] Rosa María Espinosa Elorza, "Indagaciones filológicas sobre la *Primera crónica anónima de Sahagún*", *e-Spania,* 19 (2014).
[240] Carlos Manuel Reglero de la Fuente, "El abad Domingo y la *Primera Crónica Anónima de Sahagún:* una relectura", *e-Spania*, 19 (2014), and Charles Garcia, "El narrador, los juglares y los santos en la *Primera crónica anónima de Sahagún*", *e-Spania*, 19 (2014).

Rather than an annalistic structure, as observed in some of the earlier chronicles, the narrative of the *CAS* is episodic in nature, and episodes can range from a few brief paragraphs to more extensive accounts, as occurs in the detailed descriptions of torture methods employed by the burghers and the Aragonese against the monks of Sahagún and their allies, or in the miraculous apparition of St. Facundo. It remains unclear whether the text was ever intended for division into chapters to reflect these episodes, as the manuscript has some chapter titles, but they often do not correspond to the content.[241] Instead, much as the *HC* took as its organizing principle the dignity of Santiago de Compostela, the unifying thread of the *CAS* is the dignity of the abbot and his monastery, while other actors, including the queen, come and go inasmuch as they impact on the circumstances of the monks.

Urraca in the Text

Urraca's marriage to Alfonso of Aragón is, from the beginning, established as the catalyst for the horrors which befall the abbey and the abbot. Even before it takes place, a quasi-providential narrative of destruction ties together Urraca's marriage and the disaster it unleashes upon the land. Unlike earlier accounts which focus their attention on Urraca only once she is married, the *CAS* goes to great lengths to clarify the details of the succession. Alfonso VI's explicit wish for his daughter to inherit and rule his kingdoms is made very clear: "dexó el señorío de su reino a la dicha donna Hurraca su fija, la qual cosa me acontesçió oír, porque yo allí era presente".[242] Urraca's right to the throne is doubly legitimated by the expression of her father's will and by the chronicler's

[241] Puyol, pp. 12-16.
[242] *CAS*, p. 25.

eyewitness testimony, and neither casts any doubt upon her suitability to rule on account of her gender or unmarried status.

Upon Alfonso's death, however, a warning surges from the *vox populi* of the mourning crowds in Toledo, that "en este día el sol es nasçido a los moros e ynfieles, e es mucho tenebroso a los christianos".[243] This light which shines upon the enemies of Christendom is none other than Urraca's second marriage, which is directly attributed to the desires and disloyalty of the nobility and the *burgueses*. The queen's subjects, rather than fulfilling the late king's wishes, assemble together to inform the queen that she must be married or "tu non podras gouernar nin retener el reino de tu padre".[244] In fact, the proponents and opponents of the marriage are exactly the inverse of the factions presented in the thirteenth-century chronicles: the nobility push for a foreign marriage while the clergy decry it, calling attention to the perversion and illegality of a consanguineous marriage. Archbishop Bernardo of Toledo, a secondary hero in the narrative, is given the lone voice of protest, declaring that the union "non era digno de seer llamado matrimonio", but rather "estrupo e fornicaçión prohibida".[245] The choice of *estrupo*—rape—in Bernardo's words is a strong one, highlighting the nonconsensual and criminal elements, implying the queen's resistance to the marriage, as well as a metaphorical violation of the body politic. Taking on a prophetic tone, the chronicler declares that the kingdom will suffer divine punishment for the crime: it is only because God wished to "açotar a Espanna con el bastón de su sanna"[246] that the marriage was permitted to proceed. The "danno e destruiçión"[247] of Spain is, however, not merely punishment for the nobility who have forced the queen's hand: it is explicitly framed as retribution, before the fact, for crimes

[243] *CAS*, p. 26.
[244] *CAS*, p. 26.
[245] *CAS*, p. 27.
[246] *CAS*, p. 28.
[247] *CAS*, p. 30.

of the burghers of Sahagún who have hidden "la maliçia e venino de su coraçón"[248] during Alfonso VI's reign and will unleash it, like serpents, in the reign of his daughter.

In another novel addition to Urraca's marriage, the *CAS* notes that on the day of the wedding, a great frost fell across the land, destroying the wine-grape harvest and creating from the few remaining grapes a poisoned wine that caused intense gastric distress in everyone who consumed it, throughout the kingdom, and resulted in "gran daño de la salud".[249] The unseasonal frost (for the wedding takes place in early October) and its consequences are interpreted as a divine omen, and must be read as the first signs of the aforementioned *∂anno e ∂eſtruiçión*, afflicting the body politic in the literal sense, with the marriage (the tainted wine) as the vector of sickness that must be violently purged from the physical and metaphorical body of the kingdom. In a final condemnation, one which inverts the peace of Alfonso VI's time, the chronicler anticipates the terrible crimes soon to be inflicted upon the town and the monastery: "Aquesta maldita copula e ayuntamiento fue ocasión de todos los males que nasçieron en Espanna, ca de aquí nasçieron grandes muertes, siguieronse robos, adulterios, e casi todas las leyes e fuerças eclesiasticas fueron menguadas e apocadas."[250] Blame for this state of nature is placed on the marriage itself and not the queen, however; the marriage has already been carefully framed as a violation of Urraca and her kingdom, and against the will of queen and Church.

During the conflict that follows the wedding, Urraca is largely relegated to a background role, and the narrative action of the *CAS* focuses on the mistreatment of abbot and his monks, and on the crimes of the Aragonese warriors and rebellious burghers. She is invoked frequently as the legitimate ruler, but the legitimation of Urraca

[248] *CAS*, p. 24.
[249] *CAS*, pp. 29-30.
[250] *CAS*, p. 30.

in the *CAS* is always ultimately for the benefit of the monastery at Sahagún: there is consistent emphasis on her dynasty, via reminders of her father's generosity; this in turn is used to justify her position as rightful *señora natural* over the burghers and townspeople.[251] Similarly, when the rebels are decried for interfering with the queen's ability to visit her parents' tombs, Urraca gains legitimacy as a ruler from the filial piety and religious devotion attributed to her; however, it also serves as a reminder of her dynastic ties to the institution, and to her obligation to protect it.[252]

The queen's one moment of significant intervention in this period takes place as the royal couple prepare to take control of Galicia, besieging the castle at Monterroso:

> "E ya conplidas las malditas bodas e escomulgadas, e viniéndose ya el primero tienpo del verano, el rei de Aragón aparejóse con la reina para entrar en Galiçia, e como çercase el primero castillo, que se llama Monterroso, e le entrase, un cavallero noble e a la reina bien conoçido, llamado Prado, el qual fuera fallado dentro del castillo, mucho rogava que non le matasen; e porque le fuese dada la vida, fuyó e encomendóse a la reina, metiéndose so el su manto; al qual la reina, mobida con piedad, cubriólo con su manto y estendiendo los braços sobre él por lo librar más.
>
> "El rei non aviendo bergüença a la reina, a manera de bárvaro cruel, con sus manos tomó un benablo e firiólo e matólo, el qual fecho mucho desplugo a todos los nobles que benían con la reina; e a ella mucho más…"[253]

According to the *CAS*, this incident is what prompts Urraca, on the advice of her nobles, to "façer diborçio e separación del marido",[254] physically separating herself from her husband by returning to León. The episode reveals Alfonso of Aragón to be vicious and immoral, a picture consolidated by his decision to permit "algunos moros e ynfieles" in his company to "fornic[ar] con [monjas] ant'el santo altar" in a convent they had just ransacked, as part of his campaign of destruction in Galicia.[255] Unlike the thirteenth-

[251] In particular her address to the burghers, *CAS*, p. 64.
[252] *CAS*, p. 50, 58, 60, 63-64 especially.
[253] *CAS*, pp. 32-33.
[254] *CAS*, p. 33.
[255] *CAS*, pp. 33-34.

century and Alfonsine narratives discussed earlier, the author of the *CAS* has carefully exonerated the queen from responsibility from broader conflict, whilst turning her separation from Alfonso I (attributed in earlier chronicles to her disobedience and irrational actions) into a positive decision, made jointly with her nobles as a means of protecting them from a "bárvaro cruel" incapable of moderating his own behavior. In addition to the inversion of the usual dynamics of their relationship, this episode contains entirely novel grounds for the divorce. The *HC* is similarly approving of Urraca's desire for a separation, but used the pretext of Alfonso's physical and verbal abuse. Considering that the siege of Monterroso, and the slaughter of knights within, is recorded in the *HC*,[256] with nary a mention of the queen or the knight Prado, the inspiration for this image of Urraca must be drawn from some other source.

More than any other account of Urraca's reign, this episode calls to mind a nearly identical incident in the *Crónica de tres reyes* involving Sancho IV's queen, María de Molina. In the *Crónica de Sancho IV*, the pregnant queen bodily intervenes in order to prevent her husband from killing his brother, the *infante* Juan; she shields the prince from the king's dagger with her arms and mantle, and shelters him in her chambers. In the details, the *CAS* differs only slightly: the victim is one of Urraca's vassals, not Alfonso's, and the weapon is a *venablo*, a sort of short lance, rather than a blade. In both situations, the king reacts to treason with murderous rage, and the intent to carry out the execution personally. Both Urraca and María perform paradigmatic queenship immaculately, displaying mercy towards the guilty and interceding between king and subject. But Alfonso *el Batallador*, unlike Sancho IV, is not persuaded by his queen's model actions: her attempt at mediation fails, and the king openly murders a man begging for his life, even as the queen tries to cover him with the protection of her *manto*. This, in his first action as Urraca's co-ruler, is proof that Alfonso is a bad king: while successful

[256] *HC*, I, 64.

rule requires a certain degree of necessary violence on the battlefield and in the dispensing of justice, a good king must also display *mesura* and clemency. The queen, in her capacity as *mediatrix*, offered "feminine pleading that made it permissible for a king to change his mind",[257] and was violently refused.

By representing this scene of queenly clemency thwarted, the chronicler builds a case for Urraca to rule independently of her husband. As Helen Hackett has noted, "[m]ercy and grace were virtues that could comfortably identified with a female monarch without suggesting either that she was inadequate as a ruler, or that she was unnaturally mannish."[258] The abbot Domingo explicitly praises the queen's virtues, declaring that "ansí como hera de alta nobleça e de sangre real e de gran fermosura, ansí aún era de gran prudençia e de graçiosa fabla e eloquencia".[259]This is as boilerplate a description of a medieval lady as can be imagined—beautiful, noble, prudent, and eloquent—but it nevertheless bolsters her representation as a paradigm of femininity. The majority of Urraca's other interventions in the narrative support this image of the queen, framing her as a patron and protector of the abbot and his abbey, while Alfonso of Aragón and his allies are associated with the devil,[260] accused of sorcery and necromancy,[261] and work to destroy the royally- and divinely-ordained lordship of the abbot in Sahagún. The queen is always said to act on the advice of her nobles or bishops, making her a prudent ruler and endowing her decisions with greater legitimacy, especially when they are supported by church figures; Alfonso, in contrast, rejects all attempts to mitigate his destructive kingship.

---

[257] Theresa Earenfight, *Queenship in Medieval Europe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), pp. 11-12.
[258] Helen Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen: Elizabeth I and the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1995), pp. 168-69.
[259] *CAS*, p. 111.
[260] *CAS*, p. 87.
[261] *CAS*, p. 61.

Inevitably, Urraca's involvement in the narrative centers on the resolution of the Aragonese conflict, which entails ending her cursed marriage. Because her marriage is already a moment that highlights her gender, it is therefore not surprise that many details of her representation are also highly gendered, making use of stereotypical feminine behaviors, including those considered appropriate for a queen to wield as political tools. Weeping and pleading in particular are relied upon when Urraca performs public acts of authority, cloaking harsh words in tears to soften their impact, and in some cases even heighten their effectiveness. While confronting a group of traitorous burghers in León, the queen invokes her father's generosity and her own defenselessness, threatening the burghers with the prospect of divine justice; because she "muy amargamente llorava" and issued her threat "a grandes boçes llorando", however, she is able to move some of the traitors to tears of their own, and even to repentance.[262] The queen's tears work effectively on behalf of others, too, and she is able to take on the abbot's suffering and deploy it to shame the rebels: "traspasando así el despreçio e denuesto d'él, derramó las lágrimas," causing the burghers to "[aver] bergüença de la reina" and temporarily proclaim their devotion to her.[263] Among the few instances of Urraca's political action that do not involve any element of gendered performance are the negotiations with the Moorish king of Zaragoza to obtain cash for bribing Aragonese nobles to abandon Sahagún,[264] which allows the queen to use diplomacy and economic management—both gender-neutral aspects of monarchical power—to accomplish the same ends as more direct, masculine-gendered actions like military engagement.

This is not to say that the *CAS* lacks the intense clerical misogyny observed in earlier representations; this is present in the text, but it is simply not directed at Urraca. Instead, the queen suffers from a softer misogyny that confines her exercise of queenship to a set

[262] *CAS*, pp. 63-64.
[263] *CAS*, p. 70.
[264] *CAS*, p. 59.

of appropriately feminine behaviors, and which, throughout the text, presents her as the passive and innocent victim of her husband and her half-sister. First, she "paçientemente sufrió" the excommunication occasioned by the illegal marriage, even as she desired to "se partir de el marido".[265] Then, Henry of Burgundy, her brother-in-law, schemes with some of her nobles to divide the kingdom between them: "ellos acavarían con la reina para que con él partiese el reino con suerte fraternal".[266] It is Urraca's half-sister Teresa of Portugal, however, who becomes the target of authorial misogyny, accused of pride for being "ya llamada reina de los sus domésticos e cavalleros" and said to possess a "lengua lisonjera", with which she incites her husband (otherwise a "varón sobresalir") to treachery against the queen, who is without a defender, "desanparada del solaz baronil".[267] Adding insult to the injury of divorce is Alfonso of Aragón's plot to imprison his wife for the rest of her life at the castle of Peralta and seize her kingdoms for himself.[268] Teresa, already established as a treacherous figure, incites further strife with an accusation that Urraca intends to poison her husband:

> "Considerando que para se rebelar, la fortuna non le avastava nin ayudava, con un saver astuto e yngenioso, enbió al rey un mensajero confeçionando para que se esquivase e guardase de la reina su hermana, por quanto se disponía a quererlo matar con yervas, por lo qual él goçase porque tenía justa causa para la echar de sí…"[269]

Teresa's lie, carefully crafted to target the king's insecurities, draws on popular misogyny: poisoning was a crime associated primarily with women and clerics in the Middle Ages, and was favored as an accusation because it was unproveable. It was mostly the *ıdea* of poison as the "ideal weapon for the murderess" that appealed, as criminal records show that "it was not widely used in real life".[270] Unwittingly, however, Teresa's machinations liberate Urraca from her husband's control, and the queen,

[265] *CAS*, p. 37-38.
[266] *CAS*, p. 40.
[267] *CAS*, p. 41.
[268] *CAS*, p. 51.
[269] *CAS*, p. 62.
[270] Sara M. Butler, *The Language of Abuse: Marital Violence in Later Medieval England* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 220-22.

though still defenseless, begins to act with a new degree of agency. Particularly noteworthy is her offer to prove herself innocent "por juiçio de pelea de entramos a dos" when Alfonso believes her half-sister's accusation; the king's "locura" cannot be tamed by his nobles, but once he has rejected her and refused her proof of innocence, she is no longer bound to him. Alfonso's madness also weakens the power he holds over his nobility, and it is an Aragonese knight, tasked with holding León in the king's name, who restores the city to Urraca's control and returns the queen to a place of dynastic power, her father's palace, from which she can re-establish authority over other areas of her father's domain.[271]

As the narrative reaches its climax, the queen's capacity for action broadens, and she becomes a fearsome specter for the burghers who attack the convent of Santa María: they ransack it, but flee "ca temían que estas nuebas llegasen a las orejas de la reina".[272] Her demonstrated commitment to mercy and reconciliation and other acceptably feminine avenues of power almost immediately gives way to a masculine dispensation of justice, administered to an Aragonese knight who had recently attacked the convent of Santa María and attempted to murder the abbot:

> "ante la presençia de la reina fue traydo e ella mandó que le sacasen los ojos e quedase çiego. E çiertamente digna cosa fue que aquel que despreçió a la reina del çielo e de la tierra e fuese osado de acoçear su puerta, que por la reina de la tierra careçiese de la vista terrenal e uibiese privado de la luz común."[273]

The attack on the convent is part of a broader miracle attributed to the Virgin: the abbot Domingo, recently returned to Sahagún, was called away in the middle of the night by the death of a nun at Santa María, and thereby inadvertently escaped an assassination plot led by "Giraldo Diablo", Alfonso's right-hand man in the town. Inside

[271] *CAS*, p. 63.
[272] *CAS*, p. 95.
[273] *CAS*, p. 97.

the besieged convent, a nun uses her cloak to intercept an arrow intended for Domingo; then, much as Urraca had earlier attempted to defend her vassal, the nuns intercede to protect the archer from the abbot's men, so that "la iglesia non fuese corronpida con la muerte de aquel sacrílega".[274] As brides of Christ, the nuns perform a nearly identical mediating role as the queen; the abbot and his men replace the earthly king, and (unlike Alfonso I) are saved from sin. Urraca's dispensation of a harsh, permanent, physical punishment—blinding—is a far cry from the merciful monarch idealised earlier in the chronicle. By framing the queen's justice as vengeance in the name of the Virgin Mary, whose namesake convent had been despoiled by crime, however, it becomes proof of the celestial and temporal queens functioning as two complementary parts of a whole. This association with the Virgin allows the earthly queen to transcend the usual limits of queenship (as the nuns temporarily take on the role of merciful intercessor) and assume the powers normally reserved to a king, while warding off accusations of gender-bending or mannish rule, such as those levelled in the *Chronicon Compostellanum*, with an explicit connection between the Virgin's defense and Urraca's justice.

Several elements of Urraca's representation, combined with recent studies by Espinosa Elorza and Charles Garcia, support my hypothesis that the *CAS* is in fact a fifteenth-century text rather than the late translation of an earlier twelfth-century chronicle. Firstly, it is an image of the queen that, as we have now seen, deviates wildly from all other chronicle accounts of her reign. The *CAS* is overwhelmingly positive about Urraca while literally demonizing Alfonso I of Aragón, where all of the thirteenth-century chronicles legitimize his kingship to at least a small degree. There is also no mention whatsoever of Pedro González de Lara, and only a minor reference to Count Gómez, and neither is accused of having been the queen's lover, fathered children by her, or attempted to rule over her realms; even the *HC*, which is uninterested in Urraca's

[274] *CAS*, pp. 90-95.

extramarital relations, does not erase them so thoroughly, which in itself suggests that the chronicle is not contemporary. The only twelfth-century text as positive about Urraca is the *Crónica Silense*, which was likely commissioned by Urraca, and which takes a more subtle, dynastic approach to legitimation, developing her aunt and namesake Urraca de Zamora as a model of female rule rather than the queen herself.[275]

Second, as Garcia has highlighted, many of the most compelling narrative elements in the *CAS,* including the extended digressions on torture, miracle stories, and even the insistent "yo" of the narrator who inserts himself into the action, are notably absent in twelfth-century writing.[276] Although Barbara Rosenwein has concluded that the sense of an authorial "I" in the High Middle Ages did exist, she suggests that it was categorical rather than personal,[277] as the anonymous monk purports to be. Garcia has shown, too, that the descriptions of the monks' torture by the *burgueses* of Sahagún strongly resemble scenes of martyrdom found in thirteenth-century hagiographies, especially to the Golden Legend. To this list of literary anachronisms, I would also add the defense of the knight Prado, which draws on an explicitly Marian model of queenship absent in the other twelfth-century chronicle examined in this chapter. I have already highlighted this episode's similarities with a similar intervention by María de Molina in the *Crónica de Sancho IV*, which is intended to demonstrate the queen's paradigmatic virtue; if we also recall the episode of harmony between earthly queen and heavenly queen, the main action of the narrative is effectively bookended with two events that cement a Marian image of Urraca.

[275] Patricia Rochwert-Zuili, "Muerte y memoria dinástica en la *Historia legionensis* (llamada '*silensis*')", *e-Spania*, 14 (2012), 38-45, discusses Urraca's connection to the *Silense*.
[276] Garcia, "El narrador, los juglares y los santos".
[277] Barbara H. Rosenwein, "Y avait-il un 'moi' au haut Moyen Âge?", *Revue historique*, 633:1 (2005), pp. 31-52.

We have already seen that this constitutes a radical change from the *HC*'s traditional medieval misogyny, and a total departure from the increasingly sensationalized representations of the thirteenth century, but why was this the case? What reason could monks in the late fifteenth century have for remaking the image of a queen universally reviled by historians for the preceding three hundred years? Who was the audience for such a text? For answers, it is necessary to return to the external circumstances of the chronicle's composition, under the assumption now that there is no Latin original, at least not in the same form, but only a Castilian text, composed in the second half of the fifteenth century, and most likely "sus años finales".[278] This places us in Sahagún, in the reign of Isabel I of Castile and Fernando II of Aragón.[279]

Part of the Catholic Monarchs' broader strategy to consolidate their authority, which was degraded by the war of succession, involved a slate of church reforms. Though ostensibly undertaken with a view to streamlining the ecclesiastical hierarchy in Castile, and in particular the re-organization of monastic communities,[280] the royal couple aimed to limit the Church's political power and bend it to serve their needs. Although its influence had declined considerably in the centuries since Alfonso VI had showered it with royal favor, the Benedictine monastery at Sahagún was one of the first institutions targeted by this restructuring project: over the course of two decades, the abbey was stripped of its privileges and properties, and finally, after a protracted protest, it was brought under the direct authority of the new abbey in Valladolid in 1494.[281] These ecclesiastical reforms are often referred to as a personal project of Fernando de Aragón, but it was Isabel who visited Sahagún in the autumn of 1475,[282] and who swore "delante

[278] Espinosa Elorza, 36.
[279] Even assuming an early date of composition for the *CAS*, it is likely that Fernando was King of Aragón, as he assumed the crown in 1479; in any case, he became heir to the throne in 1460.
[280] John Edwards, *Ferdinand and Isabella* (London: Pearson/Longman, 2005), pp. 84-94.
[281] María Victoria Herráez Ortega et al., *Esplendor y decadencia de un monasterio medieval. El patrimonio artístico de San Benito de Sahagún* (León: Universidad de León, Ayuntamiento de Sahagún, 2000), pp. 143-44.
[282] Escalona, *Historia del Real Monasterio de Sahagún*, pp. 693-94, records a visit by the queen on 5 October.

del altar mayor" to uphold the privileges and properties of the monastery. I propose that the *CAS* were composed with the queen in mind, as a plea to intercede with her husband in favor of the monastery's interests, and a warning of what could befall her kingdoms if Sahagún were not appropriately defended. It is difficult to be more precise, because the abbey's loss of prestige and lordly privileges was ultimately a drawn-out process which took nearly twenty years to complete, but a revised date of composition in the mid-1470s, when Isabel was fighting to secure her claim to the Castilian throne, would support Espinosa Elorza's conclusion that the chronicle is a product of the second half of the fifteenth century.[283]

The parallels that the *CAS* invoke are straightforward—Isabel, as a sovereign queen regnant of Castile and León, had only one historical predecessor, Urraca; both were married consanguineously in the third degree to kings of Aragón—and their message is clear: the last attempted union of Castile and León with Aragón had also resulted in injury to the church, especially in Sahagún, and had unleashed chaos, disorder, violence, and death upon the kingdom, and caused suffering to the queen. The kingdom's troubles were only resolved when the rightful lordship of Sahagún was restored to the abbot and the abbey. In order to maintain her own status as *señora natural* throughout her realms, a sovereign queen like Urraca (or, the chronicle insinuates, like Isabel) must not allow a foreign king to dishonor and exploit the religious houses under her protection.

Several other texts composed early in the reign of the Catholic Monarchs were intended as didactic *specula* to provide instruction on governance, and to promote a particular model of governance.[284] While most of these were intended as advice for

[283] Espinosa Elorza, 36-38.
[284] Recent studies of the didactic literature of the late fifteenth-century court can be found in Cristina Guardiola-Griffiths, *Legitimizing the Queen: Propaganda and Ideology in the Reign of Isabel I of Castile* (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2011) and Nuria Silleras-Fernández, *Chariots of Ladies: Francesc Eiximenis and the Court Culture of Medieval and Early Modern Iberia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2016), as well as Barbara F. Weissberger, *Isabel Rules: Constructing Queenship, Wielding Power* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2004).

Fernando, some were clearly aimed at the queen: Iñigo de Mendoza's *Dechado*, which was written for Isabel, the Castilian translation of Francesc Eiximenis's *Llibre de les dones*, and Martín de Córdoba's *Jardín de nobles doncellas*. The use of history, especially interwoven as the *CAS* is with elements of hagiography and Marian imagery, would have made an ideal medium to target the queen as she worked to fashion herself as a ruling queen. Inventories of Isabel's collection of books reflect an interest in didactic and religious literature, saints' lives (especially Iberian ones), and Peninsular history;[285] as regards content, then, the *CAS* are perfectly calibrated for their intended audience. But there is no record of any such text in her possession, and we know that Sahagún was stripped of its privileges during her reign, so it must be concluded that the text never reached her, or worse for its authors, did not have the intended effect.

[285] For a complete inventory of Isabel's books, see Francisco Javier Sánchez Cantón, *Libros, tapices y cuadros que coleccionó Isabel la Católica* (Madrid: CSIC, 1950), and more recently Elisa Ruiz García, *Los libros de Isabel la Católica: Arqueología de un patrimonio escrito* (Madrid: Instituto de Historia del Libro y de la Lectura, 2004).

II

Berenguela of Castile and León

(1214-1246)

Berenguela was the first child of Alfonso VIII and Leonor Plantagenet, daughter of Henry II and Eleanor of Aquitaine. For much of her childhood she was, like Urraca, her father's heir; she was ultimately displaced in 1189 by the birth of her younger brother Fernando, when Berenguela was approximately nine. Of her time as heir presumptive, documentation only begins with her marriage, aged eight, to Conrad of Swabia, son of the Holy Roman Emperor Frederick Barbarossa. The surviving text of the 1188 treaty[286] relating to their betrothal reveals deep anxieties about the prospect of rule by a foreign prince, and carefully outlines an agreement whereby the rights to the Castilian throne would always revert to Berenguela and her heirs. It makes clear that "Conrad's status was that of Berenguela's consort", undeniably a position of significant power but nevertheless "one that did not give him independent authority to rule Castile".[287] For unclear reasons, the unconsummated marriage was dissolved by the autumn of 1191, so Berenguela remained unmarried—and still a valuable asset—at her father's court.[288]

In 1197, despite an uncanonical degree of consanguinity and papal objections, Berenguela was married to Alfonso IX of León, in attempt to end the ongoing war between the kings of Castile and León over border territories in the Tierra de Campos. The union was, initially, a success: it brought peace to the two kingdoms, and produced

[286] The Treaty of Seligenstadt has been published as document 499 in Julio González, *El reino de Castilla en la época de Alfonso VIII* (Madrid: CSIC, 1960), vol. 2, p. 857-62.
[287] Shadis, *Berenguela*, p. 55.
[288] Shadis, pp. 51-61.

further potential heirs to both thrones, although both Alfonso IX and Alfonso VIII still had male heirs-apparent of their own.[289] Conflicts over the fertile and wealthy border settlements had dragged on for decades; they had begun nearly as soon as Alfonso VII divided his kingdoms in the middle of the twelfth century.[290] The solution was, however, relatively straightforward: Berenguela would be given, as her *arras* or dowry, substantial lands in León, including many of the disputed castles and towns in the Tierra de Campos, and her ownership would prevent bother her husband and her father from claiming them. The proposition was a success, and one which simultaneously enabled Berenguela to cultivate significant political power in her own right. Janna Bianchini has shown the extent to which Berenguela's personal exercise of lordship, even beyond the duration of her marriage, created relationships and support fundamental to sustaining her authority and later, that of her son.[291]

Even as Berenguela was increasing her own status, however, her marriage was under growing pressure—specifically, from Pope Innocent III, whose admonishments over the matter of the incestuous union had turned to a writ of excommunication by the summer of 1199—and though they resisted for another five years, she was separated from the king of León by the summer of 1204.[292] She returned to her natal family in Castile, but evidently continued to exercise personal authority, acknowledged by both Alfonso IX and Alfonso VIII, in at least some of her *arras* territories in the Tierra de Campos.[293] Although she appears to have engaged in some work on her parents' behalf, as an experienced member of the royal family, Berenguela no longer seemed likely to accede to the throne, having been displaced in the line of succession by two brothers, Fernando and Enrique, the elder of whom had already reached the age of majority. But

[289] The *infante* Fernando of León, son of Alfonso IX and Teresa of Portugal, died in 1214 aged 21; the *infante* Fernando of Castile, son of Alfonso VIII, died three years before that, aged 20.
[290] Pascual Martínez Sopena, *La Tierra de Campos Occidental: poblamiento, poder y comunidad del siglo X al XIII* (Valladolid: Diputación Provincial, 1985), pp. 129-33.
[291] Bianchini, *The Queen's Hand*, especially ch. 2 and 3.
[292] Bianchini pp. 70-77.
[293] Bianchini, pp. 80-92.

the *infante* Fernando's sudden death in 1211, followed by their parents' deaths in 1214, radically changed the political landscape, and Berenguela once again found herself playing a central role in the events that followed.

As regent for the minor king, however, diplomas show that she was very soon marginalized[294] by her father's *alférez* Álvaro Núñez de Lara, who was also the step-brother of Alfonso IX and son of Nuño González de Lara, one of Alfonso VIII's regents.[295] It was only the chance death of Enrique I in the summer of 1217 which offered Berenguela a route back to power, and this time she did not squander the opportunity: her son Fernando was quickly installed on the throne of Castile, with his mother at his side. For the rest of Berenguela's life, even after he became king of León, Fernando III issued the majority of his diplomas *"ex assensu et beneplacito regine domine Berengarie, genitricis mee"*, an unusual formula that Bianchini has identified as an indicator of her ongoing involvement in the government of the realm.[296]

Of the four queens considered in this study, Berenguela is unique in having been a consort, a regent, and a (co-)regnant in her own right. Because her rule coincided with the explosion of peninsular historiography in the thirteenth century, she is represented in numerous chronicles, of which three were written during her lifetime, and the rest developed from the vernacular historiographical tradition sparked by her grandson Alfonso X. Through the close reading and contextualization of these representations, I will show how narratives of her reign, though initially somewhat ambivalent, were already bending towards encomia during her own lifetime, and how they reached a peak during the reign of Fernando IV, when Berenguela's example served as a useful tool for

[294] Bianchini, pp. 108-12.
[295] Antonio Sánchez de Mora, *La nobleza castellana en la Plena Edad Media: el linaje de Lara (ss. XI-XIII)* (doctoral dissertation, Seville, 2003), pp. 244-77.
[296] Bianchini, pp. 143-45.

another queen, María de Molina, who sought to anchor her own regency in the legitimacy provided by historical record.

I. Latin Chronicles of the Thirteenth Century: *Crónica latina de los reyes de Castilla*, *Chronicon Mundi*, and *De rebus Hispaniae*

The second half of Fernando III's reign saw the production of three major works of peninsular history, all composed in Latin, by churchmen with some degree of connection to the royal court. Though they are therefore undeniably royalist in their perspectives—and thus limited in what can be said against either the king or the queen—each presents a very different image of Berenguela.

Crónica latina de los reyes de Castilla

External contexts

The scholarly consensus is that the *CLRC* is the work of Bishop Juan de Osma (also called Juan de Soria), the royal chancellor of Castile, and later chancellor of León, under Fernando III, from 1217 until his death in 1246.[297] Luciano Serrano has traced his family ties to the Soria region, and suggested that he may have been a relation of Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada;[298] Pedro Fernández Martín has also suggested that he was the son of Alfonso VIII's chancellor Diego García de Campos, who also served as chancellor during the regency of Enrique I,[299] but virtually nothing is known of his life beyond the

[297] Derek W. Lomax, "The Authorship of the Chronique Latine des Rois de Castille", *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 40 (1963), pp. 205-211.
[298] Luciano Serrano, "El canciller de Fernando III de Castilla", *Hispania*, 5 (1941), pp. 3-40, p. 4.
[299] Pedro Fernández Martín, "El obispo de Osma don Juan Díaz, canciller de Fernando III el Santo, no se llamaba don Juan Domínguez", *Celtiberia*, 27 (1964), pp. 79-95.

chancery. He is thought to have joined Alfonso VIII's chancery around 1209 as a notary,[300] and spent the rest of his career there. (The CLRC's author claims to have attended the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, when he was still a young cleric,[301] suggesting a certain amount of experience of the world beyond Castile, but this is the only indication of such travels.) Joseph O'Callaghan asserts that the queen was "almost certainly responsible" for his promotion to the position of chancellor of the realm in 1217 when Fernando became king of Castile, since she appointed other members of his royal household,[302] and his rise has also been attributed to the patronage of Archbishop Rodrigo,[303] while Linehan sees Juan as a political rival of the Archbishop,[304] though of course these are not mutually exclusive suppositions. Regardless of his relationship with Rodrigo, however, as Juan's secular status increased, so too did his ecclesiastical dignity: from the relatively modest abbacy of Santander in 1217, he attained the bishopric of Osma in the 1220s, and the bishopric of Burgos in 1240.[305]

Much like its author, there are still questions surrounding the composition of the *CLRC*. The abrupt ending of the narrative with the events of 1236, and lack of any later details, make it likely that the text was finished not long after its writing was interrupted. In any case, Juan's death provides a definitive *terminus ante quem* of 1246. Given that it is a significant source for the final books of the *DRH*, however, it must have been completed sometime before Rodrigo finished his history in 1243. The early stages of composition are the subject of more debate, however: O'Callaghan has suggested that

[300] Lomax, p. 208.
[301] Possibly he is the "Iohannes abbas" listed among the clerics accompanying the Archbishop of Toledo, per Juan Francisco Rivera Recio, "Personajes hispanos asistentes en 1215 al IV Concilio de Letrán", *Hispania Sacra*, 4 (1951), pp. 335-355 (p. 350).
[302] "Introduction", in [Juan de Osma], *The Latin Chronicle of the Kings of Castile*, trans. by Joseph F. O'Callaghan (Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002), pp. xix-xlii, p. xxxiii.
[303] Bernard F. Reilly, "Bishop Lucas of Túy and the Latin Chronicle Tradition in Iberia", *Catholic Historical Review*, 93 (2004), pp. 767-88, p. 786.
[304] Peter Linehan, "Juan de Soria: the Chancellor as Chronicler", *e-Spania*, 2 (2006) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.276>, §9.
[305] Lomax, pp. 208-210.

composition began as early as the reign of Alfonso VIII, and that labor on the chronicle was more or less continuous,[306] while Inés Fernández-Ordóñez has argued for a *terminus post quem* in the early 1220s,[307] and refined the hypothesis of progressive composition by proposing three or four separate stages of writing. In her view, which relies on the microstructure provided by changing dating systems, the process of composition stopped and started again at critical moments in Fernando III's reign: after resuming campaigns against the Moors, after becoming king of León, and after the conquest of Córdoba.[308]

The CLRC exists in a single medieval manuscript, a late-fifteenth century copy produced for Lorenzo Galíndez de Carvajal,[309] which lacks the usual prefatory materials and authorial *topoi*, meaning that the circumstances of composition are more mysterious than most of the other chronicles in this study.[310] There is no explicit clue as to the identity of a patron or an intended audience, although the chronicler's proximity to the Castilian court, and especially to the innermost circles of royal power, as well as his staunchly royalist attitude throughout, hints at the prospect of a regal patron and a courtly audience. Whether his work ever reached either, however, is another matter; Francisco J. Hernández[311] and Linehan[312] have both suggested that the *CLRC* as preserved might represent a draft set of annals rather than a completed chronicle as such. Linehan underscores its distinct lack of "influential friends or protectors",[313] for Juan de Soria's history has been overshadowed since its own time by the *DRH* and the *CM*, at least in part because of Jiménez de Rada's wholesale appropriation of its contents.

---

[306] O'Callaghan, "Introduction", p. xxx and p. xxxvi.
[307] Inés Fernández-Ordóñez, "La composición por etapas de la Chronica latina regum Castellae (1223-1237) de Juan de Soria", *e-Spania*, 2 (2006) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.283>, §18.
[308] Fernández-Ordóñez, "Composición por etapas", §22.
[309] Introduccion a la CRLC, Luis Charlo Brea, pp. 15-16
[310] O'Callaghan, "Introduction", p. xxviii, suggests that there was likely an introduction, now lost. Linehan, "Juan de Soria", §3-5.
[311] "La corte de Fernando III y la casa real de Francia: documentos, crónicas, monumentos", in *Fernando III y su tiempo (1201-1252): VIII congreso de estudios medievales* (León: Fundación Sánchez Albornoz, 2003), pp. 103-55, p. 111-12, n. 28.
[312] Linehan, "Juan de Soria", §6-8.
[313] Linehan, "Juan de Soria", §3.

Internal contexts

The *CLRC*, as its most commonly-used name suggests, is composed in Latin. The choice of language might come as something of a surprise, since Juan de Soria was responsible for overseeing a transition to the use of the vernacular as the official language of domestic government during the reign of Fernando III, marking a turning point for the use of vernacular in Castile and laying the foundations for Alfonso X's grand cultural project. Nevertheless, the chancellor followed generic conventions of language use in choosing Latin for the writing of his history,[314] and may have intended to select his audience by doing so, although his Latin does not hint at a love for the literary flourish: it is functional, sprinkled with biblical and classical references that betray an ecclesiastical education, and with turns of phrase that echo the language of the royal chancery.[315]

Despite the choice of language, however, the *CLRC* is not really a "Latin chronicle": it diverges from historiographical tradition of Iberia, based on Isidore of Seville, or single-king narratives like the *Chronica Adefonsi Imperatoris*, focusing instead on a territorial space (Castile) and its rulers.[316] It also, unusually, has no written sources: the account refers to no histories outside of itself, and even when it cannot have been eyewitness testimony of the chronicler himself, the narrative does not appear to bear any relation to other extant accounts of Castilian history, as we have already seen in the case of Urraca.

[314] Gabrielle Spiegel, *Romancing the Past,* p. 66.
[315] Luis Charlo Brea, "Introducción", in *Crónica latina de los reyes de Castilla*, ed. and trans. by Luis Charlo Brea, in *Crónicas Hispanas del Siglo XIII,* pp. 35-37.
[316] Reilly, "Bishop Lucas of Tuy".

In addition to lacking introductory text, the manuscript of the CLRC displays no formal divisions such as chapters or intitulations, and it is only divided occasionally into paragraphs. Although it was partitioned, somewhat arbitrarily, into seventy-five chapters by Georges Cirot when he published the first modern edition in the early twentieth century,[317] and these divisions' utility to readers has ensured their perpetuation by more recent editions, it is essential to avoid reading authorial intent into them. To say that the text lacks formal divisions is, of course, not to suggest that it is unstructured or disorganized; on the contrary, there is a clear overarching structure. Cirot also identified this structure, and divided his sections into three broader units accordingly: first, a brief history of Castile by way of introduction, from Count Fernán González through the ill-fated reign of Sancho III; second, an account of the reign of Alfonso VIII, emphasizing his Reconquest efforts in the final decade of the twelfth century; and finally an account of the reign of Fernando III, culminating in the conquest of Córdoba. The narrative gives the impression of being hastily (un)finished at this point, ending just as *in medias res* as it began: with the death of Lope Díaz de Haro, and Fernando III's arrival in Burgos shortly after, and a brief *explicit*.[318]

The very first sentence of the CLRC manages to encapsulate not only the death of Fernán González and the succession of counts who followed him, all the way down to the legendary assassination of the *infante* García, but also King Rodrigo's defeat and the loss of *Yspanias*, "the Spains". This introduction to the history of Castile and its kings—along with the comment that García "interfectus fuit apud Legionem… per quosdam Legionenses"—establishes both temporal parameters and the nature of Castile's relationship with its neighbors.[319] By eliding the passage of time between the Umayyad invasion of Iberia and the death of Fernán González, three centuries of Asturian and

[317] *Chronique latine des rois de Castille jusqu'en 1236*, ed. by Georges Cirot (Bordeaux: Feret, 1913).
[318] CLRC, §75
[319] CLRC, § 1.

Leonese rule are collapsed into insignificance. Indeed, León is cast as a foreign land, one evidently noteworthy only for harboring murderers. Fernán González, and by extension the kings of Castile who descend from him, is the first rightful ruler of the "populi Christiani" lost to the Muslim invaders by Rodrigo.

The introduction establishes a pattern for the uneven treatment of the two kingdoms throughout the rest of the text, where the preference for Castile over León is matched only by an insistent focus on the recent past. Fernando I's acquisition of Castile and the Leonese throne is dealt with in similarly brief terms, and even Alfonso VI's reign is stripped of all but the essential quasi-legendary elements: the fratricidal contest to reunite his father's three kingdoms, the divinely-inspired reconquest of Toledo, and the problems brought about by his lack of a male heir.[320] The narrative continues apace through the twelfth century, slowing and lingering on dates and details only when it nears the events of Juan de Soria's own lifetime. These comprise the bulk of the text, and the disequilibrium is striking: although the narrative ranges from the late tenth century to the mid-thirteenth, more than ninety percent of the material is dedicated to the period between 1188 and 1236.

Chronology, however, is not a particular concern of the CLRC, at least not in the usual sense. While the narrative follows a broadly chronological sequence of events from the distant past to the more recent, there is no attempt to quantify the past with a systematic notation of years and days. Instead, time is, for the most part, expressed in relative terms; specific dates nearly always refer to the seasons and feast days of the liturgical calendar rather than to the months of the Julian calendar, and the use of these only becomes consistent from the death of Enrique I.[321] Years are expressed much more

[320] "chapter" 2
[321] F. J. Hernández, "La corte de Fernando III", p. 111-12, n. 28.

rarely, but there is no consistent preference for Spanish era or year of the Incarnation.[322] The narrative is instead organized around the supremacy of Castile over León, the progress of pan-European Crusading efforts—of which the Castilian-led Reconquest is presented as an important part—[323]and the development of Crusading kings through the "three ages" of childhood, imperfect and rebellious adolescence, and mature, religious, martial adulthood.[324] Given that the *CLRC* celebrates an especially militaristic form of kingship, then, how does it reconcile this ideal with the realities of a ruling queen?

Berenguela in the Text

Berenguela's first appearance in the *CLRC* is as the heir presumptive to Alfonso VIII's throne, on the occasion of her marriage, aged eight, to Conrad of Swabia, and his subsequent knighting by the king of Castile. The chronicle notes that the king "non habebat filium […], sed filias"[325] at the time, and that any marriage of Alfonso IX of León to one of those daughters would be uncanonical, making the German prince the superior choice of son-in-law. Unstated, but clearly understood, is that Alfonso IX's displacement as his cousin's heir was an added humiliation after being knighted and forced to kiss his cousin's hand in full view of the Castilian court. After this, Berenguela fades to the background once more, as Alfonso IX's festering humiliation turns him into an "enemico cruel" of his cousin, joining forces with the kings of Morocco and Navarre to wage war upon Castile in a "colligatione impietatis".[326]

[322] Fernández-Ordóñez, "Composición por etapas", sees a microstructure in the changing date systems, and uses these to track the progress of composition.
[323] Francisco Bautista, "Escritura cronística e ideología historíca: *la Chronica latina regum Castellae*", *e-Spania*, 2 (2006) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.429>.
[324] Ana Rodríguez López, "Modelos de legitimidad política en la *Chronica regum Castellae* de Juan de Osma", *e-Spania*, 2 (2006) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.433>, §30.
[325] CLRC, §11.
[326] CLRC, §14.

Despite acknowledging it as the only means of ending the conflict, the chronicler nevertheless declares that Berenguela's marriage to Alfonso IX of León could only be a "matrimonio de facto quia de iure non poterat cum ipsi reges attinerent sibi in secundo gradu consanguinitatis,"[327] expressing the same concern with canon law that he wielded against Urraca's marriage to Alfonso of Aragón, albeit in milder terms (*de facto*) than other similarly illegal unions (for which *contubernio* and *incesto* are used). The resulting peace is directly tied to the precarious nature of the marriage, for discord besets the two kingdoms once more, and the CLRC is clear that the "[c]ausa uero discordie" between the kings of Castile and León is that "idem rex Legionis dimiserat filiam regis Castelle, reginam scilicet dominam Berengariam."[328]

In this account Alfonso IX is, via his repudiation of Berenguela, made individually responsible for the breakdown in relations at the personal and national level. There is extensive evidence of papal correspondence proving that the couple were only forced apart by years of pressure from Rome,[329] so this attribution of blame seems intended to reinforce the representation of Alfonso IX as irrational and quarrelsome, and the Castilian kings as well-intentioned, innocent victims of a reckless king. It also makes Berenguela an entirely passive actor in both the marriage and its dissolution; while she may well have played a passive role at the start of their union, there is much evidence to prove that she was an active political player by the end of it.[330] The charge of repudiation also offers a convenient and wholly defensible pretext for Alfonso VIII's renewed conflict with the king of León. The CLRC is even careful to note that Berenguela had fulfilled *her* portion of the marriage arrangement, producing two sons and two daughters

[327] CLRC, §15.
[328] CLRC, §17.
[329] Bianchini, *The Queen's Hand*, pp. 69-77.
[330] *Ibid.*, pp. 72-73.

for her husband (though the question of their illegitimacy is avoided),[331] and was therefore even more defenseless and in need of paternal protection.

Alfonso VIII's conquests and failures against the Moors take precedence in the narrative, and Berenguela only re-emerges into public events with the death of her brother the *infante* Fernando. With her ageing father incapacitated by the loss of his "perfect" heir, and her mother in a similarly distraught state—a grief-stricken Leonor attempts to climb into the *infante*'s death-bed in an attempt to revive him, or die trying—Berenguela becomes responsible for one of the ritual functions of queenship in her mother's place: public mourning. Accompanied by the Archbishop of Toledo, she witnesses the burial at Las Huelgas de Burgos and represents the royal family in presiding over mass public mourning, before returning to the king's side.[332] This is described in neutral terms; the praise and laments are reserved for the *infante* himself, and Berenguela again fades from view as the narrative reaches its first structural climax in the triumphant account of divinely-aided Castilian victory at Las Navas de Tolosa.

The CLRC next finds Berenguela at her father's deathbed, second among the mourners who transport the king's body to Las Huelgas: "uxor regis et filia, archiepiscopus Toletanus et episcopus Palentinus et alii nobiles".[333] This re-centering of Berenguela alongside her mother at the end of her father's life allows for a smooth transition from one queen-regent to another: the dying Leonor "comendauit filim suum regem Enricum et regnum filie sue regine domine Berengarie", using her own authority as mother of the king to legitimize her daughter's regency.[334] Leonor's own legitimacy as regent derived, of course, from her marriage to the old king and maternal relationship to the new king, but also from the personal virtues which have already been extolled by the

[331] CLRC, §17.
[332] CLRC, §20.
[333] CLRC, §28.
[334] CLRC, §31.

chronicler (she is "nobilissimam moribus et genere, pudicam et ualde prudentem",[335] that is, the very essence of the ideal medieval queen)[336]. These qualities are, along with the regency, extended to Berenguela as well.

With the aid of Archbishop Rodrigo of Toledo and Bishop Tello of Palencia, Berenguela undertakes the regency, becoming responsible for both the physical custody of the king—"fratrem suum Henricum habuit in tutela sua"—and the actual government of the realm in his stead ("curam regni"). The CLRC is careful to note the short-lived nature of this arrangement—"tres menses uel paulo plus"—and equally eager to place the blame on "[m]agnates autem quidam, indignati", highlighting their emotional response to Berenguela's rule without specifying the cause of their indignation, a strategy which minimizes any underlying explanations for their behaviour while foregrounding their dishonest actions.[337] Given this careful concealment, it would seem the cause of the indignation is something the chronicler perceives as a viable threat to her legitimacy in the face of noble opposition: her sex.

The aims of these nobles, on the other hand, are laid bare: they wish to "rege puero subducto de potestate et cura sororis et prelatorum", so that they may "dominarentur in regno pro sua uoluntate"; the chronicler is equally frank and disapproving of the dishonest means by which they plan to achieve them ("machinari et quedam inuenire figmenta").[338] These machinations, implicitly, create noble consensus to coalesce around Álvaro Núñez de Lara as the king's guardian and governor of the realm, and Berenguela's efforts to resist them are foregrounded: she is "[i]nducta", obliged, forced, to surrender the custody of king and kingdom. Nevertheless, some concessions are made

[335] CLRC, §17.
[336] Laynesmith, *Last Medieval Queens*, pp. 30-50.
[337] CLRC, §31.
[338] CLRC, §31.

to her authority, and the CLRC is careful to note all the agreed-upon limits of noble authority: Álvaro Núñez swears that he will take no action on "omnibus arduis et maioribus negociis" without the queen's "consilium et uoluntas", even doing homage ("fecit omagium domine regine") and ritually acknowledging her superior status and declaring his obedience to her personally, above and beyond his obligations as the king's *natural*.[339]

In this brief passage, the chancellor underscores the queen's legitimate authority—substantial enough that even the most powerful nobles in the realm could not avoid at least a *show* of deference, whatever their intentions—and the rightness of her cause. But he also foreshadows the deceit and treachery of the high nobility: not only does Álvaro Núñez break his own promises to consult with the queen, he breaks a formal oath of homage—an oath of submission, to a single lord—as well. It stands as an assessment of the values (or rather, lack thereof) which will define the new regency. The treacherous nobility quickly fulfill Juan's predictions, bringing Castile to a state of "dissensio et discordia" never before seen, as the Núñez de Lara brothers incite war among their fellows and enrich themselves at great cost to the kingdom.[340] Álvaro Núñez's personal immorality is also highlighted by his encouragement of an incestuous marriage between Enrique and Mafalda of Portugal; the blame is placed squarely on the count, and is cemented by the detail of Álvaro's subsequent attempt to marry Mafalda himself, despite her youth, rank, and preference for the convent.

In elaborating the fullest representation of Álvaro Núñez's wickedness, the CLRC flirts with fiction and intrigue, revealing a plot designed to sow mistrust between Enrique and his sister, corrupting her concern into the threat of assassination. By sending a false letter to the king, warning that Berenguela is conspiring to kill him, the usurpers are

[339] CLRC, §31.
[340] CLRC, §32.

finally able to cement their hold over Enrique, who had previously remained loyal to his sister, and to "denigrare famam domine regine et nobilium" who supported her.[341] The language deployed by the chancellor emphasizes the fundamentally evil nature of the Laras and their co-conspirators: the plot is a "diabolicum commentum" and "machinatione diabolica", the letter is a "maledictam cartam", and the whole thing has been propagated by "satellites quidam Sathane fraudulenti".[342] Berenguela's innocence, on the other hand, is supported with a comparison of the queen to the biblical Susanna, falsely accused and blackmailed by lecherous elders,[343] a choice of referents which simultaneously highlights the queen's sex, her innocence, and her powerlessness against more powerful accusers, as well as the ultimate righteousness of her cause.

Even in this, the queen's moment of greatest weakness, the chronicler ensures that Berenguela is surrounded by reminders of her legitimacy, both in terms of people and of places. He decries that the daughter of a king should be made to flee from the security of her father's own monastery, Las Huelgas, by the noble disrespect for the dynastic line. On the other end of her refuge in Autillo, Gonzalo Ruiz Girón and the queen's other loyalists are all men who had served Alfonso VIII faithfully, including at Las Navas, and they place her in a network of external links to her father. (It is interesting to note that these nobles are not identified until they have separated from Álvaro's faction, suggesting a clear interest in presenting them only as loyal to Berenguela and her father, and concealing their association with the Laras.) The CLRC also shows Berenguela and her supporters as "in tanta angustia constituti ut quid agerent ignorarent" when faced with the possibility of committing treason, contrasting their refusal to attack Enrique's forces with Álvaro Núñez's eager and wanton waging of war against the very kingdom he purports to be ruling.[344]

[341] CLRC, §32.
[342] CLRC, §32.
[343] Daniel 13.
[344] CLRC, §32.

The account of Enrique's death also highlights the duplicity of the nobles, and especially of Álvaro Núñez: by keeping the king's death hidden, and then secreting his body away in Tariego, we are invited to read nefarious intentions, even deliberate action to usurp more power or to retain it for as long as possible since, unlike Berenguela, Álvaro's authority derived entirely from custody of the living king. The queen, despite the secrecy, learns the news before it is made public—precisely how, Juan does not reveal—but once again the role of chief mourner precedes her return to power: this time, she is the sole representative of the royal family, accompanied as ever by clergymen, as she buries her brother at Las Huelgas.[345] This function of the queen as custodian of dynastic memory reinforces her legitimacy and primes her another moment of crisis: her own succession to the throne.

The queen receives the news of her brother's death having shifted her attentions to the question of succession already. It is stated explicitly that Berenguela's aim, from the outset, is to ensure that the Castilian throne passes to her son: in sending for Fernando, "habens <in> proposito, quod uere comparuit ex post facto, dare ipsi filio maiori regnum patris sui".[346] Her right to the kingdom, which "ad ipsam reginam pertinebat", is established on several grounds: firstly, because she is the eldest of the old king's daughters, and no male heirs remain; secondly, because it was the express will of the glorious king, "per quandam cartam", prepared at the "curia" celebrated in Carrión (almost certainly a reference to the 1188 gathering which had grown into a point of contention between the Alfonsos), sealed by the king's lead seal, and fortuitously discovered in the archives at Burgos. The defense of her rights is thus two-fold, based on both tradition and on law, but it is noteworthy that both are listed *after* her intention to give the kingdom to Fernando: this framing centers Fernando's eventual accession

[345] CLRC, §37.
[346] CLRC, §33.

even as it acknowledges Berenguela's irrefutable rights to the Castilian throne, and creates the impression that her claim to authority is first and foremost legitimized by her refusal to exercise it.

Berenguela, now established as the holder of rightful authority and its conduit to her son, is also shown to be engaged in efforts at pacification and consensus, and unjustly treated by her enemies and those who have been persuaded by them. She fails to reach a peace agreement with Álvaro Núñez and his followers, and the towns of Castilian Extremadura refuse to receive her, sending the queen and her nobles back to the safety of Valladolid.[347] The treatment of her authority is somewhat ambivalent, and the conclusion of these events is foreordained: when Álvaro Núñez convinces Alfonso IX to invade Castile and sieze the throne for himself, before the *curia* is called at Valladolid, the CLRC declares that "Castella uero tunc regem habebat, scilicet dominum Fernandum, filium domine Berengarie."[348] The structure of the account foregrounds the inevitability of Fernando's accession to the throne, and insists on his natural rights, which transcend his mother's claims even as they depend on them. Fernando, for the chronicler, is already king; he becomes king at the moment of his uncle's death and his mother's desire, as the result of divine ordination. The nearly-miraculous consensus among the quarrelsome nobility, which will reunite the kingdom at Valladolid, is the result of God's desire to provide Castile with "proprii regis solatio" and to punish Alfonso IX's arrogance. Juan makes no comment on the revelation that divine will and that of the queen are indistinguishable.

The sheer size of the crowds that gather at Valladolid in response to the queen's summons confirms her legitimate authority to call them. By unanimous consent, given

[347] CLRC, §33-34.
[348] CLRC, §35.

voice by "ex persona populorum", they acknowledge Berenguela's *de jure* rights to the kingdom and to recognize her as "dominam et reginam regni Castelle". But in the same breath, this *vox populi* pleads with her to give her rightful property to her son Fernando, because "cum ipsa femina esset, labores regiminis regni tolerare non posset", resorting to an argument of biology and natural inability based on sex.[349] The queen does not defend her right to rule, for as we already know, the goals are the same; by relying on popular consent that ostensibly denies her ability, she achieves the very thing she "ardenti desiderio concupierat". It is an interesting scene full of contradictions: the queen holding court, full of *naturales* summoned there by her authority, her rights acknowledged in full, and yet those same subjects denying the fullness of the authority which she is *already exercising*.

Juan de Osma is not expressing a new or unusual view; that women were by nature incapable of rule was a widely-held belief in the Middle Ages (and beyond), but he is the only chronicler among his contemporaries to make this assertion regarding Berenguela. All of the CLRC's enumeration of Berenguela's various legitimate claims to the throne has been deployed to one end: the transferral of those rights to her son Fernando, and the consolidation of his legitimacy as king. In the end, her legal right, expressed in her father's own written wishes, is what makes it possible for her to dictate her successor, while simultaneously rejecting her father's preferences. In this one paradoxical moment, Berenguela contains the totality of royal authority in Castile, unable to access it except for the purposes of transmitting it.

Once she has passed her rights to her son, however, Berenguela is frequently represented as an active presence at Fernando's side in the process of consolidating his hold on Castile. She even appears in a quasi-militaristic capacity, and is especially

[349] CLRC, §35.

important for the link to the "vassalli sui" who fight to capture the castle of Muño on Fernando's behalf (that they are still called *her* vassals suggests that she retains no small authority of her own). Their combined forces join together in the divinely-aided "quasi miraculose" liberation of Burgos, and her wealth is a significant factor in Fernando's success; she sacrifices "quicquid auri et argenti reliquerat ei pater suus in fine uite sue"[350] to pay the soldiers in Fernando's army, invoking a motif of self-sacrificing queenly poverty that will recur in later chronicles.

Although Álvaro Núñez becomes one of the king's enemies as Fernando begins to rule Castile, the count nevertheless continues to be identified explicitly as an enemy of the queen—"domina regina inimicum suum capitalem"[351]— and divine will is instrumental in his dramatic downfall, a "uindictam cunctis seculis admirabilem". A thwarted attempt to spy on the royal party as it passes by the Lara stronghold of Ferreruela is the beginning of a disgraceful end for the leader of the noble rebellion: "de equo precipitauerunt eum in lutum - tunc enim pluerat - et sic inuolutum ceno captiuum ante dominam reginam adduxerunt."[352] Captured while fleeing, pulled from his horse into mud and muck—because, the chronicler notes drily, it had been raining that day—the once-powerful count is quite literally brought low, and presented in a state of resplendent shabbiness before the queen. Every element of this tale is engineered to maximize the humiliation of the count, but the fact that he is brought before Berenguela and not her son is, perhaps, the most humiliating of all.

Berenguela is the undisputed figure of authority in this scene: God supports her cause (which is implicitly also Fernando's), and the narrative revels in the details of the count's humiliation, orchestrated from on high. Although the queen is, by virtue of her

[350] CLRC, §37.
[351] CLRC, §38.
[352] CLRC, §38.

sex, considered unable to administer the kingdom, she is nevertheless permitted to enact vengeance upon a traitor; Álvaro's capture becomes a sort of queen's justice that, while less violent than the king's justice, is no less effective. In fact, it may even be more effective, given that the ensuing negotiations between queen and count result in the exile of not one, but two, of the leaders of the noble resistance to Fernando's cause, as Fernando Núñez de Lara becomes part of the bargain.[353] By simultaneously enacting justice in the form of territorial negotiations, and shielding the count from the potential violence of the king's justice, Berenguela's intervention adds an extra layer of humiliation as he must rely on her for protection even as she seals his defeat.

The counts of Lara thus dispatched, the CLRC says, the kingdom of Castile was, to the surprise of many, returned to a peaceful state within six months: "diuina id agente misericordia, infra sex menses turbatio regni Castelle, que a quibusdam sperabatur perpetua, resedit, et rex cum matre sua cepit in cunctis partibus regni sui regis officia exercere."[354] This is evidently a turning point in Fernando's reign: the "cepit […] regis officia exercere" implies that until this point, Fernando has not been able to carry out the duties of a king, but the CLRC's specification of "rex cum matre sua" nevertheless implicates Berenguela explicitly as a joint ruler alongside her son. Certainly, she is said to carry out many of the same functions as before: accompanying the king's army to put down yet another Lara-lead rebellion in Medina de Rioseco,[355] and bringing her vassals along to besiege the castle of Molina when Gonzalo Pérez acts against the king;[356] negotiating a peace between the king and Álvar Pérez de Castro, and between the king and Lope Díaz de Haro when they, too, revolt against Fernando in León.[357] (In these

[353] CLRC, §38.
[354] CLRC, §38.
[355] CLRC, §39.
[356] CLRC, §42.
[357] CLRC, §66.

latter cases, she is even assisted in her negotiations by Queen Beatriz, while Fernando is limited to "confirmante filio matris factum", signing off as a formality.)

Marital politics, too, provide the venue to celebrate the queen's skills and virtues: when seeking a wife for Fernando, the main concern is first and foremost "honorem filii modis omnibus procurare", which is achieved by selecting a bride of impeccable Christian imperial lineage. Berenguela is shown to be the instigator and principal Castilian actor in the marital negotiations, and personally responsible for escorting the princess through her kingdom in the weeks leading up to the wedding. The Cortes celebrated in Burgos after the wedding, too, present the elder queen as the centre of her own bustling court of noble ladies, also in attendance: "omnes nobiliores domine tam religiose quam seculares quotquot erant in regno Castelle."[358] The same can be seen in the CLRC's account of John of Brienne's marriage to Fernando's youngest sister, Berenguela of León, but here the chancellor reveals a more openly political strategy underlying the queen's concern with her son's "honour":

> "Regina uero domina Berengaria, precauens in futurum, et, tanquam prudens femina preuidens impedimentum quod dictus rex Iherosolimitanus posset afferre filio suo, regi domino Fernando, in iure quod habebat in regno Legionense, si predictus rex contraheret matrimonium cum altera filiarum regis Legionensis, quas suceperat ex regina domina Therasia, et si remaneret in ipso regno, preelegit dare dicto regi filiam suam, Berengariam nomine, in uxorem."[359]

The chronicler lays out, in painstaking detail, the level of the queen's foresight, and her concern not with his right to Castile, but with the defense of possible future claims to the throne of León, and the hypothetical of defending such claims against one of his elder sisters if she were married to a king who might reasonably gather support in León. By persuading the king of Jerusalem to marry her own daughter instead, Berenguela resolves matters in her son's best interests, simultaneously avoiding a potential obstacle

[358] CLRC, §40.
[359] CLRC, §42.

to his own claims and extending Castile's ties further east into the Crusader kingdoms and, as a bonus, thwarting the plans of Alfonso IX, now her principal rival.

Fernando III's decision, presented at the 1224 Cortes in Burgos, to break longstanding truces with Muslim rulers in Andalusia is, however, the real turning point in the mother-son relationship, and the scene is set in such a way that the symbolism is clear. The named magnates—Lope Díaz, Gonzalo Ruiz, Alfonso Tellez, and Rodrigo Ruiz—are identifiable as longstanding supporters of Berenguela and Alfonso VIII, creating the impression that the king is outnumbered by supporters whose loyalty to him is dependent on their loyalty to his mother. This perception is corroborated by the manner in which Fernando makes his speech—the only instance of direct speech in the CLRC—to queen and court. Despite the divine inspiration which has "inflamed" his spirit, he nevertheless appeals to his mother and her nobles "humiliter et deuote tanquam filius obediencie", and he takes a supplicating tone, enumerating her virtues and actions on his behalf, before pleading his own case. "Supplico, clementissima genetrix," the king begs, permission to take up a war against the Moors,[360] so that he might see "flos mee iuuentutis euanescit sine fructu" in a court environment carefully constructed by his mother, at the helm of a kingdom at peace and with nothing productive or honorable to do with his time.

The assembled magnates are taken aback, but Berenguela remains in complete control, advising (or perhaps ordering) the king to seek the counsel of the assembled nobility: "[a]stant uassalli uestri, curia interest, ipsi consulant nobis sicut tenentur et consilium eorum sequimini in hoc facto."[361] Despite her own words, the queen is the one to perform the motions of consensus-seeking, whilst banishing him from her council with the magnates at their request. In reporting the negotiations, Juan de Osma paints the

[360] CLRC, §43.
[361] CLRC, §44.

portrait of a king who is still very much a junior partner in the ruling coalition, and offers a view of the court where the king remained alienated from the real power of government, despite the earlier claim that he had begun to "exercise the office of king". There is an implicit rebuke of Berenguela's stranglehold on her son and on power in the image of a fully-grown king pleading with his mother, who has effectively usurped all the functions of kingship, in order to execute the fundamental duties of kingship. The desire to undertake a serious, religiously-grounded war, however, confirms the king's maturation. The metamorphosis of Fernando III from boy-king to warrior-king, captured in this scene, is arguably one of the climactic points of Juan de Soria's narrative, just as much as Las Navas de Tolosa or the conquest of Córdoba.

Although Berenguela accompanies Fernando to Carrión in the aftermath of this *curia* at Muño, as he makes preparations for war, the efforts against the Moors allow the king to fully emerge into the foreground of the narrative and finally eclipse his mother. From this point, she is mentioned infrequently, and mostly serves as what Georges Martin has termed a "puerto afectivo"[362], a symbolic home to which the warrior-king returns after a long campaign. She is joined in this capacity by Queen Beatriz; at least four times the CLRC describes Fernando as returning from some conquest "ad matrem et uxorem suam", usually in Toledo.[363] There are hints in the text of a more enduring role for the queen-mother in her son's government, as when "prudentis matris consilium secutus", the king is able to capture the castle of Capilla by virtue of persistence[364], but this is the only such indication of her involvement in military matters.

When Alfonso IX of León dies, leaving his throne to the *infantas* Sancha and Dulce, Berenguela briefly becomes an important political actor again. Fernando must hurry

[362] Georges Martin, "Reinar sin reinar"
[363] CLRC §§ *47. 50. 67. 74.*
[364] §50, lines 7-11

back from his frontier campaigning to consolidate power in León, before his half-sisters can establish their claims instead. It is the queen, once again in the company of the archbishop and her magnates, who counsels her son to make haste towards the north, and it is her *arras* towns which first receive him as king.[365] But even at this critical moment for the succession, Berenguela's place in the action is no longer one of military strategist or noble liaison: instead, she, along with Teresa of Portugal, mediates between the claimants. The *topos* of queen-as-mediator is exploited to its fullest, with the two queens quickly reaching an agreement that will guarantee "pace et concordia inter regem et sorores".[366] The speed with which Fernando is said to consolidate his authority in León, however, is due to the "disponente Deo, in cuius manu regnum hominum est". The divine favour once enjoyed by the ruling queen has now definitively shifted to her son.

There are other moments of political activity after the events of 1230-31, but they confirm an image of the queen at a remove from the center of power, and primarily concerned with domestic matters. She appears among the advisors counselling Fernando after a rebellion by Lope Díaz de Haro, and, along with Queen Beatriz, plays a critical role in resolving conflict between the king and Alvar Pérez de Castro. She returns to the familiar role of mediator between king and nobility, and as a mentor to her daughter-in-law: they are now both described as "prudentes domine", both possessing the same gift of foresight, working to avert the certain disaster of Alvar Pérez joining forces with Ibn Hud, whose power was growing throughout Andalusia, against the king.[367]

Berenguela's role in the conquest of Córdoba encapsulates the CLRC's deeply ambivalent attitude towards the queen. After the king's decision to attack is determined, in a passage loaded with the language of divine inspiration and the image of the king as

[365] CLRC §60
[366] §61
[367] §65-66

a providential figure, a "miles Christi fortissimus" overcoming human and natural factors to fulfill the will of God, the chronicler says that Fernando "matrem, que tunc erat apud Legionem, de longe salutauit per nuncium, qui nunciaret ei fideliter ea que acciderant et firmum propositum filii, quod nulla ratione poterat inmutari."[368] Finally, a complete inversion is reached in the relationship between mother and son. The king *tells* his mother. He does not ask permission, much less feel any inclination to plead; he asserts his judgment and declares his mind to be set. The unstated, of course, is the assumption that his mother would attempt to persuade him otherwise, even at the age of thirty-five; Juan de Osma seems to inadvertently reveal exactly what his narrative has been designed to obscure. Instead, Berenguela is represented as a potential obstacle to Fernando's capture of Cordoba, her spectre casting a shadow from afar. In the end, her role becomes a purely logistical one, providing the chancellor with the necessary "largiendis stipendiis militibus, qui eum sequi dicebant".[369]

The CLRC does allow the possibility of a more active, explicit government on the part of a queen-mother. Describing noble rebellions in France against the minor Louis IX, he says that:

> "sperantes regis puericiam et sexum femineum nil magnum aggredi posse, siquidem dicto Lodouico regi successit filius Lodouicus, puer tenellus ferme XII annorum, cuius pueri et regni mater, regina scilicet domina Blanca, gloriosi domini Aldefonsi regis Castelle filia, curam suscepit et, tanquam prudens femina, regnum Francorum diu tenuit atque rexit."[370]

The parallels here between Blanche and Berenguela, and their sons, can only be deliberate. *Prudentia* is the virtue ascribed to both queens, and they both channel the virtues of their father to their sons, but Blanche is explicitly granted the rulership of France: "as a prudent woman, she held and governed the kingdom of the Franks for a

[368] §70, lines 20-25
[369] §70, lines 31-33
[370] CLRC §52, lines 4-9

long time". In fact, Blanche also governed her son's kingdom as regent until he was well past the age of majority; like Fernando, Louis IX did not begin to rule in earnest until he was more than twenty, and his mother played a significant role in the government of the kingdom even after that.[371] But Blanche's brief appearance reveals none of the tension of her sister's in the CLRC. Of course, she was easier to idealise: she was far away, and not meddling in the king's (and likely the chancellor's) government of Castile.

The CLRC's representation of Berenguela suggests that ruling queenship is a permissible if undesirable state of affairs when the situation necessitates it—and for Juan de Osma at least, the inferior leadership of a woman is clearly preferable to a regency guided by the whims of the greedy, immoral, and self-serving nobility—but that no queen, regardless of skill or experience, should ever displace a fully adult male king. More importantly, because the chancellor defines kingship throughout his history as shaped by war, there is no clear place for a ruling queen away from the "home front" when the crusading ideal requires precisely the opposite. The most she can do is not stand in the way.

Chronicon mundi

External contexts

The prologue of the *Chronicon mundi* identifies its author as "Luce indigno diachono".[372] Although no Lucas appears among the canons listed in the archives of San Isidoro de León, he has nevertheless been identified as a canon and deacon of the royal monastery there. (Patrick Henriet suggests he may be the *Dompnus Lucas* who witnessed

[371] Shadis, Berenguela, p. 17-18.
[372] CM, Praefatio, p. 10, lines 148-49.

a document confirming the sale of a windmill in 1225.[373]) He was later to become bishop of Tuy in 1239, a position he would hold until his death in 1249. Aside from the CM, Lucas is also known to be the author of several other works associated with San Isidoro de León, including the hagiographic *De miraculis Sancti Isidori*, and the *De altera vita*, an apologetic against an unspecified heresy apparently sweeping through León.

There are few certainties regarding Lucas of Tuy before he ascended to the bishopric, however. He has long been considered a native of León, on the basis of the strongly pro-Leonese attitudes espoused in his chronicle, and the identification of his works with the monastery, but Peter Linehan has questioned this assumption, suggesting instead that he may have been a foreign cleric, perhaps Italian,[374] drawn to León by its expansion as a place of learning and pilgrimage. This does not conflict with, but may be confirmed by, the extensive travels claimed in his writings—a pilgrimage to Jerusalem via Greece and Constantinople; time spent in Paris as a youth; a visit to Rome around the year 1230[375]—but might explain his apparent lack of connections outside of León and San Isidoro. Bernard Reilly posits him as "something of a protégé to Queen Berenguela",[376] and even as one of Archbishop Rodrigo's men,[377] but the evidence for this is mostly circumstantial: Lucas declares in his prologue that the queen has commissioned the CM, and certainly his appointment to the bishopric of Tuy came around the time he is thought to have completed his history. But his see was small, poor, and on the furthest edge of Galicia; it was hardly an extravagant reward for his labors.[378]

[373] Patrick Henriet, "*Sanctissima patria*. Points et thèmes communs aux trois œuvres de Lucas de Tuy", *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*, 24 (2001), pp. 249-278 <doi: 10.3406/cehm.2001.1179> (p. 251).
[374] Linehan, "Dates and doubts" (2001), pp. 204-05.
[375] Emma Falque, "Introducción", in CM, p. viii.
[376] Reilly, "Bishop Lucas of Túy", p. 767.
[377] Reilly, "Bishop Lucas of Túy", p. 787.
[378] Falque, "Introducción". pp. x-xi.

These labors were certainly completed sometime after 1236, since the CM concludes its narrative with the conquest of Córdoba.[379] Given the heavy reliance of the DRH on Lucas's chronicle for both form and content, the CM must also have been finished well before Rodrigo's chronicle in 1243; Enrique Jerez argues that the manuscript tradition supports a date of completion in 1238 or even the latter part of the preceding year.[380] Identifying an initial date for the commission is more complicated; it need not have been after the fall of Córdoba, and may well have been intended to support Fernando III's claims to León after the reunion of the two kingdoms in 1230.

Twice in his prefaces, Lucas declares that his history has been written to "fideliter satisfacere"[381] the "preceptis gloriosissime ac prudentissime Yspaniarum regine domine Berengarie", and that his aim is to chronicle the "sapienter et clementer" princes who ruled Spain with their "preclaro gotico sanguine".[382] This praise corresponds to his treatment of Berenguela in the chronicle, and also explicitly reveals the neo-Gothic foundations underlying his history of the world. The acknowledgment of the queen as his patroness, however, raises interesting questions about the intended audience of the CM. We know that Berenguela was the patroness of the work, but it is unlikely she intended it solely for her own edification, especially given the prologue's concern with the didactic uses of history. It is a history of kings, firmly rooted in the Iberian historiographical tradition, and one which excludes the nobility almost entirely from its vision of the past, and implying a relatively limited reception among royalty. Manuel Barbosa's suggestion that the CM was originally intended for the education of the *infante* Alfonso—that is, the future Alfonso X—is both intriguing and more plausible than a

[379] CM, Book IV, ch. 101.
[380] Enrique Jerez, "El Tudense en su siglo: transmisión y recepción del *Chronicon Mundi* en el Doscientos," in *El relato historiográfico: Textos y tradiciones en la Espana medieval,* ed. by Francisco Bautista (London: Dept. of Hispanic Studies, Queen Mary, University of London, 2006), pp. 19-57 (pp. 32-35).
[381] CM, Praefatio, p. 10, lines 143-47
[382] CM, Praefatio, p. 5. lines 47-54.

further contribution to Fernando III's learning,[383] despite the CM's own representation of Berenguela as her son's perpetual teacher.

Internal contexts

The CM is written in Latin, and both its language and sources place it firmly in a rich historiographical tradition based on the model of Isidore of Seville, as well as later peninsular Latin chronicles from León and Castile like the *Chronica Adefonsi Imperatoris* and the *Historia Silense.*[384] Over the course of three books—the division of the third book into Books III and IV came later—[385]it traces the history of the world, with a Hispano-Gothic focus, from Genesis to the conquest of Córdoba in 1236, and deliberately crafting a narrative of continuity between the Gothic kings from Sisenando in the seventh century through the rulers of Asturias, León, and Castile. Despite, or perhaps because of, the vast sweep of history, the CM takes a rigorously chronological approach to organization. Years are referred to very frequently, and regnal years especially are used to mark the regular passage of time time, although these are not syncronized across realms; Spanish Era is also employed at the beginning of reigns, to provide an external reference for each ruler, but again the system of dates is purely Hispanic.[386]

The use of reigns and regnal years as the principal organizing devices reinforces the impression that Lucas's history is primarily a history of kings,[387] and this is especially

[383] Manuel Barbosa, "A Funcionalidade Profética (ou Intenção Pedagógica) do Chronicon Mundi de Lucas de Tui", in *Literatura Medieval: Actas do IV Congresso da Associação Hispânica de Literatura Medieval (Lisboa, 1-5 Outubro 1991)*, ed. by Aires A Nascimento & Cristina Almeida Ribeiro (Lisbon: Cosmos, 1993), pp. 307-11 (p. 308).
[384] Falque, "Introducción", pp. xxxiii-cv, provides a thorough overview of the sources. See also Bernard F. Reilly, "Sources of the Fourth Book of Lucas of Tuy's *Chronicon Mundi*", *Classical Folia*, 30 (1976), pp. 127-137.
[385] Inés Fernández-Ordóñez, "La técnica historiográfica del Toledano. Procedimientos de organización del relato", *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*, 26 (2003), pp. 187-221 (p. 190).
[386] Enrique Jerez Cabrero, *El* Chronicon Mundi *de Lucas de Tuy (C. 1238): técnicas compositivas y motivaciones ideológicas* (Madrid, 2006) (doctoral dissertation), pp. 167-68.
[387] Reilly, "Bishop Lucas of Túy", pp. 772.

true throughout the more recent history in the CM. Despite accusations of favouritism towards León and the kings of León, this is clearly not in evidence in the later reigns, where, as Reilly has noted, more textual space is devoted to Castile, and significantly more attention is given to Alfonso VIII than to Alfonso IX.[388] Although much has been said about Lucas, Rodrigo, and the fight for primacy in an ever-expanding kingdom,[389] it is also true that Lucas is greatly concerned with matters of the church, much more than either of his contemporaries, and he often recounts events of clerical interest, or which glorify the church in some fashion.[390]

Berenguela in the Text

Of the three Latin chroniclers, Lucas provides the sparsest portrait of Berenguela. She appears at the beginning of her father's reign, among the standard enumeration of the king's wife and children: "[f]iliam suam promogenitam Berengariam dedit Adefonso regi Legionensi in uxorem, que fuit mulier prudentissima".[391] Berenguela is presented from the outset with the label of "primogenitam", stressing her pre-eminence among the king's daughters, and also with the qualification that she was a "mulier prudentissima" — she is legitimate, first-born, and virtuous. In contrast, the *infante* Fernando and the future Enrique I are merely named, with no further explanation, not even a mention of Enrique's brief reign. Berenguela's marriage to Conrad has also been entirely excised from the narrative, perhaps on account of its failure or the chronicler's lack of interest in foreign connections.

The circumstances surrounding her second marriage, on the other hand, are described in vivid terms. The kings of Castile and León fight "quasi duo ferocissimi

[388] Reilly, "Bishop Lucas of Túy", p. 787.
[389] Linehan, *History and the Historians*, pp. 339-406. Reilly, "Bishop Lucas of Túy", pp. 781-83.
[390] Enrique Jerez Cabrero, thesis 2006, pp. 186-90.
[391] CM, Book IV, ch. 83, lines 9-11

leones",[392] both refusing to cede their ground, and the magnitude of their conflict is so great that it prompts a miraculous intervention: an image of the Virgin and Child, held in the church of San Esteban near León, begins to emit blood, causing "orrore et admiratione" among the populace. A divine warning is quickly discerned in the bleeding statue, a sure omen for the fate of Spain if war continues between the two kings.[393] The solution is for Alfonso IX to bequeath his new wife ("que tunc degebat cum patre suo in Castella") several strategically important castles in the Tierra de Campos as means of restoring peace after the "multas strages et dampna",[394] healing both Spain's metaphorical and the Virgin's literal wounds.

However, this episode of the bleeding Virgin also demonstrates a clear case of the chronicler getting ahead of himself, for in the next passage, we return to the beginning of Alfonso IX's reign in León, and revisit the separation from his first wife, Teresa of Portugal, enforced "ex sentencia domini Pape Innocencii". It is the second account of Berenguela's marriage to Alfonso IX which reveals her substantial, strategically important dowry of "turres Legionis, Astoricam, Valenciam et alia triginta castella"[395] which are given over to Castilian magnates for security.

In detailing the outcome of the marriage, Lucas also remarks that "[f]uit prefata Berengaria filia regis Castelle adeo sapientissima, quod patris sapiencia ad eam defluxisse uideretur."[396] Berenguela is not, interestingly, identified as a queen here: she is "the daughter of the king of Castile", placing the emphasis on her natal family and lineage rather than her marital one. Her wisdom—here, the more masculine *sapientia*, rather than the feminine *prudentia*, with which she has previously been described—is

[392] CM, Book IV, ch. 84, lines 6-7
[393] CM, Book IV, ch. 84, lines 9-20
[394] CM, Book IV, ch. 84, lines 35-43.
[395] CM, Book IV, ch. 85, lines 13-18
[396] CM, Book IV, ch. 85, lines 26-27.

furthermore so great that it seemed to flow directly from her father. This allows her to possess a masculine quality, but in addition to connecting the queen with her father's legacy, it avoids the suggestion that Berenguela herself is deliberately transcending her gender; rather, she serves as a conduit for an excess of paternal virtue.

Alfonso IX is praised for fighting Moors and granting *fueros* to the cities of León, but it is Berenguela's actions—the first evidence of her acting with agency—during their marriage which attract Lucas's highest praise: "[h]edificauit regina Berengaria palacium regale in Legione ex lapidibus et calce iuxta monasterium sancti Ysidori et turres Legionis, quas rex barbarus quondam destruxerat Almazor, ex calce et lapidibus similter restaurauit."[397] The construction of a royal palace next to the monastery literally brings the monarchy and the Church closer together, with the implication that the queen's driving factor was piety, rather than a desire to keep the center of ecclesiastical power in León under royal control. Similarly, repairing Almanzor's damage to Leonese fortifications evidences an interest in military matters, but it is framed in religious language and invocations of the dangers of barbarism and impiety. But this is merely the beginning of the queen's pious generosity and devotion to the Church:

> "Hec regina serenissima auro, argento, lapidibus preciosis et sericis indumentis monasterium beati Ysidori et ceteras regni principales ecclesias studuit decorare. Hoc tempore ampliata est fides catholica in Yspania, et licet multi regnum Legionense bellis impeterent, tamen ecclesie regalibus muneribus ditate sunt in tantum, ut antique destruerentur ecclesie, que magnis sumptibus fuerant fabricate, et multo nobiliores et pulcriores in toto regno Legionensi fundarentur."[398]

Berenguela is made personally responsible for the growth of the faith in Spain via her restoration of Leonese churches to their former glory, repairing the damages of war (both Moorish and, it is implied, the internecine squabbles of her husband and father), lavishing her substantial wealth upon houses of worship, and even founding new

[397] CM, Book IV, ch. 85, lines 28-33
[398] CM, Book IV, ch. 85, lines 34-41

institutions. This is the height of her virtue, for Lucas, and he is especially thorough in enumerating the richness of her patronage: not just gold and silver, but also precious jewels and silk vestements, glorifying God through the decoration of his earthly dwellings.[399] It is a representation of her piety, but also the image of a queen fully in control of substantial wealth and personal power.

It is a representation which obscures many less-flattering details of Berenguela's time as queen-consort of León: the consanguineous nature of the marriage is never mentioned, and there is no indication of its protracted, inglorious end. Similarly, in contrast to the extensive accounts in every other chronicle in this chapter, the reign and tumultuous regency of Enrique I is glossed over in a single chapter, a mere four sentences long, including the date and the deaths of both Enrique and Leonor,[400] before Lucas moves swiftly on to Fernando's reign. These exclusions cannot have resulted from a shortage of sources, given that they are both within living memory and that Lucas claims a personal commission from the queen, so they must be read as deliberate omissions, reflecting a desire to conceal even the barest hint of illegitimacy and loss of authority. It is not a lacuna, for the years are accounted for in the usual fashion; more than simple coincidence that the lowest moments in Berenguela's political career have been replaced in the CM with a blank, this manipulation reads as both proactive and defensive.

Similarly, the mechanisms of the queen's transfer of power are largely obscured by Lucas in his account of Fernando III's accession:

> "Era Ma.CCa.La.Va. Fernandus filius Adefonsi regis Legionensis in Castella, ei matre Berengaria tradente regnum, felicissime regnare cepit. Siquidem Castelle nobiles regnum Berengarie regine tradiderunt, eo quod erat primogenita Adefonsi regis Castelle et ipsa, ut dictum est, tradidit regnum filio suo Fernando."[401]

[399] CM, Book IV, ch. 85, lines 34-45.
[400] CM, Book IV, ch. 92, lines 1-5.
[401] CM, Book IV, ch. 93, lines 1-5.

The bare bones of the narrative are much the same as in the CLRC and the DRH: Berenguela's legitimacy is confirmed by the nobility, who recognize her primogeniture and right to inherit, and she gives her kingdom to her son. But here there is no exploration of her motivations, of Fernando's escape from León, of any concerns about her natural (in)ability to rule. The CM presents a smooth and immediate transfer of power, where the queen is merely a necessary link through whom hereditary authority power must pass before her son can assume it for himself.

This does not quite fit with other elements of Berenguela's image, however. Among Fernando's virtues, Lucas mentions that "[e]tenim ita obediebat prudentissime Berengarie regine matri sue, quamuis esset regni culmine sublimatus, ac si esset puer humillimus sub ferula magistrali."[402] He notes, too, that the king's *curia* is composed of "prudentissimos catholicos uiros," who work alongside his mother to advise him. In illuminating the relationship between mother and son, Lucas is careful to paint Berenguela's role as one of educating and advising the king. Although in the first case, the king is subordinate as a boy before his teacher, this subordination is not entirely out of the order of things; as a mother, it is the queen's duty to educate, and in Berenguela's case specifically, the transmission of her father's virtues is an urgent cause. In the second, the queen is more appropriately subordinate, one among the many prudent councillors who advise the king.

Although there is one instance of her accompanying and aiding his efforts to put down a rebellion by the Lara counts—"rex Fernandus una cum matre sua Berengaria cum manu militum iuxta castrum, quod dicitur Ferreyrola"—[403]Berenguela is rarely mentioned after her son assumes her power. They are praised together, in a very similar

[402] CM, Book IV, ch. 93, lines 9-11.
[403] CM, Book IV, ch. 95, lines 1-5.

fashion to her time in León, for giving "multo auro, argento, preciosis lapidibus et sericis ornamentis" to churches,[404] and Fernando enters the city of León in 1230 "una cum prudentissima domina Berengaria matre sua", but she remains elusive in the text as Lucas focuses his history on the king.

In narrating Fernando's campaigns in the south in the 1230s, leading up to the siege of Córdoba, Lucas stresses the extent and importance of the queen's efforts on her son's behalf in unconditionally approving terms:

> "Regina uero Berengaria mater eius in tanto sapiencie culmine ferebatur, ut in regni administratione cuncta sapienter et nobiliter ordinaret. Quapropter secure rex Fernandus faciebat moram in expeditione contra Sarracenos, eo quod regina Berengaria uices eius sapienter in regno Legionis et Castelle supplebat et in tanta securitate et pace utrumque regnum gaudebat, ut paruus uel magnus aliquis non auderet uiolenter res alterius occupare. Tantus inuaserat cunctos hereticos terror, ut cuncti de utroque regno fugere festinarent. Mittebat regina Berengaria habundanter filio suo regi Fredenando, dum esset in expeditione, milites, equos, aurum, argentum, cibaria et quecumque erant necessaria exercitibus suis."[405]

This, in light of passage that follows—the triumphant conquest of Córdoba—reads as an unapologetic defense of Berenguela's role in governing the kingdom. Three times her *sapientia* is referenced in a single passage, accompanied by a reiteration of her wealth, with her provisions this time directed to the war efforts rather than the church (though this is, indirectly, to the benefit of the church and directly to the benefit of Christendom). Lucas also makes clear that the queen is a more than sufficient stand-in for the king when it comes to the business of government: there is "tanta securitate et pace" in Castile under her administration that no enemies dared to challenge her, and evildoers fled of their own accord.

[404] CM, Book IV, ch. 95, lines 19-24.
[405] CM, Book IV, ch. 100, lines 16-27.

There is much to agree with in Georges Martin's broad conclusion that Lucas represents Berenguela favourably, highlighting her promotion of peace and piety, "dejando la imagen global de un gobierno sabio y pacificador".[406] But Martin also laments that the CM obscures the queen's practice of government—beyond her financial generosity to the Church and the war—which ignores what Lucas can really offer us: an image of the queen which, by virtue of her patronage, may be as close as we can get to self-fashioning in the thirteenth century. Given that these chronicles give expression to tensions in the power structures of the monarchy, the streamlining and idealizing of Berenguela's intervention in the CM appears to be a deliberate choice that upholds the historical conventions being perpetuated by the chronicle as a whole. Lucas's "history was the history of kings",[407] after all, and acknowledging the rule of a queen, to the detriment of a king, would disrupt the coherence of his narrative structure. Some of the events excluded by the CM, particularly Berenguela's separation from Alfonso IX and the tumult of the regency period, also point to an effort to smooth over dynastic tensions and discontinuities. So too does the refusal to criticize Alfonso IX even when he was at war with Castile: Reilly suggests "[i]t may be that the relationship of the two contenders to Lucas's own patroness", and, I would add, their relationship to her son, "had an inhibiting effect".[408] Berenguela's representation in the CM is a testament to the utility of silence in the development of a historical narrative.

De rebus Hispaniae

External contexts

[406] Georges Martin, "Reinar sin reinar: Berenguela de Castilla en el espejo de la historiografía de su época (1214-1246)", *e-Spania*, 1 (2006) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.21608> §31
[407] Reilly, "Bishop Lucas of Túy", p. 772.
[408] Reilly, "Bishop Lucas of Túy", p. 774-75.

The author of the *De rebus Hispaniae* hardly needs an introduction. Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada served (or more precisely, ruled) as archbishop of Toledo from 1209 until his death in 1247. Like many high-ranking members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, he came from an elite background, with familial ties to both the Castilian and Navarrese secular aristocracy.[409] Although he is best known for his ardent devotion to the cause of his diocese, and could frequently be found at the papal court arguing the case for Toledan primacy over all of Spain,[410] Archbishop Rodrigo also engaged in the usual pastimes of the high nobility: amassing personal wealth and power. Hilda Grassotti has revealed the vast network of Rodrigo's business dealings, as well as the considerable power he held in terms of both lands (he made a particular point of collecting castles) and people (he was an ecclesiastical lord in the usual Castilian fashion, but he also took personal, feudal vassals, which was rarer).[411]

Although it is often said, truthfully, that Toledo's interests and Rodrigo's were one and the same during his time as archbishop,[412] this is not to say that his dedication to the cause of Toledo was a strictly spiritual matter. The fight for Toledan primacy, in particular, would establish his church's authority over his powerful rivals and enhance its prestige, but primacy also came with significant secular wealth and privileges which could be enjoyed by the Archbishop.[413] As part of his archiepiscopal assignment, Rodrigo was also nominally the chancellor of the kingdom of Castile, although Peter Linehan has argued persuasively that during the reign of Fernando III, Juan de Osma's rise to power

---

[409] Lucy K. Pick, "Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada (after 1170-10 June 1247)", in *Castilian Writers, 1200-1400*, ed. by George D. Greenia and Frank A. Dominguez (Detroit, Michigan: Gale, 2008), pp. 102-109.
[410] Linehan, *History and the Historians*, pp. 316-412.
[411] Hilda Grassotti, "Don Rodrigo Ximenez de Rada, gran señor y hombre de negocios en la Castilla del siglo XIII", *Cuadernos de Historia de España*, 55-56 (1972), pp. 1-302, especially pp. 4-5.
[412] Derek W. Lomax, "Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada como historiador", in *Actas del quinto congreso internacional de hispanistas: celebrado en Bordeaux del 2 al 8 de septiembre de 1974*
ed. by Maxime Chevalier et al (Bordeaux: Instituto de Estudios Ibéricos e Iberoaméricanos, Universidad de Bordeaux III, 1977), pp. 587-92 (p.589-90).
[413] Lucy K. Pick, *Conflict and Coexistence: Archbishop Rodrigo and the Muslims and Jews of Medieval Spain* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 2004), pp. ix-x.

in the royal chancery was concurrent with a deliberate effort to exclude Rodrigo from the actual work of governing Castile, and that Rodrigo was well aware of this.[414]

The DRH is, by virtue of its close relationship to the two other Latin chronicles associated with Fernando's court, relatively easy to date. If we accept that the CM and the CLRC were both finished by late 1237 or early 1238, this is the earliest possible moment for Rodrigo to be writing his history. Uniquely, the DRH's *explicit* declares a precise date of completion, claiming to have been finished on Thursday, 31 March 1243, four years before the archbishop's death, although it has been pointed out that the last day of March was not, in fact, a Thursday in 1243; Enrique Jerez suggests that it was more likely finished on 30 April 1243.[415] This leaves us with an author near the end of his life, alienated from the court, and still engaged in the ultimately unsuccessful pursuit of Toledan primacy.

This situation is difficult to reconcile with other circumstances of the DRH's composition, in particular the claim, reiterated in both the dedication and the prologue, that it was written at the specific request of Fernando III. Of the three Latin chronicles, Rodrigo's is the one which least flatters the king, and there are other indicators—an increased number of noble actors, represented in a more positive light—that it was intended for a noble audience. Luis Fernández Gallardo has suggested that the king was, in part, seeking a history that would provide a "unifying ideology" and a unified history for his two kingdoms, and a place for the nobility in that shared history.[416] This possibility aligns with Gabrielle Spiegel's hypothesis that royally-sponsored chronicles in the

[414] Peter Linehan, "Don Rodrigo and the government of the kingdom", *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*, 26 (2003), pp. 87-99 <doi: 10.3406/cehm.2003.2013>.
[415] Enrique Jerez, "La *Historia gothica* del Toledano y la historiografía romance", Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales, 26 (2003), pp. 223-239 <doi: 10.3406/cehm.2003.2020> (pp. 227).
[416] Luis Fernández Gallardo, "De Lucas de Tuy a Alfonso el Sabio: idea de la historia y proyecto historiográfico", *Revista de poética medieval*, 12 (2004) pp. 53-119 (pp. 72-73).

thirteenth century were intended to offer "a threatened elite a vehicle through which to recuperate a sense of social worth and political legitimacy".[417]

Internal contexts

The choice of Latin as the medium through which to create such a vehicle is seemingly at odds with this purpose. The French chronicles Spiegel refers to were vernacular texts, for both in France and Iberia, the vernacular had cemented itself as the language of the nobility by the middle of the thirteenth century. However, given that the DRH seems to have been translated almost immediately upon completion, and spread widely among the nobility, there is plentiful evidence to suggest that it managed to fulfil its intended function for members of the lay aristocracy.[418]

The choice of Latin was only a question of audience: it was also a means of situating the text within the tradition of peninsular historiography it proclaimed to follow, even as the DRH diverged significantly from that tradition. Rodrigo adopted the superficial form of a Latin chronicle about kingship, while introducing innovations, though these were not wholly his own. His history was compiled from a dizzying array of sources, both historiographical and documentary,[419] and the two chronicles we have already examined introduced many of the innovations he would deploy, including the narrowing geographic focus of the CLRC and the association of territory and dynasty in the CM.[420] The latter also provides the structural core of Rodrigo's text, while the CLRC becomes the principal source for more recent history, especially the century preceding his work. Both are significantly embellished and interwoven with many other minor sources, adding details, explanations, and narrative elements, and in some cases, the introduction

[417] Spiegel, *Romancing the Past*, p. 317.
[418] Enrique Jerez, "La *Historia gothica*", pp. 223-24.
[419] Lomax, "Rodrigo", pp. 589-90.
[420] Georges Martin, *Les Juges*, pp. 258-59.

of entirely new characters/figures from a parallel, oral history passed down through noble families.[421]

Such use of aristocratically-centred material reveals that, especially in its accounts of contemporary history, one of the DRH's principal concerns is the foundations and configuration of power in Castile.[422] While the kings of Spain are glorified, the defining virtues of Rodrigo's ideal kings are not faith or religious crusade, but rather *strenuitas* and *largitas*, strictly secular virtues which are essential for a king to form a reciprocal relationship of mutual obligation with the aristocratic classes, wherein royal largesse cements noble fidelity.[423] His preference for the nobility of Castile is evident, and by including them in his narrative of history, Castile becomes a joint project whose success is dependent on harmony between king and nobility.

Like the CM, the DRH recounts the history of Spain from Genesis to Fernando III; like the CM, the narrative is further subdivided, this time into nine books, each further subdivided into chapters which are more or less episodic in nature. (Inés Fernández-Ordóñez has suggested that the use of nine "books" is a later invention, and that the original intent was for a similar arrangement to Lucas's three sections.)[424] Chronology is not a organizing or structural feature of the DRH, as it is in the CM: dates are occasionally given for significant events like major battles or the deaths of kings, but they are not used in any systematic fashion, as they are in the CM, to mark an ongoing order of events. Instead, the passage of time is reflected through relative indicators like "post hec", "et tunc", or "sequenti uero die", and in general giving an impression of an ongoing *narrative* rather than chronology.

[421] Reilly, "The Rediscovery of Count Pedro Ansúrez", pp. 109-13.
[422] Martin, *Les Juges*, p. 262.
[423] Georges Martin, "Noblesse et royauté dans le *De rebus Hispaniae* (livres 4 a 9)", *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*, 26 (2003), pp. 101-121 (pp. 107-09).
[424] Inés Fernández-Ordóñez, "La técnica historiográfica", p. 188.

As is the case with the other Latin chronicles, the last major event recounted in the DRH is the conquest of Córdoba, although Rodrigo's narrative is slightly extended, and includes Fernando III's second marriage to Jeanne de Ponthieu in 1237 and some smaller campaigns in the south from that same summer. Despite starting in the same place as the CM, the DRH quickly becomes a very different book, rejecting Lucas's neogothicism to focus on the Goths not as a people, but as the rulers of "Spain" as a territorial unit, whose history he is tracing. The balance of the text is given over to post-invasion rulers, beginning with Pelayo in Book IV, and there is a clear preference for relatively recent history: approximately one-third of the narrative is given to the period between Urraca's accession in 1109 and the conquest of Córdoba in 1236.

Berenguela in the text

Because the majority of Berenguela's interventions in the DRH are derived directly from the CLRC, I will focus most of my attention on the points of divergence between the two narratives, and the resulting effects on her representation. As a general rule, Berenguela's representation in the DRH can be traced to the CLRC on a one-to-one basis, meaning that the grains of the narrative are quite similar, but Rodrigo's amplifications and alterations are substantial, sometimes to the point of rendering his source unrecognizable.

The first instance of Rodrigo's alteration of the *CLRC* is also Berenguela's first appearance in the text, with her marriage to Conrad of Swabia. Where Juan de Osma made clear that the German prince was the one to break the betrothal, Rodrigo is equally clear that the bride's protests are responsible for the divorce: as soon as Conrad had returned to Germany, "predicta domicella desponsationi continuo contradixit" until the

archbishop of Toledo and the papal legate agreed to annul the marriage.[425] Though the outcome in both cases is identical—she remains "innupta"—this alteration makes Berenguela an active participant, giving her agency in the negotiation of her first marriage, and suggests that even at an early age she was concerned, almost innately, with virtue and marital politics.

Marital politics are a consistent feature of the representations of Berenguela in the Latin chronicles, and the DRH significantly expands the discussion around her marriage to Alfonso IX: from the spare details and disapproving reference to its *de facto* status in the CLRC, Rodrigo weaves a substantial narrative, returning to the marriage in two separate chapters, and fleshing out the circumstances which brought it about.[426] The supporters of the union are anonymized as merely "quidam guerre periculum pauescentes",[427] concerned subjects fearing the consequences of further war between the kings of Castile and León. By painting Alfonso VIII as reticent on the grounds of consanguinity, the narrative creates a space, absent in the other Latin chronicles, for an easing of tensions that might simultaneously preserve the king's honor. The threat of war came from Alfonso's desire to avenge the disastrous Castilian defeat at Alarcos—by taking action against the Christian kings of León and Navarre who had failed to come to his aid, that is. The *DRH* shows Alfonso's rage to be dangerous, impairing his judgment to the point that "cum rege Arabum fecit treugam, ut posset tucius uicinis regibus obuiare."[428] The anonymous nobles represent half of the solution; the other half is performed by the "prudentissima" Queen Leonor, acting as a pragmatic mediator between the king and his subjects, as her "sagaci prouidencia et sollerte" allow a more objective consideration of the potential risks and benefits to such a marriage.[429] Her

[425] DRH, Book 7, chapter 24.
[426] DRH, Book 7, chapters 24 and 31.
[427] DRH, Book 7 ch 31
[428] DRH, Book 7, ch. 30
[429] DRH Book 7, ch. 31.

preference for peace wins out: Berenguela, bringing all of the contested territories into the marriage as a gift, embodies the reconciliation between the kings, restoring their relationship to a state of "pace quasi cum filio".[430]

Rodrigo is considerably more generous on the matter of their separation, too, apportioning blame to the pope rather than to Alfonso IX. The successes of the marriage are highlighted: temporary peace and four children, including a future king. Even more interesting is the assertion that, despite an immediate return to the "guerre et uastationes" after the termination of the marriage, Alfonso VIII did not wage war and capture Leonese castles for the benefit of his own son, but rather "set nepoti Fernando omnia acquirebat".[431] Both of Berenguela's brothers are erased from the succession as the DRH uses her to construct a direct link between Alfonso VIII and Fernando III.

As in the *CLRC*, Berenguela becomes a more active figure in the narrative after her return to Castile, and Leonor's dramatic grief-stricken display upon the death of the infante Fernando is nowhere to be found in the DRH; instead, the king's "luctus inconsolabilis" is foregrounded. However, though the *infante* is mourned in similar terms by both Rodrigo and Juan de Osma, it is Berenguela's administration of the funerary rites which dominates the archbishop's account, serving as the first of many opportunities to praise her. The virtues highlighted by Rodrigo in this passage are foundational; that is, they constitute the basis of her image in the DRH, and they accompany her throughout the rest of the narrative, and even into the vernacular chronicle tradition that follows:

> "Sepultus est autem in monasterio sancte Marie Regalis prope Burgis a Roderico Toletano pontifice et multis coepiscopis et magnatibus secularibus et religiosis, excellentissima sorore sua Berengaria regina, ad quam postea regnum Castelle successione prouenit, impendente liberaliter et decenter officia funeris et

[430] DRH Book 7. ch. 31.
[431] Book 7, Chapter 24.

> honoris, gemitus et doloris; ubi uirtutum eius sic claruit plenitudo, ut eius prudencia deuoti sexus excederet pietatem et helemosinarum largitio principum largitatem. Curialitatis etiam pudica modestia inconsolabili luctui solacia procabatur, ut exinde fame eius dulcorata suauitas in augmentum cresceret et dulcorem."[432]

Many of these qualities—*prudencia*, *modestia*, *pietatem*—align very closely with those of idealized medieval queens, and her performance of mourning duties, as well as her ability to soothe suffering, is also tied to these feminine virtues. The gendered nature of public mourning[433] is reinforced, too, when the DRH carves out space for Berenguela to take charge of Alfonso VIII's funeral cortege, where she again embodies the exemplary mourner, taking herself almost to the point of death in a violent spectacle of grieving: "que tanto dolore eius exequias consumauit, quod fere dilaceratione et lacrimis se extinxit."[434]

This praise goes beyond the image of a typical model queen with the assertion that Berenguela eclipsed both other women (the "deuoti sexus") in her piety, and even surpassed kings in her generosity to the poor: Rodrigo begins to trace the outlines of a queen almost superhuman in her virtues, transcending the limits of her gender and her status. By first raising her succession to the throne in such a context, alongside the assurance of her future "magnifica opera", he grounds the case for Berenguela's continued occupation of a central place in the monarchy in highly gendered language, justifying her role in the government of the realm with a superlative, almost Marian image of pious queenship. It is noteworthy, too, that a smooth line of succession is once again implied: Alfonso VIII, to Berenguela, to her son, eliding the problematic reign of Enrique I altogether.

---

[432] DRH, Book 7, ch. 36
[433] Miriam Shadis, *Berenguela of Castile and Political Women in the High Middle Ages*, *New Middle Ages Series* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 151-59. The construction of mourning as feminine in the Mediterranean is discussed in James S. Amelang, "Mourning Becomes Eclectic: Ritual Lament and the Problem of Continuity", *Past & Present*, 187 (2005), pp. 3-31.
[434] DRH, Book 8, ch. 15.

On the matter of Enrique's reign, where Juan de Osma did not mince words about the brevity (and failure) of Berenguela's regency for her brother, Rodrigo is significantly gentler, and indeed leverages her limited period of real power to offer another round of praise: "custodia puelli regis et regni gubernatio remansit penes Berengariam reginam nobilem sororem eius. Cuius diligencia sic apparuit toto tempore sui regiminis, ut pauperes, diuites, ecclesiastici, seculares, sicut tempore nobilis regis fuerant, in suis statibus seruarentur […]".[435] Her skill in governing is explicitly equated to her father's; she was able to maintain the kingdom in precisely the same state of peace for all its inhabitants, despite the machinations of the nobility.

In this account, even the queen's own confidants begin to fall under the nefarious sway of the Lara brothers, and the DRH attributes the final straw to the knight García Lorenzo, to whom Berenguela had entrusted the young king. García Lorenzo is a new addition to the narrative, falling victim to Count Álvaro's bribery—specifically the promise that he would "hereditatem uilla que dicitur Tabulata" if he gave Enrique over—and instigating others in the queen's circle. Berenguela, at this moment, appears trapped, and Rodrigo defends her eventual surrender of custody via an exploration of her thought process. Despite manipulation by her own advisors, she is wise enough to "percepisset" the conspiracy and fear the "insolencias" that would surely result. The chronicler insists, too, that her decision to relinquish the regency was not as willing as it might have seemed: the queen had been worn down and "propter inportunitates militum et maiorum tedio erat affecta", and furthermore, she had endeavoured to act in the best interests of the realm, "timebat ne regnum in sui custodia turbaretur".[436]

[435] DRH, Book 9, ch. 1
[436] DRH, Book 9, ch. 1.

The DRH also expands and makes explicit the conditions between Berenguela and Álvaro Núñez de Lara—among other things, that the alienation of territories and creation of dignities would require the queen's permission—as well as the circumstances under which the agreement was made. By establishing that Álvaro Núñez "iuramento et hominio in manu Roderici Toletani pontificis firmauerunt", and that he would "proditionis infamia tenerentur"[437] for violating them, the DRH anticipates that selfsame fate.

Before Count Álvaro can meet his fate/be served justice, however, the DRH turns the straightforward language of the CLRC into a more significant moment of validation for Berenguela, as chastened magnates, having experienced the destruction of the Lara regency, "humiliter supplicarunt" the queen in clear terms of submission, appealing to her *prudencia* and mercy as their "naturali domine". Álvaro's wickedness is underscored by his evident lack of respect for the royal will, having taken from Berenguela everything "que sibi pater suus dederat", and especially in his demand, "ei etiam ore temerario", that she go into exile. In contrast, Rodrigo insists that Berenguela and her nobles were careful not to claim undue authority, and that they always "regi puero fidelitatis debitum in omnibus seruauerunt".[438]

Rodrigo also manipulates the order of events in his source in order to further the impression that Berenguela is innocent, persecuted, and above all, working in Enrique's best interests. Here, Berenguela flees from Las Huelgas to Autillo after Álvaro's threat of exile, and before the episode of the messenger and the false letter, deliberately placing her in a position of weakness. Heightening the intrigue surrounding the struggle for the regency, a new element is introduced to the narrative: the suggestion that Enrique, approaching maturity and coming into his "sagaci indole", had come to realize the count's

[437] DRH, Book 9, ch. 1.
[438] DRH, Book 9, ch. 2.

destructive effects on the realm and "uolebat ad sororis custodiam se transferre",[439] while Álvaro and his co-conspirators worked to thwart him. The account of Berenguela's concern, the false letter, and the poison-plot remains the same, as does Juan de Osma's defense of the queen as a biblical Susanna, but her innocence is pre-ordained by Enrique's determination to escape, and upheld by popular opinion.[440] Where the CLRC allows that a rift came between the queen and her brother as a result of the count's subterfuge, the DRH insists that Enrique had secretly given his "beneplacitum" to the knight Rodrigo González de Valverde, who would take him away from Álvaro and to his sister.[441]

In recounting the transitional period between Enrique's death and Fernando's accession to the throne, the CLRC makes clear that Berenguela intends to give her throne to Fernando, but this is not immediately obvious in the DRH, which instead prolongs the power struggle within Castile. The queen's nobles manage to successfully extract the future king from his father's court, but Rodrigo adds a new twist to their troubles: Álvaro Núñez's demands that "infans Fernandus, rex futurus," despite being past the age of majority, "sue custodie, ut auunculus, traderetur".[442] This time, the demand is swiftly rejected, and Berenguela's rights are asserted. To Juan de Osma's defense of her claim—primogeniture and the written will of Alfonso VIII—Rodrigo adds that her status as heir, as contained in the Burgos document, had been twice ratified, "bis iuramento et hominio hoc firmarat" by the whole realm, before her father had sons.[443] He also inverts the insistence on women's natural inability to rule: here the assembled crowd at Valladolid do not protest her accession. Rather, he stresses, out of an excess of feminine "pudicicie et modestie", virtues which she possessed in greater quantities than

[439] DRH, Book 9, ch. 2.
[440] DRH, Book 9, ch. 3.
[441] DRH, Book 9, ch. 3.
[442] DRH, Book 9, ch. 4.
[443] DRH, Book 9, ch. 5.

any other woman in the world, "regnum sibi noluit retinere",[444] proactively refusing to take the throne. The positioning of the queen as modest and humble is reinforced by her subsequent pleas to Alfonso IX, in which she "humiliter supplicauit" that he cease his attacks—incited by Álvaro Núñez—on their son.[445]

The DRH then follows the CLRC very closely in recounting Enrique's burial, the queen's generosity and payment of her son's knights, and the vanquishing of Álvaro Núñez. Both accounts agree that Fernando begins to exercise his real royal authority after a settlement had been reached with the Counts of Lara, and that Berenguela's determination to find the king a bride was rooted in her concern for his virtue. Before the marriage, however, Rodrigo finds an occasion to praise the queen, making her responsible—along with God—for his success in maintaining a peaceful realm for twenty-five years,[446] and for educating Fernando to follow the example of his grandfather:

> "Aduersariis itaque sic a Domino iudicatis rex Fernandus regnum optinuit pacifice et quiete, regina nobili omnia disponente, que adeo filium sollicite educauit, ut regnum et patriam iuxta morem aui sui nobilis Aldefonsi in pace et modestia gubernaret usque ad regni sui uicesimum quintum annum."[447]

Though the wedding itself hews very closely to Juan de Osma's version of events, Rodrigo offers a rather different account of Fernando's knighting and coronation. He agrees that the king took the sword by his own hand and authority, and knighted himself, but invents a new detail for the ceremony, wherein Berenguela unfastens the swordbelt after Fernando fastens it: "ipse rex suscepto gladio ab altari manu propria se accinxit cingulo militari et mater sua regina nobilis ensis cingulum deaccinxit".[448] In doing so, the DRH mixes chivalric and feudal implications with familial ones as he ritualizes the

[444] DRH, Book 9, ch. 5.
[445] DRH, Book 9, ch. 5.
[446] That is, from the beginning of his reign in 1217, to the time of writing.
[447] DRH, Book 9, ch. 10.
[448] DRH, Book 9, ch. 10.

queen's status as an authority figure to whom Fernando has obligations. She makes a safe choice of *padrino* because her son already has natural filial obligations to his mother, and by entrusting her with a check on the king's authority, Rodrigo is able to bring Fernando into the shared system of chivalry without directly making him subject to another nobleman.[449]

Berenguela's occasional interventions in domestic matters, as a mediating force between the nobility and the monarchy, are virtually identical to their representation in the CLRC, but a fundamental change is effected in the narrative structure vis-a-vis the source text with the renewal of the Moorish campaigns. Where Juan de Osma had fashioned a dramatic turning point, full of the language of divine inspiration, and represented a change in the balance of power within the monarchy, Rodrigo prefers an explanation that flatters all parties. Faced with Berenguela's virtuous desires to keep her son out of "Christianorum iniuriis", that is, to keep him from fighting against his father and other Christian Iberian kings, Fernando decides instead to not renew truces with the Arabs, so that he can dedicate "milicie sue primicias" to Christ.[450] Because his mother presents no objection to this, and indeed supports it, there is no opportunity for the balance of power to shift between mother and son in Rodrigo's account.

Berenguela's "materna sollicitudine" continues to define their relationship as she works alongside Fernando to consolidate his claims to the Leonese throne. The DRH intensifies the opposition they face from Dulce and Sancha, who, rather than merely gathering noble support, actively "rebellionem cum complicibus preparabant", creating a more pressing threat of violence that could bring about the "regni et pauperum

[449] Bianchini, *The Queen's Hand*, pp. 147-48.
[450] DRH, Book 9, ch. 12.

uastationem".[451] The famous negotiations between the queen and Teresa of Portugal provide a further occasion for Rodrigo to praise Berenguela:

> "et in hoc enituit quamplurimum regine nobilis sollers cura, qua non minori gracia regi filio dedit hoc regnum quam regnum Castelle, quod ad eam iure hereditario pertinebat. Sic enim sciuit omnia ordinare, ut licet regnorum unio fere omnibus displiceret, ipsa studuit taliter prouidere, ut sine sanguinis effusione regnorum unio proueniret et utrumque regnum pace perpetua letaretur."[452]

Rodrigo makes the claim that, by means of her wisdom and skill in mediation, Berenguela was responsible for giving the kingdom of León to Fernando III, just as much as she gave him Castile. Both eternal peace and the pre-ordained reunion of Castile and León are directly attributed to her foresight and intervention; she effectively becomes more important than Alfonso IX in the transmission of the Leonese throne, displacing her former husband.

This is, however, not yet the pinnacle of the queen's virtues. Fully half of the penultimate chapter of the DRH, which recounts the triumphal celebrations in the aftermath of the conquest of Córdoba is given over to praise of the queen:

> Hec enim regina nobilis Berengaria sic filium in bonis operibus enutriuit, quod bona studia, que regina nobilis nullius uirtutis oblita, nullius charismatis expers, ut lac mellifluum graciis circumfusum, cordi eius influere non cessauit nec umquam ab ubere pleno uirtutibus ablactauit, et licet uir factus et in etate roboris confirmatus, mater eius numquam cessauit nec cessat que Deo et hominibus sunt accepta studio uigili suadere, quia nec umquam feminea, set semper magnificencie opera persuasit.
>
> Hec enim regina nobilis tanto studio conseruauit et adeo dilatauit recepta carismata graciarum, ut omnis etas, omnis sexus, omnis conditio, omnis professio, omnis natio, omnis lingua affectum senciat cum effectu, et uirtutum fasciculo non partito omnibus misericordie opera compartitur, et paternorum operum prouida exequtrix, plus inuenitur regni et rerum prodiga quam uirtutum; quam merito nostra tempora admirantur, cui numquam similem nec moderna nec patrum nostrorum tempora habuerunt. Pro qua Dominum

[451] DRH, Book 9, ch. 15.
[452] DRH, Book 9, ch. 15.

> exoremus ut eam dignetur diucius conseruare et sibi profutura concedat et bonis operibus habundare, donec felicem spiritum suo restituat Redemptori.[453]

Berenguela's performative celebration and joy, and her function as a "puerto afectivo", are much the same as in the chancellor's account. But Rodrigo takes the sparse threads of his source and weaves an extraordinary image of the queen as the director, from afar, of Fernando's victory: "licet absens, omnia procurarat". Her thanks to God are explicitly for aiding both Fernando (with *studio*, effort) and herself (with *sollercia*, wisdom) in their joint endeavor to restore Spain to its lost, ancient dignity. The ruination of that dignity by immoral princes meant that it could only be restored by a truly virtuous king; such a king would need, in turn, to be educated and guided around the many vices and immoralities that led his predecessors astray. The chronicler proceeds to praise Berenguela for producing just such a king, via a proper education, which she is able to provide due to her own natural virtues, which, Rodrigo reminds us, were also her father's virtues, and which have brought her worldwide renown. It is fitting that the DRH concludes with her selection of a second, equally virtuous wife to prevent the widowed king from succumbing to the temptations of vice,[454] thereby risking the loss of all that he had just gained.

The queen's place in the narrative of the CLRC, wherein Berenguela's influence and participation in government of the realm peaks when she surrenders her throne, is substantially and qualitatively altered in the DRH; instead of being relegated to a secondary plane of government, she becomes a ruling queen whose power grows alongside that of her ruling son, complementing and directing his successes. Her function, during the regency period, as a "pole of resistance" for nobles opposed to Lara hegemony[455] is merely the beginning of her ascendance, and for Rodrigo at least, her

[453] DRH, Book 9, ch. 17.
[454] DRH, Book 9, ch. 18.
[455] Martin, *Les Juges*, p. 202.

continued association with aristocratic elites does not inherently conflict with her loyalty to the king. Berenguela is represented, like her father, as the archbishop's ideal monarch. The narrative that he constructs around her will, furthermore, have a significant impact on other images of her queenship throughout the thirteenth century, and even into the fourteenth.

II. Vernacular Chronicles of the Late Thirteenth & Early Fourteenth Century: *Estoria de España (Versión amplificada de 1289), Crónica particular de San Fernando,* and *Crónica de Veinte Reyes*

It is not an exaggeration to say that the *Estoria de España*, the first of Alfonso X's vernacular historiographical projects, fundamentally changed the way that history was written in Castile and León.[456] It gave rise to a model of history writing that persisted through the fourteenth century and beyond, and because it underlies all of the texts discussed in this section, it will be necessary to touch on it briefly.

The *Estoria de España (Versión amplificada de 1289)* and the *Crónica particular de San Fernando*

External contexts

More even than the death of its patron, the overarching aims of the *EE* ultimately made it impossible to complete as envisioned: Alfonso's ideology of empire and divine monarchy with complete sovereign authority over all of a kingdom's *naturales*—nobility included—simply could not overcome the realities of prolonged aristocratic unrest, which itself had been exacerbated by the diversion of funds toward the imperial cause

[456] See Inés Fernández-Ordóñez, "De la historiografía fernandina a la alfonsí" and Georges Martin (ed.), *La historia alfonsí: el modelo y sus destinos*, among many others.

and other economic and political changes which disadvantaged the secular elite.[457] When Sancho IV finally claimed his father's throne in 1284, the consolidation of his royal authority required a redefinition of his relationship with the nobility, from fellow rebel to king. For all his popularity as a rebellious prince, Sancho faced significant opposition even in the early days of his reign, principally from aristocratic supporters of his nephews, and rival claimants to the throne, the *infantes* de la Cerda.[458] Among these opponents were his own mother, Violante of Aragón—who had by then returned to her natal family and taken the young *infantes* with her—, his younger brother the *infante* Juan, and the powerful Lord of Vizcaya, Lope Díaz de Haro. In 1288, these conflicts reached a boiling point at the castle of Alfaro, when a meeting between the principal antagonists culminated in the death of Lope Díaz (stabbed, reportedly in self-defense, by the king) and a thwarted attempt on the life of the *infante* Juan, if the *Crónica de Sancho IV* is to be believed. We will return to this episode in greater depth in the next chapter, but for now the broad outlines of the affair will suffice.

It seems reasonable to connect Sancho's decision to turn to historiography with the conflicts that had culminated in the *magnicidio* at Alfaro. He needed to re-write the model of relationships between king and nobility and assert his own dynastic position; reworking Alfonso X's historical narrative provided an opportunity to link his kingship with the Reconquest successes of his ancestors, and to place himself in the broader context of the royal Gothic lineage, while defending his own deeds.[459] It is no coincidence that Sancho's chronicle first mentions him in a chapter detailing, among other events of the mid-ninth century, Ramiro I's punishment of two noblemen who rose up and rebelled against him: "alçaronse con soberuia et locamientre contra este rey don Ramiro. Et el

[457] José Ángel García de Cortázar, "Alfonso X y los poderes del reino", *Alcanate*, 9 (2014-15), pp. 11-40 (pp. 24-26).

Also see Escalona, "Los nobles contra su rey".

[458] Ángeles Masia de Ros, "Las pretensiones de los infantes de la Cerda a la corona de Castilla en tiempos de Sancho IV y Fernando IV. El apoyo aragonés", *Medievalia*, 10 (1992), pp. 255-79.

[459] Gómez Redondo, *Historia de la prosa*, I, p. 963.

prisolos, et saco luego los oios a Alderedo, et mando descabeçar a Priuiolo et a aquellos sus VII fijos."[460]

This text, the so-called *versión amplificada de 1289*, is known for its rhetorical amplification or expansion of the source materials compared to the Alfonsine texts. It achieved a closer proximity to the present than either the *versión regia* or the *versión crítica*, ending with the 1223 noble rebellions against Fernando III.[461] The reasons for its abandonment are not entirely clear. Whether it was Sancho IV's illness and untimely death in 1295, or perhaps even earlier, with the 1291-92 agitations of the nobility led by his brother the *infante* Juan, that caused it to be set aside, Sancho's history, too, remained unfinished.

However, the *Estoria de España* as it is now best known and most widely accessible—that is, the royal manuscripts from El Escorial, edited by Menéndez Pidal as the *Primera Crónica General*—gives an erroneous impression of unity to a miscellany of Alfonsine and post-Alfonsine narratives, "put together with scissors and paste".[462] It begins with Genesis and ends with the 1252 death of Fernando III in Seville. If Alfonso X's versions only reached the year 1188, and Sancho IV's subsequent efforts progressed as far as the early 1220s, whence the narrative of the final twenty-five years?

The final chapters of the *PCG*, from 1035 to the blank 1135, have more recently been identified as part of a distinct text, the *Crónica particular de Fernando III* or *Crónica particular de San Fernando*[463], which centered on the reign of Fernando III and was, although not based on the Alfonsine model of historiography, received as a continuation of sorts. This impression has been reinforced by the fact that a manuscript of the CPSF was attached

[460] *PCG*, ch. 633, p. 363.
[461] *PCG*, ch. 1035. Gómez Redondo, *Historia de la Prosa*, I, p. 963.
[462] Fraker, "Alfonso X", p. 101.
[463] Hereafter, CPSF. References will continue to be from Menéndez Pidal's edition of the *PCG*.

to the royal codex of the *EE* in the 1340s, possibly by Fernán Sánchez de Valladolid. It is currently thought to be a product of the court of Fernando IV, and perhaps even sponsored by María de Molina during her regency, although the identity of the author-compilers remains unknown.

Internal contexts

Although the CPSF borrows the formal trappings of the Alfonsine and Sanchine histories, notably the continuity of chaptering, it abandons the adherence to chronology and diverges significantly in content, despite sharing a common source in the DRH.[464] It takes an almost hagiographic attitude towards Fernando III, adding quasi-miraculous elements to his battlefield exploits. It also includes many more nobles in the accounts of the southern campaigns; Rodrigo's relatively sparse account is bulked out with extensive details of the chivalresque exploits of numerous knights and noblemen, part of the effort to create a shared cause between the nobility and the king, highlighting the valor of individual actors in the broader sweep of the Reconquest. The CPSF emphasizes the unity of the peninsula and the kingdoms, and stresses—in an elaborate account of the king's preparations for a holy death—that royal legitimacy is achieved just as much, if not more, by divine ordination, religious ritual and personal virtue, as by birth alone.[465]

Berenguela in the text

Much of Berenguela's presence in the *EE* and *CPSF* is identical to her representation in the DRH, so again the emphasis will be on the points of diversion in the new narrative.

[464] Luis Fernández Gallardo, "La *Crónica particular de San Fernando*: sobre los orígenes de la crónica real castellana, I. Aspectos formales", *Cahiers d'études hispaniques médiévales*, 32 (2009), pp. 245-265. Also see Luis Fernández Gallardo, "La *Crónica particular de San Fernando*: sobre los orígenes de la crónica real castellana, II. Los contenidos", *Cahiers d'études hispaniques médiévales*, 33 (2010), pp. 215-246.
[465] Fernández Gallardo, "CPSF, I. Aspectos formales", pp. 247-49.

The first of these again occurs with her first marriage, which reverts to the version of events put forward in the CLRC, making clear that Conrad is the one to protest and annul the marriage: "esse don Corrado, tornado a Alemanna, contradixo luego esse desposamiento del".[466] Berenguela thus becomes a passive factor, neither favoring or rejecting a closer relationship with the Holy Roman Empire.

In this version, too, her marriage to Alfonso IX is strongly encouraged by the nobility, who display a ruthlessly pragmatic attitude towards marriage as they expound on the virtues of a potential union, excusing its uncanonical nature and even suggesting a planned end after children are produced. They are able to convince Leonor via a dizzying array of arguments, including (1) that "mas era merçed que non peccado" because so much good would come of it; (2) that they would all pray and fast so that the marriage might be pardoned; (3) that the marriage need only last long enough to produce "algunos herederos", after which point the pope would either grant a dispensation or they could separate. Whatever the outcome, they insisted, "passarien las yentes et el tiempo en paz et en bien, desuiando muchos males" for as long as the marriage endured.[467] This consideration of multiple potential outcomes is not a feature in any of the Latin chronicles, but it does bear some relation to the situation in which Sancho IV and María de Molina found themselves: that is, consanguineously married, and desperately seeking papal dispensation to legitimate their heirs.

The narrative arc of Enrique's minority and the queen's failed regency follows the DRH, but briefly reverts to the version of events put forward by the CLRC wherein Álvaro Núñez de Lara successfully induces a rift between the young king and his sister, confirming Enrique's malleability and youth.[468] In contrast to the chaos of his uncle's

[466] PCG, ch. 997, p. 677a.
[467] PCG, ch. 1004.
[468] PCG, ch. 1027.

reign, Fernando is "alzado" at Otilla as soon as he arrives from León, marking the introduction of Gothic-inspired "raising" into the narrative of his kingship, and emphasizing the importance of noble support (rather than maternal guidance or divine favor alone) in the king-making process.[469]

The resuming of hostilities with the Moors, recounted in the first chapter of the CPSF, represents a halfway point between Juan de Osma and Rodrigo, in that it portrays a certain amount of tension in the relationship between mother and son:

> "Et la noble reyna donna Berenguela […] con amor et con bien querencia de su fijo, queriendol estoruar de yr uengar los tuertos que los moros le fazien, fizol consagrar a Dios, asi commo diz la estoria, los comienços de su caualleria, et alongar por mas tiempo las treguas que el auie puestas con los alaraues, et non le dexaua mouer pora alla. Mas al cabo, el rey don Fernando auiendo a coraçon la yda contra los moros, saco su hueste muy grande […]"[470]

This is not quite the supplicatory young king of the CLRC, with grand dreams of crusade, but neither is it the maternal encouragement envisioned by Rodrigo. Instead, Fernando's aspirations are somewhat more personal and prosaic—he aspires to avenge *tuertos*—and Berenguela once again becomes an obstacle between Fernando and his destiny on the southern frontier, though a combination of piety, maternal love, and a determination to maintain peace. This image persists in the narrative of the remainder of the southern campaigns; in addition to the DRH's assessment of the queen's importance in attaining León, the CPSF recounts several visits between the king and his mother, in the vein of the CLRC, showing the strength and complementary nature of their partnership even as Fernando spends most of his time in the south, fighting, while his mother attends to his affairs in Castile.

[469] PCG, ch. 1028.
[470] PCG, ch. 1036.

The one truly novel addition in the CPSF's representation of the queen is an account of her death. It is the first of its kind because, although much of the elegy itself is largely reworked from the praise following the conquest of Córdoba, Berenguela was still alive at the completion of the three Latin chronicles, and so the royal chroniclers could only praise her and pray for her soul. Her death allows her to exceed the virtues of mere mortals. Fernando's excessive grief and sorrow—hidden, nevertheless, by the "fortalezamiento del su coraçon"—are excused because no other king had ever lost a mother so great: the queen becomes exceptional in her maternity and in the completeness of her virtues and deeds, and the praise elevates her to nearly Marian levels:

> "Et non era marauailla de auer ende grant pesar, ca perdio tal madre, qual nunca rey en su tienpo otra perdio que tan conplida fuese a todos los sus fechos. Esta era espeio de Castiella et de Leon et de toda Espanna, por cuyo conseio et por cuyo seso se guiaian muchos reynos, et ouo auentaia et grant meioria de quantas otras en el su tiempo reyno ouieron. Llorada fue por Castiella de conçeios et de todas las gentes de todas lees; muy llorada fue de caualleros pobres a quien ella muchos bienes fazia. Esta era toda conplida sierua et amiga de Dios. La nonbradia de sus bienes, et de las bonas obras et de las noblezas desta, fue esparzida por todo el mundo; ca esta fue enxienplo de toda bondat, a la qual aya Dios merced et piedat, cuya sierua et amiga uerdadera ella era, et la faga heredera con los sus fieles en el su reyno; amen."[471]

Where earlier praise emphasizes her superiority over other women as the measure of her exemplarity, after her death she becomes "espeio de Castiella et de Leon et de toda Espanna", constructing her as model of wisdom and virtue for the kingdoms as a whole, regardless of sex or status, and indeed an *exemplary* one. Her life is held up as far more than a mirror for princes: she becomes a mirror for all of Spain. However, the fact of her rule is still only obliquely acknowledged, using the language of guiding and improving, rather than directly ruling or administering justice. Instead, the queen's virtues and good deeds are more generalized and obscured again beneath a shroud of religious piety; the only virtue, of all her good deeds, that is specifically identified is generosity to poor knights. After the prayer for her soul, however, when the CPFS returns from its

[471] PCG, ch. 1073.

diversion into encomium, a more pragmatic view of the queen's death emerges: Fernando laments that Castile will now suffer, because the work of governing his northern territories while he was away on the southern frontiers had relied on "la ayuda de su madre, que lo escusaua desto et de otras cosas muchas por o quier que ella andaua".[472] This reflection, matter-of-fact as it is, suggests that this arrangement was acceptable, even ideal, maximizing the resources of the monarchy.

Crónica de Veinte Reyes

External Contexts

The *Crónica de Veinte Reyes* has long been of interest to scholars for its inclusion of epic legendary material, especially pertaining to the Cid,[473] and its origins have been hotly debated.[474] Although it was initially identified by Menéndez Pidal as a late-fourteenth century chronicle derived from the *Crónica de 1344*, Luis Lindley Cintra's study of the Portuguese chronicle revealed that the relationship was, in fact, the other way round: the *CVR* is one of the principle source texts for the *Crónica de 1344*.[475] With this new *terminus ad quem* identified, Diego Catalán was able to establish the *CVR*'s descent from the Alfonsine *Versión crítica*,[476] and traced its composition to the "primer tercio del s. XIV, cuando menos",[477] almost certainly during the reign of Fernando IV.

---

[472] PCG, ch. 1074.
[473] Theodore Babbitt, *La Crónica de Veinte Reyes: a Comparison with the text of the Primera Crónica General and a Study of the Principal Latin Sources* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936). Also Brian Powell, *Epic and Chronicle: The 'Poema de mio Cid' and the 'Crónica de veinte reyes'* (London: MHRA, 1983).
[474] For an overview, see Larry L. Collins, "The historiographical background of the *Crónica de Veinte Reyes*", *Revue d'histoire des textes*, 4 (1974-75), pp. 339-357.
[475] See the "Introdução" in the first volume of the *Crónica geral de Espanha de 1344. Edição crítica do texto português*, ed. by Luis Lindley Cintra (Lisbon: Academia Nacional de Belas Artes, 1951).
[476] Diego Catalán, *De Alfonso X al conde de Barcelos: cuatro estudios sobre el nacimiento de la historiografía romance en Castilla y Portugal* (Madrid: Gredos, 1962), p. 203.
[477] Diego Catalán, "Crónicas generales y cantares de gesta. El Mio Cid de Alfonso X y el del pseudo Ben-Alfaray", *Hispanic Review*, 31 (1963), pp. 195-215, p. 205n.

All other circumstances of its production are rather more mysterious, however: it is entirely anonymous and there has been no success in identifying a chronicler. Fernando Gómez Redondo has suggested that both it and the *Crónica de Castilla* are products of a wider cultural project undertaken during the reign of Fernando IV, under the direction of María de Molina, inspired by the Alfonsine historiographical project and relying on many of its collected materials.[478]

As in the case of the *CPSF*, the sizeable manuscript tradition of the *CVR*[479] attests to the enduring popularity of its historical view. Given their shared place of production, it seems likely that they shared a target audience, that is, the Castilian nobility attached to (or not yet attached to) the court of Fernando IV. This explains their common emphasis on the actions of the nobility, and the CVR's further expansion of epic material celebrating the noble heroes of Castile's early days as an independent kingdom.

Internal Contexts

Although based on the *EE*, the manuscripts of the *CVR* tradition entirely discard the Gothic and pre-Gothic history of Spain, covering only the reigns of Fruela II through Fernando III. Although there are vestigial indications of a division in to three or four "parts", as in the Latin chronicles,[480] the reigns of these kings provide the real structural divisions in the text. The reigns are subdivided into episodic chapters, with each king having his own numbered set of chapters; the exceptions to this rule are the short-lived Sancho III and Enrique I, and two Leonese kings, Fernando II and Alfonso IX, who are

[478] *Historia de la prosa medieval castellana*, II, pp. 1225-31.
[479] Mariano de la Campa, *La Crónica de Veinte Reyes* (doctoral thesis), pp. 11-64.
[480] Gonzalo Martínez Diez suggests that the structure is most similar to that of the *Traducción Ampliada* of Jiménez de Rada. "La Crónica de Veinte Reyes", in *La crónica de veinte reyes*, ed. by César Hernández Alonso (Burgos: Ayuntamiento de Burgos, 1991), pp. 13-31.

subordinated to their Castilian counterparts. As in the *DRH*, chronology in the strictest sense does not play a large part in shaping the narrative; there is no consistent dating of events, certainly not with the rigidity of the *EE*, and it entirely abandons the synchronization of Castilian kings with foreign realms. In fact, it could very easily have been given the title *Crónica de Castilla* for its laser-like focus on the events of Castile; as Gómez Redondo has noted, it displays interest in the recent history of León only inasmuch as this bolsters the position of Castile.[481]

In more recent studies by Inés Fernández-Ordóñez[482] and Mariano de la Campa,[483] Catalán's hypothesis of the *CVR*'s descent from the *Versión crítica* has been confirmed; in fact, Fernández-Ordóñez views them as so closely interrelated that she denies the existence of a separate tradition, preferring to see the manuscripts collectively grouped under the umbrella of the *CVR* as merely an extension of the *Versión crítica*.[484] However, the *CVR* manuscripts extend the history of Spain well beyond the end of the second Alfonsine edition, which as noted above, reached only to the death of Fernando II of León. For the reign of Alfonso IX, the source text has been identified as the *Crónica de Castilla*, which Catalán places in the very early years of the fourteenth century, or even the tail end of the thirteenth;[485] for the reign of Fernando III, it largely follows the *Versión amplificada* and the *CPSF*[486] although, as close reading reveals, there are significant differences between these narratives and the *CVR*. Compared to its sources, the *CVR* is frequently much more concise, partly due its relationship to the *Versión crítica*, which was pared back in the process of its re-writing. There are exceptions, however: the legendary

[481] *Historia de la prosa*, II, p. 1229.
[482] *Versión crítica de la estoria de España : estudio y edición desde Pelayo hasta Ordoño II* (Madrid: Fundación Menéndez Pidal, 1993).
[483] *La "Estoria de España" de Alfonso X : estudio y edición de la "Versión crítica" desde Fruela II hasta la muerte de Fernando II* (Málaga: Universidad de Málaga, 2009).
[484] *Versión crítica*, p. 112.
[485] "Crónicas generales y cantares de getsa", p. 205n.
[486] Inés Fernández-Ordóñez, "Variación en el model historiográfico alfonsí en el siglo XIII: las versiones de la *Estoria de España*", in Georges Martin (ed.), *La historia alfonsí: el modelo y sus destinos (siglos XIII-XV)* (Madrid: Casa de Velázquez, 2000), pp. 41-74.

histories of Fernán González and the Cid receive the most attention in the *CVR* of all the texts in the Alfonsine tradition, and we have already seen how Urraca's reign received significant additions. While the tendency towards concision can be seen in a few elements of the narrative concerning Berenguela, there are many more instances of alteration or straightforward expansion.

Berenguela in the text

The overall outlines of Berenguela's representation in the CVR do not deviate wildly from the image set out in the DRH and subsequently fixed in the EE and CPSF, but many details are substantially different. One of the most notable alterations can be found in the account of Fernando's accession to the throne of Castile, wherein the king's half-sisters become active foils to his kingship, and the knighting ceremony is removed entirely. Not only is there no mention of the queen unfastening her son's sword belt, the depiction of Fernando knighting himself in Burgos is nowhere to be found; the whole episode is reduced to the king's wedding.[487]

The sole ritual of king-making in the *CVR*, in fact, precedes even the gathering at Valladolid, creating a new order of events. In this account, Fernando becomes king when he successfully escapes from León and joins his mother and her nobles in Otilla. The escape itself is depicted as a near thing, for the *infantas* Sancha and Dulce, his older half-sisters, "fuéronse para su padre e dixéronle que non dexase al infante don Ferrando yr a Castilla que muerto era el rrey don Enrrique e que agora teníe tienpo de ser enperador."[488] Nevertheless, after deliberating with the *infante*, we are told, the nobles

[487] CVR, Book 14, ch. 4.
[488] CVR, Book 14, ch. 48

"alçáronlo rrey so vn olmo", and then carried on towards Palencia.[489] The *alzamiento* is not new: both the DRH and the EE include this initial king-making moment, but they both include it as the first stage in the process, which will be continued by a second phase of public acclamation (in Valladolid), and a final confirmation in the knighting rituals at the cathedral of Burgos. Here, the mutual consent of the prince and his nobles is decisive, and need only be confirmed by the rituals of transfer and public acclamation. Knighting is evidently not a necessary component of kingship here. (This excision alone dates the chronicle to the earlier part of the fourteenth century, given the emphasis that Alfonso XI would later place on both of his own knighting ceremonies-cum-coronations.)[490]

The CVR adds a small detail to the events at Otilla, specifying that Fernando was raised as king underneath an elm tree. There is nothing of trees in either of the source texts, so whence the elm specifically? Elm trees have been commonplaces of literature since Antiquity, signalling idyllic spaces or death, but in the High Middle Ages, the idyllic implications of the elm meshed with those of the oak, long a symbol of strength: Henry II of England had carried out his kingly duties of administration and justice beneath an elm tree at Gisors,[491] and chronicles of Fernando's contemporary and cousin Louis IX of France emphasize the king's personal rulership in images of him hearing petitions from his subjects in the shade of a great oak.[492] Jacques Le Goff has stressed that these scenes are purely legendary elements of the hagiographic narratives that sprang up after Louis IX's death,[493] but nevertheless they reveal the ideals of kingship

[489] *CVR*, Book 13, ch. 48.
[490] Peter Linehan, "Alfonso XI of Castile and the arm of Santiago (with a Note on the pope's foot)", in *Miscellanea Domenico Maffei dicata*, ed. by Antonio García y García and Peter Weimar (Frankfurt: Keip Verlag, 1995), pp. 121-146.

Also *History and the Historians*, pp. 592-93.
[491] This elm later became notorious for its arboricide by Philip Augustus of France. See Lindsay Diggelmann, "Hewing the Ancient Elm: Anger, Arboricide, and Medieval Kingship", *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 40 (2010), pp. 249-72.
[492] Malcolm Vale, *Henry V: The Conscience of a King* (New Haven: Yale University, 2016), pp. 20-21.
[493] Jacques Le Goff, *Saint Louis*, trans. by Gareth Evan Gollrad (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009), p. 386.

being promoted by often court-sponsored writers in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. By adding the elm tree, and open-air conference with the nobility, the CVR invokes these images of model kingship for Fernando.

In combination with the removal of Berenguela's ritual role—itself introduced in the DRH and continued in the *Versión amplificada*—this suggests an ongoing anxiety around the process of king-making, which makes sense in multiple contexts where the dynastic line was insecure and queens were involved intimately in public struggles over the succession. Such concerns are raised even after Fernando is accepted and publicly affirmed in his kingship at Valladolid: Alfonso IX proposes to Berenguela that they "tornase en vno, que fuesen amos señores de Castilla e de León todos sus días, e después que fincare todo a su fijo, e él que enbiare a ganar despensaçión de Rroma".[494] No other account includes any suggestion of a remarriage, but this episode—including Berenguela's strongly-worded rejection that "ella nunca más tornase en el pecado, e el rreyno que lo quería para su fijo, a quien lo diera Dios e los omnes buenos de la tierra"—resembles a later account of María de Molina's defense of Fernando IV's rights, including a refusal to remarry. It allows the queen to assert her virtue in the face of the illegitimacy of her (former) marriage, while defending her son's rights to Castile in terms that do not rely on birth alone for the creation of legitimacy; God and the *omes buenos* suffice.

Despite the anxiety surrounding the intersection of kingship and ruling queenship, other parts of the narrative in which Berenguela plays a principal role—the regency, the transition, and the ongoing conflicts between Castile and León, as well as the queen's quarrelsome relationship with Álvaro Núñez de Lara, which spans all of these—are significantly expanded in comparison to the EE and the DRH. The narrative of the

[494] CVR, Book 14, ch. 1.

regency period in particular becomes more substantial in the CVR, going into greater detail about Berenguela's conflict with Álvaro Núñez de Lara and her relationship with Enrique, as well as her efforts to get Fernando to come to her aid. The regency begins with the count swearing "sobre los Santos Euangelios e sobre la Cruz, los finojos fincados" to the queen herself —consciously or unconsciously mirroring his subsequent downfall and heightening his future betrayal—that he will "sienpre la amase e la siruiese commo a señora natural".[495] Berenguela intervenes again after she is excluded from the cortes in Valladolid, despite it being part of her personal demesne: "enbióle a dezir que parase mientes a lo que jurara e que non quisiese yr contra ello", admonishing Álvaro Núñez on behalf of magnates who have been "maltrechos" by the regency, and attempting to right the course of the kingdom.[496]

The secret correspondence between Enrique and Berenguela also becomes more elaborate in the CVR, and centers around Álvaro Núñez's demand for the surrender of the queen's *arras* castles; calling the count's bluff, she agrees to surrender them only if Enrique will confirm his command in a face-to-face meeting. The young king denies that this was his desire, and instead requests his sister send him "vn omne de que fuese mucho en poridat", which leads directly to an abbreviated version of the episode of the messenger and the false letter.[497] As in the DRH's account, the intrigue causes Enrique "sabor de salir de su mano e yrse para la rreyna, su hermana", leading Álvaro Núñez to arrange his marriage to Mafalda of Portugal. Where earlier chronicles attribute the dissolution of this marriage to the pope, who learned of it from unnamed sources, the CVR makes it an act of personal revenge between the queen and the count: "[l]a rreyna, con saña del conde, enbió mostrar a Ygnoçençio papa cómmo aquel casamiento era syn derecho e contra ley, que eran parientes çercanos."[498]

[495] CVR, Book 13, ch. 41.
[496] CVR, Book 13, ch. 42.
[497] CVR, Book 13, ch. 43.
[498] CVR, Book 13, ch. 44.

The account of the regency is prolonged further by Álvaro's renewed demands for the surrender of Burgos and Valladolid, two cities to which Berenguela had significant personal and dynastic connections, and his attacks on her other holdings. The queen confronts the royal messenger in direct speech, recalling Álvaro's oaths to her and accusing him of misrepresenting the king's wishes: "Esto bien lo sé yo que non lo manda el rrey mi hermano nin le plaze, mas fázelo el conde que me faze gran tuerto."[499] Retaining only Valladolid for herself, "que su padre ge la diera por heredamiento por sus días", Berenguela very nearly surrenders her cause, declaring that she would rather "yr a tierra de León a veuir en sus arras", depriving Castile of her protection. The count's desire to "buscar mal a la rreyna" comes perilously close to derailing the providential reunion of Castile and León, too: in another novel element, the CVR claims that Álvaro Núñez attempted to arrange a marriage between Enrique and the *infanta* Sancha of León, "porque non heredasen sus fijos [that is, Berenguela's children] el rreyno de León".[500]

When Álvaro takes aim at Berenguela's Galician *arras* territories, the queen's warning to her brother "quel metíe en grand yerro e dende le pudíe muy grand yerro venir", while reprimanding her rival for "consejar mal a su señor natural e non le guardaua de daño e de engaño e de yerro en que le metía",[501] carries more than a hint of prophecy, and demonstrates her superior capability and wisdom over both the king and the count. Enrique subsequent request for his nephew the *infante* Fernando to accompany him suggests another attempt to return to the queen's control, but Fernando returns to his father in León before this can come to pass.

[499] CVR, Book 14, ch. 45.
[500] CVR, Book 14, ch. 45.
[501] CVR, Book 14, ch. 45.

As we have already seen, the CVR makes Fernando III's accession to the Castilian throne a perilous endeavor through the intervention of the *infantas* of León and their father, and one which is achieved through maternal virtue and popular support. This emphasis on family dynamics continues beyond the moment of accession, however. Rather than a simple continuation of the ongoing conflicts over the Tierra de Campos that hark back to Alfonso VIII's time, the CVR frames the conflicts between Castile and León in the 1220s as a question of filial and parental relationships, stressing Fernando III's obedience to both of his parents, even when his father persists in attacking his kingdom. Berenguela advises her nobles against fighting Alfonso IX when he invades Castile, out of concern for Fernando's moral well-being: "dixo la rreyna que nunca el fijo faríe tal yerro que fuese lidiar con su padre."[502] In combination with the proposal for remarriage, this results in a much more negative image of Alfonso IX than offered by any of the previous chronicle narratives, as well as a construction of Fernando III as even more virtuous, seeking to avoid sin of violating the Fifth Commandment while his father covets and steals.

Berenguela's ongoing enmity with Álvaro Núñez de Lara, too, continues beyond Enrique's death. The account of his capture is cut short and stripped of the element of divine intervention, as well as the humiliation of being dragged muddy before the queen. Instead, the CVR says, "fue preso el conde con quinze caualleros de los mejores".[503] But his death, which in earlier chronicles emphasizes the poverty and disgrace in which he died, as retribution for his actions, gets an unexpected addition. The queen takes pity on her old enemy, and sends generous amounts of money so that his body might be returned to Uclés and given a proper funeral: "la rreyna, con mesura e con piadat, mandóle dar todo quanto ovieron para leuar e vn paño de oro para sobrel ataúd".[504] Miriam Shadis

[502] CVR, Book 14, ch. 1.
[503] CVR, Book 14, ch. 3.
[504] CVR, Book 14, ch. 6.

has already noted the similarities of this particular alteration to events in the *Crónica de Fernando IV*: on two separate occasions during her regency, María de Molina is reported to have sent cloth-of-gold palls to cover the coffins of her deceased enemies.[505]

Since there is no hint of this in any of the three chronicles composed during Berenguela's lifetime, nor in the EE, it seems a clear instance of creating a model of queenly comportment in the heroic past to reflect events in the present or recent past. Cloth of gold was expensive, and such palls were reserved for the burials of important nobles; the recipients in the *Crónica de Fernando IV* are both *infantes,* sons of the kings of Aragón and Castile, worthy of such treatment despite their enmity with the queen. Álvaro Núñez de Lara was a disgraced would-be usurper of royal power, who was, not for lack of trying, not a royal himself.[506] So why did the chronicler of the *CVR* decide to invent a spectacular burial for him, nearly a century after his death?

Shadis links the burial of the *infante* Enrique with the account of Álvaro's death in the early fourteenth-century[507] *traducción gallega* of the *Primera Crónica General.* But I have found that the detail first appears, in fact, in the even earlier *Crónica de Castilla*: "la reyna, con mesura e con piedat, mandóle dar quanto ovieron menester para lo leuar, e vn paño de oro para cobrir el ataút."[508] The language is identical, with the exception of "menester" and the semantically interchangeable "sobrel" and "cobrir". The *Crónica de Castilla* is similar in many respects to the *CVR*; it was composed during the reign of Fernando IV,

[505] Shadis, *Berenguela*, pp. 158-59.
[506] There are other indicators that Álvaro Núñez fancied himself a member of the ruling elite: his mother Teresa had married Fernando II of León during his childhood, he was raised alongside Alfonso IX at the Leonese court, and Antonio Sánchez de Mora has even discovered a charter wherein Álvaro styled himself as "filius […] regine domne Tarasie". See *La nobleza castellana en la Plena Edad Media: el linaje de Lara (ss. XI-XIII)*, University of Seville [doctoral dissertation], 2003, vol. 1, p. 185.
[507] Ramón Lorenzo (ed.), *La traducción gallega de la* Crónica general *y de la* Crónica de Castilla (Orense: Instituto de Estudios Oresanos Padre Feijóo, 1975), vol. I, p. xxiv.
[508] *Crónica de Castilla*, ed. by Patricia Rochwert-Zuili (Paris: SEMH-Sorbonne, 2010), Ch. 10, §22.

in 1300 or 1301,[509] around the time of the king's majority, and possibly at the behest of María de Molina herself. This is at least two years before the death of the *infante* Enrique; the more likely inspiration is the 1296 death of the *infante* Pedro de Aragón, also recounted in the *CFIV*.

The decision to transpose the *infante*'s burial onto Álvaro Núñez de Lara is attributed to the fact that "María's acts formed a paradigm of queenly behavior that was then read back onto Berenguela's life".[510] I would argue that this is only partly correct. There is no doubt of deliberate parallels created between the two queens; we have already seen that the *CVR* introduces the threat of the queen's remarriage into the narrative. The reason that María's acts were being read back into representations of Berenguela, however, is that Berenguela was *already* considered to be a paradigm of queenly virtue. That much is evident from her treatment in the DRH and its translations; it can also be seen in the *versión amplificada* and even in the CM. By adding to narratives of Berenguela's piety and charity, as well as her good relations with the nobility, and blurring the boundaries between María's actions and those of her illustrious grandmother, the aim was rather to legitimate María's claims to and practice of queenship.

Another possibility occurs, too, which is that this display of the queen's wealth and virtue is intended to indicate the strength and stability of the succession, as guided by Berenguela. In her pioneering study on mourning dress, Lou Taylor notes that in the Middle Ages, "grandiose royal funerals only became possible" when the succession was secure, and that these elaborate, expensive rituals "symbolised the power and stability of the Crown--the more extravagant the better".[511] Álvaro Núñez de Lara is, in every royalist chronicle of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the personification of

[509] Rochwert-Zuili, "Introduction", in *Crónica de Castilla*, §30.
[510] Shadis, *Berenguela*, p. 159.
[511] Lou Taylor, *Mourning Dress: A Costume and Social History* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1983; repr. Abingdon: Routledge, 2009), pp. 2-3.

instability in the succession. In the CVR, his capture follows immediately upon the queen's lament, "querellándose" against God, that the "rrey de Castilla aya de demandar tregua para andar por su reyno."[512] Berenguela's attitude towards Álvaro's death thus becomes an expression of strength; his funeral, ritualized like a royal one, symbolizes the stability of Fernando's succession, as well as displaying Berenguela's wealth, both spiritual and temporal, while reinforcing her ultimate triumph over the rebellious tendencies of the nobility.

[512] CVR, Book 14, ch. 2.

III

María de Molina

(1295-1321)

Unlike Urraca and Berenguela, María Alfonso de Meneses was not the daughter of a king, nor even her father's heir, and therefore we know even less of her early years than we know of queens who were themselves of royal birth. Her father was the *infante* Alfonso of León and Castile, the youngest son of Berenguela of Castile and Alfonso IX of León, and the favorite brother of Fernando III (perhaps so favored because he had ceded his rights to the throne of León). Her mother was Mayor Alfonso de Meneses, the daughter of the *ricohombre* Alfonso Téllez de Meneses, and the third wife of the *infante* Alfonso, who by that time was also the Lord of Molina, by right of his first wife Mafalda González de Lara.

Despite her high rank, as the second child of the third marriage of a prince who already had half a dozen legitimate and illegitimate heirs, María's birth was hardly momentous enough an occasion to be recorded for posterity. The outlines of her early biography are sparse enough that we can only guess at her age: Mercedes Gaibrois suggests a birth date around 1265[513], but in any case it would have been a decade or more into the reign of her cousin Alfonso X, since the *infante* Alfonso's third marriage took place in 1260—and her upbringing. Through accounts of her household later in life, we know that her governess (*aya*) was the Galician noblewoman María Fernández Coronel,

[513] Mercedes Gaibrois Riaño de Ballesteros, *María de Molina* (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1936), p. 16.

wife of Alonso Pérez de Guzmán, and that her wet-nurse (*ama*) was called María Domínguez. Beyond these bare details, anything else is speculation.

María Alfonso de Meneses entered the written record of history upon her own marriage to the *infante* Sancho of Castile in July 1282. The wedding provoked much controversy, principally because Sancho was already betrothed, and secondly because María and Sancho were first cousins once removed and related within a prohibited degree. Gaibrois,[514] Carmona Ruiz,[515] and others[516] have idly conjectured that the marriage was a love match, speculating about a first meeting at the baptism of Sancho's illegitimate daughter Violante, where María was made the infant's godmother, but there is an absence of evidence. It seems more likely that Sancho, then in the middle of a revolt against his father over the succession to the throne, married María as part and parcel of that rebellion. The decision was an affront to Alfonso X, for by rejecting the French marriage arranged for him, Sancho asserted his independence and refused to participate in an endeavour which would strengthen his father's ties to France rather than his own status. It also reinforced Sancho's support among the Castilian nobility and used conflict between the great noble houses to his advantage: María's half-sister Juana Alfonso de Molina was married to the head of the Haro family, Lope Díaz de Haro, eighth Lord of Vizcaya, and implacable enemy of Juan Nuñez de Lara, the patriarch of the Lara family, who supported the claims of the *infantes* de la Cerda. That Sancho's sister Violante married Diego López de Haro, the brother of Lope Díaz, at the same time corroborates the idea that this union was above all, deeply political in nature.[517]

---

[514] *Ibid.*, p. 18-19.
[515] María Antonia Carmona Ruiz, *María de Molina* (Barcelona: Plaza & Janés, 2005), p. 35, p. 43.
[516] Almudena de Arteaga, *María de Molina: tres coronas medievales* (Madrid: Martínez Roca, 2004, repr. 2007), p. 13-15.
[517] Fernán Sánchez de Valladolid, *Crónica de Alfonso X: Según el Ms. II/2777 de la Biblioteca del Palacio Real (Madrid)*, ed. by Manuel Gónzalez Jiménez and María Antonia Carmona Ruiz (Murcia: Real Academia Alfonso X el Sabio, 1998), pp. 224-25. Paulette Lynn Pepin, *María de Molina, Queen and Regent: Life and Rule in Castile-León, 1259-1321* (Lanham: Lexington, 2016), p. 18, notes the political aspect of María's marriage in relation to the Haro family, but does not connect it to Violante's marriage to Diego López.

Despite the importance of Sancho and María's marriage in gathering and retaining supporters, it quickly became a political weak point after Alfonso X's death. Supporters of the *infantes* de la Cerda—a diverse group that included, among others, the Pope, Philip III and Philip IV of France, and Pere III and Jaume II of Aragón—pointed to Sancho's dual illegitimacy as evidence for the righteousness of their claim. Not only had Sancho IV been disinherited and cursed by his father and removed from the line of succession in response to his rebellion, but he had entered into a marriage that was doubly prohibited on the grounds of bigamy and consanguinity.[518] For a prince occupied with the business of political revolt against the established order, the latter was not a particularly pressing concern, despite two letters from Pope Martin IV, dated January 1283, which condemned the "*incestas nupcias, excessus enormitas*" and "*publica infamia*",[519] and threatened Sancho and María with excommunication if they did not immediately separate.[520] For a new king working to consolidate his position in the face of serious, well-financed legal and military challenges, these claims of illegitimacy presented a real and potentially destabilizing threat, and the matter of the marriage was the most serious of all.

Though Sancho spent much of his reign proving his legitimacy on the battlefield and on the southern frontier, no small amount of money and effort were spent working to obtain more tangible legal proof, in the form of papal dispensation. As he planned the conquest of Tarifa and struggled with his increasingly poor health,[521] the king's

[518] Sancho's disinheritance only came in Alfonso X's final testament, but the old king's preference for his eldest son's lineage had been clear since Fernando de la Cerda's death in 1275.
[519] Martin IV's letters are reproduced in A. Marcos Pous, "Los dos matrimonios de Sancho IV", *Escuela Española de Arqueología e Historia en Roma: Cuadernos de Trabajo*, 8 (1956), pp. 7-108.
[520] There is no evidence, however, that the archbishop of Burgos and the bishop of Astorga complied with papal instructions on the matter, perhaps because of the general state of chaos in Castile at the time. E. Jaffé & H. Finke, *Anuario de historia del derecho español*, 4 (1927), pp. 298-318, pp. 300-01.
[521] José Manuel Nieto Soria, *Sancho IV de Castilla (1284-1295)*, *Estudios Históricos La Olmeda*, *Corona de España, Serie Reyes de Castilla y León* (Gijón: Trea, 2014), pp. 103-15.

desperation to resolve the matter of his "illegitimate" marriage, and concurrently the illegitimacy of his heirs, was such that in the early 1290s, he acquired a falsified papal bull of legitimation which purported to be from the chancery of Nicholas IV. We know that he acquired it, likely through Castilians who were working in Rome at the time of the two-year papal interregnum, because a bull issued by Boniface VIII in 1297, two years after Sancho's death, contains both a scathing reprimand of the forgery itself and an overview of investigation into how the suspect document was created.[522] Nevertheless, during his lifetime, the falsified bull, in conjunction with military triumphs over enemies both domestic and foreign, provided a veneer of legitimacy sufficient to content most of Castile.

But Sancho's death in early 1295 meant the rapid erosion of his hard-won political gains. Sancho's alleged dying words to the young Don Juan Manuel—that he should serve the queen "ca so çierto que lo avrá muy grant menester, et que fallará muchos después de mi muerte que serán contra ella"—proved to be prophetic.[523] With a legally-illegitimate nine-year-old boy occupying the throne and his legally unwed mother attempting to govern on his behalf, the threat presented by the wholly legitimate, papally-favored *infantes* de la Cerda exploded into a period of open and prolonged civil war which quickly drained María and her son of both supporters and money in equal measure. Once the 1292 bull was exposed as fraudulent, the campaign for a real dispensation was more urgent than ever, but only one item on the queen's very long list of political, economic, and military priorities. It is in this capacity as regent on behalf of Fernando IV that María is first drawn into Castilian narratives of history at the dawn of the fourteenth century. Though the two chronicles discussed in this chapter, the *Crónica de los reyes de Castilla* and the *Crónica de cuatro reyes*, offer differing accounts of her

[522] *Ibid.*, pp. 304-06.
[523] Juan Manuel, *Cinco tratados: Libro del cavallero et del escudero. Libro de las tres razones. Libro enfenido. Tractado de la asunción de la Virgen. Libro de la caça.*, ed. by Reinaldo Ayerbe-Chaux, *Spanish Series*, 51 (Madison: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, 1989), p. 104.

participation in Sancho's government, they are broadly in agreement that María was the rightful and legitimate guardian of the kingdom and the king. Their remarkably flattering representations of the queen, however, served very different political aims.

I. *Crónica de los reyes de Castilla* — Jofré de Loaysa

External contexts

The prologue of the *Crónica de los reyes de Castilla* attributes the text to "magister Gaufridus archidiaconus toletanus", identified by Alfred Morel-Fatio as *maestro* Jofré de Loaysa, archdeacon of Toledo, and there seems little reason to question this attribution, for the *maestro* in question comes from a well-documented family with close ties to the Castilian and Aragonese royal courts.[524] He served as a royal clerk under Alfonso X and Sancho IV, but that achievement must be seen in context, part and parcel of two generations of service to the royal family of Castile.

Maestro Jofré de Loaysa was the son of the Aragonese nobleman Jofré de Loaysa and his wife Jacometa; the couple served as *ayos* for Violante of Aragón and upon her marriage to Alfonso X in 1246, they accompanied her to Castile and remained in her service for the rest of their lives. Jofré the elder remained a regular correspondent of the Aragonese king, but gained importance in the Castilian court, even serving as the king's *copero mayor* or chief cup-bearer, a position of significant trust. He received substantial gifts of land in Andalusia, and the Loaysa family were also among the most richly rewarded when Alfonso distributed reconquered Murcian territory in the third quarter

[524] Alfred Morel-Fatio, "*Chronique des rois de Castille (1248-1305)*, par Jofré de Loaisa.", in *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*, 59 (1898), pp. 325-378. I will refer to Morel-Fatio's edition, despite its age and occasional flaws, because it remains the closest to the manuscript.

of the thirteenth century.[525] After Jofré's death in 1275, his elder son García Jofré replaced him as advisor and *copero mayor*, though he was quick to swear allegiance to Sancho IV after Alfonso X's death, and the new king named him *adelantado mayor* of Murcia in June 1284.[526]

Jofré de Loaysa's second son and namesake, however, took a very different route to royal favor and the power it entailed. Though we do not know where he received his title of *magister*, we do know that by 1272 he had acquired it and was serving as the abbot of Santander; this remote assignment caused him to lose the lands Alfonso X had bestowed upon him in Murcia, as he was not fulfilling his obligations to maintain them.[527] He was also by then a royal notary, serving in Queen Violante's chancery from the early 1270s.[528] He was promoted to the archdeaconry of Toledo, launching his career to even greater heights.[529] A new archbishop of Toledo, Gozalo Pérez Gudiel, was elected in 1280, and soon became a major player in both the ecclesiastical and secular courts of Castile. Archbishop Gonzalo had plans to finish the work begun by Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada half a century earlier, and restore Toledo, once and for all, to its long-lost primacy.[530]

As archdeacon, outranked in the Castilian ecclesiastical hierarchy only by bishops and the archbishop himself, Jofré de Loaysa soon became "a leading member of a group

---

[525] Jofré de Loaysa, *Crónica de los Reyes de Castilla: Fernando III, Alfonso X, Sancho IV y Fernando IV (1248-1305)*, ed. by Antonio García Martínez (Murcia: Patronato de Cultura de la Excma. Diputación de Murcia, 1961; Academia Alfonso X el Sabio, repr. 1982), pp. 26-31.
[526] *Ibid.*, pp. 37-38. García Jofré de Loaysa died sometime between August and November 1285, serving just over a year as *adelantado mayor* of Murcia.
[527] *Ibid.*, pp. 52-53.
[528] Francisco J. Hernández, "La reina Violante de Aragón, Jofré de Loaysa y la *Crónica de Alfonso X*. Un gran fragmento cronístico del siglo XIII reutilizado en el XIV", *Journal of Medieval Iberian Studies*, 7:1 (2015), pp. 87-111, p. 103.
[529] García Martínez and Ubieto Arteta, among others, attribute Jofré de Loaysa's 1280 promotion to Gonzalo Pérez Gudiel, but Peter Linehan has declared the link to be "demonstrably incorrect", since Pérez Gudiel was in Rome in 1280, and was detained there for several years on account of debts accrued, before finally returning to Toledo in 1284. Francisco J. Hernández & Peter Linehan, *The Mozarabic Cardinal: The Life and Times of Gonzalo Pérez Gudiel*, Millenio medievale, 44 (Firenze: SISMEL-Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2004), pp. 327n.
[530] Peter Linehan, *History and the Historians of Medieval Spain* (Oxford: OUP, 1993), pp. 448.

of *toledanos* dedicated to the cause of Toledan aggrandizement under the direction of" Pérez Gudiel.[531] Though he continued to occupy the role of abbot of Santander until at least 1287, it is clear that Jofré was as heavily involved in the life of the Alfonsine court as he was in the intellectual millieu of Toledo's cathedral school. As an advisor to Fernando de la Cerda, he was so close to the confidence of the royal family that Alfonso X explicitly named him as one of just three listeners permitted to hear a letter from the king to his heir in the summer of 1273.[532] Similarly to the case of his brother García Jofré, the *maestro*'s loyalty to Alfonso in the face of Sancho's rebellion was ultimately rewarded by the new king, and indeed, in 1294 we find him listed as one of Sancho IV's clerks, so it seems unlikely that he spent much time *away* from the royal court.[533]

All of this proximity to the center of secular power explains the *how* of Jofré's chronicle: for many of the events he relates, he was either an eyewitness or had privileged access to both private and chancery documents. But it does not explain the *why*, and for that we must return to archbishop Gonzalo and his aspirations for Toledo. In seeking to restore Toledo to the primacy it had enjoyed in Visigothic times, the archbishop cast himself as an ideological as well as literal successor to Jiménez de Rada, and dedicated himself whole-heartedly to carrying out the architectural and political expansion efforts that had been set in motion during the reign of Fernando III. To achieve this, Gonzalo relied on a mutually beneficial relationship with Sancho IV and María, whereby the Toledan church helped provide the legitimacy that the formerly rebellious prince desperately needed, and in return the king funded building projects and the establishment of the *estudios generales* at Alcalá, as well as promising to make Toledo the

[531] *Ibid.*, pp. 447-48.
[532] "[Q]uando leyeredes esta carta sea y Alfonso Fernandez mio fijo, si fuere convusco, & don Jufre & Diego de Corral & non otro". Paula K. Rodgers, "Alfonso X Writes to His Son: Reflections on the *Crónica de Alfonso X*", *Exemplaria Hispanica: A Journal on Alfonso X and Alfonsine Iberia*, 1 (1991-92), pp. 58-79, p. 79.
[533] García Martínez, p. 55.

site of all future royal coronations and his own tomb.[534] The other essential element of Rodrigo's campaign had been the *De rebus Hispaniae*, with its enshrinement of Toledo at the center of Visigothic political and religious power, and given that the prologue explicitly casts the text as a continuation of the *DRH*, we can see that Jofré's chronicle goes hand in hand with Gonzalo's project to restore Toledan primacy. However, although Jofré likely took up the composition of his chronicle at Gonzalo's behest, the archbishop died in Rome in 1299, and his death warrants nary a mention in the text, so this cannot be the whole story of the text's patronage or its author's loyalty. The narrative itself strongly suggests, as we will see, that both of these soon shifted to María de Molina.

Dating the chronicle presents some difficulties. Given that the events of the final chapter, which ends with a mention of the conflict between Juan Nuñez de Lara *el Mozo* and the infante Juan over the lordship of Albarracín, took place in 1305, it seems clear enough that Jofré finished writing his chronicle in the early years of the fourteenth century, during the most tumultuous period of Fernando IV's minority. Since his last will and testament was drawn up in late November 1307, and he died within a few months' time, we can fix the latest possible end date of the chronicle's composition in 1307.[535] Precisely when the writing process began is more difficult to determine; at the very least, the comparative brevity of the chapters devoted to the first two decades of Alfonso X's thirty-two-year reign seems to suggest that it was not a project undertaken in Jofré's very early career, a timeline which fits with the theory that it was sponsored, in its initial stages, by archbishop Gonzalo Pérez Gudiel.

[534] Hernández & Linehan, *The Mozarabic Cardinal*, pp. 249-51. Also Linehan, *History and the Historians*, p. 525.
[535] Francisco J. Hernández, having discovered two documents that reproduced Jofré's last testament in full, gives the date of the testament as 29 November 1307, and the date of his death as 24 January 1308. "Noticias sobre Jofré de Loaisa y Ferrán Martínez", in *Revista Canadiense de Estudios Hispánicos*, 4:3 (1980), pp. 281-309.

Further complicating the question of date and authorship, there is no extant manuscript of Jofré's vernacular chronicle; only a single manuscript of a Latin translation —by "Armandum de Cremona", per the prologue—survives. Armando de Cremona is a rather more mysterious figure than Jofré, with no presence in Castile before 1305, and Linehan suggests that his translation could have been completed a decade or more after Jofré's passing, based on the prologue's declaration that Armando was "canonicum cordubensem et postmodum socium in ecclesia toletana", the latter a role in which he is not recorded until 1317.[536] Though there is, of course, a risk that Armando's Latin version is egregiously mistranslated, badly copied, or significantly altered in terms of content,[537] the lack of other attestations means that we have no choice but to trust in the fidelity of Jofré's translator to the text.

Internal contexts

Jofre's chronicle is at once brief and broad; its nine manuscript folios provide a record of the events of sixty years, divided into eleven chapters.[538] Its very concise prologue, a single sentence preceding the intitulation for the first chapter, explains that after the death of the "prefati reverendi patris domini Roderici archiepiscopi toletani", the "venerabilis vir" *maestro* Jofré de Loaysa wrote and had translated into Latin a history "de gestis et aliarum rerum que tempore ipsius archidiaconi in Hispaniam contingerunt." Despite its brevity, it makes plain the connections between Rodrigo, his praise-worthy history ("laudabilem historiam… stilo composuit luculento"), the work of the Toledan church (or more specifically its cathedral school), and the writing of Spain's history which is to be carried out in Jofré's text.[539]

---

[536] Hernández & Linehan, *The Mozarabic Cardinal*, pp. 327-28n.
[537] *Ibid*, p. 327-328.
[538] Morel-Fatio further divided these chapters into a total of 100 paragraphs in his 1898 edition, and his numbering system has persisted in more recent editions. The paragraphs do reflect more or less discrete episodes, but the manuscript apparently contains no such indicators of division. Morel-Fatio, "*Chronique*, pp. 333-34.
[539] Morel-Fatio, p. 335.

Unlike many of the chronicles discussed in this study, however, the prologue contains no meditation on the uses of history, perhaps because this particular history was intended as a continuation of Rodrigo's historiographical work. Nothing included in the prologue explicitly states this, but based on its reference to the Rodrigo's text as the "historiam suprascritam", and the fact that it required translation into Latin, it seems quite likely that Jofré's chronicle was intended to be (physically) added as a sort of supplement to the codex of the *De rebus Hispaniae*.[540] The numbering of the chronicle's chapters supports this hypothesis: the first chapter, which relates the conquest of Seville and Cádiz and the death of Fernando III, is numbered CCXVIII; the final chapter of Jiménez de Rada's text, which ends with a recounting of the reconquest of Écija, Almodóvar, Lucena, Estepa, and others in the early 1240s, is numbered CCXVII.[541] On the available evidence, it is clear that Jofré de Loaysa conceived of his chronicle "as the completion of D. Rodrigo's national history, the literary complement to [archbishop] Gudiel's projected realization of D. Rodrigo's cathedral."[542]

Alas, the *Crónica de los reyes de Castilla* must certainly be said to fall short of the mark if it is judged on its merits as a continuation of the *De rebus Hispaniae*. Beyond their shared language and the numbering of their chapters, the connection between Jofré's chronicle and Rodrigo's ends, and there is little to link them in either style or content. The archbishop was renowned for his elegant prose, and his chronicle contains many a lengthy digression, but his would-be continuator (or his translator) writes in a manner that can only be described as ruthlessly concise, and only very rarely spares a few extra

[540] García Martínez, *Crónica*, p. 60. Hernández & Linehan, *The Mozarabic Cardinal*, p. 330, have also suggested that the translation into Latin was required in order to make the chronicle accessible to the international intellectual circle connected to Gonzalo Pérez Gudiel, but in light of the fact that the translation was carried out after the archbishop's death, this was at the very least a thwarted intention, if never the intention at all.
[541] Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada, *Historia de rebus Hispaniae siue Historia Gothica*, ed. by Juan Fernández Valverde (Turnhout: Brepols, 1987), lib. 9, cap. 18, linea 18.
[542] Hernández & Linehan, *The Mozarabic Cardinal*, p. 327.

sentences to offer an opinion or expand upon an event that he has related. And Jofré's text is not only very brief, especially for a chronicle that covers more than half a century, but also quite unbalanced in the weight given to each of the kings, as can be seen from the distribution of chapters: there is a single, very short chapter which serves to dispense with the final five years of Fernando III's life, comprising two "paragraphs" that glance over the reconquest of Seville and Cádiz, and Fernando's burial. Two chapters are assigned to the thirty-two year reign of Alfonso X, four chapters to Sancho IV's eleven years on the throne, and another four chapters for a period of ten years comprising the minority and early majority of Fernando IV, ending in 1305.[543]

There is, on the surface, no clear organizational scheme which applies throughout the chronicle, at least not in the sense that the *Estoria de España* and others carefully and consistently label chapters and events with years (regnal or otherwise). Time is clearly an organizing principal to some extent, since events are arranged in a loosely chronological fashion and there are occasional temporal markers (usually years, occasionally months), but they are not deployed consistently: Fernando III's conquests are undated, but the year of his death and burial is given; the births of Alfonso X's children are listed all together with no date, but the execution of his brother Fadrique is assigned a year. All in all, there are twenty dates given, scattered throughout the chronicle.

The key to understanding this apparently inconsistent use of dates lies in the chronicle's brief *explicit*: "Gloria sit Christo, de cuius munere sisto de regum gestis plus scribere vel fore testis."[544] It is the "regum gestis", the deeds of kings, and specifically the

[543] Morel-Fatio further divided these chapters into a total of 100 paragraphs in his 1898 edition, and his numbering system has persisted in more recent editions. The paragraphs do reflect more or less discrete episodes, but the manuscript apparently contains no such indicators of division. Morel-Fatio, "*Chronique*, pp. 333-34.
[544] Morel-Fatio, p. 374.

kings of Castile, which constitute the closest thing to an organizing principle that can be found in Jofré's chronicle; their most significant deeds, which can include marriages, deaths, battles, and treaties as well as more negative actions, are identified by the inclusion of year-marks. This means, however, that the minority of Fernando IV — lacking as it was in important kingly deeds — features only four dates, and the chapters devoted to his reign are instead given over to the deeds of noblemen taking advantage of political disorder.

Due to its pretensions of completing Rodrigo's venerable history whilst recounting Castilian royal deeds in the broadest of sweeps, Jofré's chronicle has elicited unfavorable comparisons to the *De rebus Hispaniae*: it has been tarred as "narrowly conceived, Castilian-dominated in the extreme, and almost strictly contemporary in its coverage".[545] All of this is true, but it only means that Jofré de Loaysa had, despite the prologue's claim to the contrary, a very different agenda in mind than his predecessor, and that his product should not be compared to Rodrigo's at all. Since the chronicle rarely lingers on any event to moralize, this agenda must necessarily be determined from the selection (and selective suppression) of events as well as the manner in which they are narrated. I would suggest, however, that two surprising omissions from Jofré's chronicle may be able to shed some light on the forces at work. Firstly, the death of archbishop Gonzalo Pérez Gudiel in 1299 appears nowhere in the text, despite the repeated invocation of "don Gonzalo who later became a cardinal," which has been much emphasized by critics.[546] This suggests that whatever the archbishop's role in conceiving of the chronicle, by the time that it was finally written, the importance of the Toledan element had fallen by the wayside. Secondly, the matter of the illegitimacy of María and Sancho's marriage, and thus of the king himself, is minimized in the extreme. Francisco J.

[545] Hernández & Linehan, *The Mozarabic Cardinal*, p. 329.
[546] García Martínez, *Crónica*, pp. 58-59. Hernández & Linehan also cast doubt on Gudiel's responsibility for Jofré's chronicle in *The Mozarabic Cardinal*, pp. 328-29.

Hernández has placed Jofré de Loaysa among the witnesses at the reading of the papal bull of legitimation at the council of Peñafiel in April 1302,[547] but there is no trace of any such event in his chronicle, and the legitimation of Fernando and his siblings is effectively combined with the dispensation for his marriage to Constanza of Portugal.[548]

María in the Text

María's wedding marks her first appearance in the chronicle, amidst the account of Sancho's rebellion against his father at the end of Alfonso X's reign. She is described in reverential terms that highlight her own nobility and the excellence of her lineage, invoking both her father and her grandfather: "nobilem mulierem dominam Mariam, filiam illustris infantis dompni Alfonsi de Molina fratris olim incliti regis Fernandi predicti, nupsit idem infans cum ipsa domina Maria […]".[549] The marriage of Sancho and María in Toledo, along with the marriage of the *infanta* Violante to Diego López de Haro is important enough to merit a date, 1319 (1281), but what is most notable about Jofré de Loaysa's account of the occasion is what it does not say. There are no hints at the controversy surrounding Sancho's unconsummated first marriage to Guillerma de Montcada, or at the paternal and papal disapproval that followed both weddings, on the grounds of upsetting carefully-arranged alliances and consanguinity, respectively. That these unions might constitute part of the broader strategy of gathering noble support for Sancho's rebellion can only be inferred from their position between the description of an Alfonso X clinging to his last strongholds in Seville, and a lament for the "magnam destructionem et desolacionem terre régis" caused by the war between father and son.[550]

[547] Hernández, "Noticias", p. 292.
[548] Morel-Fatio, p. 366.
[549] Morel-Fatio, p. 347.
[550] *Ibid.*, p. 347.

The account of the reign of Sancho IV takes little notice of the queen, very occasionally noting her comings and goings at the king's side. If she does catch the chronicler's attention, she is always mentioned in glowing terms: when the *infantes* de la Cerda revive their challenge to Sancho's throne, he remains in Valladolid with "illustrissima regina domina Maria uxore sua", his wife's lineage deployed in service of bolstering his own.[551] In fact, María is represented in an active capacity only once during her husband's eleven years on the throne, when the chronicle reports that the *infante* Juan was spared imprisonment for his defection at Tarifa "ad preces illustris regine uxoris sue et infantis Fernandi filii sui primogeniti".[552] The queen is cast in the traditional "queenly" role of intercessor, her supplications mitigating the king's potentially fatal anger and preventing a repeat of the episode of Alfonso X's execution of his brother Fadrique,[553] a key moment in the crisis of succession which caused the high nobility to coalesce behind Sancho's campaign to replace his father. The inclusion of the young Fernando in the pleading links mother and son in the prevention of fratricide, and thereby the preservation of Sancho IV's integrity as king, as well as establishing a precedent for María to serve as a model of morality for her son.

For it is in Jofré de Loaysa's account of the reign of Fernando IV that the centre stage is occupied not by the king—who, we are reminded at every turn, is only a "regis pueri"—but by his regents, including his mother the queen, and those who would take his place. Chapter CCXXV begins with the burial of Sancho IV and the return of the *infante* Enrique from his lengthy and fraught exile before finally recounting the raising of the new king, "qui tunc erat de nono etatis sue anno in decimum constitutus, in regem unanimiter et concorditer sublimarunt."[554] The chronicler's subtle questioning of Fernando IV's suitability for the throne, given his age of nine in 1295, should not go

[551] *Ibid.*, p. 354.
[552] *Ibid.*, p. 358.
[553] Morel-Fatio, pp. 343-45.
[554] Morel-Fatio, pp. 359-60.

unnoticed, but his opinions are much clearer regarding the regency arrangements, and the regents themselves:

> "Et peractis ibi diebus regio funeri deputatis, illustris regina dompna Maria mater prefati regis Fernandi et domina laudande, ymo pocius admirande virtutis, prout in sequentibus plenius apparebit, una cum predicto filio sue rege ac dompno Henrico et aliis tunc regia castra sequentibus ad locum de Valleoleti propter accedentes ibidem curias celebravit. In quibus interfuerunt multi prelati, barones ac nuncii comunitatum seu conciliorum regni Castelle et Legionis, qui inter cetera constituerunt preffatum dompnum Henricum tutorem regis Fernandi predicti et iusticiarium ac custodiam maiorem regnorum ipsius, quamvis postmodum modicam aut nullam justiciam exerceret, tanquam qui venacioni pocius et frecuenti comestioni quam alteri negocio intendebat et de loco ad locum pro libito discurrebat.
>
> "Set prefata regina, tanquam prudens multum et circumspecta domina, tam filium suum regem predictum, qui cum ea tunc moram trahebat ibidem, quam regna ipsius prout melius poterat, gubernabat. In ipsis quoque curiis monetam seu monete collectam, licet non esset perfectum septenium, concesserunt et ut monetam de novo cudi faceret, et tunc nova moneta huiusmodi facta fuit."[555]

The process of mourning Sancho's death, in a context where mourning itself is both a public performance gendered female in medieval Castile and one of the ritual responsibilities of queenship,[556] is tied to praise of María, who is no longer merely illustrious, but explicitly virtuous and praiseworthy. These qualities are ascribed to her without any real elaboration as to what deeds have made her admirable, but they provide a stark contrast to the *infante* Enrique's appointment to the regency at the 1295 *cortes* in Valladolid. Though the power to bring the three estates together should in theory be reserved to María,[557] the only regent chosen by Sancho, Jofré's chronicle depicts the calling of cortes as a joint effort, with the queen acting "una cum" the king and the *infante* Enrique in an equitable partnership. However, once Enrique's right to the regency has been granted by the will of the "prelati, barones ac nuncii comunitatum", which would normally be a clear sign of legitimate authority, his own actions are held up as proof of

[555] Morel-Fatio, p. 360.
[556] Miriam Shadis, *Berenguela of Castile and Political Women in the High Middle Ages*, *New Middle Ages Series* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 151-59. The construction of mourning as feminine in the Mediterranean is discussed in James S. Amelang, "Mourning Becomes Eclectic: Ritual Lament and the Problem of Continuity", *Past & Present*, 187 (2005), pp. 3-31.
[557] Nieto Soria, *Sancho IV*, p. 114, on the evidence of the king's testament, as well as Juan Manuel above and, as we will see, Fernán Sánchez de Valladolid all report that María was to be Fernando's *tutora* in her own right.

his dishonourable nature. Jofré's scathing assessment accuses the prince of enjoying a lifestyle filled with regular hunting and feasting, purposeless wandering, and administering practically no justice. All of this is directly contrary to the proper kingly comportment spelled out in the *Castigos del rey don Sancho IV*, which stresses that justice is the principal function a ruler, and that all sins (in this instance, sloth and gluttony) are magnified in the royal person.[558] Enrique is not the king, but as "iusticiarium ac custodiam maiorem regnorum", he should perform much of the king's role. Already he compares very badly in Jofré's estimation with Sancho, who, though overly harsh on his people, was said to have been a "multum juticiarius princeps".[559]

Because of the *infante* Enrique's dereliction of duty, the queen has no option other than to govern her son's kingdoms to the best of her abilities, as the "prudens multum et circumspecta domina" that she is. This is underlined with María receiving further praise for her prudence, and especially for her efforts to shore up support for Fernando: she is responsible for temporarily bringing the troublesome Diego López de Haro back into her son's service, making swift work of this reconciliation—"intra dies paucos reduxit (regina) ad graciam dicti regis nobilem virum dompnum Didacum germanum olim comitis dompni Lupi Viscaye domini"—by returning lands seized by Sancho and making the lordship of Vizcaya hereditary so that he might pass it on. In this careful interweaving of the queen's virtue and the prince's vice from the very beginning of the royal minority, we can observe the beginnings of the parallel discourses of legitimation and delegitimation which run through the chronicle, elevating the queen whilst casting doubts upon the nobility who would work against the king.[560]

---

[558] The idea that virtues and sins are magnified in the persons of the king and queen can be found throughout the *Castigos*; the image of the king's *mesura* as a tower, visible from a great distance, is a particularly striking contrast with Enrique's evident *desmesura*. *Castigos del rey don Sancho IV*, ed. by Hugo O. Bizzarri (Madrid-Frankfurt: Iberomericana-Vervuert, 2001), pp. 162-63.

[559] Morel-Fatio, p. 358.

[560] The framework of legitimacy, along with the dual processes of legitimation and de-legitimation, has been adapted from Isabel Alfonso and Julio de Escalona, "Introduction", in

These discourses can be very subtle, seemingly inconsistent, and even counter-intuitive. Even in the passage above, which unambiguously legitimates the queen over Enrique, there are clear indications of the limits of María's ability to control the situation. In the assertion that she governed the king and his kingdom "prout melius poterat" there is praise, but also the suggestion that her rule was somehow impeded, either by her own skills or, more likely, by the actions of those around her. At the same time, Castile's underlying economic instability is highlighted in the need to mint new money before the designated seven years have passed, and the cortes' permission is used to further legitimate the queen's governance. But María's wisdom and virtue are insufficient to maintain peace: the chronicle claims that disagreement over a tax collector in the queen's city of Toro is the spark which incited the *infante* Juan to begin ravaging Castilian lands.[561] In an uncharacteristically poetic lament, the chronicle decries the kingdom's return to a state of nature, painting a vivid picture of desolate roads reclaimed by wilderness, abandoned fields, and a people whose only pleasure was causing murder and mayhem ("aliud nisi cedes, rapinas et spolia homines sapiebant").[562]

Though it is very clearly a condemnation of the greedy, warring kings and would-be kings of Iberia seeking to displace Fernando IV from his rightful throne, Jofré's lament also reads as a warning about the dangers of minority kingship and an unstable regency. The state of nature envelops the world outside of Valladolid, as the *regis pueri*, his mother, his elderly great-uncle, and their few remaining supporters await the combined attack of the kings of Aragón, Portugal, France, Juan Nuñez de Lara, and loyalists of Alfonso de la Cerda and the *infante* Juan. These threats are both domestic and foreign, led by powerful adult warriors, and Castilian royal power, divided as it is among three

Building legitimacy: Political discourses and forms of legitimacy in medieval societies, ed. by Isabel Alfonso et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2004), pp. ix-xxiii.

[561] Morel-Fatio, p. 362.

[562] Morel-Fatio, p. 363.

individuals who fall far short of the kingly ideal, is unable to prevent the destruction and death being wrought upon the land. The chronicle emphasizes the vulnerability of their position, and the waning of noble support for Fernando's cause: the attacking force nearly arrives "ad Vallemoleti, ubi tunc ipse rex cum predicta matre sua et dompno Didaco et paucissimis militibus morabatur, cum fere derelictus esset a baronibus omnibus, cucurrerunt."[563]

The siege of Valladolid is built up to be a fatal, reign-ending catastrophe; it is a certain victory for Fernando's enemies and the downfall of his supporters. In the face of danger, however, the queen refused to flee to Toledo or another safe haven to save their lives, preferring instead, in her wisdom, to remain in Valladolid and place her faith in God and the justice of her cause: "constans et prudens domina multum de Deo misericordia precipue confidens et sperans se de dicto loco nequaquam tunc voluit amovere".[564] Despite her physical weakness, and the massed forces converging on her poorly-defended city[565], God himself intervened to "dissipavit… consilium regum et hostium predictorum"[566] and thwart their plans to capture Fernando and the regents. This fortuitous escape confirms, above all, the righteousness of María's cause, legitimating both her claim to the regency as well as the soundness of her counsel. Nor is it the only instance where the queen's actions on her son's behalf are conflated with divine action: noble supporters return to Fernando partly because "finaliter ipse Deus est ipsius regis pueri recordatus", and partly because of his virtuous mother, whose wise and prudent government, "quasi sola multum laudabiliter, prout melius poterat," preserved his kingdoms until God worked upon the minds of the king's enemies.[567]

---

[563] Morel-Fatio, p. 363.
[564] Morel-Fatio, p. 364.
[565] Valladolid was, throughout María de Molina's married and widowed life, the queen's stronghold. Though it was technically the king's city, the chronicles and her own testament show her affinity for the city, and reveal her cultivation of extensive relationships with its non-noble *concejos* and clergy. Manuel Larriba Baciero, "El testamento de María de Molina", *SIGNO. Revista de Historia de la Cultura Escrita*, 2 (1995), pp. 201-11.
[566] Morel-Fatio, p. 363.
[567] Morel-Fatio, p. 365.

Furthermore, María's strategy for regaining the support of nobles and knights consists of humbly and sagely paying them "in gradu suo quantum poterat tribuebat et maiora semper omnibus redeuntibus pollicebatur"; even as the chronicler affirms the queen's actions and praises their miraculous return, he manages to cast aspersions on their greed while elevating those who had remained faithful to Fernando throughout, "quasi martires sunt effecti", nearly to the point of martyrdom.[568]

In the rest of Jofré's chronicle, María's role in the regency is restricted to what can be broadly described as acts of reconciliation, which evolve from her intercessory action during Sancho's reign. Aside from bribing her son's enemies to return to his service, she also arranges strategic Portuguese marriages for Fernando and the *infanta* Beatriz, as a "sapientissima domina" seeking to remove the constant threat of the Aragonese-allied Dinis I on the western border.[569] She also helps to negotiate freedom for Juan Núñez de Lara, exhibiting her capacity for forgiveness; but the negotiations are concluded with Juan Nuñez's marriage to María's niece María Díaz de Haro, making the reconciliation doubly part of the queen's remit.[570] Only once is María de Molina depicted in any sort of military capacity: she is present at the failed siege of Paredes de Navas, where the attacking party are accused by the chronicler of "nec eis libenter incomoda guerre inferrent", not desiring to inflict the inconveniences of war upon the besieged; the king and queen and their supporters are said to have returned to Valladolid "non absque quadam verecundie nota."[571]

[568] Morel-Fatio, p. 365.
[569] Morel-Fatio, p. 366.
[570] Morel-Fatio, p. 368. Royal women's use of family networks, and particularly matrimonial politics, for the benefit of both their natal and marital families, has been widely studied; for a survey of the Castilian situation, see Miriam Shadis, "Berenguela of Castile's Political Motherhood: The Management of Sexuality, Marriage, and Sucession", in *Medieval Mothering*, ed. by John Carmi Parsons and Bonnie Wheeler (New York: Garland, 1996), pp. 335-58.
[571] Morel-Fatio, p. 366.

Military mishap notwithstanding, María's influence and loyalty is repeatedly shown to be superior to that of Fernando's former enemies as he grows older and more independent. When the *infante* Juan and Juan Nuñez de Lara lure the king to León with an eye to bringing him under their control, Jofré reprimands Fernando, then aged sixteen, for casting aside the "sano consilio matris sue, que pro ipsius vita et regno tuendo tot et tanta pericula perpessa fuerat," as well as the counsel of the *infante* Enrique and Diego López de Haro, and all those allies "qui sibi in tribulacionibus et pressuris constantes et fideles extiterant."[572] And even though his new advisors are leading him to worse, more damaging rule over his people than either his father (whose generally good kingship was tempered by his overzealous justice and overtaxation) or his grandfather, Fernando occupies his time with "puerilibus ludis et aliis ludibriis." Worst of all, he freely gives away parts of his kingdom ("multa alia de regno suo alienavit, tradidit et concessit baronibus et militibus ac eciam regibus") which his mother had worked and suffered so long to preserve for him.[573] Jofré accuses the king, now in his majority, of violating one of the fundamental values put forth by Jiménez de Rada, and later by Sancho IV: the territorial indivisibility of Castile-León under the rule of a single king. "Para mientes quán mal se fallaron e quán mala çima ouieron los reyes que partieron los regnos por los fijos que ouieron," Sancho had warned in the *Castigos*; to divide his estate for the sake of mere nobles was a far graver sin.[574] The queen alone possesses the wisdom, passed on by her husband, to prevent their son's greatest failing.

II. *Crónica de tres reyes/Crónica de cuatro reyes*[575] — Fernán Sánchez de Valladolid

[572] Morel-Fatio, p. 369.
[573] Morel-Fatio, p. 370.
[574] *Castigos*, p. 165.
[575] Accessing the text of the *Crónica de cuatro reyes* presents many complications, of which the most obvious is that it has not been edited as in its entirety since the nineteenth century. Cayetano Rosell's edition, contained in *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*, 66 (Madrid: Rivadeneyra,

External contexts

The prologue which accompanies the *Crónica de tres reyes*[576] explains that Alfonso XI, desiring to complete the written record of "los fechos de todos los reyes que fueron en Espanna", ordered three chronicles to be written, one for each of his great-grandfather Alfonso X, his grandfather Sancho IV, and his father Fernando IV. From the fact that this explanation applies the title of "rey… de Algezira" to the king of Castile,[577] we can be certain that the prologue was written no earlier than the spring of 1344, when the nearly two-year siege of Algeciras finally came to a victorious end for Alfonso XI and his Christian allies. The fifth decade of the fourteenth century was a troubled time in Iberia, filled with internecine wars as well as international ones, and for Castile it meant fending off repeated Muslim attempts to invade the Peninsula via western Andalusia.[578] First came the battle of Battle of Río Salado in 1340, where combined Castilian and Portuguese forces delivered a crushing defeat to the invading Marinid army from Morocco, and where Alfonso XI successfully defended Tarifa, which Sancho IV had worked so hard to conquer at the end of his life. Four years later, on the back of a second invasion from North Africa, the Castilians seized Algeciras from the Marinids, and it must have felt as though the momentum of the Reconquest had finally been renewed.

1875), has long been criticized for a litany of philological sins, including incorrect transcriptions and a poor choice of manuscript, but it remains the only modern edition of the *Crónica de Fernando IV*. For the other three chronicles, I will rely on more recent editions which contain only a single reign. *Crónica de Alfonso X: Según el Ms. II/2777 de la Biblioteca del Palacio Real (Madrid)*, ed. by Manuel González Jiménez and María Antonia Carmona Ruiz (Murcia: Real Academia Alfonso X el Sabio, 1998). *Crónica de Sancho IV*, ed. by Pablo Enrique Saracino, *Incipit Ediciones Críticas*, 9 (Buenos Aires: SECRIT, 2014). *Grán Crónica de Alfonso XI*, ed. by Diego Catalán, *Fuentes Cronísticas de la Historia de España*, 4, vol. 1 (Madrid: Gredos and Seminario Menéndez Pidal, 1977). References to these will be abbreviated as *CAX*, *CSIV*, *CFIV*, and *CAXI*.

[576] The prologue accompanies the *Crónica de Alfonso X*, which is the most commonly attested of the individual chronicles, in twenty-one of thirty-four manuscripts. Paula Kelley Rodgers, "Prolegomena to a Critical Edition of the *Crónica de Alfonso X*" (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of California, Davis, 1984), pp. 3-4.

[577] *CAX*, p. 3.

[578] Teófilo F. Ruiz, *Spain's Centuries of Crisis: 1300-1474*, *History of Spain* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2007, repr. 2011), p. 44.

This on its own is sufficient explanation for Alfonso's interest in recording the deeds of his predecessors, for history has always been used to interpret and reflect upon the present. But the prologue speaks only of the chronicles of Alfonso X, Sancho IV, and Fernando IV: three kings. In six manuscripts, this *Crónica de tres reyes* is expanded with a fourth reign, that of Alfonso XI himself, forming a unit known as the *Crónica de cuatro reyes*.[579] The *Crónica de Alfonso XI* only reaches the siege of Algeciras, suggesting that composition was concluded very shortly after the fact in 1344, and certainly before the king's death, at the siege of Gibraltar in 1350, of the plague.[580]

The decision to commission chronicles of his predecessors' reigns alongside his own suggests a desire to begin constructing a legacy and shaping the recent past to accommodate his present and, importantly, *future* political goals. Alfonso XI was a young king at the conquest of Algeciras, only 33, and having already dispatched enemies both domestic—including those quite literally in his own household—and foreign, and established himself firmly in the role of warrior-king and dispenser of justice, he had begun to turn an eye towards justifying the process by which he had consolidated his power. In particular, it was necessary to justify the tight control he exercised over the nobility and the harsh treatment meted out to them; the king's tendency towards extra-judicial executions as a cure for rebellion or treachery had made him especially unpopular among his nobles, and earned him the ambivalent sobriquet of *el Justiciero*.[581]

The historical legitimation of the new relationship between king and the second estate can be seen in other royally-sponsored works[582] of the same time period, in

[579] Rodgers, "Prolegomena", p. 4. It is Diego Catalán's assessment that the *CAXI* in its first form was joined with the *Tres reyes*, and that it makes most sense when considered in that context. *La tradición manuscrita en la 'Crónica de Alfonso XI'*, *Biblioteca Románica Hispánica, Estudios y Ensayos*, 211 (Madrid: Gredos, 1974), pp. 183-276.
[580] Ruiz, *Centuries of Crisis*, p. 45.
[581] Ruiz, *Centuries of Crisis*, pp. 60-61.
[582] The formalization of royal control over the disruptive potential of the nobility was also expressed in the creation of the Orden de la Banda, a new knightly order whose *raison d'être* was

particular the 1348 *Ordenamiento de Alcalá*, which represented the final stage of a series of law codes set out by the king to replace the patchwork of independently-evolving local laws and *fueros* that had long operated in Castile and León. The *Ordenamiento de Alcalá* approaches the *Siete Partidas* in its intended scope, issuing detailed guidance for legal procedures and for more personal interactions, and in its affirmation of the king's authority to make and be the law.[583] It also includes a series of fifty-eight laws relating to the duties and obligations of the nobility to the king, which were purportedly established by "el emperador don Alfonso en las cortes que fizo en Najara".[584] Regardless of this vague reference, which is unclear both on the matter of exactly *which* Alfonso codified the laws as well as when he held the cortes that ratified them, the example of a great king was sufficient reason to revive them.

If historical precedent was justification for law, then the raw stuff of history itself would be the most powerful tool at Alfonso XI's disposal for the legitimation of his actions and the construction of a regnal narrative for posterity. This was not in itself a novel deployment of history; as we have seen in the discussion of Berenguela in the *Estoria de España*, Alfonso X had certainly made much of the vernacular chronicle as a vehicle for the expression of royal ideology, and Sancho IV adopted both his father's methods and his materials to suit. The unusual thing about the history written for Alfonso XI was that it was recent history, and *only* recent history: in the case of the *Crónica de cuatro reyes*, the reigns of his great-grandfather, grandfather, and father, flowing neatly into his own, which traces his evolution from defenseless child-king to "conqueridor e defensor de la fe."[585]

---

the "promotion of chivalry and loyalty to the king", stripped of any religious pretensions. Linehan, *History and the Historians*, pp. 581-82.

[583] Fernando Gómez Redondo, *Historia de la prosa*, II, pp. 1302-12. The *Siete Partidas* were also made the law of the land as a result of the promulgation of the *Ordenamiento de Alcalá*.

[584] "Ordenamiento de Alcalá", ed. by Frank Waltman and Patricia Martínez de la Vega Mansilla, in *Spanish Legal Texts* in *Digital Library of Hispanic Texts* <http://www.hispanicseminary.org/t&c/lex/index-en.htm> [accessed 12 November 2016], fol 20r.

[585] *CAX*, p. 3.

While the prologue makes much of the importance of knowing and preserving *en corónica* the deeds of kings, the movement to have the deeds of recent kings "puestas en tres tratabdos" is attributed to the orders of Alfonso XI alone. The recipients and executors of the order are wholly obscured, and that obscurity has given rise to centuries of debate over the identity of the royal chronicler. Though Fernán Sánchez de Valladolid was apparently recognized by Jerónimo de Zurita as the author of the the *Crónica de tres reyes* in the sixteenth century, Ambrosio de Morales' scratched-out and corrected marginal note to the same effect caused historians and philologists, from the seventeenth century onwards, considerable confusion: was the author Fernán Sánchez de Valladolid, or Fernán Sánchez de Tovar?[586] In the early twentieth century, Julio Puyol y Alonso established from careful study of López de Ayala's chronicles that these Fernán Sánchezes were two different individuals: the former an elder statesman and high-ranking member of the royal chancery, the latter an accomplished soldier and admiral of the Castilian fleet.[587] Fernán Sánchez de Valladolid was readily accepted as the author of the *Crónica de tres reyes*, but Puyol questioned his responsibility for the *CAXI*, on the grounds that it describes him in-too glowing terms: "parece, en verdad, demasiado incienso para quemarse por el interesado en el propio altar, y, de haberlo hecho así, más bien le tendríamos por un presumido vulgar que por *sabidor*, entendido y discreto cortesano."[588] Even Diego Catalán was once reluctant, for similar reasons, to attribute the *Cuatro reyes* to Sánchez de Valladolid.[589] Paula K. Rodgers has reconciled the conflicting identities, concluding that there is at least "some evidence to indicate that Fernán Sánchez de Valladolid was a Tovar [by genealogy], and there is none to show

[586] Rodgers, "Prolegomena", pp. 80-83.
[587] Julio Puyol y Alonso, *El presunto cronista Fernán Sánchez de Valladolid* (Madrid: Reus-Real Academia de la Historia, 1920), pp. 5-26.
[588] Puyol, *El presunto cronista*, pp. 29-30. Peter Linehan has countered that the real problem is that Sánchez de Valladolid is too self-effacing, because there are many occasions when he does not mention himself, in scenes that are clearly eyewitness accounts and for which external sources document his presence. *History and the Historians*, p. 616.
[589] Diego Catalán, *Un prosista anónimo del siglo XIV (La Gran Crónica de Alfonso XI: hallazgo, estilo, reconstrucción)* (La Laguna: Universidad de la Laguna, 1957), pp. 125-29.

that he was not."[590] Catalán ultimately came to be of the belief that he was the author of all four chronicles, "principally because Fernán Sánchez de Valladolid's absences from Spain in the service of his king coincide with the sketchy passages in the Chronicle of Alfonso XI."[591] Pablo Enrique Saracino, in his recent edition of the *Crónica de Sancho IV*, raises doubts about the unity of the work and thereby the authorship of the chronicle, seeing a clear hiatus between the *Crónica de Alfonso X* and the chronicles of Sancho IV and Fernando IV, though he acknowledges that these differences in style might simply be the result of the diverse processes of compilation and composition.[592] Nevertheless, consensus now generally accepts Fernán Sánchez de Valladolid as the author of all four chronicles ordered by Alfonso XI.

Fernán Sánchez was—as the confusion over his genealogy ultimately proved—a member of the Tovar family, one of several prominent families in Valladolid's, and Castile's, growing non-noble class of urban knights. Lacking significant lands and titles of their own, many of these *omes buenos* were able to achieve status and wealth through service to the king, as part of the expanding lay bureaucracy required to administer the realm.[593] These new administrators were not necessarily trained in law, but they nevertheless required a high level of education and expertise in order to successfully climb the ranks.[594] Fernán Sánchez de Valladolid would become one of the most successful members of this first generation of *letrados*, but it is precisely his existence outside traditional noble lineages that makes it more difficult to trace his early career. We know that in 1321, he was serving as the *alcalde del rey* in Valladolid, in which capacity he appears as one of the witnesses to María de Molina's final testament;[595] by 1331, he

[590] Paula K. Rodgers, "José Pellicer and the Confusion over the Authorship of the *Cuatro Crónicas*", *La Corónica*, 17:1 (1988), pp. 41-51.
[591] Rodgers, "José Pellicer", p. 49n.
[592] *CSIV*, p. xvii.
[593] Salvador de Moxó, "El auge de la nobleza urbana de Castilla y su proyección en el ámbito administrativo y rural a comienzos de la Baja Edad Media (1270-1370)", *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia*, 178:3 (1981), pp. 407-516.
[594] Linehan, *History and the Historians*, pp. 622-23.
[595] Larriba Baciero, "El testamento de María de Molina", p. 210.

was the king's chancellor, and five years on, had been elevated to chief notary and chancellor of the privy seal.[596] The *CAXI* and chancery documents also show that he was entrusted with sensitive diplomatic missions as early as 1325, representing the king's interests to the regents in the final years of Alfonso's minority, negotiating with Pope John XXII in Avignon in the same year, settling a peace treaty with Juan Manuel in 1330, serving as ambassador to Philip VI's court in 1334-36, and even arranging the marriage of the future Pedro I to Joan of England in the late 1340s.[597] The measure of his favor with the king can be found in the rewards bestowed upon the extended Tovar clan, who were given responsibility for half of the government of Valladolid,[598] and in the variety of privileges granted personally to Fernán Sánchez, including substantial grants of land and, in 1345, the concession of a hereditary lordship over the village of Cubillas de Cerrato, near Valladolid.[599]

The challenge Fernán Sánchez and his colleagues faced, operating in the backrooms of the court, and dependent as they were on the king for their daily bread as well as for the real attainment of status and wealth, was that the king's favor could change, and so could the king. Where Alfonso XI had relied heavily on his "shadowy group of backroom boys"[600] to govern his kingdoms, his son Pedro I's court was a more complicated political environment for the *letrados*, and particularly for the most powerful among them. Fernán Sánchez de Valladolid retained his positions as chief notary and chancellor of the privy seal in the early years of Pedro's reign, but was stripped of the privy seals when Pedro was ambushed and imprisoned at Toro in late 1354, and replaced by the *infante* Fernando of Aragón. Though he reappears occasionally in López de Ayala's *Crónica de Pedro I* after the imprisonment at Toro, it is apparent that his status in the court waxed and waned

[596] Linehan, *History and the Historians*, p. 618.
[597] Salvador de Moxó, "El patrimonio dominical de un consejero de Alfonso XI. Los señoríos de Fernán Sánchez de Valladolid", *Revista de la Universidad Complutense*, 22 (1973), pp. 123-162, pp. 124-26.
[598] Linehan, *History and the Historians*, p. 618.
[599] Moxó, "Los señoríos", p. 128-33.
[600] Linehan, *History and the Historians*, p. 622.

prodigiously with the king's changing political situation.[601] The executions of both of his sons, García Fernández and Juan Sánchez, in 1360 on suspicion of plotting against the king, would certainly have raised doubts about his own loyalty; given his disappearance from the chronicles, the elderly Fernán Sánchez retired from court life shortly thereafter, and lived out his last few years in Valladolid.[602] None of this is reflected in his chronicles, however; they were finished in the earlier and happier period of his life, before he experienced for himself the consequences of the strong, king-centered government that he had helped to cement.

Internal contexts

The *Crónica de cuatro reyes* comprises four chronicles, one for the reign of each king of Castile from Alfonso X to his great-grandson Alfonso XI, and a prologue which ties the first three chronicles together. The unity of the four chronicles has been questioned, based on the stylistic differences between them, and the variety of combinations attested in manuscript witnesses.[603] But the manuscript tradition also provides substantial evidence for viewing the *Cuatro reyes* as a single unit: in thirty-one manuscripts, the first three chronicles appear together, while eleven of these also contain the *CAXI*, and the prologue appears in twenty-one manuscripts which contain either the *Tres reyes* or the *Cuatro reyes*. Other material which appears in some of the mss. is generally historiographical in nature, but there is no clear pattern to be found in these other texts, beyond the inclusion in three mss. of material from the *Crónica particular de San Fernando*.[604]

[601] Luis Vicente Díaz Martín, "Los últimos años de Fernán Sánchez de Valladolid", in *Homenaje al profesor Juan Torres Fontes*, vol. 1 (Murcia: Universidad de Murcia and Academia Alfonso X el Sabio, 1987), pp. 349-64.
[602] Díaz Martín, "Los últimos años", p. 356.
[603] Pablo Enrique Saracino, "Algunas observaciones acerca del problema de la unidad en la *Crónica de tres reyes*", *Cuadernos de historia de España*, 83 (2009), pp. 9-24.
[604] Saracino, "Algunas observaciones", p. 9n. Rodgers, "Prolegomena", pp. 3-4.

The prologue describes how Alfonso XI, desiring that the deeds of Castilian kings before him should be written down, "falló en escripto por corónica en los libros de su cámara los fechos de todos los reyes que fueron en Espanna desde los primeros reyes godos… fasta que finó el santo e mucho bien aventurado rey don Ferrando".[605] The description of the chronicle material discovered in the royal chamber corresponds exactly to the contents of the *manuscrito regio* of the *Estoria de España*, and the prologue casts the "tres corónicas" as a logical continuation of this record of "fechos de los reyes". The narrative techniques and formulaic language characteristic of the *EE* are certainly in evidence, and there is some evidence to suggest that Fernán Sánchez was partly reliant on fragmentary *estorias* produced in the late thirteenth century.[606] But many of the unifying features of Alfonsine historiography are missing from the *Cuatro crónicas*, and this is reflected even at the structural level. Each of the four chronicles is idiosyncratic in its organization, and despite the imposition of a single chronological system—dating by regnal years, which are measured by the era of Caesar and the era of Christ—across the whole project, the structure still oscillates between annalistic and episodic, sometimes in the same reign.

The *CAX*, comprising seventy-seven chapters, displays the most internal inconsistencies. It begins with an elaborate scheme of chronology to date Alfonso X's accession to the throne—using the eras of Adam, Nebuchadnezzar, Philip of Macedon, Alexander the Great, the Egyptians, and the Persians in addition to Christ and Caesar—but this is immediately dispensed with after the first chapter. The first eighteen years of Alfonso's reign are dealt with in twenty-seven chapters that are frequently vague on names, dates, and sources, and which include some quasi-legendary material, such as

[605] *CAX*, p. 3.
[606] Fernando Gómez Redondo, "De la crónica general a la real. Transformaciones ideológicas en *Crónica de tres reyes*", in *La historia alfonsí: el model y sus destinos (siglos XIII-XV)*, ed. by Georges Martin, *Collection de la Casa de Velázquez*, 68 (Madrid: Casa de Velázquez, 2000), pp. 95-123. Diego Catlán identifies a lost **Historia hasta 1288 dialogada*, spanning the reigns of Alfonso X and the first half of the reign of Sancho IV, as a

Alfonso's attempt to replace his wife, Violante of Aragón, with the Norwegian princess Christina; this section is thought to be based on oral tradition or recollection due to its significant divergences from other documentary evidence.[607] The *CAX* then gives thirty-eight chapters over to recounting the noble uprising against Alfonso X (approximately 1271-1275) in great detail. The chronicler regularly reproduces or summarizes documents, especially letters between the king's messengers and his noble enemies, and between the nobles and the king of Granada, which would have been held in the royal chancery or the king's private chamber, and therefore accessible to Fernán Sánchez de Valladolid.[608] The final sixteen chapters cover the last ten years of Alfonso's reign, with most of the emphasis on Alfonso X's economic mismanagement and the conflict between the king and the *infante* Sancho over the matter of succession, in much less detail and with minimal reference to external sources; this section is also generally favorable to Sancho's cause, paving the way for the rebellious prince to claim legitimate authority after Alfonso's death in 1284.

The *CSIV*, on the other hand, with its thirteen chapters, adheres to a strictly annalistic structure throughout Sancho IV's eleven-year reign, assigning one chapter to each year, and deviating only at the end of his life to add a pair of chapters detailing his deathbed instructions for the regency and his funeral. Documents and letters are occasionally referred to and summarized into the narrative, but there is a clear preference for private conversations and even private thoughts. Though similar in terms of sources and style, the *CFIV* is less rigidly annalistic, distributing seventeen years into twenty

---

[607] Joseph F. O'Callaghan, "Introduction", in Fernán Sánchez de Valladolid, *Chronicle of Alfonso X*, ed. by Shelby Thacker and José Escobar, *Studies in Romance Languages*, 47 (Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press, 2002), p. 12.

[608] O'Callaghan, "Introduction", pp. 13-16.
Francisco J. Hernández has suggested that some of the material in this section was intended as the basis for a *Crónica de Fernando de la Cerda* and substantially written up by Jofré de Loaysa, who would have had similar access to such documents, at Queen Violante's behest before Fernando de la Cerda's death in 1275, at a time when Violante had abandoned her husband and fled to Aragón. "La reina Violante de Aragón, Jofré de Loaysa y la Crónica de Alfonso X. Un gran fragmento cronístico del siglo XIII reutilizado en el XIV", *Journal of Medieval Iberian Studies*, 7:1 (2015), pp. 87-111.

chapters, although fully sixteen of the twenty focus on Fernando IV's seven-year minority and María de Molina's constant struggles to defend her son from the constant threats presented by the nobility and rival kings. The *CAXI*, however, reverts to the episodic nature of the *CAX* and carries it to an extreme: the thirty-two years of Alfonso XI's reign are divided into three hundred forty-two chapters, each one detailing a discrete event such as a conversation, a siege, or a battle.

At the ideological level, too, the *Cuatro reyes* diverges significantly from the *EE*. The prologue reflects an understanding of the *EE* as a series of royal chronicles, the history of kings, entirely ignoring the biblical, classical, epic, and legendary material which occupies a substantial portion of the narrative; thus, to continue the project merely requires the addition of a few more royal chronicles.[609] The prologue also makes clear that the chronicler is not interested in Alfonso X's grand providential views about *España* and the *pueblos* that have ruled it; he is only concerned with the deeds of kings, and specifically the kings of Castile and León:

> "… conuiene que los fechos de los reyes, que tienen lugar de Dios en la tierra, sean fallados en escripto, sennaladamente de los reyes de Castilla e de León, que por la ley de Dios e por acresçentamiento de la santa fee católica tomaron muchos trabajos e se posyeron a grandes peligros en las lides que ouieron con los moros echándolos de Espanna."[610]

Though the prologue claims a quasi-providential purpose for the kings of Castile and León, representing God on earth and growing the Christian faith by doing battle against the Moors, it is far from the same theocentric vision put forth in the Alfonsine interpretation of history. Kings may be the chosen representatives of God on earth, but in Fernán Sánchez's "unmistakably secular"[611] chronicles, both history and religion

[609] Gerald L. Gingras, "Sánchez's *Tres Corónicas*: An Alfonsine Legacy?", *Romance Quarterly*, 33:3 (1986), pp. 289-94.
[610] *CAX*, p. 3.
[611] Linehan, *History and the Historians*, p. 622.

become transactional.[612] On the infrequent use of miracles in *Cuatro reyes*, Gerald Gingras notes that instances of divine intercession, always at moments where the continuity of the monarchy is threatened, "correspond to an immediate, political concern. They reaffirm the importance of a just monarchy as the basis of social order"[613], but fail to offer any sort of transcendental meaning, because the only principle which transcends the chronicles is the supremacy of the just king, embodied in the "muy alto e muy noble e mucho onrado e muy bien aventurado"[614] Alfonso XI himself.

María in the Text

Crónica de Alfonso X

The *fechos del infante don Sancho*, as one editor of the *CAX* has dubbed its final chapters, mark the beginnings of María's development as a central figure in the *Cuatro reyes*, though she appears only twice. The first instance is her marriage to Sancho in Toledo; as in Jofré de Loaysa's chronicle, it is accompanied by the marriage of the *infanta* Violante to Diego López de Haro. Here, too, the weddings are placed firmly in the context of Sancho's campaign against his father, emphasizing that he has called *cortes* in Valladolid and received support from all three estates there. Referring to the meeting as *cortes* minimizes the treasonous nature of Sancho's behavior, since the estates were convened against Alfonso X's will and with the express purpose of undermining the king[615], and in combination with the affirmation of popular support, contributes to the legitimization of his cause. So, too, does the fact that his wife is named as the "infanta donna María, fija del infante de Molina": though she was not the daughter of a king, her

[612] Gómez Redondo, "De la crónica general a la real", p. 107.
[613] Gingras, "Sánchez's *Tres Corónicas*", p. 293.
[614] *CAX*, p. 3.
[615] Joseph F. O'Callaghan, *The Cortes of Castile-León, 1188-1350* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989), pp. 25-28.

father's title is nevertheless applied as proof of her own powerful lineage, and of the wealth she would contribute to the crown some years later, in the form of the lordship of Molina. What follows the wedding, however, is a clear sign of the chronicler looking forward to the present: news of the birth of Juan Manuel, Sancho's haste to Escalona to serve as his godfather, and the gift of Peñafiel to the *infante* Manuel all emphasize Juan Manuel's spiritual and temporal debts to Sancho and, by extension, his heirs.[616]

The second time that María appears in the *CAX* is in the events of late1283, as Sancho fights to defend the territories under his control from Navarrese attackers, and loses a powerful supporter in the person of his uncle, the *infante* Manuel. The birth of María and Sancho's first child, the *infanta* Isabel, serves a legitimizing function for the royal couple; before they are even crowned, they have successfully ensured the succession. Meanwhile, the efforts to reach a peace agreement are stymied by the *infante* Juan and other *ricos omnes* tasked with carrying out the negotiations, so Alfonso X and his son "tomaron otra manera por que se abiniesen". This route, in which both parties have much more faith, relies on María and Beatriz Alfonso, Alfonso's illegitimate daughter and the queen of Portugal. Sending secret messengers back and forth, the two women carry out their negotiations "con voluntat de cada uno de los sennores", and they are shown to be more trustworthy (if ultimately no more successful) than the noblemen.[617] María's first active role in the chronicle is a consummate queenly act, the resolution of a familial dispute, albeit at the highest level, but it establishes important precedent for her actions throughout the rest of the *Cuatro reyes*.

Crónica de Sancho IV

[616] *CAX*, pp. 224-25.
[617] *CAX*, p. 239.

In the *Cuatro reyes*, the reign of Sancho IV is bookended by two public rituals which affirm the sharing of power and authority between the royal couple, both symbolically and legally. The first of these is the coronation ceremony: dressed in "paños de oro reales", Sancho called himself king, and "fizo tomar por reina a doña María, su muger, et fizo tomar por heredera a la infanta doña Isabel, su fija, si fijo varón non oviesse".[618] The king is crowned first, by four bishops, and then the queen. This ceremony is unusual—it had been a very long time since Castilian kings were crowned by men of the cloth—[619]but it reflects the preoccupation with legitimacy which pervaded Sancho's early years on the throne. Alfonso X's final testament had cursed his son and all his heirs, and the threats of excommunication over his canonically-illegal marriage to María were still fresh. A ceremonial crowning by bishops from across his kingdoms (Burgos, Cuenca, Coria, and Badajoz) would grant the king and queen legitimacy in the eyes of the Church in Castile, even if the Pope still upheld the claims of the *infantes* de la Cerda. By including María in this ritual—where the *Crónica de los reyes de Castilla* does not—the *CSIV* implicitly acknowledges the validity of her marriage, and it imbues her with all of the symbolic power of queenship.

At the end of the chronicle, as he prepares his final testament, Sancho decides that the only person who can be entrusted with the government of the kingdom is the queen, because of her "grand entendimiento".[620] Although María herself does not participate, this affirmation of her authority is made in front of an audience that includes the archbishop of Toledo, the *infante* Enrique, and "otros ricos omnes et maestres de las cavallerías de las órdenes", including Juan Nuñez de Lara, whose personal promise to serve and obey the queen foreshadows his future treachery.[621] Having established the

[618] *CSIV*, p. 4.
[619] Hernández & Linehan, *The Mozarabic Cardinal*, p. 249.
[620] *CSIV*, pp. 182-183.
[621] *CSIV*, pp. 183-84.

legal basis of her regency—the king's word—it is her mourning behavior at Sancho's funeral which confirms María's exemplary queenship:

> "Et la reina doña María, su muger, con las dueñas, fizo tan grand llanto que vos non podría omne contar cuán grande era. […] el infante don Enrique et don Nuño fueron a la reina et trabaron con ella que fuesse en una mula y nunca quiso ir sino de pie y rastrándose e messándose et faciendo muy gran llanto."[622]

Rending her garments and tearing at her hair, following the king's body on foot and refusing the relief of a mule, the physical exuberance of the queen's lament in the *CSIV* may transgress the medieval Church's notions of proper mourning behaviour,[623] but in the secular context of the chronicle, such a performance further legitimizes the transfer of power.

María's proper exercise of queenship is also confirmed repeatedly throughout the *CSIV* by mentions of her motherhood, with the births of six more children in ten years appearing as regular proof of the royal couple's fecundity. The birth of the *infante* Fernando, the much-desired male heir, is the cause of "grandes alegrías" on the part of the king, who sets about establishing a household for his son.[624] Fernando is followed at more or less regular intervals by Alfonso,[625] Enrique,[626] Pedro,[627] Felipe,[628] and Beatriz.[629] The queen does not only produce heirs, however; she also devotes herself whole-heartedly to defending their rights against the schemes of Lope Díaz de Haro and Philip IV of France to replace María with a French bride. Though Sancho had been quick to defend their marriage with an angry assertion that "en el mundo non avié rey que mejor casado fuesse que él era", and that many of his ancestors who were similarly married

[622] *CSIV*, p. 186.
[623] Amelang, "Mourning Becomes Eclectic", p. 10.
[624] *CSIV*, pp. 27-28.
[625] *CSIV*, p. 51.
[626] *CSIV*, p. 96.
[627] *CSIV*, p. 129.
[628] *CSIV*, p. 156.
[629] *CSIV*, p. 171.

without dispensation "salieran ende muy buenos reyes et muchos aventurados",[630] the flattery and promises of the *privado* Lope Díaz cause the king to turn away from his wife. To emphasize the evil nature of Lope's proximity to the king, the chronicler reveals his innermost thoughts: he thwarts a meeting between Sancho and Philip IV which might bring about the papal dispensation "porque receló que el rey sería más poderoso et non faría él tanto como fazía en la tierra".[631] María's thoughts, too, are made accessible to the reader: unlike Sancho, she understands that Lope's demands to be made a *conde*, as well as the king's *mayordomo* and *alferez*, "era para se apoderar [del rey] et de los reinos", which would not only be to the king's detriment, but also that of their children, intuitively understanding that Sancho and his *linaje* are indivisible.[632] The *CSIV* is at pains to stress that the queen's fear is not for her own position, however, but concern that "los fijos que della [doña Guillelma] oviesse que heredassen et not los fijos que avié ya della".[633]

As Lope's power grows, the chronicler's depiction of the queen as subservient and wise, even in the face of mistreatment by the king, serves as an indictment of Sancho's behavior and of the noble *privados* who are leading him away from the queen's good judgment. Once again, the king's thoughts are opaque, while María's are transparent and evidence of her virtue, as she suffers in silence rather than act against the king:

> "Et la reina doña María, como era muger de grand entendimiento et que veía como el rey andava en poder del conde et de aquellos sus privados, maguer que sabía ella de todas estas cosas por qué el conde lo fazía et que era a menguamiento del rey et a daño della et de sus fijos, non ovo a quien tornar salvo a Dios et nunca al rey quiso fablar en este engaño que le traían porque non gelo creía, tan emaginado estava en el conde et en todos los suyos. Et sufriolo assí fasta que Dios diesse alguna carrera cómo el rey entendiesse todo este engaño…"[634]

[630] *CSIV*, pp. 36-37.
[631] *CSIV*, p. 32.
[632] *CSIV*, pp. 48-49.
[633] *CSIV*, pp. 48-49.
[634] *CSIV*, pp. 53-54.

The miracle which frees the king from the pernicious influence of Lope Díaz is not, in fact, attributed to divine intervention when it is recounted later in the chronicle, although the chronicler is careful to note that, having drawn a dagger in the king's presence and called for his vassals, the count "cayó en tierra muerto *non lo mandando el rey*".[635] The fighting draws the attention of the queen, who braves the scene in order to "guardar al infante don Juan que non tomasse muerte",[636] and prevent a fratricide which would certainly damage Sancho's reputation among the nobility. María's cause is proven to be righteous, and precedent is established for the queen to be favored by God, and to serve as a moral example for a king who is led astray.

Crónica de Fernando IV

The image of María in the *CSIV*—as the possessor of divinely vindicated wisdom, and an unfailingly loyal servant of the king, even when the king has been misled into working against his own self-interest—provides authorization for her actions in the *CFIV*, which are much broader in scope. Her continued performance of queenly roles in the course of Fernando's reign, principally the defense of the king's rights, but also arranging marriages for her children,[637] or providing appropriate funerary rites for her enemies,[638] serves to ground her exercise of power in incontestably correct and virtuous queenship. This is necessary because the bulk of the *CFIV* shows the queen engaged in the public, everyday activities of governing, negotiating with supporters and enemies, holding *cortes*, dispensing justice, and dealing with finances, duties which are normally—and certainly in both the *CAX* and *CSIV*—reserved to the king. As in the *Crónica de los reyes de Castilla*, there is a concurrent discourse of delegitimation directed at virtually all

[635] *CSIV*, p. 88-89.
[636] *CSIV*, p. 90.
[637] *CFIV*, pp. 108-09.
[638] The queen's provision of fine cloth to cover the coffins of the Aragonese king, and later to cover that of the *infante* Enrique, *CFIV*, p. 132.

members of the nobility around the queen—from the *infante* Enrique and the *infante* Juan, to Juan Nuñez de Lara and Juan Manuel—which is incessant. Whenever they act against the queen, and sometimes even when they are allied with her, the chronicler reveals their treacherous inner thoughts, which confirm that they are greedy, power-hungry, and deceitful.

María's legitimate exercise of power is reaffirmed immediately after Sancho's burial, when Fernando is recognized as king in the cathedral of Toledo. Not only must the new king swear to "guardar los fueros",[639] but as his guardian, the queen must also take the oath on his behalf, formally authorizing her power to uphold the law. This is the only instance in Fernando's reign of María participating in a formal ceremony which sanctions her exercise of power, but the queen invokes a similar ritual atmosphere at another key moment for the legitimation of the dynasty: the long-awaited papal dispensation for her marriage to Sancho. The *infante* Enrique, fearing that the powers of the regency would be taken from him, spread rumors that the dispensation was false (relying, no doubt, on the memory of the falsified dispensation of c. 1293, which is suppressed in the *Cuatro reyes*), and in response the queen gathered the inhabitants of Burgos together inside the cathedral and "en medio de la Iglesia fizo leer las letras del Papa ante todos".[640] The choice of time and space—a cathedral, after mass—speaks to ritual, but to read out the words of the Pope in a house of God was to prove their truth beyond doubt, which the people of the city understood.

The principle underlying all of María's actions in the *CFIV* is the defense of Fernando's rights at almost any cost, even when the costs themselves are substantial and sometimes ill-advised. The most notable such sacrifice is the queen's surrender of the "guarda de los reinos", a right explicitly granted to her by Sancho, to the *infante* Enrique,

[639] *CFIV*, p. 93.
[640] *CFIV*, p. 119-120.

so that she may retain possession of Fernando (who is, after all, the source of her power). María also appeases the greed of the *infante* Enrique and other nobles with grants of land and money, as these are the only tools at her disposal to ensure that they remain loyal to the king. Her reliance on such grants is limited only by the principle of the indivisibility of the realm, for the *infante* Juan's demands to be given lordship over Vizcaya and some of León are met with a refusal on the grounds that Fernando's kingdoms were inherited whole, "muy buen é muy derechamente del rey don Sancho",[641] and that to partition them even once would lead to the total diminishment of the realm. In her devotion to preserving dynastic continuity, she pursues these policies to the point of personal impoverishment and physical collapse, even travelling to Burgos "en unas andas encima de una acémila" to seek a loan which will enable her to pay *soldadas* to the king's supporters.[642]

Appeasement is not, however, the only strategy employed by the queen; on the contrary, her normally conciliatory stance means that her episodes of defiance are all the more unusual, and more serious. When Enrique suggests that she remarry, to the *infante* Pedro of Aragón, María's response is explosive:

> "É la noble Reina le respondió que se maravillaba mucho del commo le fabló él en aquella manera con ella aviendo el debdo que él avie con ella, é que non avie por que le dar ejemplo de las reinas que facían mal, ca non tomaria ella enjemplo si non de las que ficieron bien, que fueron muchas, señaladamente del su linaje, é que fincaron con sus fijos pequeños, é que las ayudára Dios, é dijo que si ella fuese cierta que por facer tal maldad, avria el rey su fijo los reinos sin contienda, é aun que le faria cobrar otros tantos reinos commo los que le dejára su padre, que ella non lo faria…"[643]

Her argument underscores the exemplary nature of her queenship and defines the limit of her efforts on Fernando's behalf: she will not transgress the boundaries established for proper queenly behaviour (namely, remarriage, which would

[641] *CFIV*, p. 102.
[642] *CFIV*, p. 108.
[643] *CFIV*, p. 103.

immediately disqualify the queen from guardianship, according to the *Siete Partidas*).[644] This invocation of history, and the reference to other divinely-aided queens-regents *del su linaje* to support her behavior, recurs again when she refuses an agreement that would make the *infante* Juan king of León and Galicia. María admonishes the *omes buenos* to look at the example of Castile's other minor kings, "que fincásen más pequeños que non [Fernando], é que les guardaron complidamente su señorío"; to do otherwise would present a great risk to the kingdom, and a "carrera por que todo se podria perder."[645]

María benefits from divine support as well as historical precedent, however, and this is tested early in the regency, when the royal party are faced with a siege of Valladolid by an alliance of Portuguese, Aragonese, and Castilian nobles. The *infante* Enrique explains that they are vulnerable to attack because the king "era mozo pequeño, lo otro que era ella dueña, é lo otro que era él viejo cansado", and suggests seeking refuge in another city. María merely expresses her faith in "la merced de Dios que él le ayudaria", which is reiterated more forcefully in the passage quoted above. Before the invading force can reach Valladolid, however, they receive news that "muriera el infante don Pedro de Aragon… é otros ricos omnes é caballeros aragoneses é catalanes é navarros", and that the plague which struck them was so great and terrible that "todos los que lo sabian entendieron que fuera grand juicio de Dios sobre ellos".[646] Divine retribution is equally swift when, in the early years of Fernando's majority, the *infantes* Juan and Enrique, along with Juan Nuñez de Lara, work to sow discord between the king and his mother. One of the knights entrusted with keeping Fernando entertained and under the influence of the tutors, Lorenzo Yañez de Liria, "decia al Rey cada dia muchas falsedades… tomando el rey grand placer en esto que le decia". Such wanton slander of the queen made the unfortunate Lorenzo Yañez a salutary lesson for the king, for "quiso

[644] *Siete Partidas*, Partida II, Título XV, Ley III.
[645] *CFIV*, p. 112.
[646] *CFIV*, p. 103.

Dios mostrar en él muy grand miraglo", which caused him to "[perder] la fabla é el entendimiento, que nin pudo confesar nin comulgar, é así murió."[647] God's defense of the queen is both swift and just—lies are punished first with loss of speech, then death—as well as easy to interpret.

The separation of Fernando from his mother culminates in a series of tests which pit the three scheming noblemen against the queen, hoping to prove her dishonesty and secure their own influence over the king. First, they send Fernando to ask for his father's rings, assuring him that the queen has given away his inheritance. When María offers him the rings, along with some of her own jewels, he begins to understand "que era mal consejo el que le dieron", but this is not enough to lure him away from the *infante* Juan and Juan Nuñez. The second test they propose is a revision of the queen's accounts, assuring the king that his mother has stolen "cuatro cuentos" (that is, four million *maravedís*) from the royal treasury each year during her regency. This test, too, only reveals the false nature of the noblemen, as an audit reveals not only no theft, but that the extent of the queen's debts "para mantener la guerra" are such that "non fincó con ella más de un vaso de plata con que bebia, é comia en escudillas de tierra."[648] The dramatic revelation of the queen's self-sacrificial poverty in the interests of governing the kingdom, preserving the dynasty, and continuing the Reconquest is sufficient proof of her virtue (and simultaneously the dishonorable nature of his own *privados*) that Fernando, after this episode, finally begins to seek his mother's counsel once more.

In addition to all of these strategies, the queen and the chronicler together construct a new basis for the legitimation of monarchical power. Throughout the minority period, María relies on the support of the *omes buenos* (non-noble urban knights) and the urban *concejos*, and her use of the *cortes* as both an offensive and defensive strategy to protect

[647] *CFIV*, p. 121.
[648] *CFIV*, pp. 124-25.

the king's sovereignty, and to negate or circumvent the demands of the nobility. Even in the very early days of the regency she is shown to be concerned with the interests of the people, repealing the unpopular *sisa* (a universal sales tax) which Sancho had passed, as part of her campaign to ensure that Fernando retained popular support.[649] Whenever there are conflicts over the composition of the regency, or proposals which threaten the kingdom, as when the *infante* Enrique suggests selling Tarifa to the kingdom of Granada,[650] the queen appeals directly to the non-noble elements of the *cortes* and to the urban councils to either delay her response or legitimate her refusal. That this reliance on the a broader base of support, which negates the power of the trouble-making *omes ricos*, is the innovation of a queen who staunchly defends the rights of her dynasty and is repeatedly proven to be virtuous and divinely-favored, associates the strategy itself with the queen's wisdom, and establishes it as precedent for her heirs to follow.

Crónica de Alfonso XI

When, after the death of Fernando IV, the *infante* Juan and Juan Nuñez propose that María should once again be regent for the infant Alfonso XI, they appeal to her sense of responsibility for the kingdom: if the *infante* Pedro were to take up the mantle, war would break out and "toda la tierra se estragaría".[651] Deploying the deflecting skills honed throughout the first minority, the queen says that she is "flaca" and that counsel should instead be sought from the *concejos* and *omes buenos* to settle the matter. The *cortes* decide that María should be entrusted with the custody of the king, and that the *infantes* Pedro and Juan should be given the government of the kingdom, but although the queen is shown making every effort to preserve peace and unity, the demands of the nobles begin to overwhelm her. The fighting that breaks out, in the queen's own chambers,

[649] *CFIV*, p. 93.
[650] *CFIV*, p. 107
[651] *CAXI*, p. 275.

between armed knights over money at the *cortes* in Carrión, is an indictment of their uncontrolled violence and greed, unable to respect even the honor of the queen in her own palace.[652] Juan Manuel's determination to acquire the regency, against the queen's wishes, even though she offers her approval contingent on that of the *cortes*, is the pinnacle of noble treachery: he even creates his own unauthorized set of royal seals, proving that he cannot be bound by the rule of law, as expressed by the will of the people (the *cortes*) and the will of the king (represented by the queen).[653] When Juan Manuel even dismisses a letter from the pope, which pinpoints the source of "quanto mal e daño e escandalo avia en la tierra" as his decision to act as "tutor non seyendo fecho por cortes"[654], it is clear that there is no earthly power that can contain him and his ilk.

After the untimely deaths of the *infantes* Pedro and Juan on the Vega de Granada, the composition of the regency shifts once again. The disobediance and strife between the new regents (Juan Manuel, the *infante* Felipe, and Juan *el Tuerto*) is directly linked to María's death in the chronicle:

> "Dize la historia que los tutores del rrey andaron por las tierras y en lugar de poner paz e avenençia entre los pueblos, qu'ellos començaron aver contiendas e tomaron la tutoria cada vno como se queria, ansi que los pueblos lo pasauan peor que en el comienço. E la rreyna doña Maria, veyendo el mal e daño que las tierras del rrey rresçibian, ovo grand pesar, e adolesçio de vna dolençia de que fino."[655]

The absence of the queen's moderating influence, weakened as it was, leads to immediate war and chaos, and the illegitimacy of the regents is underscored by the fact that Alfonso XI, who is still "de poca edad", must send messengers to the regents "a dezir e afrontar que oviesen paz e que no le estragasen el rreyno".[656] The last chapter devoted to the regency describes the state of the kingdom on the eve of Alfonso's majority: a

[652] *CAXI*, p. 301.
[653] *CAXI*, p. 324-26.
[654] *CAXI*, p. 346.
[655] *CAXI*, p. 351. This account comes from the a manuscript of the later *Gran Crónica de Alfonso XI*, as there is a lacuna at this point in the *CAXI*.
[656] *CAXI*, p. 358.

barren wasteland where men feared to walk the streets; where the appearance of dead men on the roads was a normal sight; where towns were abandoned by their residents, many of whom had fled to neighboring kingdoms because "en ninguna parte del rreyno no se fazie justiçia con derecho". This lament is, however, clear on where the responsibility lies for the ruination of the kingdom: all of these things have happened "ca los rricos omes e los caualleros biuian de rrobos e de tomas que fazian en la tierra, e los tutores consentianselo por se aver cada vno dellos en su ayuda".[657] The implicit threat is equally clear: the regents and their noble supporters will have much to answer for when a just king takes the throne.

Conclusions

Both of the chronicles examined in this chapter present a window into the conflictive nature of the Castilian-Leonese monarchy at the turn of the fourteenth century, and especially during the reign of Fernando IV. Though the transitional years between Alfonso X and Sancho IV are full of rebellion and outright war between father and son, the royalist perspective of both chroniclers leads to a narrative which favors Sancho over his father, and bolsters its claim with accounts of his justice and military success. The inauspicious beginnings of Fernando IV's reign, in contrast, are highlighted by both chroniclers. By their very nature, royal regencies were disruptive to the smooth flow of genealogy and history which relied upon an unbroken succession of competent adult male kings, and during Fernando's minority, both chroniclers are at pains to emphasize that the already-flexible structures of plural monarchy are stretched beyond advisable limits[658], to the detriment of the people and the land, and even to the detriment of the

[657] *CAXI*, p. 360-70.
[658] Janna Bianchini has usefully written about medieval Castilian-Leonese royal authority as "a collaborative endeavor, shared among the members of a variably defined royal family", whose composition was determined by a combination of custom, preference, and external pressures.

king himself. As a result, in both chronicles, Fernando IV stands as an exemplar of bad and ultimately ineffective kingship, but to different ends. Fernán Sánchez de Valladolid's image of the queen shares many of the same features highlighted by Jofré de Loaysa, but his chronicles do not glorify María for her own sake: her virtue serves a very utilitarian purpose for the rest of his project. The exemplary nature of her queenship, which provides an alternate thread of continuity from Fernando III and essentially displaces the example of weak, bad kingship set by Fernando IV, provides a foundation upon which Alfonso XI's model of kingship can be based. The actions of the nobility during her regencies provide justification for Alfonso XI's harsh treatment of his regents and other suspected traitors among the nobility, while her strategy of reliance on the *cortes* also legitimates Alfonso's program of centralizing royal power into the person of the king with no input from the high nobility.

The only person in the king's immediate environs to escape Jofré de Loaysa's criticism is the queen, who is praised at every possible turn. María as envisioned by Jofré is a model queen: interceding, advising, mourning, defending, placing her faith in God, and only actively governing when the situation was dire. Her moral exemplarity through a litany of tribulations, in the face of scheming and deceitful nobles and an irresponsible son, makes the chronicle read as a condemnation of the king's governance and, above all, a defense of María's regency and her role as an advisor. This interpretation fits with the approximate composition date of the chronicle, and with its author's close ties to the royal court.[659] The last two years about which Jofré writes are a critical moment for María, for with the death of the *infante* Enrique, the uneasy detente which she had carefully constructed over the course of a decade had come undone. And although

The Queen's Hand: Power and Authority in the Reign of Berenguela of Castile (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), pp. 8-9.

[659] On balance, it is difficult to disagree with the assessment that "Jofré de Loaisa was one of nature's trimmers, and his history was trimmer's history." Hernández & Linehan, *The Mozarabic Cardinal*, p. 329.

Fernando had apparently begun to seek her counsel once again, he was still influenced by the *infante* Juan, Juan Nuñez de Lara, and Diego López de Haro. There were new elements in play at court, too: Juan Manuel, son of the *infante* Manuel, was beginning to make a name for himself, and the new queen, Constanza of Portugal, though still too young to be genuinely disruptive to María's avenues of power, was accompanied by her *aya* Vataza Lascaris, who acted effectively as the Constanza's spokeswoman and maintained regular correspondence with both Dinis of Portugal and Jaume II of Aragón.[660] A version of recent history which presented María as a wise and trustworthy advisor who was simultaneously disinterested in taking power for herself (only wielding it to defend her son) would have reassured a still-insecure king of her good intentions, and may even have preserved her place alongside the king as the dynamic plural monarchy continued to change shape.

[660] Gaibrois, *María de Molina*, p. 169.

IV

Catalina de Lancaster

(1406-1418)

When Enrique III died in 1406 at the age of twenty-seven, he left a will and testament that nominated his only son, Juan, as his heir and successor. This was relatively uncontroversial, though some amongst the nobility may well have preferred to see a vigorous adult king on the throne (in the person of the late king's younger brother Fernando) than a child of twenty-two months. What was out of the ordinary, however, was the establishment of the regency. Enrique did not repeat his father's mistake of leaving no provisions; nor did he follow the historical precedent, well-established, as we have seen, in the the examples of Berenguela and María de Molina, of entrusting the education of the heir and the governance of the kingdom to the queen mother alone. Heeding the recommendation of the *Partidas* that the guardians of a young king should be no more than five in number,[661] and undoubtedly incorporating lessons learned from the experience of his own chaotic minority, Enrique stipulated in his will that custody of his heir should be shared between his *justicia mayor*, Diego López de Estúñiga, his chamberlain, Juan de Velasco, and the Bishop of Cartagena, Pablo de Santa María.[662] But these men were not to rule the kingdom of Castile in the name of their young charge: that responsibility was explicitly given over to the widowed queen Catalina de Lancaster — and to the *infante* Fernando. They were to serve jointly and equally as "tutores… e regidores de sus Reinos e señoríos", governing on behalf of the new king, and retaining

[661] Alfonso X of Castile, *Las Siete Partidas del Rey Don Alfonso el Sabio*, v. 2 (Madrid: Real Academia de la Historia, Imprenta Real, 1807), p. 134.
[662] Alvar García de Santa María, *Crónica de Juan II de Castilla*, ed. Juan de Mata Carriazo (Madrid: Real Academia de la Historia, 1982), p. 31.

the power to administer his realms and affairs in all matters except for those relating to "la tenençia e guarda del dicho prínçipe"[663], in which Fernando and Catalina were strictly not to interfere.

This new tripartite division of the regency undoubtedly reflected Enrique's desire to prevent a recurrence of the unwieldy regency council which had ruled Castile during the three years between his father's death and his own declaration of majority at the age of thirteen — a period marked by power squabbles amongst the nobility and an ever-changing roster of more than a dozen regents.[664] By nominating his brother as a regent, he successfully prevented Fernando from making a bid for the throne; by naming his widow as co-regent, he provided a counterweight to Fernando's authority; by choosing independent guardians for the king, he forestalled any attempt that the regents might make at seizing power for themselves by virtue of physical possession of the king. Even the best laid plans are difficult to implement from beyond the grave, but Enrique's death marked the beginning of Catalina's "queenly time"[665] and sanctioned her presence at the center of the Castilian political stage during the regency to follow.

Born in the summer of 1372, against the tumultuous backdrop of the Hundred Years' War and the Schism of the Western Church, Catalina was part of the political stage from her earliest youth, long before she gained a means of acting on that stage. Her father, John of Gaunt, the ambitious Duke of Lancaster, had sought a marriage with her mother, Constanza of Castile, the daughter of the recently-deposed Pedro I, in the hopes of claiming the Castilian throne for himself. Though Edward III and Parliament formally

---

[663] *Crónica de Juan II*, pp. 33-34.
[664] Ana Echevarría, *Catalina de Lancaster: reina regente de Castilla (1372-1418)* (Hondarribia: Nerea, 2002), pp. 61-62. Echevarría's is the only comprehensive study of Catalina; the dearth of research is such that even the *Diccionario Biográfico Español* refers readers to a historical novel by María Teresa Álvarez.
[665] This concept of "queenly time", the association of queens with "kinds of time marked as extraordinary", in particular moments of dynastic transition, comes from Louise O. Fradenburg, "Rethinking Queenship", in *Queenship and Sovereignty* ed. by Louise O. Fradenburg, *Cosmos*, v. 7 (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992), p. 7.

recognized John as King of Castile in early 1372, his attempt to take the kingdom by military force a few years later floundered spectacularly. The Anglo-Portuguese expedition of 1386-87 was similarly unsuccessful in military terms, but it succeeded in finally forcing John of Gaunt to negotiate with the other King John of Castile - that is, Juan I. As it had been previously, the proposed solution to the competing claims was the marriage of Catalina to Juan I's heir, Enrique; this time, John of Gaunt accepted, and in 1388, a treaty was signed in Bayonne which ensured that the Lancasters would make no further claim to the throne of Castile. So important was this settlement that Juan I's reign is remembered in the *Siete edades del mundo* for the king's effort to "quitar un inconveniente" — neutralizing the threat presented by John of Gaunt and Constanza.[666] The other main achievement of the Treaty of Bayonne (that is, beyond the enrichment of the Dukes of Lancaster, who were paid handsomely for relinquishing their ambitions) was to re-unite the descendants of Pedro I and Enrique II, symbolically healing the Petrista/Trastámara divisions created by the fratricide at Montiel.[667]

Catalina, aged sixteen at the time of her betrothal, was married to the ten-year-old Enrique in the autumn of the same year, finally allowing Castile a moment of respite from constant war and threats to the crown, and little is known of her life after marriage until her husband's majority.[668] Between Juan I's death in 1390 and Enrique III taking control of the kingdom in 1393, Castile was ruled chaotically by a council of regents numbering no fewer than seventeen.[669] The internal politics of the Iberian Peninsula would be no less messy during the course of Catalina's life in Castile, between competing claims for practically every available throne, intermittent war with the Moorish kingdom of Granada, and dynastic turmoil of precisely the sort that allowed her to become an

[666] Juan Carlos Conde, *La creación de un discurso historiográfico en el cuatrocientos castellano: Las siete edades del mundo de Pablo de Santa María*, Textos Recuperados, v. 18 (Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca, 1999), pp. 114-15.
[667] Echevarría, pp. 10-42.
[668] Echevarría, p. 72.
[669] Echevarría, p. 60.

important actor on the political stage. That would come not long after the arrival of the *infante* Juan, the third and final of Catalina's children with Enrique — final, because not two years after Juan's birth in the spring of 1405, Enrique III died.

Though the *Siete Partidas*, officially the guiding legal principle of the day, established, and encouraged, the possibility of well-chosen guardians in the case of a minor king, it also provided a dowager queen with the grounds to act as sole regent on her son's behalf:

> "… pero si aveniese que al rey niños fincase madre, ella ha de seer el primero et el mayoral guardador sobre todos los otros, porque naturalmente ella lo debe amar mas que otra cosa por la laceria et el afan que levó trayéndolo en su cuerpo et desí criándolo; et ellos débenla obedescer como á señora, et facer su mandamiento en todas las cosas que fueren á pro del rey et del regno; mas esta guarda debe haber en quanto non casare et quisiere estar con el niño."[670]
> (*Partida II, Título XV, Ley III*)

Neither of these things fully came to pass for Catalina. While she ultimately retained physical control of her son, her powers of regency were split with the *infante* Fernando, who had political ambitions of his own. But though her defining feature would necessarily be the possession of her son (the *Crónica de Pero Niño* notes that "la reyna sienpre estaua a miedo que avía de ser desapoderada del rey su hijo"), these powers of regency nevertheless allow Catalina a means of re-entry to the political arena, and consequently, into the chronicles of Castile.[671] As we shall see, Barefield's thesis that queens emerge into the historical narrative at points of dynastic crisis, moments that threaten or create a break in the uninterrupted, "smoothly flowing" genealogy of kings following kings, is as true for Catalina as it is for Urraca, Berenguela, and María de Molina before her.[672]

---

[670] *Las Siete Partidas*, v. 2, p. 135.
[671] Gutierre Díez [*sic*] de Games, *El Victorial: Crónica de Pero Niño, Conde de Buelna*, ed. Juan de Mata Carriazo, Colección de Crónicas Españolas, v. 1 (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1940), p. 312.
[672] Laura D. Barefield, *History and Gender in Medieval English Romance and Chronicle*, Studies in the humanities series, v. 63 (New York: Peter Lang, 2003), p. 7.

Along with its political system, Castile's chronicle tradition is also undergoing a shift in the later middle ages, and especially in the fifteenth century. The fourteenth century had seen, on the whole, movement away from the massive *generales estorias* of Alfonso X and his Latin precursors towards *crónicas particulares*, chronicles of the reigns of individual kings, and the simultaneous diversification of authorial voices as learned members of the nobility sought to set down their own worldviews. Leonardo Funes ties this movement to the rejection of the concept of "señorío universal", even as that shift does not fully bear fruit until the fifteenth century — for now, the king remains at the center of the historiographical conception, regardless of authorial ideology.[673] As the examples of Don Juan Manuel and the Conde de Barcelos demonstrate, the chronicler himself no longer need be in the king's employ, with an increasing amount of historiography taking place "al margen de la cancillería real", carried out by men unattached to the royal court, and often reflecting contradictory interpretations of events.[674] The late fourteenth century efforts of López de Ayala to provide a record for the reigns of Pedro I and Enrique II, however, mark the resurgence of court-based historiography, and presage the fifteenth-century rise of the *crónica real*, which would see chroniclers becoming the record-keepers of court and military events, given an official post in the king's household (and unprecedented access to the royal chancery).

For the study of Catalina, this means that there are multiple accounts of her time as queen written by chroniclers who were her contemporaries or very near contemporaries; the texts thus arise from a broadly shared socio-political context, though this does shift

[673] "De Alfonso el Sabio al Canciller Ayala: variaciones del relato histórico", *Memorabilia*, *7* (2003) <http://parnaseo.uv.es/Memorabilia/Memorabilia7/Funes/Funes.htm> [accessed 21 February 2015]
[674] Robert B. Tate, *Ensayos sobre la historiografía peninsular del siglo XV*, trans. Jesús Díaz, Biblioteca Románica Hispánica (Madrid: Gredos, 1970), p. 281.

gradually over the period during which these chronicles were composed (nearly all during the reign of Juan II). Whilst this does mean that there is less opportunity to see how her queenship is represented and re-constructed over a longer period of time, as is the case with Urraca, it offers the opportunity for a more synchronic study of coexisting and conflicting perspectives. The chronicles to be considered, taken together, cover the the entirety of Catalina's political life.

I. Pero López de Ayala, *Crónica ∂e Juan I* & *Crónica ∂e Enrique III*

External context∫

With a court career spanning the reigns of four kings and a civil war, Pero López de Ayala is one of the most imposing figures on the Castilian political scene in the fourteenth century. Born around 1332 in Álava, and making his way to court as a *∂oncel* (page) in the service of Pedro I, he quickly ascended the political and military ranks. In 1359, he captained of one of the largest ships deployed in the Castilian war against Aragón, and he was rewarded with the position of *alguacil mayor* of Toledo under Pedro in 1360.[675] By the end of the decade, however, his loyalties had changed, and he fought alongside Enrique de Trastámara at the Battle of Nájera, where he was taken prisoner. By a stroke of luck, López de Ayala had chosen his loyalties correctly, and when he was finally released from his captivity, his service was handsomely rewarded with lands and titles by the new king. But his skills were not merely military; Enrique II sent him as a special envoy to the court of Aragón in 1376 and launched a diplomatic career that would have him meet with the kings of France, England, Portugal, and even the Avignon Pope. López de Ayala was captured again after the Castilian defeat at Aljubarrota in 1385; whilst he was waiting to be ransomed, he began to compose the *Rima∂o ∂e Palacio*.[676] After

[675] Pero López de Ayala, *Crónica∫*, ed. José-Luis Martín (Barcelona: Planeta, 1991), p. xlix.
[676] Michel García, *Obra y per∫onali∂a∂ ∂el Canciller Ayala* (Madrid: Alhambra, 1983), pp. 65-71.

the death of Juan I in 1390, he was a member of the Regents' Council during the minority of Enrique III, and unlike many of the regents, he managed to retain the king's favor; he was named *Canciller Mayor* of the kingdom in 1399, a position which he held until his death in 1407.[677]

The exact dates of composition for these two chronicles are uncertain. While the chronicle project as a whole was probably conceived at a weak point in the history of the Trastámara line — after the Portuguese thrashing of Castilian forces at Aljubarrota in 1385 — in order to provide an ideological grounding for the dynasty.[678] The *Crónica de Enrique III* leaves off at the beginning of the year 1396, not long after the young Enrique has begun to rule for himself, more than a decade before López de Ayala's own death, but there is no hint in them that the king has predeceased the chronicler. This suggests that the writing of his chronicles had halted before 1406, which coincides with Alvar García de Santa María's assertion that "el dicho estoriador [his predecessor, i.e., López de Ayala] çesó, por ocupación de vejez e de dolençia, que finó".[679] The decision to end the chronicle at this point could simply have resulted from López de Ayala's declining health, from his increased workload at court, or, perhaps, it could be that with Enrique's ascent to the throne (with Catalina beside him), the driving ideological forces behind his massive historiographical project — the need to heal, in some fashion, the rift between Pedro and Enrique II — were now satisfied.[680]

Internal contexts

[677] Pero López de Ayala, *Las Crónicas*, ed. Cherrie L. Soper, Biblioteca Clásica Ebro, Clásicos Españoles, (Zaragoza: Ebro, 1975), pp. 6-13.
[678] *Crónicas*, p. lxv.
[679] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 5.
[680] Echevarría, pp. 71-72.

Some of the internal contexts are outlined straight-forwardly in the prologue. While the basic guideline is chronology, with regnal years and chapters as the primary basis for division ("en cada año partiré la estoria de aquel año por capítulos"), the overarching means of measuring history is that of the reign of kings. Each reign represents a new beginning ("comenzaré al Año que el Rey regnó") and is set apart into a separate chronicle which is nevertheless presented as a continuation of the line of kings traced in the prologue and in the chronicles themselves. The division of events changes slightly with the reign of Juan I, whose chronicle includes the important events of other kingdoms beyond Iberia.[681] As regards his sources, López de Ayala claims that he will relate only what he has seen, or what he has learned "por verdadera relacion de Señores é Caballeros, é otros dignos de fé é de creer".[682] Whilst reporting on events that he has personally witnessed and participated in, he also extensively incorporates court documents (such as letters, treatises, and testaments) to which he would have had access as *Canciller Mayor*.

There are two principal versions of López de Ayala's chronicles, known as the *Vulgar* and the *Abreviada*. The former concludes at the end of the reign of Juan I, whilst the latter includes the first years of Enrique III's time on the throne. The differences are mostly minor after the chronicle of Enrique II, but some attestations of the *Abreviada* also contain a prologue which is not present in the *Vulgar*.[683] I have relied here on the edition by Jose-Luis Martín, which incorporates the chronicles of all four reigns.

Catalina in the text

[681] *Historia de la prosa medieval*, p. 1787.
[682] *Crónicas*, pp. 3-4.
[683] *Crónicas*, p. lxv.

Catalina de Lancaster makes her first appearance near the end of the *Crónica de Juan I*: after royal representatives offer a point-by-point refutation of John of Gaunt's claims to the Castilian throne, one of the envoys approaches the duke secretly, to put forth the possibility of marriage between Catalina — "una fija de su mujer doña Costanza, fija del rey don Pedro" — and Enrique. The king proposes, through his intermediary, "que se ficiese casamiento dellos, e serían herederos de los regnos de Castilla e de Leon, e cesaría esta quistión e guerra"[684]. The implications are straightforward: with her lineage, Catalina quite literally embodies the potential for a solution to the most pressing dynastic conflict plaguing the kingdom, and it is primarily in this light that López de Ayala seems to find her useful to his own interests.

The possibility of the marriage-solution hangs over the Anglo-Portuguese attempts to invade Castile; it is the final Castilian matter discussed in the eighth year of the reign of Juan I (that is, 1386), and the ninth year begins with the strengthening alliance between John of Gaunt and the king of Portugal — cemented by the marriage of Philippa of Lancaster to João I — and a reference to "doña Catalina, que fue después reyna de Castilla"[685]. John of Gaunt and Juan I carry out their fruitless expeditions - the combined English and Portuguese forces turn back at the threat of Castile's French allies, while the Castilians lack the food provisions to invade Portugal - only for the first item on the negotiating table in Trancoso to be the very solution put forth the year before, this time with even greater concessions to the Dukes of Lancaster. López de Ayala goes on to recount in extensive detail the stipulations of the Treaty of Bayonne, wherein Catalina is necessarily mentioned as a subject of the negotiations; here again her importance is as a means of production of corporeal evidence of reconciliation between the two claimants to the Castilian throne, with much enumeration of the "fijos, nietos, bisnietos e legítimos descendientes que ovieren e vinieren [del infante don Enrique] e de

[684] *Crónicas*, p. 619.
[685] *Crónicas*, pp. 625-26.

doña Catalina su mujer" as well as the circumstances under which Catalina might secure the throne for herself[686]. This is the source and centre of her political power: the production of heirs, which was necessary for "the proper succession of stability and power" within the royal family, was dependent on the queen's body.[687]

Catalina's interest primarily as a means of conflict resolution seems to be confirmed by the fact that, once she has been named as an heir to the kingdom and Enrique "la rescibió por su mujer" in Palencia, the queen disappears entirely from the pages of the *Crónica de Juan I* [688]. She does not resurface again until the first year of Enrique's minority in the *Crónica de Enrique III*, where she is mentioned only in passing as the reason that the *infante* Fernando cannot yet contract marriage with the countess Leonor de Alburquerque[689]. Somewhat later, she again serves as a physical representation of the agreement between the Lancasters and the crown of Castile, as John of Gaunt reminds the young Enrique of "el debdo que avían en uno, pues él era casado con su fija la reyna doña Catalina", which obligates the duke to offer his support - but also serves as a way of placing pressure on the king to continue/renew the treaties and payments associated with that union[690]. Her final appearance comes as part of Enrique's declaration of majority: he calls the *cortes* in Madrid as a sign of his political maturity and power, and the consummation of his marriage - taking Catherine as his "mujer legítima, por quanto el casamiento era ya firme" - is equally a sign of his physical maturity, making the queen a reinforcement to his authority[691].

---

[686] *Crónicas*, p. 637.
[687] Barefield, p. 8.
[688] *Crónicas*, p. 641.
[689] *Crónicas,* p. 702.
[690] *Crónicas*, p. 737.
[691] *Crónicas*, p. 827. For the queen, and particularly consummation, as necessary for kingship: Alison Basil, "Henry VI and Margaret of Anjou: Madness, Gender Dysfunction and Perceptions of Dis-ease in the Royal Body", in Sean McGlynn & Elena Woodacre (eds.), *The Image and Perception of Monarchy in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014), pp. 168-182.

In López de Ayala, we see Catalina in the expected place of a queen: alongside her husband, the king. This means, for the most part, that she is *not* seen. The moments when she is needed in the narrative seem to fit with Barefield's moments of dynastic crisis or potential crisis[692] — in particular, Catalina is the solution to John of Gaunt's claims to the throne of Castile; she is then again the means through which Enrique affirms his kingship. This representation, while not the most extensive of those treated, nevertheless serves as a sort of control for the sake of comparison — for this is a portrait of Catalina before a real dynastic crisis places her squarely in the middle of the political action.

II. Álvar García de Santa María, *Crónica de Juan II de Castilla*

External contexts

The youngest son of the Jewish Leví family from Burgos, Alvar García de Santa María (as he was renamed after his conversion to Christianity in 1390), was the court historian of Juan II. He was likely educated by his eldest brother, Pablo de Santa María, one of the most prominent figures in the Castilian court of the early fifteenth century, serving as bishop of Cartagena, advisor to Enrique III, and later, tutor to the young Juan II.[693] Alvar García, too, was close to the seat of power: introduced at court under the auspices of his brother, he soon became a friend and advisor to Fernando de Antequera, even accompanying him on his campaigns against Granada.[694] In 1408 he was appointed *escribano de cámara*, effectively scribe of the privy chamber, by the regents, and it was in this post that he would begin composing an account of Juan II's reign.[695] The chronicle itself seems to have been undertaken on the orders of Fernando and Catalina, according

[692] Barefield, pp. 8-9.
[693] Francisco Cantera Burgos, *Alvar García de Santa María y su familia de conversos: Historia de la Judería de Burgos y de sus conversos más egregios* (Madrid: Instituto Arias Montano, 1952), pp. 64-66.
[694] Alvar García de Santa María, *Le parti inedite della Crónica de Juan II*, ed. Donatella Ferro (Venice: Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, 1972), p. ii.
[695] Cantera Burgos, p. 66.

to the prologue, for these two "ordenaron estoriador que tomase las ystorias… e las feciese e ordenase".[696] Undertaken likely around the time of his appointment, the *Crónica de Juan II* is an exhaustive register of court and military life, written "a medida que los acontecimientos se desenvuelven" for many of the years and events it records, but Alvar García seems to have stopped writing the chronicle around 1435 for reasons that are unclear.[697]

Internal contexts

The *Crónica de Juan II* exists in two parts, of which the first part, spanning the years 1406 to 1419, details the events during the minority of the new king, and focusing in particular on his regent, the *infante* Fernando.[698] Such is the interest in Fernando, in fact, that the narrative even follows him to his new kingdom of Aragón in 1412, temporarily looking away from Castile and the regency. The record for the years 1418-19 exists only in a skeleton narrative form, a *borrador* that in some parts resembles a to-do list more than anything else.[699] The second part, which covers the years 1420-1434, turns the narrative back to Castile and the court of the adult Juan II, where the king is soon eclipsed by the figure of Álvaro de Luna.

The chronicle begins, after a prologue summarizing the history of Spain and its kings, and explaining how Alvar García came to continue the practice of writing these histories, culminating with a report on the death of Enrique III and the Cortes de Toledo just prior to his death. In the prologue, the text is positioned as a direct continuation of

[696] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 4.
[697] Cantera Burgos, pp. 112-26. Potential explanations have included Pablo de Santa María's death in the summer of 1435, a newfound interest in the religious reform of monasteries, or the ire of Álvaro de Luna — but all we know for sure is that his chronicle does not continue beyond this date.
[698] *Historia de la prosa medieval*, p. 2196.
[699] While there are more fully-fashioned blocks of narrative, these years are filled with instructions such as "[n]otar el ayuntamiento que fizo el rey" or "[n]otar en como vinieron nuevas". Ferro, pp. 213-23.

López de Ayala's work, which is itself in turn presented as the continuation of the work of earlier chroniclers, including Alfonso X. The summary of the kings of Spain, and then of Castile, is arranged so as to situate Juan II, though he is but a "niño de pequeña hedad", directly and unquestionably in the line established by Enrique II.[700] Fernando, too, is indirectly placed in the lineage ("hijo del dicho rey don Juan"), while there is no hint at the less-than-orderly nature of the transition from Pedro to Enrique II, or of Catalina's own connection to Pedro.

The chronicle is not precisely divided into chapters, but the end of each section is signaled very clearly with a repetitive, formulaic "[e] agora dexa la Historia de fablar desto, e torna a contar…", which also serves to signpost the material to be related in the next passage. Dates are not always used to introduce a new section to the narrative, though they are given in full for major events such as the death of Enrique III, and occasionally for military engagements as well. As in the case of López de Ayala, the chronicle relies heavily on eyewitness testimony, usually from Alvar García himself, and even includes dialogue from deliberations in the Cortes when these are of interest to the chronicler.

Though Alvar García's own manuscript has been lost, there are three extant manuscripts of the first part of the *Crónica*, covering the years 1406-1419. For the first part of the chronicle, which is of most interest, I have relied on the edition by Carriazo, which contains the years 1406-11, but also refer to Ferro's edition, as it includes the incomplete years 1418-19. For the second part, I refer to the text published in the *Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de España,* occupying volumes 99 and 100 of that series.[701]

[700] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 4.
[701] M. Fernández Navarrete (ed., and others), *Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de España* (Madrid: 1842-95), vv. 99-100.

Catalina in the text

While the text is ostensibly a chronicle of the reign of Juan II, the undisputed protagonist of the first part is, in fact, Fernando de Antequera in his capacity as regent.[702] Consequently, Catalina, as his co-regent, appears frequently in the text; of all the chronicles under consideration, the *Crónica de Juan II* is that which provides the most extensive representation of the queen in terms of sheer volume. This could, of course, partly be due to the fact that she was one of the patrons of the project;[703] but it must also, to some extent, be due to her increased visibility and political power as an official governor of the kingdom during nearly the entire period covered by the first part of the chronicle. But this does not necessarily equate to an equal share of the attention, for Catalina disappears from the narrative entirely for long periods while it takes up the political and military affairs of her co-regent. And even when she is explicitly present in the retelling of an event, it is not infrequently a nominal presence in which she and Fernando are represented as a single unit, *los señores Reyna e Ynfante*, with a single voice and a single will. This is typically the case when the proceedings of the Cortes are related, and the phenomenon can be seen just as much at the beginning of their regency as near its end, though of course this is unlikely to reflect the historical reality of their joint rule — indeed, the chronicle itself indicates as much. Catalina emerges as an individual, distinct from the governing unit, in three sorts of circumstances: firstly, those concerning the custody of her son, the king; secondly, in matters concerning the queen's advisors; and thirdly, in questions of joint government of the two regents.

---

[702] So much so, in fact, that the first part of the *Crónica de Juan II* serves as the primary source for Inez Macdonald's 1948 biographical study of Fernando de Antequera. Inez Isabel Macdonald, *Don Fernando de Antequera* (Oxford: Dolphin, 1948).

[703] From the prologue: "Los muy altos e muy poderosos señores la reina doña Catalina, su madre, e el infante don Fernando, su tio, […] continuando que los fechos de España no quedassen olvidados e se llegasen e copilassen a las dichas coronicas con grandeza e nobleza de la sangre real, ordenaron historiador que tomasse las estorias en el lugar e estado que fueron dexadas en el tiempo e reinando el dicho rey don Enrique de buena memoria, las fiziesse e orgenasse segun los fechos que adelante despues passaron e passen." Ferro, p. 4.

The queen's struggle to maintain possession of the young Juan II is, in fact, the first real moment of conflict in the reign of the new king, for the narrative begins in late 1406 with a summary account of the Cortes at Toledo and the death of Enrique III. Upon receiving news of her husband's death, Catalina's reaction is both grief — "fizo fazer su llanto, en Segouia do ella estaua, muy grande" — and rage: "ovo ende muy grande enojo a marauilla".[704] The reason for her anger is immediately clarified, as she sends messages to the *infante* Fernando, on his way to Segovia, pleading with him to "trauajar e ayudar en manera que ella touiesse e criase al dicho Rey don Juan, su hijo." She first appeals to him by invoking the close, even physical, bond between mother and child, for no other person could have as much reason to keep and raise her son "como ella que lo traxera en su vientre e lo pariera"[705]. Before Fernando has even had a chance to reply to the first message, Catalina has sent another, offering to forfeit any powers of regency in order to retain her son, again invoking her natural, maternal role and disavowing interest in any matters other than the care of the infant king: "a ella le plazía que él touiese la carga e administraçión e regimiento de todo el Reino; ca ella no entendía de curar de al sino de tener e criar al dicho Rey su hijo"[706]. This is of course disingenuous, for possessing the person of the king is itself a key to power; but this is even more true of a widowed queen with a young son, who could in effect stand in for the late king during the (inevitably temporary) period of minority.[707]

Already, then, the picture is of a grief-stricken, and panic-stricken, Catalina, in a frenzy over the possibility of losing her only son — and her only guaranteed means of authority. Her fear is described in terms that make it seem unreasonable, mistrustful and

[704] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 23.
[705] *Crónica de Juan II*, pp. 23-24.
[706] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 24.
[707] Clara Estow, "Widows in the Chronicles of Late Medieval Castile", in Louise Mirrer (ed.), *Upon My Husband's Death: Widows in the Literature and Histories of Medieval Europe* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992), pp. 153-167.

overly suspicious, particularly when she refuses to allow Fernando entrance to Segovia, for fear that he will seize her son: "no lo quiso acoger la Reina en la çiudad… reçelándose… que la desapoderaría dél." The implication, too, is that she is overreacting, sealing off the city and the castle — "las puertas çerradas de la çiudad e del castillo, velándose e rondándose"[708] — in an effort to keep the *infante* out, though he has not been shown to have any interest in taking Juan away from her.

Fernando himself is presented as a mediator, a calming presence, seeking only to resolve the discord: meditating on "la discordia que hera entre la dicha Reina… e los dichos Diego López e Juan de Velasco", he comes to realize the dangers that "podrían venir al seruiçio del Rey don Juan su sobrino" and the "grandes daños de sus Reinos si la dicha discordia durase"[709], thinking too of the consequences such a division could have on the war with Granada. Already, Catalina's insistence upon this point, her defiance, comes with the suggestion of danger and disorder, with the hint of greater, more serious implications for the security of the realm. We are, of course, locked into this view by the chronicler, for the narrative allows us to look inside Fernando's careful consideration of the problem, while we can only see Catalina's behavior from outside.

Once the queen has been convinced to allow Fernando into the city and the castle, there follows a reading out of the king's testament, which stipulates that Catalina shall not retain custody of the new king, but only be able to choose a replacement guardian if either of those named by Enrique (Juan de Velasco and Diego López de Estúñiga) should die.[710] This clause has precisely the expected effect on the queen: panic and anger — "la Reyna madre del Rey fué toda turbada e enojada" — and a healthy heaping of defiance. Catalina straightaway declares her intention to disobey her husband's wishes:

[708] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 24.
[709] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 24.
[710] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 32.

"ella lo entendía contradezir de fecho e de derecho, en quanto a la tenençia e criança del dicho Rey su hijo"[711]. To her surprise, she is supported in this by the *infante* Fernando and the *procuradores* of the realm. This backing, however, does not ease her worries, for she is still shown to be skeptical and suspicious, eyeing the unexpectedly large numbers of armed men at the reading of the king's will with fear and anger, and yet again ordering the city to be sealed off:

> "[A] la Reina, madre del Rey, paresçió que iba más gente de la que en la postura fué asentada… lo ouo a gran enojo e sentimiento; e salidos de publicar el dicho testamento, mandó poner recaudo en la çiudad, e velarse e rondarse, ansí como ante fazían. E estuvo ansí la çiudad de Segouia treze días, que se non abrió."[712]

Thirteen days, nearly a fortnight, is an exceptionally long time for which to disrupt the city's business. By making both the king and the city completely inaccessible, Catalina may be protecting herself and her son, but she is also effectively besieging the city from the inside, apparently without care or concern.

Fernando goes to see her "con gente çierta", and with "buenas maneras", in an attempt to quell her fears — and we can see clearly that the favorable assessment of his supporters is not extended to the queen. Catalina re-asserts her willingness to fulfill all the conditions of Enrique's will except for the one regarding her son: "saluo en la criança del dicho Rey su hijo, que dixo que ella lo entendía tener e criar, pues lo pariera e saliera de las entrañas de su bientre"[713]. Again she appeals to her superior suitability for the task, establishing her credentials and her physical connection to her son — deepening that connection, now, from the earlier "vientre" to the more visceral and emphatic "entrañas de su bientre".

[711] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 43.
[712] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 44.
[713] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 44.

As the custody dispute drags on, Catalina becomes almost a caricature, jealously guarding her son within castle walls veritably crawling with armed men, terrified that he will be taken from her and desperate to defend herself from the merest possibility:

> "La Reyna, madre del Rey, estaua en el alcáçar de la dicha çiudad de Segouia, e tenía ay su hijo el Rey… E con el gran amor que la Reyna tenía al Rey su hijo, estaua a muy gran reçelo que por la claúsula… que ge lo tirarían, tenía el alcáçar bien basteçido de gente de armas e de lo que menester le fazía, e fazíalo muy bien guardar de día e de noche. Lo qual entendía de tener su hijo e lo criar, e lo no partir de sí por ninguna de las guisas del mundo, así como madre que lo pariera."[714]

Though her maternal right is never denied, and her stubbornness on the matter hardly questioned, it is the disproportionate nature of her reactions which are beginning to undermine her.

But although Juan de Velasco and Diego López de Estúñiga press their case — that the king's will must be fulfilled in full, not merely in part — and even as Catalina's responses become more irrational, the *infante* and the *procuradores* concede that she is right: "niño de veinte e dos meses más razón era que lo criase ella que non otro, como aquella que avía el mayor deudo con él, […] e no ternía ninguno tan grande amor como ella para le fazer piedad en su niñez"[715]. The *contador mayor*, Alonso García de Cuéllar, also refuses to aid the frustrated would-be guardians, because, he says, Catalina is now firmly in charge of Segovia, and she has more power than he ("la Reina madre del Rey con el Rey su hijo… tenían mayor poder que no él"[716]).

When Fernando appoints a group of bishops and *procuradores* to mediate between the two parties, Catalina is shown to be doubling down, and playing politics: while she claims to welcome an agreement, a resolution, she declares that now, "yo lo quiero tener e criar

[714] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 49.
[715] *Crónica de Juan II*, pp. 49-50.
[716] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 50.

fasta que sea de hedad de catorze años, que él pueda regir e gouernar sus reinos e señoríos"[717]. This represents a moving of the goalposts (for previously it has been implied that her custody is only necessary for a small child), which is given a chilly reception by Fernando's group of advisors — and which does little to placate Catalina's opponents. The *infante*'s earlier concerns about the disruptive, dangerous nature of the Queen's behavior is now shown to be prescient: "por esto [the matter of custody] se estoruaban mucho los fechos, ansí en fecho del regimiento del Regno como en razón de la guerra."[718] The narrative again offers a glimpse into the *infante*'s thought process — he recognizes the rightness of both claims, and is uncertain of what to do. We are also treated to his perception of the queen: "E veía que la Reina hera muy noble de condiçión, e muy casta, e non avía razón legítima porque le deuiese ser tirado, queriéndolo ella tener."[719] As before, however, this is a limited view — while the narrative offers a full vista from the *infante*'s perspective, there is no means of seeing matters from the queen's point of view.

At one point in the negotiations, Catalina even rejects an offer from the dowager queen Beatriz, the widow of Juan I, to care for the infant Juan II: she refuses, saying that "para la criança del Rey no hera menester otro sino ella e sus ofiçiales e sus criados"[720]. This mention of the queen's household — never previously included in any of her attempts to control the king's person, and thus another moving of the goalposts — leads the narrative suddenly away from the ongoing custody disputes, and directly into a lengthy digression on those who the chronicle frames as responsible: those who are "muy sus priuados, e del su Consejo".

Alvar García takes up the matter of the queen's counsellors with such eagerness that it feels almost like the fulfilment of anticipation, the need for an explanation for Catalina's

[717] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 52.
[718] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 53.
[719] *Crónica de Juan II*, pp. 53-54.
[720] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 55.

irrational behavior. Leonor López de Córdoba in particular is singled out for her near-total influence over the queen:

> "E estaua ay con ella vna dueña que es natural de Córdoua, que dizen Leonor López Carrillo, fijo del maestre don Martín López, maestre que fué de Calatrava en tienpo que reynava en Castilla el Rey don Pedro. La qual dueña hera muy priuada de la Reyna, en tal manera que cosa del mundo non fazía sin su consejo; e quando venía a dezir lo que avía visto con los del su Consejo, si ella en al acordaua, eso se fazía; tanto hera el amor que con ella tenía."[721]

Catalina is still almost sequestered ("muy apoderada") in the castle at Segovia, surrounded by her own guards and ladies and officials even when she attends the Council at the bishop's palace in the city ("salían siempre con ella treinta o quarenta omes armados, que heran sus guardas"[722]) — it is a place where her rule is absolute, and thus, the power of her *priuados* is also total.

The reason for introducing the problematic *priuados* becomes clear in short order, for the queen's *priuados* and those of the *infante* conspire amongst themselves to create an atmosphere of distrust between the regents. In order to increase their own status ("buscando la honrra e el provecho para sí"), they strive to make each of the regents believe that the other is trying to diminish their power and honor: "boluieron las voluntades los vnos a la Reina e los otros al Ynfante, por les ser más priuados, poniendo sospecha la vna parte a la otra, dándoles a entender que cada vno quería llevar la honrra al otro."[723] In their respective *priuado*-induced paranoias, the queen and the *infante* surround themselves with increasing numbers of armed guards.

It is up to Fernando, once again, to resolve the situation, easing Catalina's fears with his deference to her ("faziendo todavía muy gran reverençia a la Reina", despite her

[721] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 56.
[722] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 57.
[723] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 57.

suspicions and her outsize response to the situation) and his dedication to truth and the good of the kingdom ("siguiendo el camino derecho de la verdad, curando del seruiçio de Dios e del Rey e bien del Reino"). As a result of his good and proper actions, soon "fueron tiradas las sospechas puestas maliçiosamente, no aviendo por qué".[724] The reminder that the queen's suspicions are groundless, the result of malicious manipulation, does not escape unnoticed.

After this reconciliation and re-established trust between Catalina and Fernando, they begin to be referred to as a unit, "la Reyna e el Infante", nearly always acting in harmony as they rule the kingdom side by side. Catalina is given a separate voice only when she disagrees with Fernando. To wit: when the *infante* first petitions for funds to pay soldiers who have been fighting in the frontier campaigns against the Moors, the queen is reticent. But since her objections are soon overcome by the rest of the council, they are explained as an instance of her trying to act appropriately (in her son's interest, but then in the interests of the kingdom and Christendom): "la Reina estava dura en no querer venir a ello, por guardar el tesoro del Rey su hijo," as was commanded in Enrique's will, no less, but she eventually agrees to contribute "porque la guerra por mengua della e de dineros no se dexase de fazer".[725] This agreement also reads as further confirmation of peace and reconciliation between the regents, echoing and answering Fernando's earlier concerns that the custody disputes would endanger the war efforts.

At the 1407 Cortes of Segovia, however, Catalina is again shown to express doubts about the funding of a new campaign. She agrees at length with the idea of going to war, to defend Christendom, Castile, and the King, but, she suggests, that given the expense of these campaigns, that "non se podrían tan bien aver las contías que nesçesarias

[724] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 58.
[725] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 61.

fuesen"[726]. Her argument is once more couched in terms of concern: that the funds in the royal treasury will fall short of what is needed, and, as a result, might not be able to pay as much as is deserved — and the campaign might have to be abandoned halfway through, heaven forbid, for lack of provision: "por vos menguar las cosas neçesarias oviésedes a dexar lo que toviésedes començado"[727]. This objection, too, is smoothed over after the deliberation and advice of the *procuradores*, who approve the funding, and once again "los dichos señores Reina e Infante"[728] are shown to act as a single unit in swearing to spend the forty-five million maravedís only for the purposes of making war on the Moors. Catalina's agreement to fund the war, and later to declare a truce, on the basis of the deliberations of the *procuradores*, posits her as capable of receiving and acting upon good counsel. Her disagreements, as long they are aimed at protecting the king's economic interests, are allowed to stand, without their attribution to bad advice from her *privados*, when they are eventually reconciled with the wishes of either Fernando or the wider council.

When it comes time for Fernando to depart for the frontier, and for the kingdom to be divided between the regents as specified in Enrique's will, however, Catalina again does not wish to be bound by the terms established by her late husband. Her perception of the division of the realm as unequal is encouraged by those around her, once more seeking to cause disunity between the co-regents: "los que les plazía de mouer discordia entre ellos los fazían desconçertar, boluiendo las voluntades a los señores Reyna e Infante." Interestingly, unlike the earlier *privados* who were named, these sowers of strife are doing their work in such secret that they are only hidden, menacing figures, inaccesible and unknown even to the chronicler: "La Historia no haze mençión quien

[726] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 72.
[727] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 73.
[728] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 79.

hera, porque verdaderamente no se pudo saber."[729] The impression is more than a little sinister.

On the back of this manipulation, the queen decides that she will go to war, and sets about preparing herself for the event (even going so far as to "tajar pendones" and nominate caretakers for the king in her absence). Though Fernando immediately sees the advantages of the queen's presence near the frontier (ostensibly these are advantages for the war effort, but the convenience of having the royal treasury to hand would undoubtedly be of some personal benefit, too!), it is not to be. The king's council, turning Catalina's own earlier arguments against her (and simultaneously validating them), declares that "por quanto el Rey hera en tan pequeña hedad, […] convenía que ella estouiese a su criança dél e de sus fijas".[730]

Another obstacle to the preparations for war is that the matter of custody has not been settled — and it threatens the war effort, for both Juan de Velasco and Diego López de Estúñiga possessed large fighting forces and substantial treasuries, "que amos a dos podrían aver mucha gente, suya e de sus parientes".[731] It is the *infante* who settles the matter at last, with payments to the two nobles, for the good of the kingdom — for, of course, as soon as the reconciliation has taken place, they call for their men to go to war alongside Fernando.

Once Fernando takes his leave of Catalina and the king, and sets off for Andalusia, Juan II and the queen-mother both disappear from the narrative, which follows Fernando to the frontier. Catalina resurfaces briefly as she sends reinforcement to the Castilian fleet in the Strait of Gibraltar[732], and does not appear again until the beginning

[729] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 86.
[730] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 87.
[731] *Crónica de Juan II*, pp. 87-88.
[732] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 109.

of 1408, upon Fernando's return to Guadalajara for the Cortes in early February, where she asks for a report on the state of the war, "porque ella no sauía tanto de los fechos que eran pasados e de lo en que estaua"[733], showing her to be disconnected from Fernando and the frontier, but at least interested in the running of the kingdom. The narrative once again returns to the practice of referring to them together, as "los señores Reina e Infante", and their opinions and decisions as if from a single mind. This remains the status quo through deliberations by the King's Council about war with Granada, until Catalina (alone) calls an assembly of the *procuradores* to discuss the possibility of a truce with Granada, so that revenues might be raised to fund the next campaign. The representatives declare, after lengthy debates, that the "yntención del Infante e vuestra […] es muy buena, por seruiçio de Dios e del Rey nuestro señor, e bien de su reyno"[734]. But the fragile harmony between the co-regents is shattered by self-interested outsiders once again.

These *procuradores* are said to be hedging their bets and not speaking clearly in favor of the truce, so as not to offend the *infante*: "algunos no lo dezían tan claramente porque se les entendiese ansí, saluo por poner desuarío en los fechos de la guerra, porque endendían que la avía el Infante muy a voluntad"[735]. So they mislead and manipulate the queen ("boluían la voluntad de la Reyna") with combination of lies and flattery, telling her that Fernando's aim is to win the support of all the knights in the land and seize all power for himself — "[c]a después que él todo el poder tenga, forçado será que fagades vos todo lo que a él plugiere" — but a truce will enable her to claim her rightful authority, as "señora e apoderada del Rey e del reyno".[736] These counsellors are said to not have good intentions, but rather are "faziéndolo por sus atijaras, por llevar della de los dineros

[733] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 200.
[734] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 230.
[735] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 236.
[736] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 236.

del Rey", and she is so suggestible, and they manipulate her so frequently, that she never agrees with Fernando in any matter regarding the governance of the kingdom.[737]

Two things are notable in this episode. Firstly, the queen's sudden and constant contrary nature — she is now an obstacle to even those things which are right and proper, simply because they are desired by Fernando or the counsellors:

> "Que luego le hera puesta en contrariedad. E magüer que mostraua razones legítimas porque se deuía fazer, no curava de las oir la Reyna. E magüer que los del Consejo, la mayor parte, dezían que hera justa e derecha la razón del Infante, no curava sino estar en su intençión. E si ofiçio vacaua alguno, e era dado por parte del Infante e del Consejo del Rey, luego le hera contradicho e dado por la otra parte a otro. E todo se fazía por consejo destos que les plazía de desvariar los fechos."[738]

and secondly, the mysterious origins of this change in the queen, which puzzle the infante:

> "el Infante se marauillaba e no podía çiertamente saber dónde venía e nasçía todo este desvarío, e trauajávase mucho por lo saber; magüer que por las maneras él presumía dónde nasçía, e quién la ponía. Pero no curaua saluo por buenas maneras e con la verdad trabajarse quanto podía porque los fechos viniesen en concordancia e a bien, por convençer maliçia de los que la voluntad boluían a la Reyna."[739]

Again, we are given a window into the *infante*'s perspective, where Catalina's obstructive behavior is perceived to be erratic, not governed by reason, and the work of individuals who only desire to benefit from the disunity between the co-regents. Fernando, innocent and confused, is left to resolve these problems on his own.

The infante is advised not to let this discord persist by Count Fadrique — but when Juan de Velasco and Diego López hear word of Fadrique's counsel (and offer to arrest

[737] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 237.
[738] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 237.
[739] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 237.

and punish "los que tales desvaríos ponen"[740] between the infante and the Queen), they first leave the city of Guadalajara to speak in private, and then flee, in secret ("se yvan dende, e con ellos muy pocos", "con muy gran reçelo de ser presos"), from punishment. The queen's reaction is predictable at this point — she is angrier in the face of her advisers' cowardice and fear of Fernando. "E sy desavenençia estaua de ante, mucho más estaua después entrella e el Infante."[741] This is immediately followed by a lengthy description of a fight between two young noblemen which turns into an armed brawl that draws in even men of high rank and good judgment, leaving eight dead. The regents' reactions are illustrative: the queen, cowed, begs Fernando not to get involved, and to send someone in his stead. Fernando, once his envoy has returned, goes out to speak to the maestre again himself; from the vantage point of his thoughts, we can also observe as he realizes that events such as this are the result of the "desacuerdo e desavenençia" between himself and Catalina, and that "se esperauan otros peores males que estos"[742] if they did not reconcile and rule the kingdom jointly and in peace.

Catalina, hearing Fernando's arguments — that "los que ansí andavan voluiendo su voluntad" not only "fazían mucho deseruiçio del Rey e suyo", but they also were the cause of the discord, "por lo qual peresçía la justiçia"[743]. Though she might readily agree with her co-regent, the Queen is not firm in her decisions, or even in control of them: the peace she has achieved with Fernando is short-lived once more, not because she so desires it, but because "los que se trauajauan de la desviar trabajaron porque durase poco"[744]. The chronicle here allows her no agency, no active role in changing her mind — placing the blame, in order to avoid directly criticizing her whilst simultaneously emphasizing her weakness of character and unsuitability for the political scene, given

[740] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 243.
[741] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 244.
[742] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 245.
[743] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 245.
[744] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 245.

her inability to recognize that her advisers are manipulating and misleading her (for she receives their advice "con sana voluntad, teniendo que le dezían bien", even though the chronicle tells us, clearly, that "lo fazían ellos por esforçar su bando e abiuar más la discordia")[745]. The matter that drives the discord again is Fernando's refusal to grant a *carta de seguro* to Juan de Velasco and Diego López de Estúñiga, protecting them from punishment. Fernando goes through a very reasoned list of arguments why he can and should not grant the *carta*, to demonstrate the differences in their approach. He questions their need for it: if they haven't done anything wrong, they should have no need of such a carta; if they have done something wrong and he grants it anyway, then it would bring defamation on his own head, and it would cause others to demand similar exemptions from the king's justice, and he could not carry out justice against them. It is a very thorough justification of his refusal, as well as demonstrating his capacity for reasoned judgment.

This episode is the culmination of the conflict between the Infante and the Queen; Fernando has by now (two years in) reached the end of his leash, calling the King's Council to complain that he cannot cope with Catalina's subjection to her counsellors, but their malice is having far-reaching consequence. He frames his appeal in terms of his own powerlessness and the importance of the Council's advice while highlighting the potential damage done to the kingdom as well as the state of political gridlock:

> "E por ende, que así Dios le ayudase que no sabía ya qué maneras traer en ello, porque fasta áy avía trabajado con su voluntad a sofrir muchas synrazones que veía que algunos consejeros de la Reyna, con maliçia, le fazían entender que hera bien e su seruiçio, seyendo por el contrallo. E que veía que padesçía la justicia, e en los fechos del reyno que se non librava cosa alguna; de lo qual entendía que le venía ende muy gran carga a él e a ellos.
>
> E que le paresçía que se non devía ya sofrir tal sinrrazón, que por malos consejeros della dexasen padesçer e perder el reyno. E que ge lo dezía porque fablasen sobre ello, e con ellos él podiese remediar en estos fechos, por quel

[745] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 246.

> seruiçio de Dios e del Rey su señor e su sobrino, e bien de sus reinos, fuese guardado."[746]

The council proceed to spend many days in discussion, trying to find a way to right the govern the kingdom, but come up with no solution more effective than removing the Queen's bad counsellors from the court: "no fallauan que en ninguna manera del mundo podiese ser concordia entre la Reyna e el Infante si no hechasen de la corte sus malos consejeros."[747] The fact that these deliberations are revealed in the chronicle creates a direct parallel to the counsel received by Catalina, except that the counsel she receives is not subject to debate and reason, and not brought into the light shed by the chronicle. It takes place in private — in secret — and its unknown quality, far beyond Fernando's control and influence, is what makes it so dangerous.

Council decision made, we hear no more about Catalina's malicious counselors from Alvar García. We know that Leonor López de Córdoba and her fellows are sent away from court as a result, but this is not immediately apparent from the text of the chronicle.[748] It does, however, result in a sudden, seeming reconciliation between Catalina and Fernando, whose governance is now harmonious; the formulaic "la Reyna e el Infante" making decisions and presiding over the court together. The chronicle turns, in the next two years, largely to the matter of war with Granada, and Catalina fades to the background; her name re-emerges briefly in 1409 when the infanta María reaches the age of seven and her betrothal to Fernando's son, her cousin Alfonso, is ratified by the *procuradores*.[749]

Catalina does not play any part in the proceedings again until 1410 when, after a successful campaign against the Moors, Fernando finds himself without the means to

[746] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 247.
[747] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 247.
[748] Echevarría, pp. 124-26.
[749] *Crónica de Juan II*, pp. 286-88.

pay his soldiers, even with donations collected from the citizens of Seville and Cordoba. In his desperation, he writes to request money from Catalina to make up the difference — and uses, as part of his request, some letters that he requests from Leonor López de Córdoba.[750] She writes in her letter of all the ways that aiding Fernando will benefit Catalina and her son — and it works:

> "des que vido las cartas del Infante e de doña Leonor López, magüer que se le fazía de mal en sacar los florines del tesoro del Rey, óbolo a fazer. Lo primero porque vido que hera razón de acorrer al Infante a tal tiempo de menester, pues que ella ge lo prometiera en la primera guerra, que quando le fallesçiese que sus joyas vendería para le acorrer… E lo otro, por las cartas de doña Leonor, que hera dueña que mucho amaba, a maravilla."[751]

Simply to keep her old friend happy ("por la conplazer"[752]), she sends the requested six million to Fernando. Catalina's subjection to her *privado* is used against her by her co-regent, but because Fernando is the protagonist, and the narrative is designed to accommodate his goals and opinions, it is presented in this instance as a positive influence. Furthermore, Leonor López no longer controls Catalina's every decision; safely removed from the queen's household, she is harmless, a much-loved friend, while still a useful tool to Fernando because of Catalina's desire to please her. This is a clear demonstration of Fernando's upper hand in the regency, and the success of his scheming with the council, despite the obvious hypocrisy.

In 1414, Fernando again appeals to Catalina for money, asking for an extra tax in the part of the kingdom under her control to fund another campaign against the Moors. But Catalina refuses, and, uncharacteristically, her disagreement with Fernando is approved: "la noble reina doña Catalina, tutora del rey su hijo, mando que se non cogiese en la suya, e fue muy bien probado que fizo bien, sintiendo el daño que dello podia venir segun vino"[753]. Catalina's capability for wisdom and good judgment now presents a threat

[750] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 353.
[751] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 354.
[752] *Crónica de Juan II*, p. 354.
[753] Ferro, p. 154.

to Fernando, however, so this is qualified with the reassurance that, although many people accused the Infante of greed and wanting to use the monies for his commitments in Aragón, this was not his intention: he intended to carry on with the campaign against the Moors. It is noteworthy that the suggestion of Catalina acting unquestionably in the best interests of the kingdom is potentially destabilizing for Fernando's authority.[754]

After Fernando's death in 1416, we see Catalina at the center of court matters once again, receiving news and corresponding on matters of both church and state with apparent competence, and occasionally losing her temper when her orders are disobeyed ("la reina le escribio al dicho maestre [de Calatrava] que no lo abia enviado alla [Sevilla] para que el se entremetiesse en sus officios"[755]). The thin register of events at the end of the *primera parte* runs out before reaching Catalina's death, so we have no final assessment of her life.

The *Crónica de Juan II* is really something of a misnomer: it is, in the first part at least, a chronicle of Fernando de Antequera. This forces Catalina de Lancaster to function, if not precisely as the main antagonist, then at least as a sort of foil, thwarting and complicating Fernando's path to glory and good government. We are only allowed to see her through a chronicler who has nearly omniscient knowledge of Fernando's mind, but only superficial access to the queen's words and actions. Her actions, leave the unflattering impression of a paranoid and fearful woman, jealously guarding her source of power and reacting in disproportionate ways to threats. She is the source of strife within the court, or a conduit for the chaotic forces that surround her and endanger the stability at the center of the kingdom: from this perspective, it is Catalina's inclination to and reliance upon *privados* — and her inability to detect their influence — which has driven a wedge between the two regents. This elevates Fernando to an exemplary model

[754] Ferro, p. 155.
[755] Ferro, p. 203.

of kingship to be preserved for posterity. Catalina must, by necessity, provide the counter-example.

III. Pedro Carrillo de Huete, *Crónica del Halconero de Juan II*

External contexts

A "hidalgo sencillo e ingenuo," or at least so Carriazo gathers from the autobiographical details contained in his chronicle, Pedro Carrillo de Huete first came to prominence in the service of Fernando de Antequera, who knighted him in Setenil in 1407. When the Compromise of Caspe resulted in Fernando being chosen as king of Aragón, however, Carrillo de Huete chose to stay in Castile and enter the service of Juan II, whose confidence he quickly earned and for whom he acted as master falconer from 1415, as well as serving the king as a diplomat on delicate missions. Carriazo concludes that he must have followed the court from at least 1420 until 1441, though the composition of the chronicle itself likely did not begin until around 1435[756], when García de Santa María left his post as royal chronicler.

Internal contexts

Though Carrillo de Huete was part of Juan II's court, and may even have taken up his chronicle at the king's behest, his text is not — and does not position itself as — a "verdadera continuación del tronco de la cronística real" that precedes it.[757] The narration is divided into chapters, mostly very short, and carefully labelled with the date of the event to be recounted — day, month, and year, and frequently day of the week as

[756] Pedro Carrillo de Huete, *Crónica del Halconero de Juan II*, ed. Juan de Mata Carriazo, Colección de Crónicas Españolas, v. 8 (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1946), p. xi.
[757] Fernando Gómez Redondo, *Historia de la prosa medieval*, 4 vols (Madrid: Cátedra, 1998-2007), p. 2211.

well, in the format of "Domingo, a seys dias de junio" or "luego el martes siguiente". This constant, fastidious marking of time, and exhaustive details of movement and lists of knights and nobles present at a particular moment, lend the chronicle a feeling of monotony (Carriazo, perhaps somewhat unfairly, remarks on his "ausencia de intención artística")[758] but also a sense of trustworthiness, for in providing such minutiae, Carrillo de Huete affirms his own qualifications for the role of chronicler, usually as a first- or secondhand witness to the events related.[759] Additionally, the chronicle reproduces at length nearly forty documents — principally letters, but also an "envenenado memorial contra don Álvaro de Luna" — from among the sources used in its compilation[760], and refers to many more. This might be an effort to avoid having to rework material, or perhaps, given its concurrence with the meticulous marking of time, a reflection of a desire to present events in the most complete fashion possible.

Catalina in the text

Catalina had been deceased for more than a decade by the time Carrillo de Huete began to try his hand at historiography, and so naturally she does not appear as an actor in the events of his chronicle. She is mentioned, in fact, just once in what is preserved of the text of *M*, and curiously, only in relation to the August 1430 passing of Juan II's *contador mayor*, who was at the time held captive in the castle of Uzeda. The gentleman in question, Fernán Alfonso de Robles, is identified as "el mayor pribado que ovo la rreyna donna Catalina". But this is not merely a passing mention of a long-ago role; the power of the queen's favoritism lingers long. For more than ten years after Catalina's death, the falconer says, this Fernán Alfonso remained one of the most important members of the King's Council, and in the council "non se fazía nenguna cosa que algo

[758] *Halconero*, p. xii.
[759] Chris Given-Wilson, *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England* (London: Hambledon & London, 2004), pp. 2-6.
[760] *Halconero*, p. xii.

fuese syn él." He is keen to stress the late counsellor's humble origins, for though Fernán Alfonso de Robles had by his death acquired a few properties over which he could claim lordship, "no era ome de linaje, e fué moço escribano de Jhoan García de Soria, escribano de la rreyna doña Catalina."[761] This preference for the company of those who were outside the nobility reads as questioning the queen's judgment — a queen's reputation depended on maintaining a household full of good servants and advisors.[762]

If we trace the little-lamented Fernán Alfonso de Robles in the text, the criticism becomes clearer: a few months earlier, the king had ordered the execution of Sancho Fernández, "contador que fué por Fernán Alfonso de Robles". Like his sponsor, the unfortunate Fernández was also "vn ome de pequeño linaje", and of what importance he did have, he "alcançó en la menor hedad del Rey mucho"[763], during which time he achieved his status as *contador* and participated in the King's Council. The reference to Catalina, though she is not named, is clear enough from the mention of the king's minority and the connection to Fernán Alfonso. Sancho Fernández's crime is equally damning: "la causa porque fué degollado se dezía ser por algunas cosas que avía fablado non devidamente."[764] By linking the serious, even treasonous, crime of revealing royal secrets (secrets pertaining to the royal purse, it is hinted — though the charges are nebulous) to Catalina's *privado* and indirectly to her decisions as regent, Carrillo de Huete manages to cast aspersions on her even in passing. The message is brief, but, I think, a plausible reading of the text: the queen's choice of advisors, even years after her death, had the potential to put the king and court at risk.

Given the chronological range of its contents, we cannot see much beyond the barest traces of Catalina's queenship in the *Crónica del Halconero*, but they are traces which do

[761] *Halconero*, pp. 70-71.
[762] *Siete Partidas*, v. 2, pp. 126-130.
[763] *Halconero*, p. 62.
[764] *Halconero*, p. 62.

not exist in other chronicles of the reign. Carrillo de Huete's presentation of Catalina could be influenced by a few factors, among them his close relationship with Fernando de Antequera or with Juan II; a desire to support the king's decisions, especially on serious matters, might lead to some internal conflict, if the king had chosen these advisors — whereas if the blame can be placed at Catalina's feet, it can be the malice of her ill-chosen advisors forcing the king's hand.

IV. The *Refundición de la Crónica del Halconero*: Escorial X-ii-13

External contexts

The circumstances surrounding the composition of the chronicle designated by Carriazo as the *Refundición del Halconero* have long been a matter of some confusion. Lorenzo Galíndez de Carvajal, the Latin secretary of Fernando el Católico who prepared the *Crónica del rey don Juan el Segundo* for print in 1517, explained in his introductory notes that after Alvar García de Santa María had left his post as royal chronicler, that task was taken up by Pero Carrillo de Albornoz, who wrote the remainder in a brief and summary fashion ("más por manera de sumario que de historia ni de crónica"); this register of events was later expanded in some details by the bishop Lope de Barrientos. It was then, he says, that "Fernán Pérez de Guzmán, caballero prudente, ordenó esta Crónica."[765] Juan de Mata Carriazo roundly denied this attribution in his 1940 edition of the Escorial ms. X-ii-13, seeing only the work of Barrientos, who, he claimed, had simply taken parts of Pérez de Guzmán's *Generaciones y semblanzas* and used them to flesh out what was, in his estimation, the less-than-elegant work of the royal falconer.

[765] *Refundición*, p. xxiii.

The case for Barrientos as the author of this chronicle is built on the back of the shifting focus, from Álvaro de Luna to the Bishop of Cuenca, in the final part of the BN 9445 text. It also depends, in large part, on the prelate's extensive involvement in Castilian politics, both inside and outside the court, as a confessor to Juan II and tutor to the future Enrique IV,[766] and a longtime ally of Álvaro de Luna. After the *privado*'s execution, Juan II even appointed Barrientos, along with Gonzalo de Illescas, as governor of the kingdom.[767] Despite his ideological conflicts with Enrique IV, the new king apparently trusted his judgment, appointing him *Canciller Mayor* for a time in the 1460s before he retired to his bishopric in Cuenca.

Barrientos makes for a very appealing chronicler: his account of Juan II's reign would be, "más que nada, una justificación de sus actividades políticas."[768] But it is precisely this wide array of commitments which seems to preclude him from authorship of the chronicle contained in X-ii-13. For one, the register of events begins with the death of Enrique III in 1406, when Barrientos was still moving up the university ranks in Salamanca[769], and more than two decades before his arrival at court. Secondly, the circumstances that Carriazo proposes for the composition of the *Refundición* are difficult to slot into the bishop's busy biography: even assuming that he had sufficient time to write the chronicle, the extensive incorporation of material from the *Generaciones* limits the potential window of time to, at most, the period 1455-1469, from the addition of portraits of Juan II and Álvaro de Luna to Pérez de Guzmán's work until Barrientos's own death. This window coincides with the height of his responsibilities in court as well as with his final few years of retirement in Cuenca, at a time when he seems to have been tired and infirm, in his eighties. Third, and most convincingly, is the observation that

[766] Luis G. A. Getino, *Vida y obras de Fr. Lope de Barrientos*, Anales Salmantinos, v. 1 (Salamanca: Establecimiento tipográfico de Calatratva, 1927), p. xxx-xxxi. The exact date of Barrientos's arrival at the court of Juan II is given as 1434 by Getino, while both Carriazo and Fernando Gómez Redondo place him at the king's side in 1429.
[767] Getino, p. lxiii-lxviii.
[768] *Refundición*, p. xv.
[769] Getino, p. xix.

Barrientos had no real need to rewrite the *Halconero* in an attempt at self-justification: Carrillo de Huete's accounting of events already presents him in a relatively positive light.[770]

These factors have led to a reassessment of the authorship of the text contained in ms. X-ii-13, with Gómez Redondo coming to the tentative conclusion that it is in fact the work of Pérez de Guzmán, using García de Santa María's chronicle as a guide and incorporating material from the *Halconero*, as well as drawing on his own experiences and extensive historiographical interests.[771] This argument provides both time and motive for the composition of a new account of the reign of Juan II: Pérez de Guzmán spent the last three decades of his life at Batres, in exile from the court as a consequence of his opposition to the growing power of Álvaro de Luna, but remained very much informed of political and literary developments through his extensive network of correspondents.[772] Since many others who opposed Luna continued to engage in court politics, this exile may even have been self-imposed[773] and a matter of conscientious objection to the deterioration of Castile and its nobility.[774]

Pérez de Guzmán, like the other chroniclers of Juan II's reign, came of age in the reign of Enrique III, and was a nephew of Pero López de Ayala. Like Alvar García, he was an ardent supporter of the *infante* Fernando, even during Enrique's reign, viewing him as a paragon of the traditional values of the nobility.[775] After Fernando's death, he shifted allegiance to the *infante* Enrique, even in the aftermath of the failed coup at Tordesillas in 1420. Once Enrique lost support, Pérez de Guzmán fell in line behind

[770] Ángel Martínez Casado, *Lope de Barrientos: un intelectual en la corte de Juan II* (Salamanca: San Esteban, 1994), pp. 118-19.
[771] *Historia de la prosa medieval castellana*, v. 3, pp. 2318-22.
[772] Fernán Pérez de Guzmán, *Generaciones y semblanzas*, ed. José Antonio Barrio, Letras Hispánicas, 465 (Madrid: Cátedra, 1998), pp. 14-21.
[773] Fernán Pérez de Guzmán, *Generaciones y semblanzas*, ed. Robert B. Tate (London: Tamesis, 1965), p. x.
[774] *Historia de la prosa medieval*, p. 2434.
[775] *Historia de la prosa medieval*, pp. 2420-21.

Juan II, taking part in military expeditions against Aragón and Granada. Upon his return to Castile in 1432, however, he was arrested and possibly exiled, victim of an attempt by Álvaro de Luna to suppress his political opponents.[776] He never returned to court, remaining in Batres and devoting himself to study, especially of a historiographical nature. In particular, his work in translating Giovanni della Colonna's *Mare historiarum* not only offered a model for the biographies that he would set out in his *Generaciones y semblanzas*, it provided a framework upon which to construct his own, large-scale analysis of Castilian decline.[777]

The inclusion in the chronicle of Álvaro de Luna's final fall from favor, and of Juan II's death, mean that it is not likely to have been completed any earlier than late 1454 or any later than Pérez de Guzmán's death in 1460. This certainly fits with the proposed timeline for the composition of the *Generaciones* (approximately 1450-1455),[778] and the presence of some minor factual errors (such as placing Enrique IV's birth in 1424, rather than in 1425) is consistent with a narrative being composed decades after the events it recounts.[779]

Internal contexts

Pérez de Guzmán's account of Juan II's reign begins, as the royal chronicle does, in the final months of his father's rule, setting the stage for the beginning of the regency. Despite the narrative ending in 1439, it is, in Gómez Redondo's estimation, the fullest chronicle of Juan II's years on the throne, and the only one which does not allow the king to be entirely eclipsed by his uncle and his *privado*.[780]

---

[776] This incident is alluded to in the portrait of Álvaro de Luna: "fueron presos… con ellos Ferrand Pérez de Guzmán…", Barrio, p. 189.
[777] *Historia de la prosa medieval*, pp. 2424-34.
[778] Barrio, p. 35.
[779] *Historia de la prosa medieval*, p. 2309.
[780] *Historia de la prosa medieval*, p. 2306.

Where the falconer's text lacks prefatory material, and Alvar García de Santa María's prologue situates his chronicle in a long tradition of king-based historiography, linking himself to his predecessors and to his royal patrons, Pérez de Guzmán's prologue — largely shared with the *Generaciones*[781] — carefully establishes his principles and practices in approaching historical material. Noting that historians are often disbelieved because they write at the behest of kings or princes, and therefore might be prone to falsifying their accounts "por los conplazer y lisongar, o por temor de los enojar", he states that, in order to be free from untruths, a chronicle must not be made public during the life of the king. Given the fate of Alvar García's text ("pasada a otras manos, segúnt comiçiones desordenadas"), he stresses that this chronicle in particular must remain secret "porque non la enmienden los poderosos que queren onrra syn trabajarla, segúnt sus priuanças y favores."[782] This concern with relating the truth, and with the dangers of undeserved power and glory, provides a guiding principle by which to read the chronicle as a whole.

Chapters or sections devoted to individual events remain a formal structuring device for the text, while chronology fades to the background: the most notable change in organization from Carrillo de Huete's text is that there is no longer a relentless, inexorable provision of dates. Especially once Pérez de Guzmán has filled in the gaps in the *Crónica de Juan II* and reached the beginning of Carrillo de Huete's material, "se alivia el texto de fechas, tan profusamente acumuladas".[783] Days and years are mentioned occasionally, often to give greater precision to important events — among them, Catalina's death, a detail missing from the *Generaciones* and largely glossed over in the royal chronicle, which records events of the years 1418-19 in a bare-bones note format

[781] *Refundición*, p. cxxx.
[782] *Refundición*, p. 7.
[783] *Refundición*, p. cxxx.

— but they do not drive the narration in the same rigid way that chronology does in the *Halconero*. Internal divisions, too, seem more organic, each indicating a new event with more subtle temporal markers than explicit dates and times (in particular "luego" and "despues"); this is as much a function of Pérez de Guzmán's stylistic concerns (his first requirement for a historian is the possession of "buena Retórica para poner la estoria de fermosa y alto estilo", after all)[784] as well as the temporal remove at which he writes — unlike Carrillo de Huete, his goal is much grander than a register of events.

Catalina in the text

While it is, like its source chronicles, primarily a chronicle of court life and military battles, the *Refundición* devotes much more attention to Catalina in her capacity as regent than the *Halconero*. There are some elements which correspond to those related in the *Crónica de Juan II*, regarding the custody disputes between Catalina and the king's guardians; others, such as the queen's death, are unique. After a brief, passing mention upon Enrique's death establishing her co-regency, Catalina veritably bursts onto the scene, expressing displeasure with Enrique's appointed guardians for the two-year-old newly-crowned Juan II and defending her rights as the king's mother: "La Reyna syntióse desto por muy agrauiada, diziendo que más rrazón era, pues élla era madre del Rey, que élla touiese la tenençia y guarda de su persona que otro ninguno".[785] Since this sort of care and keeping of the heir falls firmly within the sphere of queenly responsibility, Catalina's authority is not subject to much dispute by the the *grandes omnes* — but the chronicle is careful to note that it is equally because of their own, presumably political, opposition to Velasco and Estúñiga, that they agree on the queen as custodial guardian of the king: "E asy por esto [that is, Catalina's motherhood] como porque a

[784] *Refundición*, p. 5.
[785] *Refundición*, p. 16.

otros grandes del rreyno non plazía que estos dos señores touiesen la guarda de la persona del Rey."[786]

When Fernando leaves Castile to win the Aragonese crown, there is a lament that Fernando's departure will weaken the kingdom and lead to poor governance and its consequences; this is quickly followed by an accusation that the Queen is improperly sequestering the young king in her co-regent's absence. The *infante*'s newfound interest in Aragón "fué grant daño para el rreyno de Castilla," because Fernando "gouernaua en mucha paz y justiçia". And as a result of his absence, "grandes males y daños que por falta de buen rregimiento después vinieron en el rreyno".[787] The inference is that this downfall of the kingdom comes at the hands of Catalina, but it is not explicit. What *is* declared is that the queen, free of Fernando's supervision, "metió al rrey don Juan su fijo consigo en el monasterio de Sant Pablo de Valladolid, con rreçelo que le non fuése tomado, y tóuolo allí grant tienpo, que non salió con él a parte ninguna".[788] The queen is painted as suspicious, paranoid, and irrational in her judgments, incapable of making good decisions on her son's behalf. This latter point is driven home by the report that before he set off for Aragón, Fernando's sons Enrique and Sancho were named as the *maestres* of Santiago and Alcántara. This juxtaposition of parental approaches — one hiding her son away from rights and responsibilities, the other working to ensure his sons' increased power —elevates Fernando and casts aspersions on Catalina's abilities as a caretaker for her son and for his kingdom.

The situation does not improve upon Fernando's death: "por la su muerte… se desigualó la paz y concordia de Castilla." The king of Aragón is eulogized at some length, praised for his wisdom, his willingness to heed wise counsel, and his unselfish loyalty to

[786] *Refundición*, p. 16.
[787] *Refundición*, p. 20.
[788] *Refundición*, p. 21.

his brother and nephew ("non le perterbó nin ocupó el señorío rreal", with the implication, perhaps, that this would not have been unexpected).[789] As before, Fernando's shining example serves as a counterpoint to Catalina, who apparently kept Juan II with her in the monastery in Valladolid for "espaçio de seys años que nunca de allí avía salido".[790] When some nobles hatch a plot to liberate the king from his mother's grasp, it is said to be the first time that "conosçió él a su rreyno y su rreyno a él, que antes non conosçía synon aquellos que continuamente le seruían".[791] This is both a criticism of Catalina's raising of her son — depriving him of knowledge of his own vassals, in turn limiting their access to the king — and an accusation that Juan II's tendency to surround himself with favorites began long before he reached the age of majority, the result of his mother's control.

This episode contains further curiosities, in the form of queenly deceptions. Not wishing to register her displeasure with the king's newfound freedom, Catalina is said to have accompanied Juan II and his vassals on a short trip ("a lo menos fasta la villa de Tordesillas") whilst attempting to plot a re-capture of sorts. In an exchange with the *condestable* Ruy López Dáualos, Catalina is shown to move beyond being merely an overprotective, suspicious queen-mother, and into damaging the King's position: when Dávalos refuses to aid her in bringing Juan back under her control, saying that "el Rey deuíe ser común a todos", Catalina becomes "muy descontenta y enojada", and begins to plot with the archbishop of Toledo and the guardians appointed by Enrique III to bring the young king back into their control.[792] The queen's anger is an element which recurs, too: she is described on frequently as "enojada", which contrasts sharply with Fernando,

[789] *Refundición*, p. 23.
[790] *Refundición*, p. 24.
[791] *Refundición*, p. 24.
[792] *Refundición*, p. 26.

blessed with the virtue of patience: "era tan paçiente, que pareçía que non avía en él turbaçión de saña nin de yra."[793]

The *Refundición* is the only one of the narratives to report at any length on Catalina's death. The account interpolates the portrait of the queen from the *Generaciones*, which creates a final, somewhat contradictory impression of Catalina: the emphasis on her physical manliness (and by extension, her unwomanliness; she is not, however, attributed manly virtues) and her weakness for *privados* (the "viçio y tacha, en espeçial a los rreyes",[794] which is otherwise only alluded to, but not made explicit, in the rest of the account) would seem to undermine her example of queenship, but there is also the assertion, seemingly at odds with previous reporting, that the kingdom would be worse off because of her death: "Fué su muerte muy grant daño para el rreyno, segúnt después se paresçió".[795] This echoes the earlier lament for Fernando when he abandoned Castile for Aragón, with exactly the same phrasing. While it is possible that this praise is only offered as part of Pérez de Guzmán's biographical formula (even Álvaro de Luna is given grudging praise[796] for helping others, after all), it may also be read as a portent not only of the factions and infighting that occupied the Castilian court in the years after Catalina's death, but as a reference to the effective displacement of the old nobility from the center of power and to the concurrent rise of Álvaro de Luna.

The execution of Sancho Fernández on the orders of Juan II also appears in the *Refundición* — "contador que avía seydo por Fernánd Alonso de Robles, contador mayor del rey", "fué onbre de baxo linaje, y alcançó mucho en la menor hedad del Rey, y con la priuança de Fernánd Alonso de Robles cavía en todas las cosas del Consejo" — so that

[793] *Refundición*, p. 23.
[794] *Refundición*, p. 27
[795] *Refundición*, p. 27.
[796] In the *Generaciones,* brief and reluctant though it may be: "Non se puede negar que él ayudó e fizo mucho bien a muchos". Barrio, p. 185.

there remains the original allusion to achieving power in Catalina's court, and going on to mis-use that power for his own benefit (or at least, at the suggestion of Robles).[797] However, there is no mention of Robles as the queen's *privado*; the chapter detailing his death has been elided entirely, and so the link that in the *Halconero* tied Catalina to the treasonous *contador* disappears. This is unexpected, especially as Robles is singled out for vituperative criticism in the *Generaciones*, as an example of the "los baxos omnes quando alcançan estado que non se saben tener dentro de límites e términos", brought to the queen's side by Leonor López de Córdoba, and ultimately so influential that Catalina "non se rigía nin governava por otro consejo, sinon por lo qu'él dizía." He and Leonor López are even held up as examples of those of "baxa condiçión" who take delight in lording over members of the nobility.[798] It seems very unlikely that such a figure would simply be forgotten by our chronicler, so the omission may be deliberate, intended to reduce Catalina's responsibility for royal over-reliance on *privados* — and shift that responsibility elsewhere.

Pérez de Guzmán paints a portrait of Catalina that takes her from virtuous protector of her infant son, to obstacle between the child-king and his subjects. His repeated emphasis on her anger — more than any of the other chronicles — undermines or questions her suitability for a role which above all required the virtue of patience. Were this the total extent of Catalina's representation, we might guess that her narrative arc became more black-and-white simply due to the temporal remove at which he wrote or because he had a desire to create in her a more perfect foil for Fernando. The lessening of Catalina's contribution to the problem of *privados* is more of a puzzle —given the opinions he expresses in the *Generaciones* — but the accusation has greater impact when levelled at the much more recent example of the king and his *privado*.

[797] *Refundición*, p. 96.
[798] Barrio, pp. 155-56.

There are some common elements recurrent in these representations of Catalina. Firstly, suggestions of susceptibility to *privanza*: though studies by recent historians place the earliest appearance of the *privado* in Castile in the 15th century and on the shoulders of Álvaro de Luna, chronicle accounts of Juan II's minority do not all see this as the king's own innovation.[799] For Fernán Pérez de Guzmán, after reflecting on Enrique III's wisdom in choosing counsellors, Catalina represents the introduction of the "viçio común" of being subject to *privados*. He is less concerned about the long-term implications of her vice; this is not said to continue beyond her death, while for Carrillo de Huete, more invested in the king, Catalina's influence is both persistent and pernicious. For the chroniclers devoted to Fernando and to upholding the values of the aristocracy, Álvaro de Luna presents a much greater problem after her death, and his rise is dependent on Juan II's personal weakness. Nevertheless, for Gutierre Díaz, tasked with writing the life and exploits of a nobleman whose social ascent no doubt owed much to the queen's favor, Catalina's advisors merit no mention whatsoever.

Secondly, secrecy: Catalina, and particularly her counsellors, are repeatedly said to be acting in secrecy and away from the reach of the king's vassals, the chronicler, and the *infante* Fernando — but at the same time, she disappears from narratives for long stretches of time, and her actions, aside from her custody of the king, do not receive even a tiny fraction of the attention given to Fernando's military actions. The form of the chronicles thus corresponds to the content, and these prolonged, repeated absences from the narrative, especially during the years when she is meant to be ruling jointly with Fernando, reinforce impressions of secrecy and mistrust surrounding her. It is only when

[799] In particular *The World of the Favourite*, ed. J.H. Elliott and Lawrence W. B. Brockliss (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1999). Even Nicholas Round, *The Greatest Man Uncrowned: A Study of the Fall of Don Álvaro de Luna* (London: Tamesis, 1986), though acknowledging that earlier kings were prone to favoritism, makes no mention of Catalina.

Fernando is removed from the *Crónica de Juan II* that Catalina's presence in the register of events is fully normalized — present, recorded, but unremarked upon.

Thirdly, the preservation of her supreme authority as mother: No criticism of the queen can be too direct or too harsh, because she is the mother of the king, and the surrogate of her husband the king — she is the means of reproducing the lineage. Attributing her behavior and decisions (when they are unfavorable to Fernando, or against his wishes) to the actions of *privados* is a mechanism by which Catalina is technically safeguarded at the same time as her suitability for the exercise of power is called into question, for she is simultaneously relieved of responsibility and shown to be failing at one of the main tasks of queenship — the selection of good and appropriate counsellors.[800]

None of these elements are unique to chronicle representations of Catalina. The criticism of a ruler's advisors in particular is a mainstay of political rhetoric: the Roman emperor Claudius was noted by contemporaries for his favoritism towards freedmen and the sway held over him by his wife Agrippina and (freed) advisor Narcissus;[801] Juan II faced backlash for his reliance on a rotating cast of *privados*[802], as did Felipe IV for his dependence on the counsel of the Conde-Duque de Olivares. It has become no less popular over time, of course; the influence of Rasputin over the royal family, and especially the Tsarina Alexandra, was one of the accusations that helped to bring an end

[800] Christine de Pisan's 1405 book of wisdom for ladies advises that the wise princess "will establish a certain number of wise gentlemen who will sit on her council, who she will deem good, loyal, virtuous and not too covetous." *The Treasure of the City of Ladies, or the Book of the Three Virtues*, trans. by Sarah Lawson (London: Penguin, 1985; repr. 1987), p. 60.
[801] Tacitus, *Histories: Books 4-5. Annals: Books 1-3*, trans. by Clifford H. Moore, John Jackson, Loeb Classical Library, 249 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931), pp. 316-417.
[802] María del Pilar Carceller Cerviño, "Álvaro de Luna, Juan Pacheco y Beltrán de la Cueva: un estudio comparativo del privado regio a fines de la Edad Media", *En la España Medieval*, 32 (2009), pp. 85-112.

to tsarist Russia[803]. Especially in a political system headed by an individual whose right to rule was divinely ordained, such rhetoric was a relatively safe means of criticism that also served to validate and confirm the unimpeachable nature of the monarch.

Those who stood in the monarch's stead could receive the same treatment, and there are cases of other medieval queens-regent whose representations are very similar. Agnes of Poitou, mother of the Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV, lost custody of her son and ultimately the regency in the face of similar accusations.[804] In the early years of her rule, explicitly accepted by the princes of the realm on account of her maternal authority, Agnes' governance was described in favorable terms by the chronicler Lampert of Hersfeld. However, as the upper nobility became critical of her decisions, she was said to be unduly influenced by the advice of Bishop Henry of Augsburg, and even accused of an "immoral liaison".[805] In an episode not unlike the attempted kidnapping of Juan II by his vassals, Henry IV was taken from his mother's custody, effectively ending her regency. Proving the point that kings and queens are subject to different standards where criticism is concerned, the new regent, Bishop Anno of Cologne, was promptly accused of acting out of a desire for personal gain, and said to be damaging his charge's reputation! Indirect accusations made against the queen had the benefit of allowing her reputation to be restored, and in Catalina's case, used as needed to the advantage of future queens.

---

[803] Bernard Pares, "Rasputin and the Empress Alexandra", in *The Russian Revolution and Bolshevik Victory: causes and processes*, ed. by Arthur Adams (Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath, 1972), pp. 19-28.
[804] Amalie Fößel, "The Political Traditions of Female Rulership in Medieval Europe", in *Oxford Handbook of Women & Gender*, ed. by Bennett & Karras, p. 78-79.
[805] Eva-Maria Butz, "Empress Agnes of Poitou (1043-1077). Reflections on the Legal Basis of Her Regency", in *Less Favored — More Favored*, ed. by Grethe Jacobsen et al. (Copenhagen: The Royal Library, 2005)

V

Conclusions

> "Por parte de la Reyna se alegó, que segun las leyes de España, é mayormente de los Reyes de Castilla, las mugeres eran capaces para heredar, é les pertenecia la herencia dellos, en defeto de heredero varon descendiente por derecha linea: lo qual siempre había seydo usado é guardado en Castilla, segun parecia por las Crónicas antiguas, do se falla, que […] Doña Urraca que casó con el Conde Don Remon de Tolosa, subcedió en los reynos de Castilla é de Leon por fin del Rey Don Alonso su padre, que ganó a Toledo: é despues casó con Don Alonso Rey de Aragon, é fué madre del Emperador Don Alonso. Doña Berenguela la fija del Rey Don Alonso de Castilla el que venció la batalla de las Navas de Tolosa, subcedió en el reyno de Castilla por fin de su hermano el Rey Don Enrique el que murió niño en Palencia. Doña Catalina fija del Duque de Alencastre, fué jurada por todo el Reyno en concordia por primogénita heredera de Castilla, con su esposo el Rey Don Enrique fijo del Rey Don Juan el primero, bisaguelo desta Reyna."[806]
>
> — *Crónica de los Reyes Católicos*, Segunda Parte, Capítulo II

The aim of this thesis is to explore narratives of four ruling queens of medieval Castile, seeking to trace internal shifts within successive accounts of each reign or regency, as well as to compare the treatment of all four queens to discern whether there exist any patterns in representing the exercise of royal authority by women, and, if so, to what extent they diverge from narrative archetypes of consort queenship. As we have now seen, the chroniclers of medieval Castile constructed a wide range of narratives around the women who exercised direct royal authority, painting them variously in terms of explicit misogyny and elegiac admiration, in accordance with the political paradigms they sought to support.

[806] Hernando del Pulgar, Crónica de los señores Reyes Católicos Don Fernando y Doña Isabel de Castilla y de Aragón (Valencia: Benito Monfort, 1780), pp. 34-35.

Given the diversity of these texts and their treatment of queens, therefore, it is noteworthy that not a single one of these texts argues overtly against the practice of female rule. From the *Historia Compostellana* through to the *Crónicas anónimas de Sahagún*, it appears that the idea of female inheritance and governance was acceptable, at least in theory, to writers of royal history, long before it was codified in the *Siete Partidas*, and even to authors like Lucas de Túy who otherwise minimized the portrayal of active rule by queens. Although the demurring language of feminine weakness and unsuitability for government is frequently placed in the mouths of the queens themselves, or in the pleas of townspeople, these pronouncements of humility are always intended to legitimate, rather than undermine, their eventual rule. Their acceptance by writers of history may also be due partly to a certain homogeneity in this group of queens: all of them were part of the Castilian royal family or high nobility, and all had sons, who represented the promise of a return to the normalcy of mature kingship, within a clear time limit. Female rule, especially when framed in terms of regency and as an alternative to government by the high nobility, could therefore be represented as an extraordinary measure, but one which did not inherently threaten dynastic continuity: heirs had already been produced, and as long as their ruling mothers remained unmarried, there was little danger of foreign interference because they were themselves of the same dynastic line.

In a case of the exception proving the rule, the complicated dynastic position occupied by Catalina de Lancaster seems to confirm this supposition. At once an insider of royal blood and an outsider to the Trastámara line, her treatment in the

Crónica de Juan II gives voice to anxieties about the potential resurgence of Petrist sympathies by casting members of her household as inappropriately low-born *privados*, effectively domestic "foreign" agents. The mistrust directed towards their social status is a razor-thin veneer disguising the open political wounds of civil war, but Catalina herself cannot be attacked directly on the grounds of such foreignness without exposing the rift. Her right to govern the kingdom, legitimated as it is by the explicit wish of her husband, is unimpeachable even for chroniclers determined to portray her as incompetent in the exercise of that right.

Second, for all that there was no quibbling over the notional *right* of women to rule, the question of how to represent and assess their exercise of power presented new challenges. Law codes and mirrors for princes might set out criteria for selecting consorts, and establish the circumstances under which a royal wife or daughter ought to stand at the helm of the kingdom, but they did not encourage prolonged contemplation of how such a queen ought to govern. In the absence of external guidelines, it is clear that the chroniclers of medieval Castile overwhelmingly arrived at a model of constructing female rule which was based predominantly on paradigms of consort queenship, rather than kingship.

To paint a queen's regency or rule as successful required a thorough assessment of her conformity to the expectations of a king's consort: fertile, maternal, chaste, noble, pious, charitable, subservient to the king, wise in her counsel and choice of advisors, diplomatic and conciliatory in her relations with the nobility and with subjects of the realm. Although a positive representation did not necessarily enumerate all of these qualities, the suggestion of failure on any one point was

sufficient to tarnish a queen's exercise of power: Urraca was variously portrayed as hostile to the church, licentious, greedy, and hostile to her own vassals; Catalina was principally represented as weak-willed and poorly-advised; even Berenguela, in the ambivalent view of Juan de Osma, was insufficiently deferential to the will of her (adult) son. No single point was a universal requirement for all authors, either: although maternity plays a significant role in both legitimating and undermining narratives of all four queens, the overwhelmingly positive treatment of Urraca in the *CAS*, which is not a royal chronicle, includes only a single perfunctory mention of her son.

Because the paradigms for ruling queenship are derived from the ideals of consort-queenship, an institution whose foundation is a partnership between an adult male king and an adult female queen, all of the texts examined in this thesis represent their ruling queens at least partly in relation to male figures of authority other than their sons. The importance of Alfonso I of Aragón, the counts of Lara, the *infantes* Enrique and Juan, and Fernando de Antequera, respectively, in these narratives suggests that medieval chroniclers on the whole found it difficult, regardless of political inclination, to construct a fully fleshed-out and functional monarchy with only the two subordinate members of the necessary three. A queen and a child-king required a king-figure to complete the picture, even if only to play against him, cast him as a usurper, and thereby justify the temporary instability of the monarchy. This seems to be a unique feature of narratives of ruling queenship: adult male kings are not defined by their consorts in these chronicles, even when they are (as in the case of Leonor of England, wife of Alfonso VIII) frequently drawn into narrative accounts of their reigns.

Even as they constructed these frameworks of queenship, chroniclers must have recognized the limits of idealised consortship as a model: when the adult male pretenders to authority are framed as destabilizing or usurping (as occurs with all but Fernando de Antequera), the successful performance of ruling queenship need not involve subservience; instead, the ruling queen can play against her political rivals (and in María's case, even her son) by excelling at the other virtues of queenship while they fail to embody the ideals of kingship.

However, the insistent emphasis on some of these male counterparts as true kingly figures, as is the case with both Alfonso of Aragón in chronicles of the thirteenth century and Fernando de Antequera in chronicles of the fifteenth, suggests a state of heightened anxiety and preoccupation around the imagined deficiencies of their queenly foils, which are primarily military in nature. Narratives which, despite his open hostilities with Castile, nevertheless praise Alfonso *el Batallador*'s military skill and kingly qualities, and hold him in higher esteem than the rightful heir to the throne, betray a preoccupation with Castile's offensive and defensive capabilities in the absence of an adult king. They also seem to reflect a concern with the potential consequences of an unchaste ruling queen: in comparison with the threat of an illicit lover governing and seizing power in the shadows (Pedro González de Lara), Alfonso I's actions are understandable and wholly justifiable, and his virtue is confirmed by his reconciliation with Alfonso VII. The consistent portrayal of Catalina as reluctant to fund or otherwise support Fernando of Antequera's Reconquest efforts reflects similar anxieties around the permanence of the Trastámara line and Castile's

limited success on the southern frontier in the early decades of the fifteenth century. This trend more broadly indicates some universal limits on the chroniclers' ability or desire to portray the regular exercise of certain ruling powers by queens. Both the dispensation of justice, with the sole exception of Urraca in the *CAS*, and active participation in warfare are roles reserved to men. On the other hand, strategic advice, military administration, and proximity to the battlefield are equally potential sites for legitimating queens or undermining them.

* * *

From the twelfth century through the late fifteenth, then, writers of history in Castile were forced to develop novel representational strategies to accommodate the repeated fact of female rule, incorporating pre-existing ideas about gender and power to endorse or denounce the women who claimed the authority to rule the kingdom outside of the normative monarchical structure of [adult king + queen-consort + heir]. The defensive and legitimating strategies rely on the successful achievement of maternity (including education of children) and the performance of "feminine" virtues like chastity and piety. The mediation of relationships with other individuals and social groups (both the nobility and the more humble *omes buenos* of towns and cities) also features heavily in these narratives. Attacking or critical strategies must strike a balance between wholesale delegitimation—especially where the queen is the mother of a king whose dynastic position and exercise of power is *not* under attack—and the customary themes of medieval misogyny and evidence of failure to exhibit the

necessary personal and public merits of consort queenship. The representations of individual queens shift over time, as they are revisited in different contexts, whether different periods or by chroniclers with different political and social alignments. Far from being set on a single course or preserved whole in aspic, some of these narratives are surprisingly dynamic over the course of centuries.

Since the writing of history reflects, above all, a desire to impose order and meaning on the past in aid of the present, what aims, if any, do these extensive and frequently-revised narratives of ruling queenship serve? First and most obviously, they serve a practical purpose by modelling different types of queenship, and the possibilities available to women in a position to rule, since as we have seen, this was not an infrequent occurrence. In this way, they fill in the gap between the theoretical guidelines for hereditary and regent queenship (as laid out in the abstract terms of the *Siete Partidas*), and the ways a woman might navigate such a role in contemporary society. This is most evident in the thirteenth-century texts based on the *DRH* and its vernacular reception, which present a wide array of rulers and consorts, both male and female, and moralize extensively on their exercise of power. The clear oppositions between Urraca and Berenguela in these narratives simultaneously stoke anxieties about "bad" queenship, which exposes the kingdom and its *naturales* to moral and literal danger, and provide reassurances that "proper" ruling queenship, which safeguards the king and his realm, can exist and even be desirable.

Secondly, these representations can legitimate and uphold individual queens in their exercise of power, by providing and elaborating clear historical precedent

for their behavior, or at least the behavior the chroniclers wish for them to exhibit and be recognized for. This seems to be particularly the case of Berenguela's queenship in the chronicles of the early fourteenth century, which hold up and double down on her exemplary nature (the addition of an elegy upon her death confirms that she is quite literally an *espejo* of virtues) while simultaneously eliminating some details surrounding her involvement in Fernando III's king-making rituals that might have induced unnecessary anxieties about María de Molina's first regency. Similarly, the portrait of Urraca in the *CAS* seems intended to offer a very specific example to Isabel of Castile, down to the dangers of a meddling Aragonese husband.

This application was not necessarily gendered, either: narratives of queenship could be deployed to validate changes or continuity in the broader political system. María de Molina's exemplarity as both consort and regent, and her mistreatment by greedy, traitorous members of the high nobility, which is built up over the course of three reigns and nominally separate chronicles, establishes a veritable laundry list of justifications for Alfonso XI's later efforts to bring the great lords of Castile more firmly under centralized royal control. This use of María also takes advantage of the fact that her highly-gendered virtues are not comparable to, and so do not overshadow, Alfonso XI's own exercise of power. Similarly, Catalina de Lancaster's inadequacy as a ruler heralds the chroniclers' hopes for the resurgence of a vigorous Reconquest model of masculinity and kingship, embodied by Fernando de Antequera and the *infantes* de Aragón, in which personal military prowess was still an essential ingredient.

* * *

By the late fifteenth century, it is safe to say, there was a well-established framework within which writers of history in Castile might understand and narrate ruling queenship, and a substantial, widespread corpus of texts which provided a diversity of examples, both positive and negative. The existence of the *CAS* confirms the existence of just such a cultural paradigm, and importantly its independence from any particular queen, which allowed these narratives to be dynamic and adaptable to the equally changeable needs of chroniclers. Castile's first queen regnant underwent, some three and a half centuries after her death, a dramatic rehabilitation of her image: no other account of Urraca's reign bears more than a passing resemblance to the events it depicts, and yet the anonymous monks of Sahagún were able to create, from a combination of whole cloth and the idealized configuration of female rule, a radically new interpretation of her queenship which would serve their immediate political requirements. These strategies had not, however, yet been tested by another regnant queen.

When she finally triumphed, in 1478, over the claims of her niece Juana, *la Beltraneja*, queen of Portugal, it fell to Isabel of Castile to defend her new throne from a usurper much closer to home: Fernando of Aragón. Among the arguments for preserving her sovereignty against even her husband, the queen's chronicler Hernando del Pulgar included a lengthy discourse, cited at the beginning of this chapter and placed in Isabel's mouth, on the long-standing legal precedent of women inheriting and ruling the kingdoms of Castile and León. Beginning with Ormisinda, the daughter of Pelayo, and ending with Catalina de Lancaster, Isabel's own grandmother, the queen's speech invokes the weight of history to

construct an alternative genealogy of *suo jure* queenship extending back to the mythic origins of Castile and the Reconquest.

The sophisticated manipulation of historical narratives to legitimate Isabel's succession, from as early as her 1468 nomination as Enrique IV's heir, demonstrate a keen awareness of the uses to which all sorts of rhetoric could be put.[807] Isabel's own collection of books, to which her chroniclers would undoubtedly have had access, contained dozens of chronicles, including many of those explored in this thesis: the *EE* in multiple copies, the *CFIV*, the *CAXI*, the *Crónica de Juan II*, and a text catalogued as *Crónica de los reyes de Castilla* (with a note that it "comiença desde los godos") that was likely a vernacular translation of the *DRH* or a later text in the Alfonsine tradition.[808] From the long list of queens, seven in total, it is clear that they were scoured for every possible example, and the circumstances of the inheritance.

By presenting Isabel as only the most recent in a centuries-long line of women inheriting the throne for themselves, Pulgar had seized upon the dynamic potential of ruling queenship and taken it one step further than his predecessors, adapting it to his monarch's needs: specifically to legitimate a claim to the sole exercise of royal authority in Castile, as a *married* queen regnant. Pulgar was clearly aware of and working within well-developed narrative models laid out in the chronicles which then comprised the historical record. In recounting the early events of the succession crisis, he neatly inverts the scene where Berenguela is

[807] The definitive study on Isabelline propaganda and rhetoric in this period is Ana Isabel Carrasco Manchado, *Isabel I de Castilla y la sombra de la ilegitimidad: Propaganda y representación en el conflicto sucesorio (1474-1482)* (Madrid: Silex, 2006).
[808] Elisa Ruiz García, *Los libros de Isabel la Católica: arqueología de un patrimonio escrito* (Madrid: Instituto de Historia del Libro y de la Lectura, 2004), pp. 375-15.

beseeched to give the throne to Fernando III: instead, rebellious magnates beg *Isabel* to take the throne for herself. Her claim thus legitimated, Isabel nevertheless follows the model of exemplary queenship established by Berenguela, deferring to her brother Alfonso, and asserting she will not be queen in Enrique IV's lifetime.[809]

Noteworthy in Pulgar's imagining of the queen's speech are certain elisions and alterations of the extant narratives from which he extracted these examples: where both of Urraca's marriages and her heir are named, Berenguela's inheritance is derived from her father and her brother, with nary a mention of her saintly son. But the claim that Catalina de Lancaster was, jointly with Enrique III, the firstborn heir of the realm, is perhaps the most obvious example of a brute-force alteration of the prevailing historical narrative: it prefers the conciliatory terms laid out in the Treaty of Bayonne to the messy and unflattering accounts of the co-regency period. Confirming the appeal, and the inherent malleability, of these narratives is the fact that Pulgar distills their essence—the proof they provide for female inheritance—but wipes the slate clean of any details which might detract from the queen's argument, no matter how significant they might have been in the source texts.

This thesis is of course not directly concerned with Isabel and the historiography of her reign and relationship with Fernando of Aragón, but this proudly-claimed lineage of queens in many ways represents the natural culmination medieval Castilian historical narratives around female rule. If monks in twelfth-century

[809] Pulgar, pp. 2-3.

Galicia could not delegitimate a female regnant on any grounds but moral ones, and if thirteenth- and fourteenth-century court chroniclers could hold up regent queens as model rulers without needing them to entirely transcend their gender, there was material aplenty from which to construct a history of Isabel's reign that did not relegate her to the status of mere consort.

* * *

Narratives around women and the exercise of power, and specifically the rhetorical terms in which they are framed and the cultural anxieties they prey upon, remain undeniably important in the present day: one need look no further than the failure of Hilary Rodham Clinton's presidential campaign, or the hand-wringing over a majority-female, so-called *Consejo de Ministras* in Spain,[810] to choose just a few very recent examples. At the same time, contemporary fascination with both historical and fictional medieval queenship in entertainment and politics is on the rise. Not much differently than their medieval counterparts, these representations of medieval or pseudo-medieval queenship serve to mediate and propagate myths and anxieties around power dynamics writ large: from RTVE's *Isabel* to the sensationalistic *Game of Thrones*, and even the superhero film *Thor: Ragnarok*, which uses a secret, literally painted-over history of violent female conquest and rule as a metaphor for whitewashed narratives of colonialism. This tendency to treat medieval queenship as mere archetype, however, serves as a salient reminder of the importance of being attuned to the structures and careful

[810] Jaime Rubio Hancock, "Si hay más mujeres que hombres, ¿podemos decir Consejo de Ministras?", *El País*, 6 June 2018 <https://verne.elpais.com/verne/2018/06/06/articulo/1528276192_614423.html> [accessed 12 June 2018].

strategies underpinning these narratives, and of understanding them, first and foremost, in their historical contexts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Source Texts

Chronica Adefonsi Imperatoris, ed. by Luis Sánchez Belda (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1950)

Crónica anónima de Enrique III de Castilla (1390-1391), ed. by Michel García (Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2013)

Las crónicas anónimas de Sahagún, ed. by Julio Puyol y Alonso (Madrid: Real Academia de la Historia, Establecimiento tipográfico de Fortanet, 1920)

Crónicas anónimas de Sahagún, ed. by Antonio Ubieto Arteta (Zaragoza: Anubar, 1984)

Crónica de Castilla, ed. by Patricia Rochwert-Zuili (Paris: SEMH-Sorbonne, 2010) < http://journals.openedition.org/e-spanialivres/63> [accessed 27 November 2017]

Crónica geral de Espanha de 1344. Edição crítica do texto português, ed. by Luis Lindley Cintra, vol. 1 (Lisbon: Academia Nacional de Belas Artes, 1951)

Crónica de la población de Ávila, ed. by Manuel Abeledo (Buenos Aires: SECRIT, 2012)

Crónica de veinte reyes, ed. by César Hernández Alonso et al. (Burgos: Ayuntamiento de Burgos, 1991)

Grán Crónica de Alfonso XI, ed. by Diego Catalán, *Fuentes Cróniticas de la Historia de España*, 4, vol. 1 (Madrid: Gredos and Seminario Menéndez Pidal, 1977)

Historia Compostelana, ed. and trans. by Emma Falque, Clásicos Latinos Medievales, 3 (Madrid: Akal, 1994)

Historia Compostellana, ed. by Emma Falque, Library of Latin Texts, 70 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1988)

Alfonso X, *Primera Crónica General de España*, ed. by Ramón Menéndez Pidal, 2 vols (Madrid: Gredos, 1906, repr. 1977)

Alfonso X, *Las Siete Partidas del Rey Don Alfonso el Sabio*, 3 vols (Madrid: Real Academia de la Historia, Imprenta Real, 1807)

Barrientos, Lope de, *Refundición de la Crónica del Halconero*, ed. by Juan de Mata Carriazo, Colección de Crónicas Españolas, 9 (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1946)

Carrillo de Huete, Pedro, *Crónica del Halconero de Juan II*, ed. by Juan de Mata Carriazo, Colección de Crónicas Españolas, 8 (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1946)

Chacón, Gonzalo de, *Crónica de Don Álvaro de Luna, condestable de Castilla, maestre de Santiago*, ed. by Juan de Mata Carriazo, Colección de Crónicas Españolas, 2 (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1940)

Díaz de Games, Gutierre, *El Victorial*, ed. by Rafael Beltrán Llavador, Clásicos Taurus, 25 (Madrid: Taurus, 1994)

Diez [*sic*] de Games, Gutierre, *El Victorial: Crónica de Don Pero Niño, Conde de Buelna*, ed. by Juan de Mata Carriazo, Colección de Crónicas Españolas, 1 (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1940)

Flórez, Henrique, *Memorias de las reynas catholicas, historia genealógica de la casa real de Castilla y de León*, I (Madrid: Antonio Marín, 1770)

García de Santa María, Alvar, *Crónica de Juan II*, ed. by José Sancho Rayón and Francisco de Zabáluru, in *Colección de Documentos Inéditos para la Historia de España*, 99 (Madrid: Imprenta de Rafael Marco y Viñas, 1891)

García de Santa María, Alvar, *Le parti inedite della 'Crónica de Juan II' di Álvar García de Santa María*, ed. by Donatella Ferro (Venice: Consiglio Nazionale Delle Ricerche, 1972)

Geoffroy de Beaulieu, *Vita et sancta conversatio piae memoriae Ludovici quondam regis Francorum*, in Martin Bouquet and Léopold Delisle, eds, *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, vol. 20 (Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1904), 3-27

Jiménez de Rada, Rodrigo, *Historia de rebus Hispaniae sive Historia Gothica*, ed. by Juan Fernández Valverde, Library of Latin Texts, 72 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1987)

Jiménez de Rada, Rodrigo, *Historia de los hechos de España*, ed. and trans. by Juan Fernández Valverde (Madrid: Alianza, 1989)

Jofré de Loaisa, *Crónica*, ed. by Agustín Ubieto Arteta, Textos Medievales, 30 (Valencia: Anubar, 1971)

Jofré de Loaysa, *Crónica de los Reyes de Castilla: Fernando III, Alfonso X, Sancho IV y Fernando IV (1248-1305)*, ed. by Antonio García Martínez (Murcia: Patronato de Cultura de la Excma. Diputación de Murcia, 1961; Academia Alfonso X el Sabio, repr. 1982)

Juan Manuel, *Cinco tratados: Libro del cavallero et del escudero. Libro de las tres razones. Libro enfenido. Tractado de la asunción de la Virgen. Libro de la caça.*, ed. by Reinaldo Ayerbe-Chaux, *Spanish Series*, 51 (Madison: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, 1989)

Juan de Osma, *Crónica latina de los reyes de Castilla*, ed. and trans. by Luis Charlo Brea (Cádiz: Universidad de Cádiz, 1984)

Juan de Osma, *Crónica latina de los reyes de Castilla*, ed. and trans. by Luis Charlo Brea, in Rocío Carande Herrero et al., *Crónicas hispanas del siglo XIII*, Corpus Christianorum in translation, 5 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010)

[Juan de Osma], *Chronique latine des rois de Castille jusqu'en 1236*, ed. by Georges Cirot (Bordeaux: Feret, 1913)

[Juan de Osma], *The Latin Chronicle of the Kings of Castile*, ed. and trans. by Joseph F. O'Callaghan (Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002)

López de Ayala, Pero, *Las crónicas*, ed. by Cherrie L. Soper, Prosa Biblioteca Clásica Ebro, 127 (Zaragoza: Ebro, 1975)

López de Ayala, Pero, *Crónicas*, ed. by José-Luis Martín, Clásicos universales Planeta, 200 (Barcelona: Planeta, 1991)

Lucas de Tuy, *Chronicon Mundi*, ed. by Emma Falque Rey, Library of Latin Texts, 74 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002)

Morel-Fatio, Alfred, "*Chronique des rois de Castille (1248-1305)*, par Jofré de Loaisa.", in *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*, 59 (1898), 325-78

"Ordenamiento de Alcalá", ed. by Frank Waltman and Patricia Martínez de la Vega Mansilla, in *Spanish Legal Texts* in *Digital Library of Hispanic Texts* <http://www.hispanicseminary.org/t&c/lex/index-en.htm> [accessed 12 November 2016]

Pérez de Guzmán, Fernán, *Generaciones y semblanzas*, ed. by Robert B. Tate, Serie B — Textos, 11 (London: Tamesis, 1965)

Pérez de Guzmán, Fernán, *Generaciones y semblanzas*, ed. by José Antonio Barrio Sánchez, Cátedra Letras Hispánicas, 456 (Madrid: Cátedra, 1998)

Pisan, Christine de, *The Treasure of the City of Ladies: or the Book of the Three Virtues*, trans. by Sarah Lawson (London: Penguin, 1985)

Pulgar, Hernando del, *Crónica de los señores Reyes Católicos Don Fernando y Doña Isabel de Castilla y de Aragón* (Valencia: Benito Monfort, 1780)

Sánchez de Valladolid, Fernán, *Chronicle of Alfonso X*, ed. by Shelby Thacker and José Escobar, *Studies in Romance Languages*, 47 (Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press, 2002)

Sánchez de Valladolid, Fernán, *Crónica de Alfonso X: Según el Ms. II/2777 de la Biblioteca del Palacio Real (Madrid)*, ed. by Manuel Gónzalez Jiménez and María Antonia Carmona Ruiz (Murcia: Real Academia Alfonso X el Sabio, 1998)

[Sánchez de Valladolid, Fernán] *Crónica de Sancho IV*, ed. by Pablo Enrique Saracino, *Incipit Ediciones Críticas*, 9 (Buenos Aires: SECRIT, 2014)

[Sánchez de Valladolid, Fernán], *Crónica de tres reyes*, ed. by Cayetano Rosell, *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*, 66 (Madrid: Rivadeneyra, 1875)

[Sancho IV], *Castigos del rey don Sancho IV*, ed. by Hugo O. Bizzarri (Madrid-Frankfurt: Iberomericana-Vervuert, 2001)

Tacitus, *Histories: Books 4-5. Annals: Books 1-3*, trans. by Clifford H. Moore and John Jackson, Loeb Classical Library, 249 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931)

The Treaty of Bayonne (1388), ed. by John Palmer and Brian Powell, Exeter Hispanic Texts, 47 (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1988)

Vilaplana Gisbert, María Victoria J., ed., *Documentos de la minoría de Juan II: la regencia de don Fernando de Antequera*, Colección de documentos para la historia del Reino de Murcia, 15 (Murcia: Real Academia Alfonso X el Sabio; CSIC, 1993)

Secondary Texts

Alfonso, Isabel, and Julio de Escalona, "Introduction", in Isabel Alfonso et al., eds, *Building legitimacy: Political discourses and forms of legitimacy in medieval societies* (Leiden: Brill, 2004)

Álvarez, María Teresa, *Catalina de Lancaster: primera princesa de Asturias* (Madrid: La Esfera de los Libros, 2008)

Amelang, James S., "Mourning Becomes Eclectic: Ritual Lament and the Problem of Continuity", *Past & Present*, 187 (2005), 3-31

Aram, Bethany, "Authority and Maternity in Late-Medieval Castile: Four Queens Regnant", in Brenda M. Bolton and Christine E. Meek, eds, *Aspects of Power and Authority in the Middle Ages*, International Medieval Research Series, 14 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), pp. 121-129

Aristotle, *Poetics*, trans. by Malcolm Heath (London: Penguin, 1996)

Arizaleta, Amaia, "La *Chronica regum Castellae*: aledaños de la ficción", *e-Spania*, 2 (2006) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.517>

Arizaleta, Amaia, "*Ut lector agnosceret*: discurso y recepción en la obra de Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada (primera mitad del siglo XIII)", *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*, 26 (2003), 163-186 <doi: 10.3406/cehm.2003.2018>

Arteaga, Almudena de, *María de Molina: tres coronas medievales* (Madrid: Martínez Roca, 2004, repr. 2007)

Babbit, Theodore, *La crónica de veinte reyes: a comparison with the text of the Primera crónica general and a study of the principal Latin sources* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936)

Barbosa, Manuel, "A Funcionalidade Profética (ou Intenção Pedagógica) do Chronicon Mundi de Lucas de Tui", in Aires A. Nascimento & Cristina Almeida Ribeiro, eds, *Literatura Medieval: Actas do IV Congresso da Associação Hispânica de Literatura Medieval (Lisboa, 1-5 Outubro 1991)* (Lisbon: Cosmos, 1993), pp. 307-11

Barefield, Laura D., *History and Gender in Medieval English Romance and Chronicle*, Studies in the Humanities, 63 (New York: Peter Lang, 2003)

Barton, Simon, *The aristocracy in twelfth-century León and Castile* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)

Basil, Alison, "Henry VI and Margaret of Anjou: Madness, Gender Dysfunction and Perceptions of Dis-ease in the Royal Body", in Sean McGlynn and Elena Woodacre, eds, *The Image and Perception of Monarchy in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014), pp. 168-82

Bautista, Francisco, "Escritura cronística e ideología histórica: la *Chronica latina regum Castellae*", *e-Spania*, 2 (2006) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.429>

Bautista, Francisco, "Poesía, archivo y heterogeneidad en la historiografía castellana medieval", in Amaia Arizaleta, ed., *Poétique de la chronique: L'écriture des textes historiographiques au Moyen Âge (péninsule Ibérique et France)*, Méridiennes, Études Médiévales Ibériques (Tolouse: CNRS — Université de Tolouse-Le Mirail, 2008), pp. 215-228

Beceiro Pita, Isabel, "Modelos de conducta y programas educativos para la aristocracia femenina (siglos XII-XV)", in María Teresa López Beltrán, ed., *De la edad media a la moderna: mujeres, educación y familia en el ámbito rural y urbano*(Málaga: Universidad de Málaga, 1999), pp. 37-72

Bellido, Juan Félix, *Razones de una mujer: Memorias autobiográficas de Leonor López de Córdoba* (Córdoba: El Almendro, 2012)

Bennett, Judith, and Ruth Karras, eds, *The Oxford Handbook of Women & Gender in Medieval Europe* (Oxford: OUP, 2013)

Bennett, Judith, and Ruth Karras, "Women, Gender, and Medieval Historians", in *The Oxford Handbook of Women & Gender in Medieval Europe* (Oxford: OUP, 2013), pp. 1-14

Benz St. John, Lisa, *Three Medieval Queens* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012)

Bianchini, Janna, "Foreigners and Foes in the Leonese Succession Crisis of 1230", in James J. Todesca, ed., *The Emergence of Léon-Castile c. 1065-1500: Essays Presented to Joseph O'Callaghan* (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2015), pp. 47-67

Bianchini, Janna, *The Queen's Hand: Power and Authority in the Reign of Berenguela of Castile* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012)

Boyden, James M., "'Fortune Has Stripped You of Your Splendour': Favourites and their Fates in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Spain", in L.W.B. Brockliss and J.H. Elliott, eds, *The World of the Favourite* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), pp. 26-37

Breitenberg, Mark, *Anxious Masculinity in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

Brockliss, L.W.B., and J.H. Elliott, eds, *The World of the Favourite* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999)

Butler, Sara M., *The Language of Abuse: Marital Violence in Later Medieval England* (Leiden: Brill, 2007)

Butz, Eva-Maria, "Empress Agnes of Poitou (1043-1077). Reflections on the Legal Basis of Her Regency", in Grethe Jacobsen et al., eds, *Less Favored — More Favored* (Copenhagen: The Royal Library, 2005) <http://www.kb.dk/export/sites/kb_dk/da/publikationer/online/fund_og_forskning/download/A19A_Butz-ENG.pdf> [accessed 8 January 2018]

Campa, Mariano de la, "La *Crónica de Veinte Reyes* y las *Versiones crítica* y *concisa* de la *Estoria de España*. Ediciones críticas y estudio." (unpublished doctoral thesis, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 1995)

Campa, Mariano de la, *La "Estoria de España" de Alfonso X: estudio y edición de la "Versión crítica" desde Fruela II hasta la muerte de Fernando II* (Málaga: Universidad de Málaga, 2009)

Cantera Burgos, Francisco, *Alvar García de Santa María y su familia de conversos: Historia de la Judería de Burgos y de sus conversos más egregios* (Madrid: Instituto Arias Montano, 1952)

Carceller Cerviño, María del Pilar, "Álvaro de Luna, Juan Pacheco y Beltrán de la Cueva: un estudio comparativo del privado regio a fines de la Edad Media", *En la España Medieval*, 32 (2009), 85-112

Carmona Ruiz, María Antonia, *María de Molina* (Barcelona: Plaza & Janés, 2005)

Carrasco Manchado, Ana Isabel, *Isabel I de Castilla y la sombra de la ilegitimidad: Propaganda y representación en el conflicto sucesorio (1474-1482)* (Madrid: Silex, 2006)

Catalán, Diego, *De Alfonso X al conde de Barcelos: cuatro estudios sobre el nacimiento de la historiografía romance en Castilla y Portugal* (Madrid: Gredos, 1962)

Catalán, Diego, "Crónicas generales y cantares de gesta. El Mio Cid de Alfonso X y el del pseudo Ben-Alfaray", *Hispanic Review*, 31 (1963), 195-215

Catalán, Diego, *Un prosista anónimo del siglo XIV (La Gran Crónica de Alfonso XI: hallazgo, estilo, reconstrucción)* (La Laguna: Universidad de la Laguna, 1957)

Catalán, Diego, *La tradición manuscrita en la 'Crónica de Alfonso XI'*, *Biblioteca Románica Hispánica, Estudios y Ensayos*, 211 (Madrid: Gredos, 1974)

Cayrol Bernardo, Laura, "De infantas, domnae y Deo votae. Algunas reflexiones en torno al infantado y sus señoras", *Summa*, 3 (2014), 5-23

Cerrada Jiménez, Ana Isabel, "Tres generaciones de mujeres en el poder: Urraca de Zamora, Urraca de Castilla, Teresa de Portugal y Doña Sancha. Las mujeres en la construcción de las monarquías feudales hispánicas", in Ana Isabel Cerrada Jímenez and Cristina Segura Graíño, eds, *Las mujeres y el poder: Representaciones y prácticas de vida* (Madrid: Al-Mudanya, 2000), pp. 99-106

Collins, Larry L., "The historiographical background of the *Crónica de Veinte Reyes*", *Revue d'histoire des textes*, 4 (1974-75), 339-357

Collins, Roger, "Queens-Dowager and Queens-Regent in Tenth-Century León and Navarre", in John Carmi Parsons, ed., *Medieval Queenship* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1993), pp. 79-92

Conde, Juan Carlos, *La creación de un discurso historiográfico en el cuatrocientos castellano: Las siete edades del mundo de Pablo de Santa María (Estudio y edición crítica)*, Textos Recuperados, 18 (Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 1999)

Cuenca Coloma, Juan Manuel, *Sahagún: monasterio y villa, 1085-1985* (Valladolid: Estudio Agustiniano, 1985)

Culler, Jonathan, *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: OUP, 1997, repr. 2011)

Deyermond, Alan, "Historia universal e ideología nacional en Pablo de Santa María", in *Homenaje a Álvaro Galmés de Fuentes*, 2 (Madrid: Gredos, 1985), pp. 313-24

Dias, Isabel de Barros, "Gathering, Ranking, and Denegating Sources in Thirteenth- and Fourteenth-Century Iberian Chronicles" in Erik Kooper, ed., *The Medieval Chronicle V* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2008), pp. 47-60

Díaz Martín, Luis Vicente, "Los últimos años de Fernán Sánchez de Valladolid", in *Homenaje al profesor Juan Torres Fontes*, vol. 1 (Murcia: Universidad de Murcia and Academia Alfonso X el Sabio, 1987), pp. 349-64

Diggelmann, Lindsay, "Hewing the Ancient Elm: Anger, Arboricide, and Medieval Kingship", *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 40 (2010), 249-72

Dillard, Heath, *Daughters of the Reconquest: Women in Castilian Town Society, 1100-1300* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984)

Drayson, Elizabeth, *The King and the Whore: King Roderick and La Cava* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007)

Earenfight, Theresa, *The King's Other Body: María of Castile and the Crown of Aragón* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010)

Earenfight, Theresa, "María of Castile, Ruler or Figurehead?", *Mediterranean Studies*, 4 (1994), 45-61

Earenfight, Theresa, *Queenship in Medieval Europe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013)

Earenfight, Theresa, ed., *Queenship and Political Power in Medieval and Early Modern Spain* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005)

Earenfight, Theresa, "Royal Women in Late Medieval Spain: Catalina of Lancaster, Leonor of Albuquerque, and María of Castile", in Charlotte Newman Goldy and Amy Livingstone, eds, *Writing Medieval Women's Lives* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), pp. 209-25

Earenfight, Theresa, "Without the Persona of the Prince: Kings, Queens and the Idea of Monarchy in Late Medieval Europe", *Gender & History*, 19.1 (April 2007), 1-21

Echegaray, Lynne, "The Missing Family: Silencing in the *Crónica de Don Álvaro de Luna*", in Erik Kooper, ed., *Medieval Chronicle IV* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006), pp. 81-9

Echevarría, Ana, *Catalina de Lancaster: reina regente de Castilla, 1372-1418* (Hondarribia: Nerea, 2002)

Echevarría, Ana, "The Queen and the Master: Catalina of Lancaster and the Military Orders", in Theresa Earenfight, ed., *Queenship and Political Power in Medieval and Early Modern Spain* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), pp. 91-105

Erler, Mary C., and Maryanne Kowaleski, eds, *Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1988)

Erler, Mary C., and Maryanne Kowaleski, eds, *Gendering the Master Narrative: Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003)

Escalona, Julio, "Los nobles contra su rey. Argumentos y motivaciones de la insubordinación nobiliaria de 1272-73", *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*, 25 (2002), 131-62

Escalona, Romualdo, *Historia del Real Monasterio de Sahagún* (Madrid: 1782), ed. by Carlos Estepa Diez (León: Ediciones Leonesas, 1982)

Espinosa Elorza, Rosa María, "Indagaciones filológicas sobre la *Primera crónica anónima de Sahagún*", *e-Spania*, 19 (2014) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.23843>

Esteban, Alfonso, and Yves-René Fonquerne, eds, *La condición de la mujer en la Edad Media: actas del coloquio celebrado en la Casa de Velázquez, del 5 al 7 de noviembre de 1984* (Madrid: Casa de Velázquez; Universidad Complutense, 1986)

Estepa Díez, Carlos, "Sobre las revueltas burguesas en el siglo XII en el Reino de León", *Archivos Leoneses*, 55-56 (1974), 291-307

Estow, Clara, "Leonor López de Córdoba: Portrait of a Medieval Courtier", *Fifteenth Century Studies*, 5 (1982), 23-46

Estow, Clara, "The Chronicler as Protagonist: Notes on the Historical Writings of Pedro López de Ayala and King Pere III of Cataluña", *Hispania*, 71.3 (September 1988), 472-78

Estow, Clara, "Widows in the Chronicles of Late Medieval Castile", in Louise Mirrer, ed., *Upon My Husband's Death: Widows in the Literature and Histories of Medieval Europe* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992), pp. 153-67

Falque, Emma, "Chronicon Compostellanum", *Habis*, 14 (1983), 73-84

Falque [Rey], Emma, "Lucas de Túy y Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada: el uso de las fuentes", *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*, 26 (2003), 151-161 <doi: 10.3406/cehm.2003.2017>

Fernández Gallardo, Luis, "La *Crónica particular de San Fernando*: sobre los orígenes de la crónica real castellana, I. Aspectos formales", *Cahiers d'études hispaniques médiévales*, 32 (2009), 245-265 <doi: 10.3406/cehm.2009.2076>

Fernández Gallardo, Luis, "La *Crónica particular de San Fernando*: sobre los orígenes de la crónica real castellana, II. Los contenidos", *Cahiers d'études hispaniques médiévales*, 33 (2010), 215-246 <doi: 10.3406/cehm.2010.2243>

Fernández Gallardo, Luis, "De Lucas de Tuy a Alfonso el Sabio: idea de la historia y proyecto historiográfico", *Revista de poética medieval*, 12 (2004), 53-119

Fernández Martín, Pedro, "El obispo de Osma don Juan Díaz, canciller de Fernando III el Santo, no se llamaba don Juan Domínguez", *Celtiberia*, 27 (1964), 79-95

Fernández-Ordóñez, Inés, "La composición por etapas de la *Chronica latina regum Castellae* (1223-1237) de Juan de Soria", *e-Spania*, 2 (2006) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.283>

Fernández-Ordóñez, Inés, "De la historiografía fernandina a la alfonsí", *Alcanate*, 3 (2002-03), 93-133

Fernández-Ordóñez, Inés, "El taller historiográfico alfonsí. La *Estoria de España* y la *General estoria* en el marco de las obras promovidas por Alfonso el Sabio", in Ana

Domínguez Rodríguez and Jesús Montoya Martínez, eds, *Scriptorium alfonsí, de los libros de astrología a las "Cantigas de Santa María"*,(Madrid: Universidad Complutense, 1999), 105-126

Fernández-Ordóñez, Inés, "La técnica historiográfica del Toledano. Procedimientos de organización del relato", *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*, 26 (2003), 187-221 <doi: 10.3406/cehm.2003.2019>

Fernández-Ordóñez, Inés, "Variación en el model historiográfico alfonsí en el siglo XIII: las versiones de la *Estoria de España"*, in Georges Martin, ed., *La historia alfonsí: el modelo y sus destinos (siglos XIII-XV)* (Madrid: Casa de Velázquez, 2000), pp. 41-74

Fernández-Ordóñez, Inés, *Versión crítica de la estoria de España: estudio y edición desde Pelayo hasta Ordoño II* (Madrid: Fundación Menéndez Pidal, 1993)

Finke, H., and E. Jaffé, "La dispensa de matrimonio falsificada para el rey Sancho IV y María de Molina", *Anuario de historia del derecho español*, 4 (1927), 298-318

Fita, Fidel, "Concilio nacional de Burgos (18 febrero 1117). Texto inédito", *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia*, 48 (1906), 387-407

Fletcher, Richard A., *St. James's Catapult: The Life and Times of Diego Gelmírez of Santiago de Compostela* (Oxford: OUP, 1984)

Fößel, Amalie, "The Political Traditions of Female Rulership in Medieval Europe", in Judith Bennett and Ruth Karras, *The Oxford Handbook of Women & Gender in Medieval Europe* (Oxford: OUP, 2013), pp. 68-81

Fradejas Lebrero, José, "Valores literarios de la *Crónica de veinte reyes*", in *Crónica de veinte reyes*, ed. by César Hernández Alonso et al. (Burgos: Ayuntamiento de Burgos, 1991), pp. 31-51

Fradenburg, Louise O., "Rethinking Queenship", in Louise O. Fradenburg, ed., *Women and Sovereignty, Cosmos, 7* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992), pp. 1-13

Fradenburg, Louise O., *Women and Sovereignty*, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992)

Fraker, Charles F., "Alfonso X, the Empire, and the *Primera crónica*", *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 55 (1978), 95-102

Fuente, María Jesús, *Reinas medievales en los reinos hispánicos* (Madrid: Esfera de los libros, 2003; repr. 2004)

Funes, Leonardo, "De Alfonso el Sabio al Canciller Ayala: variaciones del relato histórico", *Memorabilia*, *7* (2003) <http://parnaseo.uv.es/Memorabilia/Memorabilia7/Funes/ Funes.htm> [accessed 15 February 2015]

Funes, Leonardo, "Elementos para una poética del relato histórico", in Amaia Arizaleta, ed., *Poétique de la chronique: L'écriture des textes historiographiques au Moyen Âge (péninsule Ibérique et France)*, Méridiennes, Études Médiévales Ibériques (Tolouse: CNRS — Université de Tolouse-Le Mirail, 2008), pp. 241-273

Funes, Leonardo, "El lugar de la Crónica Particular de San Fernando en el sistema de las formas cronísticas castellanas de principios del siglo XIV", in Aengus Ward, ed., *Actas del XII Congreso de la Asociación Internacional de Hispanistas 21-26 de agosto de 1995, Birmingham*, vol. 1 (Birmingham: Department of Hispanic Studies, University of Birmingham, 1998), 176-182

Gaibrois Riaño de Ballesteros, Mercedes, *María de Molina* (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1936)

Garcia, Charles, "Itinérance de la cour et attaches sédentaires sous Alphonse VI et Urraque Ire", *e-Spania*, 8 (2009) <doi:10.4000/e-spania.18692>

Garcia, Charles, "La ligne brisée, ou l'image de la malédiction du pouvoir royal à León au Moyen Âge", *e-Spania*, 3 (2007) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.375>

Garcia, Charles, "El narrador, los juglares y los santos en la *Primera crónica anónima de Sahagún*", *e-Spania*, 19 (2014) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.23860>

Garcia, Charles, "Le pouvoir d'une reine: L'image d'Urraque 1re (1109-1126) dans les *Crónicas anónimas de Sahagún*", *e-Spania*, 1 (2006) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.319>

García de Cortázar, José Ángel, "Alfonso X y los poderes del reino", *Alcanate*, 9 (2014-15), 11-40

García de Cortázar, José Ángel, "Conclusiones: la *Primera Crónica de Sahagún* entre historia y metahistoria", *e-Spania* 19 (2014) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.23907>

Gaunt, Simon, *Gender and Genre in Medieval French Literature*, Cambridge Studies in French Series (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)

Getino, Luis G. A., *Vida y obras de Fr. Lope de Barrientos*, Anales Salmantinos, 1 (Salamanca: Establecimiento tipográfico de Calatrava, 1927)

Gil, Juan, "La gran historiografía del siglo XIII", in *La cultura del románico: siglos XI al XIII : letras, religiosidad, artes, ciencias y vida*, Ramón Menéndez Pidal: Historia de España series, vol. 11, ed. by Francisco López Estrada (Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1995, repr. 1997), 83-109

Gingras, Gerald L., "Sánchez's *Tres Corónicas*: An Alfonsine Legacy?", *Romance Quarterly*, 33:3 (1986), pp. 289-94

Given-Wilson, Chris, *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England* (London: Hambledon & London, 2004)

Le Goff, Jacques, *Saint Louis*, trans. by Gareth Evan Gollrad (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009)

Gómez Redondo, Fernando, "De la crónica general a la real. Transformaciones ideológicas en *Crónica de tres reyes*", in Georges Martin, ed., *La historia alfonsí: el model y sus destinos (siglos XIII-XV)*, *Collection de la Casa de Velázquez*, 68 (Madrid: Casa de Velázquez, 2000), pp. 95-123

Gómez Redondo, Fernando, *Historia de la prosa medieval castellana*, 4 vols (Madrid: Cátedra, 1998-2007)

González, Julio, *El reino de Castilla en la época de Alfonso VIII*, vol. 2 (Madrid: CSIC, 1960)

Gordo Molina, Ángel G., "Conflicto de mujer, de reina y de mito histórico. Urraca I de León en primera y tercera persona", *Estudios de historia de España*, 17:1 (June 2015) <http://www.scielo.org.ar/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S2469-09612015000100002&lng=es&nrm=iso&tlng=es> [accessed 3 May 2017]

Grassotti, Hilda, "Don Rodrigo Ximénez de Rada, gran señor y hombre de negocios en la Castilla del s. XIII", *Cuadernos de Historia de España*, 55-56 (1972), 1-302

Guardiola-Griffiths, Cristina, *Legitimizing the Queen: Propaganda and Ideology in the Reign of Isabel I of Castile* (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2011)

Hackett, Helen, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen: Elizabeth I and the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1995)

Henriet, Patrick, "Cluny and Spain before Alfonso VI: remarks and propositions", *Journal of Medieval Iberian Studies*, 2017 <doi: 10.1080/17546559.2017.1305120>

Henriet, Patrick, "*Sanctissima patria*. Points et thèmes communs aux trois œuvres de Lucas de Tuy", *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*, 24 (2001), 249-278 <doi: 10.3406/cehm.2001.1179>

Hernández, Francisco Javier, "La corte de Fernando III y la casa real de Francia: documentos, crónicas, monumentos", in *Fernando III y su tiempo (1201-1252): VIII Congreso de Estudios Medievales* (León: Fundación Sánchez-Albornoz, 2003), 103-156

Hernández, Francisco Javier, "La hora de don Rodrigo", *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*, 26 (2003), 15-71 <doi: 10.3406/cehm.2003.2011>

Hernández, Francisco Javier, "Noticias sobre Jofré de Loaisa y Ferrán Martínez", in *Revista Canadiense de Estudios Hispánicos*, 4:3 (1980), 281-309

Hernández, Francisco Javier, "La reina Violante de Aragón, Jofré de Loaysa y la *Crónica de Alfonso X*. Un gran fragmento cronístico del siglo XIII reutilizado en el XIV", *Journal of Medieval Iberian Studies*, 7:1 (2015), 87-111

Hernández, Francisco Javier, and Peter Linehan, *The Mozarabic Cardinal: The Life and Times of Gonzalo Pérez Gudiel*, Millenio medievale, 44 (Firenze: SISMEL-Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2004)

Herráez Ortega, María Victoria et al., *Esplendor y decadencia de un monasterio medieval. El patrimonio artístico de San Benito de Sahagún* (León: Universidad de León, Ayundamiento de Sahagún, 2000)

Isabel, <http://www.rtve.es/television/isabel-la-catolica/> [accessed 13 January 2016]

Jardin, Jean-Pierre, "Rodrigue Jiménez de Rada comme *auctoritas*: les sommes de chroniques générales du XVe siècle", *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*, 26 (2003), 295-307 <doi: 10.3406/cehm.2003.2025>

Jerez Cabrero, Enrique, "El *Chronicon Mundi* de Lucas de Tuy (C. 1238): técnicas compositivas y motivaciones ideológicas" (unpublished doctoral thesis, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 2006)

Jerez, Enrique, "La *Historia Gothica* del Toledano y la historiografía romance", *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*, 26 (2003), 223-239 <doi: 10.3406/cehm.2003.2020>

Jerez, Enrique, "El Tudense en su siglo: transmisión y recepción del *Chronicon Mundi* en el Doscientos," in Francisco Bautista, ed., *El relato historiográfico: Textos y tradiciones en la Espana medieval* (London: Dept. of Hispanic Studies, Queen Mary, University of London, 2006), pp. 19-57

Jiménez Belmonte, Javier, "Hagiografía y denuncia política en la primera *Crónica anónima de Sahagún*", *La corónica*, 29:2 (2000), 213-32

Johnstone, Hilda, "The Queen's household", in J. F. Willard and W. Morris, eds, *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336* (Cambridge, MA: The Medieval Academy of America, 1940), I, pp. 250-99

Kagan, Richard L., *Clio & the Crown: The Politics of History in Medieval and Early Modern Spain* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009)

Klinka, Emmanuelle, "L'affirmation d'une nouvelle dynastie", *e-Spania*, 3 (2007) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.19260>

Klinka, Emmanuelle, "Entre paz de Dios y paz de las armas: el papel de las mujeres (León y Castilla en torno a los siglos XI y XII)", *e-Spania*, 20 (2015) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.24313>

Larriba Baciero, Manuel, "El testamento de María de Molina", *SIGNO. Revista de Historia de la Cultura Escrita*, 2 (1995), 201-11

Laynesmith, J. L., *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship 1445-1503* (Oxford: OUP, 2004)

Lema Pueyo, José Ángel, *Alfonso I el Batallador, rey de Aragón y Pamplona (1104-1134)* (Gijón: Trea, 2008)

Linehan, Peter, "Alfonso XI of Castile and the arm of Santiago (with a Note on the pope's foot)", in Antonio García y García and Peter Weimar, eds, *Miscellanea Domenico Maffei dicata* (Frankfurt: Keip Verlag, 1995), pp. 121-146

Linehan, Peter, "Dates and doubts about don Lucas", *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*, 24 (2001), 201-17

Linehan, Peter, "Don Rodrigo and the government of the kingdom", *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*, 26 (2003), 87-99 <doi: 10.3406/cehm.2003.2013>

Linehan, Peter, *History and the Historians of Medieval Spain* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993)

Linehan, Peter, "Juan de Soria: the Chancellor as Chronicler", *e-Spania*, 2 (2006) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.276>

Linehan, Peter, *The Ladies of Zamora* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997)

Linehan, Peter, *The Spanish Church and the Papacy in the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge: CUP, 1971)

Liss, Peggy, *Isabel the Queen: Life and Times* (Oxford: OUP, 1992; repr. 2004)

Lobato Yanes, Elena, *Urraca I: La Corte Castellano-Leonesa en el siglo XII* (Palencia: Diputación Provincial, 2000)

Lomax, Derek W., "The Authorship of the *Chronique Latine des Rois de Castille*", *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 40 (1963), 205-211

Lomax, Derek W., "Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada como historiador", in Maxime Chevalier et al., eds, *Actas del quinto congreso internacional de hispanistas: celebrado en Bordeaux del 2 al 8 de septiembre de 1974*, vol. 2 (Bordeaux: Instituto de Estudios Ibéricos e Iberoaméricanos, Universidad de Bordeaux III, 1977), 587-592

López Alsina, Fernando, *La ciudad de Santiago de Compostela en la Alta Edad Media* (Santiago de Compostela: Ayuntamiento de Santiago de Compostela, Centro de Estudios Jacobeos, Museo Nacional de las Peregrinaciones, 1988)

Lorenzo, Ramon, ed., *La traducción gallega de la* Crónica general *y de la* Crónica de Castilla (Orense: Instituto de Estudios Oresanos Padre Feijóo, 1975)

Lupián Zapata, Antonio, *Epitome de la vida y muerte de la Reyna Doña Berenguela, primogenita del rey don Alonso de Castilla, aclamado el noble* (Madrid: Juan Bernardo Noguès, 1665)

MacCurdy, Raymond R., *The Tragic Fall: Don Álvaro de Luna and Other Favorites in Spanish Golden Age Drama*, North Carolina Studies in the Romance Languages and Literatures, 197 (Chapel Hill, NC: UNC Department of Romance Languages, 1978)

Marcos Pous, A., "Los dos matrimonios de Sancho IV", *Escuela Española de Arqueología e Historia en Roma: Cuadernos de Trabajo*, 8 (1956), 7-108

Martin, Georges, "Le concept de 'naturalité' (naturaleza) dans les *Sept parties*, d'Alphonse X le Sage", *e-Spania*, 5 (2008) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.10753>

Martin, Georges, "La contribution de Jean d'Osma à la pensée politique castillane sous le règne de Ferdinand III", *e-Spania*, 2 (2006) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.280>

Martin, Georges, "Introduction", *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*, 26 (2003), 11-13

Martin, Georges, *Les juges de Castille: Mentalités et discours historique dans l'Espagne médiévale* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1992)

Martin, Georges, "Mujeres de la *Najerense*", *e-Spania*, 7 (2009) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.17990>

Martin, Georges, *Mujeres y poderes en la España medieval: cinco estudios* (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 2011)

Martin, Georges, "Noblesse et royauté dans le *De rebus Hispaniae* (livres 4 a 9)", *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*, 26 (2003), 101-121 <doi: 10.3406/cehm.2003.2014>

Martin, Georges, "Reinar sin reinar: Berenguela de Castilla en el espejo de la historiografía de su época (1214-1246)", *e-Spania*, 1 (2006) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.21608>

Martin, Therese, "Hacia una clarificación del infantazgo en tiempos de la reina Urraca y su hija la infanta Sancha (ca. 1107-1159)", *e-Spania*, 5 (2008) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.12163>

Martin, Therese, *Queen as King: Politics and Architectural Propaganda in Twelfth-Century Spain*, The Medieval and Early Modern Iberian World, 30 (Leiden: Brill, 2006)

Martínez, H. Salvador, *Berenguela la Grande y su época (1180-1246)* (Madrid: Polifemo, 2012)

Martínez Casado, Ángel, *Lope de Barrientos: un intelectual en la corte de Juan II* (Salamanca: Editorial San Sebastián, 1994)

Martínez Díez, Gonzalo, "La *Crónica de Veinte Reyes*", in César Hernández Alonso et al., eds, *Crónica de veinte reyes* (Burgos: Ayuntamiento de Burgos, 1991), pp. 13-30

Martínez Pizarro, Joaquín, "Mixed Modes in Historical Narrative", in Elizabeth M. Tyler and Ross Balzaretti, eds, *Narrative and History in the Early Medieval West*, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 16 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), pp. 91-104

Martínez Sopena, Pascual, *La Tierra de Campos Occidental: poblamiento, poder y comunidad del siglo X al XIII* (Valladolid: Diputación Provincial, 1985)

Masia de Ros, Ángeles, "Las pretensiones de los infantes de la Cerda a la corona de Castilla en tiempos de Sancho IV y Fernando IV. El apoyo aragonés", *Medievalia*, 10 (1992), 255-79

Maurer, Helen E., *Margaret of Anjou: Queenship and Power in Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003)

McNamara, Jo Ann, and Suzanne Wemple, "The Power of Women through the Family in Medieval Europe: 500-1100", *Feminist Studies,* 1 (1973), 126-141

Ménendez Pidal, Gonzalo, "Cómo trabajaron las escuelas alfonsíes", *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, 5 (1951), 363-380

Montiel Roig, Gonzalo, "Los móviles de la redacción de la *Crónica de Don Álvaro de Luna*", *Revista de Literatura Medieval*, 9 (1997), 173-95

Morales, Fernando, "'Isabel' se corona en TVE batiendo su récord de audiencia", *El País*, 4 December 2012 <http://cultura.elpais.com/cultura/2012/12/04/television/1354648747_678572.html> [accessed 16 November 2015]

Moxó, Salvador de, "El auge de la nobleza urbana de Castilla y su proyección en el ámbito administrativo y rural a comienzos de la Baja Edad Media (1270-1370)", *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia*, 178:3 (1981), 407-516

Moxó, Salvador de, "El patrimonio dominical de un consejero de Alfonso XI. Los señoríos de Fernán Sánchez de Valladolid", *Revista de la Universidad Complutense*, 22 (1973), 123-162

Mudan Finn, Kavita, *The Last Plantagenet Consorts: Gender, Genre, and Historiography, 1440-1627* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012)

Nelson, Janet L., "Queens as Jezebels: The Careers of Brunhild and Balthild in Merovingian History", *Studies in Church History. Subsidia*, 1 (1978), 31-77

Nieto Soria, José Manuel, *Sancho IV de Castilla (1284-1295)* (Gijón: Trea, 2014)

North, Janice, "*El Caballero de Dios y la muy noble reina*: María de Molina's patronage of the *Libro del Caballero Zifar", Romance Quarterly*, 63:3 (2016), 107-115

North, Janice, "The Constructions of a Cultural Legacy: Queen María de Molina of Castile and the Political Discourses of Molinismo" (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Virginia, 2013)

O'Callaghan, Joseph F., *The Cortes of Castile-León, 1188-1350* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989)

Oakley-Brown, Liz, and Louise J. Wilkinson, eds, *The Rituals and Rhetoric of Queenship: Medieval to Early Modern* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009)

Orduna, Germán, *El arte narrativo y poético del canciller Ayala*, Biblioteca de filología hispánica, 18 (Madrid: CSIC, 1998)

Pallares, María Carmen, and Ermelindo Portela, *La reina Urraca* (San Sebastián: Nerea, 2006)

Pallares, María Carmen, and Ermelindo Portela, "La reina Urraca y el obispo Gelmírez. Nabot contra Jezabel", in Luís Carlos Amaral et al., eds, *Os reinos Ibéricos na Idade Média: livro de homenagem ao Professor Doutor Humberto Carlos Baquero Moreno* (Porto: Livraria Civilização, 2003), III, pp. 957-62

Pares, Bernard, "Rasputin and the Empress Alexandra", in Arthur Adams, ed., *The Russian Revolution and Bolshevik Victory: causes and processes* (Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath, 1960; repr. 1972), pp. 19-28

Parsons, John Carmi, ed., *Medieval Queenship* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1993)

Pascua Echegaray, Esther, "Urraca imaginada: representaciones de una reina medieval", *ARENAL*, 21 (2014), 121-52

Pastor Bodmer, Isabel, "Catalina de Lancaster", in Quintín Aldea Vaquero et al., eds, *Diccionario Biográfico Español*, vol. 12 (Spain: Real Academia de la Historia, 2009), pp. 758-62

Pelaz Flores, Diana, "Queenly Time in the Reign of Juan II of Castile (1406-1454)", in Elena Woodacre, ed., *Queenship in the Mediterranean: Negotiating the Role of the Queen in the Medieval and Early Modern Eras* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), pp. 169-190

Pepin, Paulette Lynn, *María de Molina, Queen and Regent: Life and Rule in Castile-León, 1259-1321* (Lanham: Lexington, 2016)

Perez, Joseph, "Defensa del honor de la Reyna Doña Urraca, indignamente mancillado por varios rumores esparcidos en su tiempo…", in Romualdo Escalona, *Historia del Real Monasterio de Sahagún* (Madrid: 1782), ed. by Carlos Estepa Diez (León: Ediciones Leonesas, 1982)

Pick, Lucy K., *Conflict and Coexistence: Archbishop Rodrigo and the Muslims and Jews of Medieval Spain* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 2004)

Pick, Lucy K., "Gender in the Early Spanish Chronicles: from John of Biclar to Pelayo of Oviedo", *La corónica*, 32:3 (2004), 227-48

Pick, Lucy K., "Rethinking Cluny in Spain", *Journal of Medieval Iberian Studies*, 5 (2013), 1-17 <doi: 10.1080/17546559.2012.758443>

Pick, Lucy K., "Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada (after 1170-10 June 1247)", in *Castilian Writers, 1200-1400*, ed. by George D. Greenia and Frank A. Domínguez, Dictionary of Literary Biography, vol. 377 (Detroit: Gale, 2008), 102-09

Porras Arboledas, Pedro Andrés, *Juan II: rey de Castilla y León (1406-1454)* Gijón: Trea, 2009)

Powell, Brian, *Epic and Chronicle: The 'Poema de mio Cid' and the 'Crónica de veinte reyes'* (London: MHRA, 1983)

Power, Eileen, *Medieval Women* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975; repr. 1997)

Puyol y Alonso, Julio, *El presunto cronista Fernán Sánchez de Valladolid* (Madrid: Reus-Real Academia de la Historia, 1920)

Ramos y Loscertales, José María, "La sucesión del Rey Alfonso VI", *Anuario de Historia del Derecho Español*, 13 (1936-41), 36-99

Reglero de la Fuente, Carlos Manuel, "El abad Domingo y la *Primera Crónica Anónima de Sahagún*: una relectura", *e-Spania*, 19 (2014) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.23894>

Reilly, Bernard F., "Bishop Lucas of Túy and the Latin Chronicle Tradition in Iberia", *Catholic Historical Review*, 93 (2007), 767-788

Reilly, Bernard F., *The Contest of Christian and Muslim Spain, 1031-1157* (Oxford: OUP, 1992)

Reilly, Bernard F., "The *De rebus Hispaniae* and the Mature Latin Chronicle in the Iberian Middle Ages", *Viator*, 43 (2012), 131-145 <doi: 10.1484/J.VIATOR.1.102708>

Reilly, Bernard F., *The Kingdom of León-Castilla under Queen Urraca, 1109-1126* (Princeton: University Press, 1982)

Reilly, Bernard F., "The Rediscovery of Count Pedro Ansúrez", in Simon Barton and Peter Linehan, eds, *Cross, Crescent and Conversion: Studies on Medieval Spain and Christendom in Memory of Richard Fletcher* (Leiden: Brill, 2014), pp. 109-26

Reilly, Bernard F., "Sources of the Fourth Book of Lucas of Tuy's *Chronicon Mundi*", *Classical Folia*, 30 (1976), 127-37

Rivera Recio, Juan Francisco, "Personajes hispanos asistentes en 1215 al IV Concilio de Letrán", *Hispania Sacra*, 4 (1951), pp. 335-355

Rochwert-Zuili, Patricia, "La actuación pacificadora de María de Molina", *e-Spania*, 20 (2015) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.24170>

Rochwert-Zuili, Patricia, "*Auxilium* et *consilium* dans la *Chronica regum Castellae*", *e-Spania*, 2 (2006) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.28>

Rochwert-Zuili, Patricia, "El mecenazgo y patronazgo de María de Molina: pruebas e indicios de unos recursos propagandísticos y didácticos", *e-Spania*, 24 (2016) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.25549>

Rochwert-Zuili, Patricia, "Muerte y memoria dinástica en la *Historia legionensis* (llamada '*silensis*')", *e-Spania*, 14 (2012) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.21795>

Rodgers, Paula K., "Alfonso X Writes to His Son: Reflections on the *Crónica de Alfonso X*", *Exemplaria Hispanica: A Journal on Alfonso X and Alfonsine Iberia*, 1 (1991-92), 58-79

Rodgers, Paula K., "José Pellicer and the Confusion over the Authorship of the *Cuatro Crónicas*", *La Corónica*, 17:1 (1988), pp. 41-51.

Rodgers, Paula Kelley, "Prolegomena to a Critical Edition of the *Crónica de Alfonso X*" (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of California, Davis, 1984)

Rodríguez López, Ana, "*De rebus Hispaniae* frente a la *Crónica latina de los reyes de Castilla*: virtudes regias y reciprocidad política en Castilla y León en la primera mitad del siglo XIII", *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*, 26 (2006), 133-149 <doi: 10.3406/cehm.2003.2016>

Rodríguez López, Ana, *La consolidación territorial de la monarquía feudal castellana: expansión y fronteras durante el reinado de Fernando III* (Madrid: CSIC, 1994)

Rodríguez López, Ana, "Modelos de legitimidad política en la *Chronica regum Castellae* de Juan de Osma", *e-Spania*, 2 (2006) <doi: 10.4000/e-spania.433>

Rodríguez López, Ana, "*Quod alienus regnet et heredes expellatur*. L'offre du trône de Castille au roi Louis VIII de France", *Le Moyen Âge*, 105 (1999), 109-128

Rodríguez López, Ana, "Sucesión regia y legitimidad política en Castilla en los siglos XII y XIII. Algunas consideraciones sobre el relato de las crónicas latinas castellano-leonesas", *Annexes des Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*, 16 (2004), 21-41

Rohr, Zita Eva, "The Practice of Political Motherhood in Late Medieval France: Yolande of Aragon, *Bonne-Mère* of France", in Sean McGlynn and Elena Woodacre, eds, *The Image and Perception of Monarchy in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014), pp. 23-47

Ros, Xon de, and Geraldine Hazbun, eds, *A Companion to Spanish Women's Studies* (Woodbridge: Tamesis, 2011, repr. 2014)

Rosenwein, Barbara H., "Y avait-il un «moi» au haut Moyen Âge?", *Revue historique*, 633:1 (2005), 31-52 <doi: 10.3917/rhis.051.0031>

Round, Nicholas, *The Greatest Man Uncrowned: A Study of the Fall of Don Álvaro de Luna*, Serie A - Monografías, 111 (London: Tamesis, 1986)

Rubio Hancock, Jaime "Si hay más mujeres que hombres, ¿podemos decir Consejo de Ministras?", *El País*, 6 June 2018 <https://verne.elpais.com/verne/2018/06/06/articulo/1528276192_614423.html> [accessed 12 June 2018]

Ruiz, Teófilo F., *Spain's Centuries of Crisis: 1300-1474*, *History of Spain* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2007, repr. 2011)

Ruiz, Teófilo F., "Unsacred Monarchy: The Kings of Castile in the Late Middle Ages", in Sean Willentz, ed., *Rites of Power: Symbolism, Ritual, and Politics since the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), pp. 109-44

Ruiz García, Elisa, *Los libros de Isabel la Católica: arqueología de un patrimonio escrito* (Madrid: Instituto de Historia del Libro y de la Lectura, 2004)

Sánchez Cantón, Francisco Javier, *Libros, tapices y cuadros que coleccionó Isabel la Católica* (Madrid: CSIC, 1950)

Sánchez de Mora, Antonio, "La nobleza castellana en la Plena Edad Media: el linaje de Lara (ss. XI-XIII)" (unpublished doctoral thesis, Universidad de Sevilla, 2003)

Saracino, Pablo Enrique, "Algunas observaciones acerca del problema de la unidad en la *Crónica de tres reyes*", *Cuadernos de historia de España*, 83 (2009), 9-24

Serrano, Luciano, "El canciller de Fernando III de Castilla", *Hispania*, 5 (1941), 3-40

Shadis, Miriam, "Berenguela of Castile's Political Motherhood: the management of sexuality, marriage, and succession", in John Carmi Parsons and Bonnie Wheeler, eds, *Medieval Mothering* (New York: Garland Press, 1996), pp. 335-58

Shadis, Miriam, *Berenguela of Castile (1180-1246) and Political Women in the High Middle Ages* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009)

Shadis, Miriam, "Piety, Politics and Power: the Patronage of Leonor of England and her daughters, Blanche of Castile and Berenguela of León", in June Hall McCash, ed., *The Cultural Patronage of Medieval Women* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1996), pp. 202-27

Silleras-Fernández, Nuria, *Chariots of Ladies: Francesc Eiximenis and the Court Culture of Medieval and Early Modern Iberia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2016)

Silleras-Fernández, Nuria, *Power, Piety, and Patronage in Late Medieval Queenship: María de Luna* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008)

Smith, Colin, "History as Myth in Medieval France and Spain", *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society*, 18 (1982), 54-68

Spiegel, Gabrielle, *The Past as Text: the Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997)

Spiegel, Gabrielle, *Romancing the Past: The Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-Century France* (Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993)

Sponsler, Lucy, *Women in the Medieval Spanish Epic and Lyric Traditions* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1975)

Stafford, Pauline, *Queen Emma & Queen Edith: Queenship and Women's Power in Eleventh-Century England* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997)

Strohm, Paul, *Hochon's Arrow: The Social Imagination of Fourteenth-Century Texts* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992)

Suárez Fernández, Luis, *Isabel, mujer y reina* (Madrid: Rialp, 1992)

Suárez Fernández, Luis, *Nobleza y monarquía: entendimiento y rivalidad: el proceso de la construcción de la corona española* (Madrid: Esfera de los Libros, 2003)

Tate, R. B., "López de Ayala, Humanist Historian?", *Hispanic Review*, 25.3 (July 1957), 157-74

Tate, R. B., "The Official Chronicler in the Fifteenth Century: A Brief Survey of Western Europe", *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 41 (1997), 157-85

Taylor, Lou, *Mourning Dress: A Costume and Social History* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1983; repr. Abingdon: Routledge, 2009)

Tomás y Valiente, Francisco, *Los validos en la monarquía española del siglo XVII (estudio institucional)* (Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos, 1963)

Traggia, Joaquín, "Ilustración del reynado de don Ramiro II de Aragón, dicho el Monge, ó memorias para escribir su vida", *Memorias de la Real Academia de la Historia*, 3 (1799), 469-562

Vale, Malcolm, *Henry V: The Conscience of a King* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016)

Valle Curieses, Rafael del, *María de Molina, el soberano ejercicio de la concordia (1260-1321)* (Madrid: Alderabán, 2000)

VanLandingham, Marta, "Royal Portraits: Representations of Queenship in the Thirteenth-Century Catalan Chronicles" in Theresa Earenfight, ed., *Queenship and Political Power in Medieval and Early Modern Spain* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), pp. 109-119

Vones, Ludwig, *Die* Historia Compostellana *und die Kirchenpolitik des nordwestspanischen Raumes 1070-1130: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Beziehungen zwischen Spanien und dem Papsttum zu Beginn des 12. Jahrhunderts* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1980)

Ward, Aengus, *History and Chronicles in Late Medieval Iberia: Representations of Wamba in Late Medieval Narrative Histories*, Later Medieval Europe, 7 (Leiden: Brill, 2011)

Ward, Aengus, "Past, present and future in the Latin and Romance historiography of the medieval Christian kingdoms of Spain", *Journal of Medieval Iberian Studies*, 1 (2009), 147-62

Ward, Aengus, "Rodrigo Ximénez de Rada: auteur et acteur en Castille à la fin du XIIIe siècle", *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*, 26 (2003), 283-294 <doi: 10.3406/cehm.2003.2024>

Weissberger, Barbara, *Isabel Rules: Constructing Queenship, Wielding Power* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003, repr. 2004)

West, Geoffrey, "The Destiny of Nations: Treatment of Legendary Material in Rodrigo de Toledo's *De rebus Hispaniae*", in Ian Macpherson and Ralph Penny, eds, *The Medieval Mind: Hispanic Studies in Honour of Alan Deyermond* (London: Tamesis, 1997), 517-533

White, Hayden, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992)

Whittow, Mark, "Motherhood and Power in Early Medieval Europe, West and East: The Strange Case of the Empress Eirene", in Conrad Leyser and Lesley Smith, eds, *Motherhood, Religion, and Society in Medieval Europe, 400-1400: Essays Presented to Henrietta Leyser* (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 55-84

Woodacre, Elena, *The Queens Regnant of Navarre: Succession, Politics, and Partnership, 1274-1512* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013)

Zimbalist Rosaldo, Michelle, "Woman, Culture, and Society: A Theoretical Overview", in Louise Lamphere and Michelle Zimbalist Rosaldo, eds, *Woman, Culture and Society* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974), pp. 17-42